



Demographic Factors as Disparities in Sabah Values of Patriotism

Mohd Rahimi Ramli^{1*}, Mazli Mamat², Asilatul Hanaa Abdullah³, Faezah Kassim³, Muhammad Shamshinor Abdul Azzis³, Fatimi Hanafi³

¹Pusat Sains Kemanusiaan,
Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Gambang, Kuantan, 26300, MALAYSIA

²Jabatan Pengajian Kenegaran, Fakulti Ekologi Manusia,
Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang, 43400, MALAYSIA

³Pusat Pengayaan Akademik dan Latihan *Intern* (CITrA),
Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, 50603, MALAYSIA

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30880/jts.2023.15.01.004>

Received 12 May 2022; Accepted 18 June 2023; Available online 27 June 2023

Abstract: The main challenges of nation -building is to manage and organize the social differences of society, is by sharing the same values of patriotism. The value of patriotism that can be shared without differentiating between ethnic and religious identities will make it easier to cultivate and maintain harmonious relations in a society that is complex. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to examine the practice of the Kadazan-Dusun, Bajau and Murut communities on the value of patriotism as their identity as Malaysian citizens. The values of patriotism in this study are based on six values, namely loyalty, sacrifice, pride, sense of belonging, discipline, striving and productivity. The domain of practicing the value of patriotism is based on five frequency scales. The finding scores of this section are divided into three levels, namely high, moderate and low. The study involves 500 respondents consisting of Kadazan-Dusun, Bajau and Murut ethnic groups. This study is based on a quantitative research approach and uses the Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) sampling method. Study data were obtained through survey method with the distribution of questionnaires to respondents from selected districts in Sabah. The findings of this study were analyzed descriptively and inferentially. The results of the study found that the respondents' practice of patriotism values is high and there is a significant difference between ethnic and religious factors on the practice of patriotism values. It can be concluded that the society in Sabah is a patriotic society, but ethnic and religious factors also determine the differences in patriotic practices between the Kadazan-Dusun, Bajau and Murut ethnic groups.

Keywords: Patriotism, practice, nation-state, Kadazan-Dusun, Bajau, Murut, Sabah

1. Introduction

Patriotism is one of the catalysts in the effort to build a Malaysian nation state. This is because the country's efforts to address challenges in economic, political and social aspects needs a patriotic nation state. This form of manifestation of patriotism should not be blind patriotism but centered on the correct and rational awareness and understanding. The patriotism agenda should be a national priority (Zaheruddin Othman & Zawiyah, 2016). According to Abdul Rahman (2001) an important component in the nation building agenda is patriotism. Without a patriotic society, nation-building

efforts become difficult, and this aspiration takes longer to achieve (Mustapha Ishak, 2005). Meanwhile, there are several issues in Sabah that involves the behavior of some communities trying to bring 'Sabah out of Malaysia' Nizam (2016) and Agus (2002) which is contrary to patriotic characteristics because one of the patriotic values is the value of loyalty. This is because Huntington (2008), stressed that a patriot should be loyal not only to a region but loyal to the entire political system of the country. Loyalty to the country needs to be proven by empirical studies because the attempt to take Sabah out of Malaysia does not reflect loyalty to the Malaysian political system. In addition, the factor of statehood sentiment was also raised as an initial reason leading to the idea of separation (Nidzam et al., 2017). Furthermore, Mohamed Mustafa (2014) explained that the spirit of Kadazanism that thickens in the Kadazan Dusun community will hinder the nurturing of values and acceptance of Malaysian political objects. The study of Wan Shawaluddin Wan Hassan and Ramli Dollah (2013) raises the issue of family matters also plays an important role because there are a few Sabahans who prioritize the family ties thus provides space to cooperate with enemies that threaten national security. This situation can undermine the value of patriotism in society (Huntington, 2008).

In line with the situation, this study examines the value of patriotism among the people of Sabah. The value of patriotism is measured based on the practice of the selected patriotism values. The concept of patriotism in this study refers to feelings of national love (Druckman, 1994; Hand, 2011; Huntington, 2008; Muller, 2006 & 2007; Primoratz & Pavkovic, 2007). The characteristics of love for the country are based on six values, namely pride, loyalty, sacrifice, belonging, discipline as well as striving and productivity (Berns, 1997; Druckman, 1994; Nazri Muslim & Jamsari Alias, 2004; Tuan Pah Rokiah et al., 2016). For each of these values it is matched with the political object or national identity of Malaysia. In addition, each feature of patriotism in the Malaysian context takes into account the spirit of the Constitution and the Ideology of *Rukun Negara* (Sivamurugan Pandian & Ronald Kiandee, 2016). Therefore, actions that are contrary to the Constitution and the *Rukun Negara* Ideology are not considered patriotic features. However, for a patriot who adheres to the values of extreme patriotism will erode the value of humanity because it gives too much priority to the demands of the country. The value of patriotism should be based on the system of a government of a particular country and differ between countries (Primoratz & Pavkovic, 2007)

