

Self-Construal and Demographic Variables as Predictors of Blind and Constructive Patriotism in University Students

Hülya Ercan¹

¹ Educational Faculty, Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey

Correspondence: Hülya Ercan, Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Faculty of Education, Karaman, Turkey.

Received: November 27, 2017

Accepted: December 15, 2017

Online Published: December 18, 2017

doi:10.5430/ijhe.v6n6p170

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n6p170>

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the blind and constructive patriotism tendencies of university students in light of the demographic structure and variables. The investigation is performed by using the correlational descriptive model. The purposeful sampling technique has been used and data was collected from a total of 390 university students. 225 (57.7%) of the participants were female and 165 (42.3%) were male; the age group of participants ranged from 18 to 26 years with a mean age of 20.42 (SD = 1.88). Demographic Information Form, Patriotism Attitude Scale and Relational, Individual and Collective Self Aspects Scale have been applied to the participants. The correlation, t-test, analysis of variance and regression analysis techniques were used in the analysis of the data. The obtained results reveal that, the blind patriotism scores of the participants show a significant difference according to sex. Also it was found that, the blind patriotism scores vary according to the city in which participants live. On the other hand, we conclude that there is a relationship between the blind patriotism and relational and collective aspect of the self. In addition, it has been seen that there is a significant relationship between the constructive patriotism and the relational aspect, individual and collective aspect of the self. Additionally, the collective self-aspect is a significant predictor of constructive patriotism.

Keywords: Blind patriotism, Constructive patriotism, Self-construal, Individualism, Relatedness, Collectivism

1. Introduction

Human beings are social creatures by nature. They need to others to stay alive from the moment they are born. Their ability to construct themselves as individuals and even to shape up their most fundamental developmental characteristics is dependent on the existence of others. Therefore they lead their lives as part of a group and this process gives rise to the emergence of a significant element: Patriotism.

From a very early age, individuals become aware of the group in which they find themselves in. They internalize the beliefs and values of their groups and they adapt themselves to their group's perspective on life. They learn the habits and rituals from the group members. This interaction is not only limited to the individuals in their immediate vicinity. As Bronfenbrenner (1981) argues, individuals are also influenced by the various layers of their social environment through direct or indirect means. Their self concepts, as well as who they are, how they think and how they feel, are shaped by group members. A deep and firm bond takes root over time between the group and its members, which lays the foundations of patriotism; individuals learn to love their country (Berns, 1997).

The concept of patriotism is used to express a phenomenon that has existed for a long time and forms one of the most important forms of group bonding in the modern world. Although different definitions of the concept are proposed, there is a compromise point: Positive identification of oneself with their country and harboring positive feelings towards their country (Bar-Tal, 1993; Hand, 2011; Schatz, Staub & Lavine, 1999). It seems that the concept is often used in conjunction with the concept of nation. But, since the concept of nation is a relatively modern invention, associating the concept of patriotism with nations would be inaccurate. A sense of patriotism can be detected in every ethnographic group occupying a certain area. In this respect, the sense of patriotism expresses the affection that one feels towards their group and homeland. It reflects the positive evaluations and feelings that one feels towards their group and county and contains such feelings and beliefs as affection, devotion, pride, attachment, loyalty and care (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997; Viroli, 2003).

Individuals expect their group to serve them and protect them at the very least. They hope that the group members will help and support them in their time of need. Moreover, patriotism is also significant in terms of people's sense of well-being as well; as suggested in Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1954/1970), it also helps satisfy the needs of

security, being loved and being respected. Expectations are doubtless mutual. The group also needs members in order to exist and maintain its existence. Members are essential in terms of creating, building, furthering a group and protecting it against enemies. Those who sacrifice themselves for the sake of the group are declared heroes and set an example for future generations. In a way, the group maintains its ties with its members in order to secure its existence and those ties, in turn, play a role in the construction of patriotism. Every group makes use of cultural, educational, social and political means through which they can instill their members with a sense of allegiance (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997). Thus allegiance functions at both individual and group level. However, since the ways in which such functions are fulfilled may differ from one another, one may speak of negative and positive forms of patriotism. While some forms of patriotism are highly democratic in nature, some other forms of patriotism may have the opposite character and undermine such democratic ideals (Kahne & Middaugh, 2006).

