

# A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDONESIAN AND MALAYSIAN YOUTHS' PATRIOTISM

Rukiyati \*, Achmad Dardiri \*\*, Abdul Razak Ahmad \*\*\* Farida Hanum \*\*\*\* Mami Hajaroh \*\*\*\*\*

\* Faculty of Educational Science, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

\*\* Faculty of Educational Science, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

\*\*\* Faculty of Education, The Nasional University of Malaysia, Malaysia

\*\*\*\* Faculty of Educational Science, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

\*\*\*\*\* Faculty of Educational Science, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

**Abstract-** This research aimed to: Firstly, identify social environment encouragement, social participation, patriotism knowledge, and patriotism behaviors of Indonesian and Malaysian youths Secondly, identify the contribution level of social environment, social participation, and patriotism knowledge to their patriotism behaviors Cluster random sampling was employed to determine respondents. A number of 1,172 respondents took part in the study, comprising 521 Indonesians and 651 Malaysians. This study employed descriptive statistics and multiple regression techniques in data analysis. Research findings show that Indonesian youths have better patriotism knowledge than their Malaysian counterparts. However, their patriotism behaviors both share the same level. Findings also show that social participation and patriotism knowledge variables are factors that significantly influence both Indonesian and Malaysian youths' patriotism behaviors. Yet, the contribution levels of the factors differ in the two countries. The countries need to take more intensive efforts based on plans and programs to increase social participation and patriotism behaviors for their youths. Further research is also necessary to identify factors that dominantly contribute to youths' patriotism, especially in Malaysia.

**Index Terms-** Social environment, social participation, patriotism knowledge, patriotism behavior, Indonesian and Malaysian youths

## I. INTRODUCTION

Discourses and studies on patriotism have been undertaken more intensively recently. This is inseparable from the social and political dynamics at the national, regional, and international levels. Patriotism is essentially a profound love of the homeland so that a citizen voluntarily sacrifices for the sake of their country and nation. A country really needs patriotism since it is the principal and fundamental capitals in ensuring the integrity of a state and nation [1] [2]. Patriotism embodies the enormous enthusiasm, passion, inspiration, and vitality to maintain, defend, protect, and develop the nation and country [3].

In some countries, patriotism internalization is carried out intensively and systematically. China, for instance, carries out patriotism internalization program called "Patriotism Education

Campaign" through education. The campaign makes use of history subject as the instrument for teaching the history of China's humiliation and greatness ages of the past. The efforts have resulted in the proper growth of the people of China's patriotism [4] [5]. In Indonesia, patriotism internalization efforts are carried out systematically through educational institutions, from kindergarten to university levels. The efforts are carried out through plans and programs in curriculum through Pancasila and Civics Education (PPKn), Social Sciences (IPS), and Indonesian History subjects (as per Minister of Education and Culture Regulation No. 21 of 2016). At university level, it is carried out through Pancasila and Civics course (Law No. of 2012). Since patriotism internalization efforts are carried out through educational institutions, teachers play a vital role in the process. They spearhead the internalization efforts on the future generations of the nation [6] [7].

A country's bitter history to seize independence from the grip of other nation's colonization has ultimately made the people aware of the importance of patriotism. Indonesia, as a country, endured the severe suffering of other nation's colonization for a very long period. It has built a nation-state due to the Dutch's discriminative colonization against the natives. Patriotism movements sprouted as of the beginning of the 20th century encouraged by the drive for nationalism among Indonesian youth organizations. They were pioneered by youth intellectuals since 1908 with the establishment of Budi Utomo and other youth organizations, such as Jong Java, Jong Celebes, Jong Islamit Bond. Political organizations also emerged, such as Indonesian Nationalist Party, despite being later banned by the Dutch government. Other than region-specific organizations, many socio-religious organizations were established, such as Serikat Islam, Muhammadiyah, Nahdatul Ulama, resulting in more intensive communication and drive for unity among the youths and activists. Years prior to Indonesia's independence, specifically on 28 October 1928, Indonesian youths declared a Youth Pledge stating One Homeland, One Nation, One Language of Indonesia. Originating from different ethnic groups and cultures, the youths felt united and were therefore aware to fight for an independent state. The zeal for patriotism grew in the hearts of the colonized people that they had the courage to fight against the colonizers to achieve independence.