To better understand, a discussion related to political orientation was initiated before a discussion of practices as a manifestation of behavior was done. An early discussion of orientation was initiated by Max Weber and developed by Parsons in Action Theory (Parsons & Shils, 1951). Next is the discussion of orientation as a pattern to political action was developed by Easton (1957) through the idea of political system, Almond (1956) through the discussion of political culture, Pye (1965) and Pye and Pye (1985) as researchers of Asian culture as well as discussion by Welch (2013). In this case, political orientation is defined as the direction or foundation of an individual's behavior. This orientation is important because each individual who is socialized will further develop his orientation dimension. Meanwhile, Almond and Verba (1989) explained that a person's behavior pattern is through orientation dimensions which are divided into three namely cognitive, affective and evaluation. Therefore, the value of patriotism in this study is measured through practice as a form of behavioral manifestation of patriotic values.

2. Literature Review

The concept of patriotism is not new because for Primoratz and Pavkovic (2007), this concept is an idea in the political field that dates back to Ancient Rome. However, in the 19th century, patriotism began to be discussed widely, including the idea of nation-state. In general, the concept of patriotism is referred to as feelings of love for the homeland (Nathanson, 1989, 1993; Primoratz. & Aleksandar Pavkovic, 2007; Simon Keller, 2007; Berns, 1997; Wang & Jia, 2015). Based on that definition, patriotism is associated with feelings and behaviors. The bond of feeling is translated through feelings of pride and love as well as a willingness to sacrifice for the country (Curti, 1946; Berns, 1997). Yet the feeling of pride is not enough if without considering the aspect of loyalty to the country as a bond of feelings (Doob, 1964). Meanwhile, Daniel Druckman (1994), stated that loyalty to the country should be translated into actions that show loyalty and positive feelings among citizens. Patriotism is not limited to relations with the country but also involves relations between compatriots. Therefore, patriotism does not refer to heroic figures only but involves figures who play an important role in society. Patriotism is also not limited to joining a uniformed body, but other aspects of practice based on patriotism values such as pride, loyalty and discipline (Mohd Taib Osman, 2004). According to Mangena (2010) in his analysis of patriotism presented by Aristotle in his book 'The Politics', the concept of patriotism is divided into two, namely malicious and well -intentioned patriotism. Malicious patriotism is labeled evil when it is outside the parameters of moral judgment. The concept of patriotism cannot be separated from citizenship as a prerequisite of a patriot. Haminah's study (1999), found that some students understand certain elements of patriotism, except the aspect of national emblem, sensitivity problems and issues of race and country, goodwill, as well as defending and upholding the national constitution. Meanwhile, Chua (2007) studied the development process and application of patriotism elements in KBSM form two History subjects. The results of the study found that the level of development of patriotism in History subject is low. In addition, the study of Hasnah Hussiin et al., (2009) also revealed that the current generation is thoughtless and forgets the difficulties of previous generations because they do not appreciate the meaning of independence and do not understand the spirit of patriotism that is love of nation and

country because they do not experience difficulties in the struggle for independence (Ahmad Shah Pakeer Mohamed, 2013).

Mohmad Noor Mohamad (2006) identified the effect of teaching patriotic value in history learning for the application of patriotism. Three aspects of patriotism, namely pride, loyalty and respect for national symbols are used as indicators of patriotism. The findings of the study indicate that there are significant differences in the achievement of patriotism based on treatment group and gender. Haminah Suhaibo's (2007) studies found that respondents understood some elements of patriotism, except for aspects of the national emblem, they were sensitive to the problems and issues of race and country, goodwill, and defended and upheld the national constitution. Meanwhile, Ku Hasnita's (2007) study on non -Malay students in Higher Education Institutions showed that the level of patriotism among non -Malay students was moderate. Ramlah@Ayu (2007) in a study of the application of elements of patriotism through teaching and learning among polytechnic lecturers found that there is a need, ability and willingness to apply the elements of patriotism through the teaching and learning process. While the study of Jaiz et al. (2016) found that the level of practice of applying patriotism values of secondary school History teachers is at a moderate level even though their level of knowledge is at a high level. This situation shows that they are still at a good level regarding the practice of their patriotism values. However, with a simple level this is not a level to be proud of. Similarly, the study of Abd Sukor (2003) who found that teachers have an understanding of the efforts to foster patriotism in the classroom, but teachers are less successful in linking between the requirements of the curriculum to foster the spirit of patriotism in the teaching and learning process.