The initial studies on patriotism addressed the issue from a singular point of view and viewed it as either negative or positive patriotism. For instance, Tolstoy (1894) suggests that patriotism may have been a virtue in Antiquity. Because at that time the homeland was the highest ideal that can be reached. However, this is not the case for the current day and age. This is because patriotism requires the dominance of a particular state and nation over others rather than the recognition of equality and fraternity of all human beings. From this perspective, not only does patriotism fail to qualify as a virtue, but it represents the very opposite of what is a virtue. For this reason, such a notion is wrong and does not exist in the modern world as it is devoid of material and moral foundations. A similar view is voiced by Kateb (2006) in more recent times. He holds that patriotism is a mistake and what is surprising is that such a mistake is continually encouraged by political theoreticians, moral philosophers and theologians. That being said, Nathanson (1989) adopts a more moderate approach towards patriotism. He believes that a moderate form of patriotism can be a key to an everlasting peace and it can be regarded as a virtue for as long as it does not promote immoral acts. Binary classifications of patriotism were started to be used nearly half a century after Tolstoy's views on the subject. For instance Adorno, Frenkel-Brunsvik, Levinson and Sanford (1950) made the distinction between true and false patriotisms. For them, a false patriotism requires a blind devotion and uncritical conformity to one's nation and rejection of other nations. A true patriotism, on the other hand, is underpinned by one's affection to their country and their attachment to national values is based on a critical foundation; a patriot is one who is tolerant to the values and ways of other nations. This binary classification was followed by Somerville's (1981) binary classification where he calls the first form of patriotism as ignorant and irrational and the second as reasonable and dissident. In his view, such a distinction results from two questions: Does patriotism have to be associated with aggressive militarism and enmity towards external groups? And does patriotism require a blind and uncritical allegiance to one's country? In other words, is patriotism (1) belligerent or benevolent? (2) Does it require an uncritical loyalty or an inquisitive and constructive criticism and opposition? (Schatz, Staub & Lavine, 1999). One of the most widely accepted binary classifications has been made by Staub.

Staub (1997, 2003) treats the patriotism under two headings: blind and constructive patriotism. He believes that blind patriotism requires an uncritical loyalty. The policies and actions implemented by the group are supported by its members even if their consequences are at odds with moral values and at the expense of the rights of other groups and people. Blind patriotism may contain destructive measures not only towards other groups but also towards the members of its own group. Those who criticize the policies and actions of the group are accused of betraying the fundamental values of the group, fundamental human rights or conflicting the interests of the group. When a government or powerful groups within the society engage in destructive acts such as mass killing, genocide or war, the public has the potential to prevent further destruction from taking place. However, more often than not, the group members other than those of perpetrators and victims are nothing more than mere bystanders due to the mentality of blind patriotism.

Studies often suggest that blind patriotism is associated with the idea of nationalism which promotes a hierarchy among nations and domination of strong nations over weaker ones. The slogans such as "love it or leave it" are the motto of blind patriotism and according to this perspective criticism is perceived as a non-patriotic act. As suggested by Kahne & Middaugh (2006), a blind patriot adopts a perspective whereby they accept every policy of their country unquestioningly. They deny the value of criticism and analysis and emphasize the importance of loyalty and symbolic behaviors. This form of patriotism is inconsistent with the democratic principle. Because intolerance towards criticism implies being against free thought and interaction with others. And thus the values of sensible debate, analysis and criticism are ignored.

In constructive patriotism, on the other hand, the emphasis is laid on the general well-being and welfare of the nation and its citizens irrespective of their individual ethnic identity or social status. This form of patriotism requires equilibrium between the sense of attachment to the nation and being respectful to the human rights of all individuals.

The objective of this form of patriotism is to build a positive identity for the nation in the long run while opposing the political agents who undermine the fundamental human values when necessary. Because the policies, practices, institutions and cultures are always liable to be faulty and it is essential that citizens are willing and capable of engaging in corrective actions when conditions change. However, since governments and blind patriotic groups often regard “true” patriotism as a unquestioning loyalty, it takes courage to take action to correct the wrongdoings committed in the name of patriotism (Staub, 1997; 2003).

In this case, it can be argued that the fundamental difference between the both forms of patriotism is about the way in which the boundaries among the groups are perceived. In blind patriotism, the boundaries among the groups are emphasized to a great extent and the focus of attention is on the threats and sensitivities among the groups. In constructive patriotism, by contrast, the emphasis is on the welfare of the entire nation, and less attention is paid to the differences between nations (Staub, 2003). Moreover, while blind patriotism is intolerant of every kind of criticism towards the country, constructive patriotism questions an action in terms of its compatibility with the group’s objectives. While blind patriotism is characterized by political discrimination and ignorance, constructive patriotism aims at achieving greater social goals and higher political participation. While blind patriotism is strongly associated with a sense of being in danger in terms of national security (and especially of national culture), constructive patriotism is capable of setting national identity aside and even denying the sense of national supremacy. While social ties in blind patriotism are identified based on the genealogy and primordial terminology that is created in the course of national history, the social boundaries in constructive patriotism are created through civil procedures and commonly shared political structures (Schatz, Staub & Lavine, 1999).