On the other side, the Malaysian nation was a legacy of Malay Sultanates and British imperialism. The Britain's migration policy brought in a large number of Chinese and Indian workers who later become the residents of Malay lands. The Indians worked in rubber plantations and built Indian settlements, while the Chinese worked in tin and iron mines and built roads. The arrival of these immigrants brought in a new Malay order of society thanks to diverse ethnicities, religions, languages, and cultures. Debates of equilibrium level occurred between the natives and newcomers resulting in the idea to incorporate colonies on the island of Borneo, i.e., Sabah and Sarawak. The objective was to balance the number of natives and non-natives to reach accommodation, adaptation, and integration. It should be acknowledged that the willingness to accept and adapt among ethnic groups and cultures play a vital role in developing the new face of Malaysian nation. Each ethnic group must be willing to engage a social contract not on behalf of the ethnic group, but on behalf of the state and nation's civilization so that the passion to solidify the nation's identity would be successful. The passion for inter-ethnic and inter-culture national integration may be realized consistent with the passion to solidify national identity, starting from families, schools, to communities, and societies.

Throughout British colonization period, from 1776 to Malaysia's independence day on 31 August 1957, Britain purposely ran economic activities and settlement of Malaysian residents based on ethnicities through the *divide and rule* tactics that further widen the gaps among the ethnicities. The British colonial government gave no room for unification efforts. The impacts were clearly visible in the racist attitudes, prejudices, and polarization that resulted in polemics and social disharmony. These are essentially the root of the failure to assimilate and integrate the ethnic groups that pose a serious challenge to contemporary Malaysian state. If social acceptance is high and free of prejudice, the multi-ethnic and multicultural Malaysian people would certainly be able to live together, help each other, and have a sense of belonging to each other as the people of the same country.

The processes of social acceptance, appreciation to elements of diversity, compromise stance, and social adaptation have actually proceeded gradually and consistently since 1950s. It occurred thanks to diverse group leaders' awareness on the importance of integration post British decolonization. The early challenge for Malaysian state development was the assimilation concepts and practices that were still strange, thus necessitating a change of *mindset* to accept, appreciate, and adapt as a nation, instead of ethnicities. Razak, Harun, & Hamzah [8] claims that development of a Malaysian nation requires the willingness of each ethnic group to accept and recognize each other and reach a compromise of any existing differences.

Compared to Malaysia, Indonesia has stronger patriotism, since it comes out of the nation's own spirit to fight against colonization free from any ethnic or cultural polarization externally imposed by means of the colonizer's policies. However, patriotism spirit continues to be an important issue for Indonesia in order that the country would not disintegrate. The emergence of separatist movements, such as GAM, RMS, OPM since the New Order era, signifies that patriotism is dynamically fluctuating, especially

during the Reforms era as of 1998. The presence of religiously narrow-minded radical-fundamentalist groups has inflicted damages to the Indonesian state and posed threats to the nation's unity and integrity. Used to be recognized as a strong, peaceful, and very tolerant nation, the country has suffered a decline in its self-identity, put priority for its own groups or ethnicities only (primordialism), and showed intolerance to fellow citizens.

Therefore, the challenge the Indonesian nation faces as Azra [9] states is how to revive the national insight that covers "the four pillars", namely Pancasila, NKRI, Constitution of 1945, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, and reinforced the self-identity of the nation amidst the diversity of ethnic groups, religions, races, genders, customs, and social traditions. Moreover, the nation currently appears to undergo disorientation in many aspects of life owing to the impacts of globalization. To make matters worse, the country is home to ethnic communities who live at different levels of civilizations that further entail disparities and cultural lags. Some of the citizens still live in pre-agrarian culture, most in agrarian culture, some others in industrial culture, and a minority in digital culture.

Indonesian children living in large cities have been accustomed to living with cultures of different nations of the world, while their fellow teenagers living in a remote place live in a world separate from their city peers. The same applies to Malaysian teenagers. Is still relevant for Indonesian and Malaysian teenagers to talk about self-identity and patriotism amidst the strong drive for globalization and cosmopolitan society? It is fair to assume different stances of patriotism among the youths in the two countries. It is also fair to assume different patriotism behaviors among the youths due to their respective social environment constructs.

In view of the above, this research aimed to: 1) describe social environment, social participation, patriotism knowledge, and patriotism behaviors of Indonesian and Malaysian youths; 2) describe the contribution of social environment, social participation, patriotism knowledge to patriotism behaviors of Indonesian and Malaysian youths. The benefits of this research are for development of scientific knowledge on civics and patriotism values of Indonesian and Malaysian youths. Findings of this research are expected to serve as a reference for national policy making for educating Indonesian and Malaysian younger generations to maintain the unity of their respective nations and increase the role of the youths in developing their nation and state.