Wan Hasni et al. (2013) also studied the practice of patriotism that exists among Pre -School students. The results of the study found that pre -school students lack knowledge about the history of the homeland, of other ethnic cultures and do not have the expected spirit of unity. While the study of Idris Md. Noor et al., (2013), on the impact of patriotism values on former PLKN students showed that all mean scores were at a high level. While the study of Aziz Ujang et al., (2014) found that the level of awareness of the younger generation on aspects of patriotism is low, which is 66.5 percent. Ahmad Zaharuddin Sani et al., (2014) in his study also found that the younger generation has low patriotic spirit. Their patriotic consciousness diminished over time because they did not go through hardships in the struggle. Meanwhile, Sarjit S. Gill et al., (2014) in their study on urban youth in the Peninsula found that the level of awareness of respondents is 78.0 percent is at a high level and the level of understanding of respondents is 93.2 percent is at a high level. Meanwhile, the study of Hamini et al., (2016) who examined the level of youth patriotism in Malaysia, showed that overall found that the mean value is at a high level among Malaysian students who are studying in the United Kingdom (UK). It was found that respondents love Malaysia as a country, but lack pride.

In a study on patriotism abroad by Kosterman and Feshbach (1989), showed the existence of differences between the dimensions of attitude. The findings of the study show that a person's behavior is influenced by their understanding and perception. Minoru (2002), meanwhile, studies of Japanese society attitude. The analytical factors involved in his study were responsibility for national heritage, love of homeland, belief in racial superiority and priority on international cooperation and unity. The results of the study found that Japanese society is different and unique compared to America in terms of patriotism and nationalism because, patriotism is not solely based on the national anthem and flag which is typical of patriotism in America. While for the new generation or second-generation Hong Konger differs their patriotism because Ho Ying Pong (2020) explained that the identity of young generation who have never experienced life in China and only know the country from books and their parents find it difficult to identify themselves with China. This situation made it easier for them to identify themselves as Hong Konger alone and made the basis of Chinese racial similarity that bound their patriotic values. This was also explained earlier by Siu-Keung Cheung (2017) regarding the state of Hong Kong society in the 20 years after the surrender of Hong Kong to China, the society finds it difficult to identify themselves and to be patriotic to China yet they have already identified themselves as patriotic to Hong Kong and the Chinese race as a common identity.

Pesti and Kirchler (2003) define the concept of national identity as nationalism and patriotism which have different effects on European identity. By comparing the level of patriotism towards Austria and Europe, it was found that the majority of respondents were more patriotic towards Austria. However, the majority of respondents are not confident and believe in the future of Austria compared to Europe. Moreover, through the comparison of old and young, the elderly is more patriotic towards the Austrian state. Ariely's (2016) study that examined national pride across 93 countries led to four principles of patriotism. First, expressions of pride in the country as patriotic across a large portion of the world's population. Second, people in developed countries are more open or less proud of their country. Third, patriotic sentiments are higher in countries experiencing income inequality and religious homogeneity. Fourth, citizens who experience intense conflict or who are vulnerable to terrorist threats and external conflict threats are more likely to be patriotic. Based on the findings of Ariely's (2016) study, patriotism is seasonal and according to circumstances. In addition, several other factors that have been identified also contribute to the current phenomenon, namely age, education, income and religion.

Smith and Kim's (2006) study found that the level of pride in country varies around the world according to socio-demographic groups. Men were found to be prouder of the country than women. The minority is less proud of the country than the majority. Meanwhile, patriotism also gives aspiration to the obedience and willingness of citizens to sacrifice (Macedo, 2011). The study of Yang et al., (2010), adopted the measurement level of volunteerism as one of

the benchmarks levels of patriotism with regards to community participation in the Beijing Olympics. It was found that someone with a spirit of patriotism would be more likely to participate in volunteer activities. Parker (2009), meanwhile, parses patriotism as translated into symbolic patriotism and blind patriotism. Patriotism is proven to affect political behavior. Even patriotism can further increase responsibility or voluntary action in response to feelings of love for the country. Moreover, Munoz (2009) who defined patriotism in Spain found that religion and ideology had lessened the level of pride towards the country and had eroded their sense of pride towards the country.