It can be argued that there is a number of personal and social factors that affect the development of blind and constructive patriotisms. Staub (2003) notes that the sources of blind patriotism include the learned differentiation between in-group and out-groups at an early age; the excessive rootedness of personal identity in the group; shared culture; an overly strong authority orientation in the group; and difficult life conditions and situations of stress and threat. The development of constructive patriotism is associated with factors such as the nature of an individual’s own identity, especially as it relates to the individual’s connection to others (a connected but not embedded self), self-awareness, knowledge of one’s own group and of process that have a destructive potential, and the development of positively inclusive social values (Schatz, Staub & Lavine, 1999; Staub, 2003). In this respect, it can be argued that the various aspects of “self-construction” -being one of the most significant elements of intercultural comparisons of today- are also related to the various forms of patriotism as well.

The contemporary studies on self-construal go as far back as to Hofstede’s (1980/2001) cultural classification of individualism and collectivism. The studies conducted on the subject generally suggest that the prevalent values in one’s culture determine that person’s self-construction, which in turn determines one’s behaviors (Matsumoto, 2000; Markus & Kitayama, 1995). In this respect, a person having grown up in an individualistic culture tends to be independent and autonomous from their groups. They put personal goals ahead of those of the group and are concerned with justice. By contrast, a person having grown up in a collectivistic culture is more attached to their group and they prioritize their group’s goals over their personal goals and they are concerned with interpersonal relationships (Triandis, 1995). This binary classification of self-construal in the form of individualism and collectivism has recently come under criticism from various quarters and alternative classifications have been put forward. One of such classifications has been offered by Kağıtçıbaşı.

Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) criticizes the way in which the self is addressed from a singular perspective in the form of interdependency and interdependency and argues that the assessments can be made on two dimensions: Interpersonal distance and agency. The elements of interpersonal distance are relatedness and differentiation, while the elements of agency are autonomy and relatedness. In this respect, we are presented with four different self-construal possibilities: Autonomous-differentiated self, autonomous-relational self, related-differentiated self and related-relational self.

Theoreticians other than Kağıtçıbaşı suggest that the self should be addressed on three different aspects (Bresnahan, Chiu & Levine 2004, Bresnahan et al., 2005, Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Hardie, Kashima & Pridmore, 2005; Kashima & Hardie, 2000, Schott & Bellin, 2001; Uleman et al., 2000). The triple self-models include a third aspect that is called as relational self, familialism or personal collectivism in addition to the existing aspects of individualism and collectivism. The triple self-model introduced by this study works under the assumption that the self consists of three aspects, namely individual, relational and collective. According to the model put forward by Kashima and Hardie (2000), the individual self-aspect assumes that there are open borders between the individual and others and it perceives itself to be unique and autonomous. The relational self-aspect requires an individual to identify themselves based on their relationships with certain other people and involves the quality of such

relationships and the characteristics they share with them. The collective self-aspect, on the other hand, involves the definitions of self that are derived from memberships in the social category, and it emphasizes group loyalty, intra group norms and the roles and statuses defined within the group. While the individual self-aspect is more dominant in one person, the relational self-aspect may be accentuated in another or a combination of two or three self-aspects may be prevalent at the same time.

It is possible to speak of a significant amount of literature devoted to the study of patriotism in the West. Those studies usually focus on the subject matters such as migration, multiculturalism, national attachment, political participation, national symbols, ideological attitudes etc. (Ariely, 2011; Depuiset & Butera, 2005; Finell & Zogmaister 2015; Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Livi, Leone, Falgares & Lombardo, 2014; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). However, the studies conducted in Turkey are fairly limited in length and scope and they are usually focused on patriotic education and the relationship between patriotism and multiculturalism (Yazıcı, 2016; Yazıcı & Kabapınar, 2015; Yazıcı, Pamuk & Yıldırım, 2016; Yazıcı & Yazıcı, 2010). One is yet to come across any study conducted on the relationship between patriotism and self-construal in the literature. The purpose of this study is to examine the patriotic tendencies of the university students in the light of demographic variables and self-construction. It is believed that this study will contribute to the literature and provide guidance for future studies.