## II. METHOD

Based on the above research problems, quantitative approach was employed in this research. This type of research belongs to survey research by employing survey cross-sectional design, where data is collected simultaneously at all clusters within a certain period of time [10]. This type of research is very relevant with this research since it can collect data quickly and research findings can be generalized on the population. Survey type research is not only efficient, but its findings also provide accurate description of the population as a whole.

The population of the research was Indonesian and Malaysian youths. Cluster random sampling was employed in the research

to select research samples. Since the number of population was unknown precisely, the number of samples was determined based on Cohen technique [11]. Based on the technique, a number of 1,172 samples were selected, comprising 521 Indonesians and 651 Malaysians.

Data was collected by means of a questionnaire that was developed using Lickert scale adopted from Vagias [12]. In the questionnaire, respondents were requested to fill out 4 groups of questions, covering variables on social environment, social participation, patriotism knowledge, and patriotism behavior.

Data analysis employed two techniques, namely, descriptive statistics and multiple regressions techniques. Descriptive statistics technique was used to analyze data in order to answer research problems on the construct of social environment, social participation, patriotism knowledge, and patriotism behavior variables. Next, multiple regression technique was employed to analyze data to answer research problems on the contribution of social environment, social participation, and patriotism knowledge on patriotism behaviors. The results of the analysis on the two problems were compared for both Indonesian and Malaysian youths.

### III. FINDINGS

#### 3.1. Social Environment Encouragement, Social Participation, Patriotism Knowledge, and Patriotism Behaviors of Indonesian and Malaysian Youths

Findings of the research on social environment encouragement, social participation, patriotism knowledge, and patriotism behaviors of Indonesian and Malaysian youths are shown in the table below:

**Table 1:** Levels of social environment encouragement, social participation, patriotism knowledge, and patriotism behaviors of Indonesian youths

Variables	Very Low	Low	Moder.	High	Very High	Mean	Categ.
Social Environment	1.15%	6.90%	20.53%	35.12%	36.276%	5.170	High
Social Participation	8.06%	15.73%	25.14%	28.40%	22.64%	4.530	Mode.
Patriotism Knowledge	0%	0.57%	5.95%	36.27%	57.19%	5.870	Very High
Patriotism Behavior	0%	2.68%	16.31%	41.84%	39.15%	5.448	High

**Table 2:** Levels of social environment encouragement, social participation, patriotism knowledge, and patriotism behaviors of Malaysian youths

Variables	Very Low	Low	Moder.	High	Very High	Mean	Categ.
Social Environment	0.8%	4.2%	30.2%	61.7%	3.2%	4.737	High
Social Participation	4.4%	12.4%	29.7%	38.1%	15.5%	4.604	Mode.
Patriotism Knowledge	3.6%	13.5%	38.6%	35.5%	8.8%	4.481	Mode.
Patriotism Behavior	1.6%	6.5%	32.1%	51.9%	7.9%	4.716	High

Table 1 and Table 2 show that the four variables have different encouragements from each other. The variable with the strongest encouragement for Indonesian youths was patriotism knowledge factor at very high category, followed by patriotism behavior and

social environment at high category, while the variable with the lowest encouragement was social participation factor at moderate category. The variable with the strongest encouragement for Malaysian youths was social environment and patriotism behavior factors at high category. While social participation and patriotism knowledge factors were at the moderate category.

The data above shows that none of the four variables have encouragement at low or very low category in both Indonesia and Malaysia. The findings also show differences in the encouragement of the four variables in Indonesia and Malaysia, where Indonesia has an encouragement factor with very high category, namely patriotism knowledge. Meanwhile, Malaysia has no no encouragement factor with very high category. On the other side, Indonesia has only one factor with encouragement at moderate category, namely social participation, and 2 factors having encouragement with high category, namely social environment and behavior. Whereas Malaysia has two factors with encouragement at moderate category, namely social participation and patriotism behavior and 2 other factors having encouragement with high category, namely social environment and patriotism behavior.