While, Peter Hays Gries et al. (2011), have made a comparison of patriotism and nationalism between the United States and China. The study found that the comparison of patriotism and nationalism between the two countries differed due to factors of national identity, history and foreign policy practices. In addition, the preference for the presumption of dignity for a country also distinguish patriotism and nationalism. Wagner et al., (2012) examined the causal relationship of adult Germans. This study found that nationalism can lead to increased prejudice against members of outside groups. This contrasts with patriotism which does not cause prejudice or negative perceptions to outside groups to increase. Hoyt and Goldin (2015) in their study on the relationship between majority and minority groups of Americans focus on the tension between support for ‘Americans’ versus support for ‘ethnic American minorities’. The results of the study indicate the role of strong political ideology and patriotism in influencing the personality of the American national majority group as well as relative to certain American ethnic groups. Meanwhile in Ukraine, the younger generation of Ukrainians impressed by the ‘Era of Hybrid War’, tied their patriotism with Ukraine based on their homeland. The spirit of belonging between them takes precedence over other differences (Mateusz Kamionka, 2020).

Based on previous studies, it is found that patriotism is important to a country to ensure the stability and unity of society. Every citizen should be bound by the values of patriotism towards the political system and not bound only by physical objects or territory and statehood alone. In fact, patriotism is important for a country to maintain national sovereignty and differentiate the identity of the people from other countries. In the context of Malaysia, nation building is very necessary because patriotism is a value that binds society to the system and responsibility to fellow countrymen.

3. Methodology

In this study, a quantitative approach based on survey research was used by collecting data employing questionnaires. This study uses ‘Probability Proportional to Size’ (PPS) as a sampling technique. While the sample of this study consists of 500 respondents selected from selected districts in the state of Sabah. Three ethnicities were pre-determined in this study, namely Kadazan-Dusun, Bajau and Murut. This patriotism research instrument is based on six values of patriotism namely loyalty, sacrifice, pride, sense of belonging, discipline, striving and productivity measured through practice as a manifestation of behavior. This domain of practice is based on five frequency scales. The findings score of these two sections are divided into three levels, namely high, medium and low. Each value used will be tailored to the political object of Malaysian identity and refer to past studies as well as the views of relevant scholars.

4. Findings and Discussions

4.1 Respondent Background

Table 1 - Overall demographic distribution of patriotism study respondents in Sabah

Items	(n)	Percentage (%)
Age		
< 25	154	30.8
26 – 35	181	36.2
36 – 45	94	18.8
46 – 55	58	11.6
56 – 65	13	2.6
Gender		
Male	202	40.4
Female	298	59.6
Ethnicities		
Kadazan Dusun	209	41.8
Bajau	196	39.2
Murut	95	19.0

Based on Table 1, the age distribution is divided into five categories, i.e., 30.8 percent are under 25 years old, 36.2 percent of respondents are between 26 to 35 years old while respondents aged between 36 to 45 years old contributed 18.8 percent. Respondents ranging from 46 to 55 years and 56 to 65 years comprised 11.6 per cent and 2.6 per cent respectively. In addition, based on the distribution of gender, majority respondents consisted of female respondents

which is 59.6 percent and followed by 40.4 percent male respondents. The distribution in terms of ethnicity, generally shows that numerous respondents are Kadazan-Dusun which accounted for 41.8 percent of respondents. Meanwhile, the Bajau ethnic group is the second largest ethnic group at 39.2 percent as the study sample. In the meantime, respondents from the Murut ethnic group contributed 19.0 percent to the study sample.

4.2 Practicing Levels of Patriotism Values

Table 2 - Practicing levels of patriotism values in Sabah

Levels	n	%
High	251	50.2
Moderate	249	49.8
Low	0	0.0
Total	500	100.0

Table 2 shows that the majority of respondents got a score of practicing patriotism values at a high level, which is 50.2 percent. Meanwhile, 49.8 percent of the selected respondents have a moderate level of practice. This situation proves that the society in Sabah is a patriotic society. Although they are embroiled in some issues that show an unpatriotic attitude towards the Malaysian Constitution. However, it is possible that this allegedly unpatriotic issue is only played by a handful of irresponsible people and does not represent the true voice of the majority of Sabahans. Therefore, these findings have indirectly strengthened the real situation of Sabah society. This domain of practice is used to measure the translated behavior after the orientation process has taken place. Practice is the culmination of the action used in determining whether each respondent consistently behaves according to which dimension of orientation is present in them or vice versa. This is because in the discussion of political orientation, an individual will behave according to the dimension of orientation within themselves (Almond, 1956; Almond & Verba, 1989).