The sub goals of this study can be stated as follows:

1. Do the blind and constructive patriotism scores differ based on gender?
2. Do the blind and constructive patriotism scores differ based on the types of settlement in which the study participants grew up?
3. Do the blind and constructive patriotism scores differ based on the city in which the study participants currently live?
4. Are the blind and constructive patriotism scores relevant to the individual, relational and collective self-aspects?
5. What are the variables that predict blind patriotism?
6. What are the variables that predict constructive patriotism?

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

The present study was conducted based on correlational descriptive design; by using a quantitative approach. This model aims to present the relationships existing between two or multiple variables without interference (Cresswell, 2014).

2.2 Research Sample

The study group consists of students enrolled in various undergraduate programs at Cumhuriyet University and Ankara University. For this reason, the participants are still domiciled in the provinces of Sivas and Ankara. In the present study we have used a purposeful sampling technique. In a purposeful sampling method, the researcher attempts to collect samples from the individuals whom he/she believes to possess the required demographic characteristics of the study population (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). In this study, data was collected from a total of 411 individuals; 6 of whom had to be excluded from the study as they failed to fill out the scales properly and the data obtained from 15 individuals had to be excluded from the analysis as they represented extreme values (such as <1% and >99%). As a result, the analyses were performed based on the data obtained from 390 individuals. 225 (57.7%) of the participants were female and 165 (42.3%) were male; the age group of participants ranged from 18 to 26 years with a mean age of 20.42 (SD = 1.88). 250 students (64.1%) of the participants were from Cumhuriyet University and living in Sivas and 140 students (35.9%) were from Ankara University and living in Ankara.

2.3 Research Instruments and Procedures

A personal information form, Patriotism Attitude Scale and Relational, Individual and Collective Self Aspects Scale were used to collect data in this study. The personal information form contained questions as to the participant's age, gender, university and the type of settlement where he/she grew up.

The Patriotism Attitude Scale was developed by Schatz, Staub and Lavine (1997) and adapted into the Turkish context by Yazıcı and Yazıcı (2010). The scale consists of two sub scales, namely blind patriotism and constructive patriotism. Data collected from 490 university students during the adaptation of the scale into the Turkish context. Explanatory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted as part of the validation study. The explanatory factor analysis showed that the factor loading of blind patriotism level ranged between .331 and .645 while the factor

loading of constructive patriotism between .570 and .792. The confirmatory factor analysis confirmed the two factor model and the goodness of fit indices were calculated as RMSA= .08, RMR=.08, SRMR= .07, GFI=.90, AGFI=.87, CFI=.81. While the internal consistency coefficient for blind patriotism was established as .76, it was established as .77 for constructive patriotism and the internal consistency coefficient for the entire scale was established as .75. Having removed three items following the adaptation study, the final version of the scale consisted of 17 items. The scale in question is a 5 point Likert type scale that provides details regarding the individuals' blind and constructive patriotism levels. The reliability coefficient for this study was recalculated and the Cronbach Alpha value for the entire scale was established as .74.

The Relational, Individual and Collective Self-Aspects Scale was developed by Kashima and Hardie and adapted into the Turkish context by Ercan (2011). The scale was developed with a view to obtaining information regarding the individual, relational and collective self-aspects. Data was collected from 344 young adults during the adaptation study. A confirmatory factor analysis was performed during the validation study. The analysis results validated the three factor model and the goodness of fit indices was established as follows: $\chi^2/df= 2.66$, GFI= .85, AGFI= .82, NNFI= .90, CFI= .91, RMSA= .07, SRMR= .06. Having removed three items following the adaptation study, the final version of the scale consisted of 27 items. The scale in question is a seven point Likert type scale that is designed to provide information regarding the individual, relational and collective self-aspects. The reliability coefficient for this study was recalculated and the Cronbach Alpha value for the entire scale was established as .84.

After having been briefed as to the purpose of the study, the voluntary participants were asked to fill out the scales in the classroom. It took 15 to 20 minutes to complete the scales.

2.4 Data Analysis

The SPSS 17.00 software pack was used in the analysis of the research data. Priority was given to the distribution of the missing data and it was established that they were randomly distributed. The missing data was then completed by using the series mean method. According to the descriptive statistics analysis results, the values obtained from the Patriotism Attitude scale are as follows: arithmetic mean= 64.00 (SD= 7.23), median= 64, mode=65 minimum=45, maximum=84. While the values of skewness and kurtosis were found to be .101 and -.208 respectively, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov value was calculated as .09 ($p > .05$). Based on the findings thus far, it can be argued that the assumption of normality is accounted for (See Can, 2004).