#### 3.2. The Contribution of Social Environment, Social Participation, and Patriotism Knowledge to Patriotism Behaviors of Indonesian and Malaysian Youths

Levels of contribution of social environment, social participation, and patriotism knowledge on patriotism behaviors of Indonesian and Malaysian youths are shown on the results of analysis below:

**Table 3:** The contribution of social environment, social participation, and patriotism knowledge on patriotism behaviors of Indonesian youths

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standar Coef.	T	Sig.	R2	Contribution
	B	Std. Error	B				
(Constant)	9.681	4.642		2.086	.038		
Social Environment	.041	.040	.048	1.024	.306	0.029	2.9%
Social Participation	.202	.036	.274	5.680	.000	0.159	15.9%
Patriotism Knowledge	.834	.044	.587	19.097	.000	0.534	53.4%

**Table 4:** The contribution of social environment, social participation, and patriotism knowledge on patriotism behaviors of Malaysian youths

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standar Coef.	T	Sig.	R2	Contribution
	B	Std. Error	B				
(Constant)	0.279	0.031	0.211	9.044	.000	0.308	6.7%
Social Environment	0.158	0.017	0.220	9.029	.000	0.341	3.4%
Social Participation	0.297	0.023	0.307	13.036	.000	0.241	24.1%
Patriotism Knowledge	1.144	0.141		8.129	.000		

The above table shows that in Indonesia the factors that significantly influence youths' patriotism behaviors include patriotism knowledge contributing 53.4% and social participation contributing 15.9%. In sum, the contribution of the three factors totals 72.2%. Social environment factor did not have significant influence over Indonesian youths' patriotism behaviors. Factors

that significantly influence patriotism behaviors of Malaysian youths and the levels of the influence of each factor are shown in Table 4 above. The table shows that all of the three factors researched had significant influence over the youths' patriotism behaviors. The factor with biggest contribution was patriotism knowledge with a contribution level of 24.1%, followed by social environment factor with a contribution of 6.7%, and social participation with a contribution of 3.4%. In sum, the contribution level of the three factors totals 34.2%.

As such, the findings show differences in the factors that influence patriotism behaviors of Indonesian youths and that of Malaysian youths. Only two out of three factors tested influenced Indonesian youths' behaviors. Whereas, all the three factors tested influenced the patriotism behaviors of Malaysian youths. Likewise, on the level of contribution of each factor and level of contribution of all factors studied, the most dominant factor that influenced Indonesian youths' patriotism behaviors was patriotism behavior, while the other factors did not have significant contribution. As a whole, it also shows that contribution of the three factors studied was very high. To the contrary, none of the three factors studied had dominant contribution to the Malaysian youths' patriotism behavior. The level of contribution of the three factors was relatively low. As such, Malaysian youth's patriotism behavior was not dominantly influenced by certain factors like that on their Indonesian counterparts. In addition, there were other factors beyond the three factors that had more significant influence on Malaysian youths' patriotism behavior.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

Findings of social environment, social participation, patriotism knowledge, and patriotism behavior factors of Indonesian and Malaysian youths show that three out of the four factors, namely social environment, social participation, and patriotism behavior, had similar level of encouragement. Only patriotism knowledge factor encouragement was different in the two countries. Social environment factor was at a high level, social participation factor at a moderate level, and patriotism behavior factor at a high level. The patriotism knowledge of Indonesian youths was at a very high level, which was far better than their Malaysian counterparts, who were at a moderate level.

The above findings show that the quality of the social infrastructure that supports national and state life in both countries in general is almost similar. Out of four aspects studied, only patriotism knowledge showed a disparity. The patriotism knowledge of Indonesian youths was two levels higher than their Malaysian counterparts. The disparity was just normal, since the quantity of instrument used for patriotism value internalization in the two countries was different. In Malaysia, nationalism internalization was carried out only through Civics Education subject [13], while in Indonesia transformation of patriotism knowledge and values was carried out through several subjects, such as Civic Education, Social Sciences Education, History. Efforts for patriotism internalization through the instruments were carried out systematically through plans and programs from kindergarten to university levels [14]. The findings also corroborated claims by Learner [6] and findings of studies by Hanum et al. [15] Sumardi et al. [16], and Wahyudiati et al. [17]

stating that education was a very powerful instrument for transforming knowledge and values to students.

What is interesting in the findings was that despite of the level of patriotism knowledge of Malaysian youths (moderate) was two levels below that of Indonesian youths (very high), the quality of their patriotism behavior was the same (high). This shows that there were different factors that influenced youths' patriotism behaviors in both countries. It is normal to say one's patriotism knowledge level does not absolutely determine their patriotism behavior quality. In other words, very high patriotism knowledge does not automatically resulted in very high patriotism behavior, vice versa. At a minimum, we can say that patriotism knowledge level is not always linear to patriotism behavior. These findings are consistent with claims by Ghozali [18] that one's attitude and behavior are not determined by their knowledge level, but by their internalization of their values.