4.3 Practice According to Values

To further explain the practices of each ethnic group studied, the details of the Kadazan Dusun, Bajau and Murut ethnic practice scores according to patriotism values were studied. This study by ethnicity is important to ascertain whether the Kadazan Dusun, Bajau and Murut ethnics share the same values of patriotism or not because the political object of Malaysia, is also related to the original identity of the states in Peninsular Malaysia. Meanwhile, the Kadazan Dusun ethnic group which at the beginning of the formation of Malaysia was different in terms of political image and the spirit of Kadazanism as well as different religious beliefs with most of the population in Peninsular Malaysia certainly different in terms of sharing the same patriotic values. This situation occurs due to the sharing of the same values of patriotism. An individual or group must accept all political objects or national identities whether they are 'Peninsular' or 'Islamic' and also 'Malay'. However, the Bajau and Murut ethnicities may be different because most of them are Muslims, and this indirectly means they have shared the same religious practices. However, this factor does not mean that the Bajau and Murut ethnic groups have fully accepted Malaysian identity. Thus, the findings of the practice of the value of patriotism according to ethnicity are as follows:

Table 3 - The level of Kadazan Dusun ethnic practices towards patriotism values

Values of Patriotism	Kadazan Dusun Ethnic Practices Towards Patriotism Values (n:209)		
	High	Moderate	Low
Pride	89 (42.5%)	118 (56.5%)	2 (1.0%)
Sense of Belonging		106 (50.7%)	8 (3.8%)
Disciplined	100 (47.8%)	103 (49.3%)	6 (2.9%)
Sacrifice	10 (4.8%)	142 (67.9%)	57 (27.3%)
Loyalty	98 (46.9%)	110 (52.6%)	1 (0.5%)
Striving and Productive	56 (26.8%)	141 (67.5%)	12 (5.7%)

Based on Table 3, it is found that the Kadazan Dusun ethnic group has a moderate practices of patriotism values. This is because five of the six values of patriotism were found by the majority of respondents to be at a moderate level only. In details, the practice of the value of pride was found that only 42.5 percent of respondents made high scores. While the scores at the medium and low levels were 56.5 percent and 1.0 percent of the respondents respectively. In addition, the relevance value score for the high level was only 45.5 percent compared to the medium level comprising 50.7 percent of the respondents. Meanwhile, another 3.8 percent of respondents achieved low scores. Meanwhile, the disciplined value of 47.8 percent of respondents attained a high score. While 49.3 percent of respondents got a moderate score while only 2.9 percent of respondents were at a low level. As for the value of sacrifice, only 4.8 percent of respondents got a high score compared to 67.9 percent of respondents were on a moderate score and another 27.3 percent of respondents got a low score. Meanwhile, the value of loyalty according to the Kadazan-Dusun ethnicity was

found to be only 46.9 percent of the respondents achieved a high score. This percentage is very low compared to the percentage of respondents at the moderate level, which is 52.6 percent of respondents, and another 0.5 percent of respondents are at a low level. The value of effort and productivity was found that 26.8 percent of respondents got a high score. While the medium and low levels consist of 67.5 percent of respondents and 5.7 percent of respondents respectively.

This finding once again proves that there are still many ethnic Kadazan-Dusun who do not practice patriotic values because the percentage of respondents who attained a moderate score is still large. Therefore, when a behavior born of the Kadazan-Dusun ethnic group in Sabah is said to be less patriotic, it is difficult to reject the accusation even if it does not represent the majority of the Kadazan-Dusun community in Sabah. The findings of the study show that there are still many respondents from this ethnic group in the moderate level only practice all patriotic values. In fact, the study also proves that the element of regional identity (statehood) is their consideration compared to the overall national identity (Malaysia). If this situation becomes extreme, it will be difficult for the authorities to integrate between the communities of Sabah, Sarawak and Peninsular Malaysia.

4.4 Practices According to Values and Ethnicity

Table 4 - Level of Bajau ethnic practice towards patriotism values

Values of Patriotism	Bajau Ethnic Practices Towards Patriotism Values (n: 196)		
	High	Moderate	Low
Pride	81 (41.3%)	112 (57.1%)	3 (1.5%)
Sense of Belonging	105 (53.6%)	88 (44.9%)	3 (1.5%)
Disciplined	97 (49.5%)	97 (49.5%)	2 (1.0%)
Sacrifice	14 (7.1%)	113 (57.65%)	69 (35.2%)
Loyalty	97 (49.5%)	97 (49.5%)	2 (1.0%)
Striving and Productive	76 (38.8%)	111 (56.6%)	9 (4.6%)