3. Results

The first question of the study was whether the blind and constructive patriotism scores differed significantly based on gender. The analysis results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The t-test results for the blind and constructive patriotism scores based on gender

	Variables	N	M	SD	df	t	p
	Gender						
Blind patriotism	Female	225	32.09	5.55	388	2.53	.01*
	Male	165	33.69	6.89			
	Gender						
Constructive Patriotism	Female	225	31.02	3.48	388	1.48	.14
	Male	165	31.52	3.15			

* $p < .05$

As seen in Table 1, there is a statistically significant difference between the blind and constructive patriotism scores in terms of gender ($t_{388} = 2.53$, $p < .05$). The average blind patriotism scores of male students ($M=33.69$, $SD=6.89$) are higher than those of female students ($M=32.09$, $SD= 5.55$). There is, however, no statistically significant difference between the scores of constructive patriotism in terms of gender.

The second question of the study was whether the blind and constructive patriotism scores changed based on the types of settlement in which the individuals grew up. The analysis results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Variance analysis results of the blind and constructive patriotism scores based on the types of settlement in which the individuals grew up

Dimension	Variables	N	M	Sd	F	p
Blind Patriotism	Village-town	63	32.86	6.68	0.401	0.75
	County	97	32.20	5.87		
	Province	152	32.86	6.13		
	Big city	78	33.19	6.20		
Constructive Patriotism	Village-town	63	31.62	3.31	0.528	0.66
	County	97	31.15	3.67		
	Province	152	31.28	3.35		
	Big city	78	30.93	2.98		

The findings suggest that the participants' blind and constructive patriotism scores did not differ in a statistically significant way based on the types of settlement in which they grew up.

The third question of the study was whether the blind and constructive patriotism scores differed based on the city in which they lived. The analysis results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The t-test results for the blind and constructive patriotism scores based on the city in which the students live

	Variables	N	M	SD	df	t	p
Blind patriotism	Province						
	Ankara	140	31.40	5.36	388	3.30	.00**
	Sivas	250	33.50	6.50			
Constructive Patriotism	Ankara	140	30.95	3.60	388	1.24	.22
	Sivas	250	31.39	3.20			

**p <.01

As seen in Table 3, there is a statistically significant difference between the blind and constructive patriotism scores based on the city in which the students live ($t_{388} = 3.30, p < .01$). The average blind patriotism scores of those living in Sivas ($M = 33.50, SD = 6.50$) are higher than those living in Ankara ($M = 31.40, SD = 5.36$). There is, however, no statistically significant difference between the constructive patriotism scores based on the city in which the students live.

The fourth question of the study was whether there were relationships between the blind and constructive patriotism scores and the individual, relational and collective self-aspects. The analysis results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. The relationship between blind and constructive patriotism and the self-aspects

	Individualism	Relatedness	Collectivism
Blind patriotism	.08	.18**	.23**
Constructive Patriotism	.13*	.18**	.26**

* p<.05, ** p<.01

The analysis results suggest that there is a low level of statistically significant relationship between blind and constructive patriotism and the individual, relational and collective self-aspects. There is a low, positive and significant ($r = .18, r = .23$) relationship between blind patriotism and the relational and collective self-aspects. Similarly, there is a low, positive and significant ($r = .13, r = .18, r = .26$) relationship between constructive patriotism and the individual, relational and collective self-aspects.

The fifth question of the study was whether the self-aspects and the demographic variables were the predictors of blind patriotism. In order to answer the study question, a multiple linear regression analysis was performed by entering the three self-aspects (individualism, relatedness and collectivism) and the variables of being male and living in Sivas into the analysis as predictor variables. The analysis results suggest that the individual and relational

self-aspects are not the predictors of blind patriotism (individualism $t = .41$, $p > .05$; relatedness $t = 1.03$, $p > .05$), but the collective self-aspect and the variables of being male and living Sivas constitute the significant predictors of blind patriotism. Following this result, the regression analysis was repeated by entering the collective self-aspect and the variables of being male and living in Sivas as predictor variables. The analysis results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Results for regression analysis for the prediction blind patriotism levels by the collective self-aspect and demographic variables

Model	B	Std. Error _B	β	t	p	Zero-order r	Partial r
Constant	23.59	1.87		12.59	.00		
Collectivism	.15	.04	.20	4.08	.00	.22	.20
Gender (Male)	1.50	.61	.12	2.44	.01	.13	.12
City (Sivas)	1.40	.65	.11	2.15	.03	.17	.11

R = .28, $R^2 = .08$
 $F_{(3-386)} = 11.09$ $p = .00$

The analysis results suggest that there is a statistically significant relationship between the blind patriotism scores and the collective self-aspect, being male and living in Sivas ($R = .28$, $R^2 = .08$, $p < .01$). Taken together, these three variables account for 8% of blind patriotism ($F_{(1-388)} = 11.09$, $p < .01$). According to the standardized regression coefficient values, the order of relative importance of predictor variables is as follows: collectivism ($\beta = .20$, $p < .01$), being male ($\beta = .12$, $p < .05$) and living in Sivas ($\beta = .11$, $p < .05$).