Based on the factors that influence patriotism behaviors of Indonesian and Malaysian youths, findings of this research show different levels of influence of the three factors studied. For Indonesian youths, the three factors studied contributed very significantly to their patriotism behavior (72.2%), where patriotism knowledge had a dominant contribution (53.4%). Whereas, all the three factors had a very small contribution to Malaysian youths' patriotism behaviors (34.2%). Notwithstanding, knowledge continued to be the factor with the most dominant contribution (24.1%) of all the factors. The above findings show that out of the three factors studied, patriotism knowledge factor had the most dominant contribution to patriotism behavior for both Indonesian and Malaysian youths. The above findings also clearly show different factors that influence patriotism behaviors of the youths in each country. Indonesian youths' patriotism behaviors were dominantly influenced by patriotism knowledge factor, while Malaysian youths' patriotism behaviors were influenced by factors other than the three factors.

The level of knowledge contribution to Indonesian youths' patriotism behavior as described above is consistent with the claims of Piaget and Kohlberg [19] that one's attitude and behavior are strongly determined by their knowledge. They assert that people will perform attitudes and acts relevant to what they know. Whereas Malaysian youths' patriotism behavior may be influenced by other factors as asserted by experts and past research findings. Experts argue that many factors influence one's patriotism behaviors. Nucci & Narvaez [20], for example, assert that mass media, religious communities, youth's culture, peer groups, organization, and family are factors that determine one's attitude and behaviors, including patriotism behaviors. Findings of previous studies also show that many factors influence one's patriotism behaviors. A study by Rispati & Sumardi [7] shows that among factors that influence one's patriotism behaviors are educational background, social media, cultural background, organizational involvement, parents' edification level, and involvement in religious groups. Malaysian youths' patriotism behavior may possibly be determined by one of the factors above and not dominantly influenced by the three factors studied.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research findings above, it can be concluded that there were no significant differences in the social environment, social participation, and patriotism behavior between Indonesian and Malaysian youths. A significant difference occurred only on patriotism knowledge aspect, where Indonesian youths had better patriotism knowledge than their Malaysian counterparts. Concerning factors that have dominant contribution to patriotism behavior of the youths' in both countries, the quality of Indonesian youths' patriotism behavior was influenced by patriotism knowledge and social participation, while the quality of Malaysian youths' patriotism behavior was influenced by factors outside of the said factors.