Based on Table 4, only one of the six values of patriotism that attained a high score of more than 50 percent of the respondents is the Bajau ethnic practice of the value of belonging. This situation is clear, showing respondents from the Bajau ethnicity based on the value of patriotism is almost similar to the practice of Kadazan Dusun ethnicity. In details, the value of pride was found to be only 41.3 percent of respondents achieved high scores. While the scores at the medium and low levels were 57.1 percent and 1.5 percent of the respondents respectively. In addition, the relevance value score for the high level is 53.6 percent of respondents compared to the medium level only consists of 44.9 percent of respondents. While another 1.5 percent of respondents made a low score. Meanwhile, the disciplined value of 49.5 percent of respondents got a high score. While 49.5 percent of respondents managed a moderate score while only 1.0 percent of respondents were at a low level. As for the value of sacrifice, only 7.1 percent of respondents achieved a high score compared to 57.65 percent of respondents were on a moderate score and another 35.2 percent of respondents got a low score.

Meanwhile, the value of loyalty according to Bajau ethnicity was found that 49.5 percent of respondents attained a high score while the percentage of respondents at the moderate level was also 49.5 percent of respondents and 1.0 percent of respondents were low. The value of effort and productivity was found that only 38.8 percent of respondents scored high. Meanwhile, 56.6 percent of respondents got a moderate score and another 4.6 percent of respondents had a low score.

Table 5 - Level of Murut ethnic practice towards patriotism Values

Values of Patriotism	Murut Ethnic Practices Towards Patriotism Values (n: 95)		
	High	Moderate	Low
Pride	49 (51.6%)	46 (48.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Sense of Belonging	59 (62.1%)	33 (34.7%)	3 (3.15%)
Disciplined	55 (57.9%)	38 (40.0%)	2 (2.1%)
Sacrifice	4 (4.2%)	69 (72.6%)	22 (23.15%)
Loyalty	41 (43.15%)	51 (53.7%)	3 (3.15%)
Striving and Productive	50 (52.6%)	43 (45.3%)	2 (2.1%)

Based on Table 5, it is found that four of the six values of patriotism that are used as elements of measuring patriotic characteristics attained high scores of more than 50 percent of respondents. This situation clearly shows that the level of practice of respondents from Murut ethnic group on the value of patriotism is better than Kadazan Dusun and Bajau ethnic groups. However, in general, the practice of Murut ethnic group is still at a good level, which is in the range of 50 percent to 60 percent of respondents. In details, the value of pride was found that 51.6 percent of respondents got a high score while the score at the moderate level consisted of 48.4 percent of respondents. In addition, the respondents' practice score on the value of belonging for the high level is 62.1 percent of respondents compared to

the medium level which consists of only 34.7 percent of respondents. While 3.15 percent of respondents achieved a low score. Meanwhile, the disciplined value of 57.9 percent of respondents achieved a high score. While 40.0 percent of respondents and a moderate score while only 2.1 percent of respondents were at a low level. As for the value of sacrifice, only 4.2 percent of respondents attained a high score compared to 72.6 percent of respondents were on a moderate score and another 23.15 percent of respondents achieved a low score.

Meanwhile, the value of loyalty according to Murut ethnic practices was found to be 43.15 percent of respondents made a high score. This percentage is lower compared to the percentage of respondents at the moderate level, which is 53.7 percent of respondents and 3.15 percent of respondents are at a low level. The value of effort and productivity was found that 52.6 percent of respondents got a high practice score. While 45.3 percent of respondents got a moderate score and another 2.1 percent of respondents were on a low score. The findings of this study differ from previous studies on several factors namely the scope of the study involving the Kadazan Dusun, Bajau and Murut ethnicities, an instrument that uses six values as supporters of patriotism characteristics and measured through mental and behavioral processes.

In conclusion, the results of this study are in line with the findings of the study detailed in Huntington (2008). Through his research, patriotism in some countries is at a commendable level. Even in American for example, when asked about its citizenship, only 5 percent attribute themselves to physical features, while Britain 17 percent, Mexico 22 percent, and Italy 25 percent. This is because when a political object that matches that value is accepted, then values such as pride in that political objects are better. Thus, Malaysians not only bind themselves to the territory but also bind themselves to most of the Malaysian political system. Similarly, in this study, general acceptance in objects such as the *Jalur Gemilang* flag and the *Negaraku* song are better while the reception of Palace Institution and the *Yang Dipertuan Agong* are a little less but overall, they are still in good shape.