The sixth question of the study was whether the self-aspects and the demographic variables were the predictors of constructive patriotism. In order to answer the study question, a multiple linear regression analysis was performed by entering the three self-aspects (individualism, relatedness and collectivism) into the analysis as predictor variables. The analysis results suggest that the individual and relational self-aspects are not the predictors of blind patriotism (individualism $t = .41$, $p > .05$; relatedness $t = 1.03$, $p > .05$), but only the collective self-aspect constitutes a significant predictor of blind patriotism. Regression analysis for the prediction of constructive patriotism by the collective self-aspect was repeated by entering the variables. The analysis results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Results for regression analysis for the prediction constructive patriotism levels by the collective self-aspect

Model	B	Std. Error _B	β	t	p	Zero-order r	Partial r
Constant	26.07	1.01		25.89	.00		
Collectivism	.10	.02	.26	5.20	.00	.26	.26

R = .26, $R^2 = .07$
 $F_{(1-388)} = 27.06$ $p = .00$

The analysis results suggest that there is a statistically significant relationship between the participants' collective self-aspect and constructive patriotism scores. The participants' collective self-aspect accounts for 7% of constructive patriotism ($F_{(1-388)} = 26.07$, $\beta = .26$, $p < .01$).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The present study has analyzed the patriotic tendencies of university students based on the distinction between blind and constructive patriotisms. The blind and constructive patriotism scores of the study participants were compared in accordance with their gender, the types of settlement they grew up in and the city in which they lived; and the relationships between the blind and constructive patriotism scores and the individual, relational and collective self-aspects were observed.

An unrelated samples t-test was performed in order to address the first question of the study, and the blind and constructive patriotism scores were compared as per gender. The analysis results showed that the blind patriotism scores differed based on gender. The blind patriotism scores of male students were higher than those of female students. However, no statistically significant difference was observed among the constructive patriotism scores. While the finding on constructive patriotism was supported by the findings of other studies, the finding on blind patriotism was not supported by the findings of other studies (Baş, 2016; Ercan, 2015; Tonga & Aksoy, 2014; Yazıcı, 2009). The reason for this difference may have to do with the participants' characteristics. On the other hand, it is possible to explain the blind patriotism scores being higher in men than in women with the individuals' upbringing.

Male children are brought up in a more protective manner and they are also prepared for the future military service and thus given the responsibility of “protecting the motherland against the enemies”. This may have played a role in the fact that the blind patriotism scores of male participants were higher than those of female participants.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to address the second study question and the blind and constructive patriotism scores were compared based on the types of settlement in which the participants grew up. The analysis results suggested that the blind and constructive patriotism levels did not differ based on the type of settlement where the individuals grew up, be it a village-town, county, province or a major city. In this respect, the fact that individuals have grown up in a small town or in a major city does not appear to be relevant to their blind or constructive patriotism levels.

An unrelated samples t-test was performed in order to address the third question of the study, and the blind and constructive patriotism scores were compared based on the city in which the participants lived. The analysis results showed that the blind patriotism scores differed in this particular category: The blind patriotism scores of those living in Sivas are higher than those living in Ankara. However, no statistically significant difference was observed among the constructive patriotism scores. The fact that the blind patriotism scores being higher among those living in Sivas can first be explained by the differences between the student profiles in both cities. Sivas is a typical Anatolian city where the majority of the university students come from the neighboring provinces. The common characteristic of these provinces is that they are relatively more conservative than the rest of the country. However, Ankara is the capital city of the nation and the students come from all over the country. In this respect, it is likely that some of the students studying in Ankara come from more liberal and progressive provinces. Secondly, Ankara is a more cosmopolitan city in comparison to Sivas. This cosmopolitan nature may be influential in being more broad-minded and tolerant towards differences. This may, in turn, explain the lower blind patriotism scores.