Based on the above conclusions, we propose the following suggestions and recommendations: 1) The Malaysian government needs to take more intensive efforts to improve youths' patriotism knowledge, 2) Both countries need take creative efforts to encourage and boost youths' social participation, 3) Both countries need to have breakthrough programs to grow youths' patriotism behavior.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was funded by Yogyakarta State University, therefore we would like to thank to Yogyakarta State University leaders.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ris pawati, L. Sumardi, and Dahlan, "The effect of the theoretical factors on students nationalism: Study in Mataram, Indonesia." *Journal of Critical Reviews*, no. 7, vol. 12, 2020, pp. 666-671.
- [2] F. Hanum, Suyata, and L. Sumardi, "A Better approach to internalising nationalism in higher education." *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, no. 13, vol. 11, 2020, pp. 182-197. [https://www.ijicc.net/images/vol\\_13/Iss\\_11/131114\\_Hanum\\_E\\_R.pdf](https://www.ijicc.net/images/vol_13/Iss_11/131114_Hanum_E_R.pdf).
- [3] D. William R. and Metthew G., "Multivariate analysis methods and application", United States of America: John Wiley & Sons. Inc., 2013, pp. 63-80.
- [4] B. Ane and L. Xing, "Conceptualizing the cultural and political facets of "Chinese nationalism" in an era of China's global rise." *International Communication of Chinese Culture*, vol. 1, no. 1-2, 2014, pp. 21-33. <https://www.infona.pl/resource/bwmeta1.element.springer-8f080bf5-5c7e-3e84-9dcd-0b4f58a0313b>.
- [5] C. Rou-Lan, "Chinese youth nationalism in a pressure cooker", USA: University California Press, 2017, pp. 3-4.
- [6] R. M. Learner, "Character development among youth, linking lives in time and place", *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2018, pp. 267-277. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0165025417711057>.
- [7] Ris pawati and L. Sumardi, "Why does Nationalism High or Low? Revealing Factors Affecting Nationalism." *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2020, pp. 671-676. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339286037\\_Why\\_Does\\_Nationalism\\_High\\_Or\\_Low\\_Revealing\\_Factors\\_Affecting\\_Nationalism](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339286037_Why_Does_Nationalism_High_Or_Low_Revealing_Factors_Affecting_Nationalism).
- [8] M. R. Abd. Razak, A. G. Harun, Z. Hamzah and A. M. Dali, "Reconciliation of Malaysia Indonesia's relations in the context of West Southeast Asian Regionalism." *Malaysian Journal of History, Politics dan Strategy*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2013, pp. 177-197. <https://ejournal.ukm.my/jebat/article/view/42033>.
- [9] A. Azra, "Constitution 1945, and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika): A Educational Approach, The Congress of Pancasila XI. Gadjah Mada University: Pancasila Study Center, 2019.
- [10] J. W. Creswell, "Research Design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches", London: SAGE Publications, 1994. 154-160.
- [11] Rukiyati and L. Sumardi, "Indonesian students' nationalism quality and it's affecting factors", *Hong Kong Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 58, 2021, 43-50. <http://hkjoss.com/index.php/journal/article/view/455>
- [12] W. M. Vagias, "Likert-type scale response achors", Clemson International Institute for Tourism & Research Development, Departement of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management. Clemson, 2006. <http://www.clemson.edu/centers-institutes/tourism/documents/sample-scales.pdf>.
- [13] M. M. Ismail, Z. Othman, N. A. Hassan, N. H. Abdullah, A. Abdullah, and U. M. S. M. Zan, "Nation-building among youths in Malaysia: The Civic Education approach." *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2019, pp. 390-409, <http://dx.doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol4iss2pp390-409>.
- [14] L. Sumardi, F. Hanum, Ris pawati, and Dahlan, "Does gender influence on nationalism? Study on pre-service teachers in the West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia", *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, vol. 8, no. 12, 2019, pp. 1315-1318. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Does-Gender-Influence-On-Nationalism-Study-On-In-Sumardi-Hanum/bebacc287f2c513d81aedaa891c7100def9cfbb4>.
- [15] F. Hanum, A. Dardiri, and L. Sumardi, "Measuring Indonesian youth's tolerance and patriotism at the beginning of the 21st century", *Hong Kong Journal Of Social Sciences*, vol. 57, 2021, pp. 16-24. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352899557\\_Measuring\\_Indonesian\\_Youth's\\_Tolerance\\_and\\_Patriotism\\_at\\_the\\_Beginning\\_of\\_the\\_21st\\_Century](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352899557_Measuring_Indonesian_Youth's_Tolerance_and_Patriotism_at_the_Beginning_of_the_21st_Century).
- [16] L. Sumardi, A. Rohman, and D. Wahyudiati, "Does the teaching and learning process in primary schools correspond to the characteristics of the 21st century learning?", *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2020, pp. 57-71. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13325a>.
- [17] D. Wahyudiati, E. Rohaeti, Irwanto, A. Wiyarsi, and L. Sumardi, "Attitudes toward Chemistry, self-efficacy, and learning experiences of pre-service Chemistry teachers: grade level and gender differences." *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2020, pp. 235-254. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13116a>.

- [18] L. Sumardi. *Anti-corruption education*, Pustaka Lombok, 2020, pp. 12-15.
- [19] R. E. Slavin, "Educational psychology: Theory and Practice", USA: Allyn & Bacon, 2000, pp117.
- [20] L. P. Nucci and D. Narvaez, *Handbook of moral and character education*", New York: Routledge, 2008. Pp. 240-245.

#### AUTHORS

**First Author** – Rukiyati, Dr, Faculty of Educational Science, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia, rukiyati@uny.ac.id.

**Second Author** – Achmad Dardiri, Prof, Faculty of Educational Science, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia, achmaddardiri@uny.ac.id.

**Third Author** – Abdul Razak Ahmad, Prof, Faculty of Education, The Nasional University of Malaysia, Malaysia, [razaq@ukm.edu.my](mailto:razaq@ukm.edu.my).

**Forth Author** - Farida Hanum, Prof, Faculty of Educational Science, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia, faridahanum@uny.ac.id.

**Fith Author** - Mami Hajaroh, Dr, Faculty of Educational Science, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia, mami\_hajaroh@yahoo.com

**Correspondence Author** – Rukiyati, Dr, Faculty of Educational Science, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia, rukiyati@uny.ac.id. +628157941370.