Overall, the findings of the level of patriotism practice of the respondents in this study, has proven that the practice of the communities in Sabah is at a good level because 50.2 percent of the respondents attained a high practice score. Although there are still many respondents who are at a moderate level, but this situation is not a surprise because if examined from the study of Haminah (2007), there is still an inability among teachers to translate patriotism in teaching and learning. Some of the values of patriotism that are poorly understood by a handful of respondents found in this study may be due to the inability of teachers to translate the understanding and appreciation of the values of patriotism in teaching and learning in schools.

4.5 Differences in the Practices of Patriotism Values According to Background

This section discusses the findings of the study for the fifth objectives of the studies, which is to determine the differences between the practice of patriotism values according to ethnicity, background, religion and level of education of Sabahans. ANOVA analysis and t test were used to obtain the results or objectives of the fifth objective of this study. One Way ANOVA or also known as analysis of variance is a method of analysis involving differences between two or more than two groups. Whereas the t test analysis was to compare the mean values between the two groups of samples. This analysis will answer the fifth objective of this study. This study was conducted to determine the comparison of the level of community involvement on the value of patriotism according to selected demographic factors, namely differences between ethnicity, level of education and religion.

4.5.1 Differences in Practice According to Ethnicity

Table 6 - Differences in practice according to ethnicity

Dimension	Min	SP	F	(Sig.) P
Practices			4.780	.009
Kadazan Dusun	98.3923	10.58478		
Bajau	100.1633	12.92955		
Murut	102.9685	13.01427		

p<0.05

Table 6 shows the results of the significant value of ANOVA for respondents' practice of the value of patriotism. The results of ANOVA analysis on the difference in practice according to ethnicity obtained a significant value of 0.009 and this significant value is smaller than the alpha value of 0.05 proves that there is a difference in the level of practice between respondents according to ethnicity. In the determination of ANOVA analysis, if the significant value is above or greater than 0.05, then there is no difference between the groups. If on the other hand, the significant value obtained is below or less than 0.05, then there is a difference between the groups. Thus, the findings of this study prove that there are significant differences between respondents based on ethnic factors on their level of practice. Findings comparing the significant value of practice according to ethnic factors showed a value of [F (2,497) = 4.780, P = 0.009].

After an examination, the mean values for the Bajau and Murut ethnic groups are higher compared to the Kadazan Dusun ethnic groups. This situation coincides with the initial assumptions by researchers after examining Mohamed

Mustafa Ishak (2014) who examined several issues related to dissatisfaction of the people in Sabah towards some elements in the Malaysian political system that are said to be Malay and Islamic while the spirit of Kadazan nationalism or Kadazanism is still thick in some ethnic Kadazan. In fact, the Kadazan Dusun ethnic group, which is more numerous among the bumiputra ethnic groups in Sabah, strongly opposed some of the early efforts to form Malaysia. This is because some of them think that if this merge occurs, the language, cultures, and values in the Kadazan Dusun ethnic group will be challenged. In addition, the findings of this study which found that there are differences in the practice of patriotism values also coincide with Mohamed Mustafa (2014) who stressed the existence of assumptions from some communities in Sabah see some political objects are 'Peninsula and Islam' researchers do not deny that patriotism values tied to objects Malaysian politics or identity differs based on ethnic differences.

4.5.2 Differences in Practice According to Education

Table 7 - Differences in practice according to education

Dimension	Min	SP	F	(Sig.) P
Practices			1.202	.302
Illiterate, UPSR and others	101.1212	14.29982		
High School and Certificate	99.1440	11.78414		
Higher Learning Institutions	100.7667	12.13157		

p<0.05

Based on Table 7, with regards to the differences in practice according to the level of education. The results of ANOVA analysis on the difference in practice according to education level obtained a significant value of 0.302 and this significant value is greater than the alpha value of 0.05 proves that there is no difference in practice level between respondents according to education level. Therefore, there is no significant difference between respondents according to their level of education on their level of practice. While the comparison of the significant value of practice with age showed a value of [F (2,497) = 1.202, P = 0.302].

This element of education is important to identify because this educational background also contributes to the nurturing of patriotism values. This situation can be seen, when the United States uses the influence of patriotism to mobilize the energy of its people to face the enemy and the interests of the government in the issue of war with Vietnam and Korea. The United States government puts the state of the country always right, and all actions taken by the country need to be supported by every citizen. However, this situation is no longer the case because the increasing level of education has rationalized the actions and thoughts of the community to either support or criticize the actions taken by the government (Mohd Taib, 2004). However, the influence of education in this study could not confirm the association because it was found that there were no significant differences in educational background.