A correlation analysis was performed to address the fourth study question, the relationship between the blind and constructive scores and the individual, relational and collective self-aspects was observed. The analysis results suggested that there were statistically significant relationships between blind patriotism and the relational and collective self-aspects and between constructive patriotism and the individual, relational and collective self-aspects. It can be argued that these findings are consistent with the theoretical literature in the fields of both patriotism and self-construction. Blind patriotism places an emphasis on the unquestioning loyalty to one's group. Of the self-aspects, individualism emphasizes autonomy and personal boundaries; relatedness emphasizes the relationships with certain individuals; and collectivism emphasizes the attachment to the bigger group and compliance with the norms set by the group. In this respect, as opposed to the individual self-aspect, the relational and collective self-aspects are expected to be more in favor of emphasizing an uncritical attachment to the motherland. Constructive patriotism, on the other hand, is found to be relevant to the individual self-aspect in addition to the relational and collective self-aspects. The fact that individualism involves autonomy and the ability to draw lines between oneself and others may also bring about the ability to view others and their rights in a more objective fashion. In this respect, the fact that the individual self-aspect is associated with constructive patriotism rather than blind patriotism, where one is more tolerant and respectful to the rights of other groups and capable of criticizing the values of his/her own group, is also supported by the theoretical literature.

A linear regression analysis was performed to address the fifth and sixth questions of the study with a view to identifying the predictor variables of blind and constructive patriotisms. As a result of the analysis, it was established that the collective self-aspect, being male and studying in Sivas were the significant predictors of blind patriotism. The collective self-aspect was also established as the sole predictor of constructive patriotism. The fact that being male has been established as a predictor of blind patriotism may have as much to do with the characteristics of the study group as it does with the way boys are brought up. Living in Sivas being a predictor may also be explained with the city's student profile and/or the fact that it is a conservative city compared to Ankara. On the other hand, the fact that the collective self-aspect plays a role in the development of both forms of patriotism appears to support the theoretical literature on patriotism and the suggestion that the concept of self can be assessed in a three-way classification. Patriotism emphasizes the positive feelings towards one's nation and motherland. Therefore, the predictability of collectivism as a self-aspect placing emphasis on the relationships with one's group can be viewed as an expected outcome that supports the theoretical literature. Again, it can be argued that this finding may also contribute to the recent discussions on self-construction. As mentioned earlier in this study, the initial studies on self-construction generally relied on a binary classification in which individuals and/or societies were classified as either individualistic or collectivistic. However, while such a classification may be applicable on various levels from a dialectical point of view, the relational self-aspect emphasizing the relationships with the immediate vicinity (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996) may also be taken as a separate aspect from that of collectivism, which emphasizes the

relationships with the group at large. The finding of this study, which suggests that “the collective self-aspect, not the relational self-aspect, is the predictor of both blind and constructive patriotism”, appears to support this view.

Finally, it should be noted that there are certain limitations to this study. Since the study has been conducted based on the convenience sampling method, one should be cautious while making generalization. It should also be noted that there is always room for error as the findings have been established based on personal statements.

It may be recommended that future studies on the subject pay a more particular attention to intercultural comparisons. Moreover, addressing the concept of patriotism through more different variables may also contribute to the further study of the phenomenon. In addition, the practices intended for promoting constructive patriotism may also be encouraged particularly in various stages of the education system.

References

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunsvik, E., Levinson, D. J. & Sanford, R. T. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Ariely, G. (2011). Globalization, immigration and national identity: How the level of globalization affects the relations between nationalism, constructive patriotism and attitudes toward immigrants? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 15, 539–557. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430211430518>
- Bar-Tal, D. & Staub, E. (1997). Introduction: patriotism, its scope and meaning. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: in the lives of individuals and nations* (pp. 1-21). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Baş, M. (2016). The evaluation of the university students patriotism levels according to gender, age, family structure and sports activities. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 2(2), 34-43.
- Berns, W. (1997). On patriotism. *Public Interest*, 127, 19-32.
- Bresnahan, M.H., Chiu, H.C. & Levine, T.R. (2004). Self-construal as a predictor of communal and exchange orientation in Taiwan and the USA. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 187-203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839x.2004.00144.x>
- Bresnahan, M.J., Levine, T.R., Shearman, S.M., Lee, S.Y., Park, C., & Kiyomiya, T. (2005). A multimethod multitrait validity assessment of self-construal in Japan, Korea, and The United States. *Human Communication Research*, 31, 33-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2005.tb00864.x>
- Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. L. (1996). Who is this "we"? levels of collective identity and self representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 83-93. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.1.83>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Can, A. (2014). *SPSS ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi [Quantitative data analysis by SPSS in the scientific research process]*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Cresswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Depuiset, M.A. & Butera, F. (2005). On the relevance of studying patriotism and normative conflict in changing attitudes towards immigrants. *Psicolog ú Pol fica*, 30, 71-84.
- Ercan, R. (2015). Yetişkinlerde yurtseverlik tutumlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [An investigation into attitudes of patriotism in adults with respect to demographic variables]. *Turkish Studies*, 10, 409-426. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/490647>
- Finell, E. & Zogmaister, C. (2015). Blind and constructive patriotism, national symbols and outgroup attitudes. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 56, 189–197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12193>
- Hand, M. (2011). Should we promote patriotism in schools? *Political Studies*, 59, 328–347. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2010.00855.x>
- Hardie, E.A., Kashima, E.S. & Pridmore, P. (2005). The Influence of Relational, Individual and Collective Self-Aspects on Stress, Uplifts and Health. *Self and Identity*, 4, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13576500444000146>
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences*. Second Edition. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.
- Huddy, L. & Khatib, N. (2007). American patriotism, national identity, and political involvement. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51, 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00237.x>

- Johnson, B. & Cristensen, L. (2014). *Educational research: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed approaches*. California: Sage Publications.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996). Özerk-İlişkisel Benlik: Yeni Bir Sentez [Autonomous-relational self: a new synthesis]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 11(37), 36-43.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36, 403-422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022105275959>
- Kahne, J. & Middaugh, E. (2006) Is patriotism good for democracy? A study of high school senior's patriotic commitments. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87, 600-607. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170608700815>
- Kashima, E. & Hardie, E.H. (2000). The development and validation of the relational, individual and collective self aspects (RIC) scale. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 19-48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-839X.00053>
- Kateb, G. (2006). *Patriotism and other mistake*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Livi, S., Leone, L., Falgares, G. & Lombardo, F. (2014). Values, ideological attitudes and patriotism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 64, 141-146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.040>
- Markus, H.R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: implications for cognition emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>
- Maslow, A. H. (1954/1970). *Motivation and Personality*. Harper & Row Publishers.
- Matsumoto D. (1994). *People psychology from cultural perspective*. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Nathanson, S. (1989). In defense on "moderate patriotism". *Ethics*, 99, 535-552. <https://doi.org/10.1086/293096>
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E. & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology*, 20, 151-174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00140>
- Schott, G.R. & Bellin, W. (2001). The relational self-concept scale: a context- specific self- report measure for adolescents. *Adolescence*, 36(141), 85-103.
- Somerville, J. (1981). Patriotism and war. *Ethics*, 91, 568-578. <https://doi.org/10.1086/292271>
- Spry, C. & Hornsey, M. (2007). The influence of blind and constructive patriotism on attitudes toward multiculturalism and immigration. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 59, 151-158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530701449489>
- Staub, E. (1997). Blind versus constructive patriotism: moving from embeddedness in the group to critical loyalty and action. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and nations* (pp. 213-228). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Staub, E. (2003). *The psychology of good and evil: why children, adults, and groups help and harm others*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615795>
- Tolstoy, L. (1894). *On patriotism*. http://www.nonresistance.org/docs_pdf/Tolstoy/On_Patriotism.pdf
- Tonga, D. & Aksoy, B. (2014). Evaluation of the patriotic attitudes of the prospective teachers according to various variables. *International Journal of Academic Research Part B*, 6(1), 172-178. <https://doi.org/10.7813/2075-4124.2014/6-2/B.24>
- Triandis, H.C. (1995). *Individualism-Collectivism*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Uleman, J.S., Rhee, E., Bardoliwalla, N., Semin, G. & Toyoma, M. (2000). The relational self: closeness to in groups depends on who they are, culture, and the type of closeness. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-839X.00052>
- Viroli, M. (2003). *For love of country*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yazıcı, F. (2009). Yurtseverlik eğitimi: sosyal bilgiler ve tarih öğretmenlerinin tutum ve algılarına yönelik bir araştırma (Tokat ili örneği) [Patriotic education: a research on attitudes and perceptions of social studies and history teachers (Tokat province example)]. (Unpublished master thesis), Gaziosmanpaşa University, Tokat.
- Yazıcı, F. (2016). Tarih öğretmen adaylarının çokkültürlülük ve yurtseverlik tutumları [The relationship between attitudes of pre-service history teachers toward multiculturalism and patriotism]. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 1, 947-947. <https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.9510>
- Yazıcı, S. & Yazıcı, F. (2010). Yurtseverlik tutum ölçeğinin geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [A study of the validity and reliability of the patriotism attitude scale]. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 7, 901-918.