4.6 Differences in Practices According to Religion

Table 8 - Differences in practices according to religion

Dimension	Min	SP	T	(Sig.) P
Practices			2.851	.005
Islam	101.0398	12.40825		
Christianity	97.9075	11.28451		

p<0.05

Table 8 is regarding the differences of practices according to religion. The results of t test analysis on the difference in practice by gender obtained a significant value of 0.006 and this significant value is smaller than the alpha value of 0.05 proves that there is a difference in the level of practice between respondents according to religion. Although all respondents from these two religions are patriotic, however, the mean difference value of 3.13 indicates that Muslim respondents are higher in practicing the value of patriotism compared to respondents who are Christians.

The findings of the study of religious differences show that the mean of practice for Muslims is higher than Christians. This situation may be due to some respondents seeing the values that need to be translated to the political object as contradictory to their religious beliefs or the religious values of others that are more dominant in the practice. This coincides with Huntington (2008) who asserted that there is a religious influence in the determination of an identity. If every behavior is seen as important and demanded by their religion, it is certain that the behavior will get response from the followers of a religion. In addition, the influence of a religious leader's affirmation on something can also influence a person's behavior.

Thus, in this context, the researcher thinks that the mean practice of Muslims is higher than that of Christians is because the factor of acceptance of political objects is said to be partly more peninsular. This is because in the early stages of the establishment of Malaysia, Mohamed Mustafa Ishak (2014), stated that there was opposition from Christians to the establishment of Malaysia because they thought this process was an effort for 'Malayization and

Islamization' and some elements in political objects and provisions in the Constitution in favor of Muslims. Therefore, if suspicion and dissatisfaction still congeal within them, the value of belonging to Malaysian political objects is difficult to cultivate.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the findings of this study found that the majority of respondents practices the value of patriotism, although there are still many who do not make the value of patriotism as a way of life. The series of results of this study shows that Malaysia's efforts to build the Malaysian nation are still far reaching. Building the bond of citizens towards Malaysia should take precedence over the bond to their respective states and ethnicities. History has shown that the time and effort for the formation of Malaysia as a sovereign nation is not an easy task and the effort should be defended. Therefore, every Malaysian citizen needs to cultivate a sense of love for the country which is upheld by six values across state, ethnic and religious boundaries. Positive patriotism in the context of Malaysia not only produces a society that is submissive and obedient to the actions taken by the state alone or criticizes the actions of the government but by upholding the six values expressed in this study is able to measure the shared responsibility between the ruled society and ruler. Violations of the principles of the Federal Constitution and the ideology of the *Rukun Negara* must be rejected even if some irresponsible people admit that it is a form of patriotism. Apart from that, the appreciation through the practice of each principle of the *Rukun Negara* must be ingrained in oneself to ensure that the values that is built can be supported and further increase the level of patriotism.

Acknowledgement

The authors fully acknowledged the Pusat Sains Kemanusiaan, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Jabatan Pengajian Kenegaran, Fakulti Ekologi Manusia, Universiti Putra Malaysia, and Pusat Pengayaan Akademik dan Latihan Intern (CITrA), Universiti Malaya for supporting this work.

References

- Abdul Latiff Abu Bakar. (2012). Jati Diri dan Patriotisme Berpaksikan Sejarah, Perlembagaan dan Dasar Kerajaan. Dlm Abdul Latiff Abu Bakar (pnyt.), *Jati Diri dan Patriotisme Teras Peradaban Malaysia* (ms. 1–34). Tanjong Malim: Gepena & UPSI.
- Ahmad Shah Pakeer Mohamed. (2013). Patriotisme Belia ke Arah Perpaduan dan 1Malaysia. *Jurnal Biro Tatanegara*, 1, 5–20.
- Allerton, C. (2014). Statelessness and the lives of the children of migrants in Sabah , East Malaysia, 19 (1-2), 26–34.
- Almond, G. A. (1956). Comparative Political Systems Comparative Political Systems. *The Journal of Politics*, 18(3), 391–409.
- Almond, G. A., & Powell, C. (1966). *Comparative Politics a Developmental Approach*. California: Little Brown & Co.
- Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1989). *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Aziz Ujang, Jamaluddin Md. Jahi, Kadir Arifin & Kadaruddin Aiyub. (2014). Kesedaran Generasi Muda Terhadap Patriotisme dan Perpaduan Nasional di Malaysia. *International Journal of the Malay World and Civilisation*, 2(2), 31–39.
- Berns, W. (1997). On Patriotism. *The Public Interest*, (127), 19–32.
- Bunch, R. E. (1971). Orientational Profiles: A Method for Micro-Macro Analysis of Attitude. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 24(4), 666–674.
- Curti, M. (1946). *The Roots of American Loyalty*. London: Columbia University Press.
- Daimond, L. J., (1993). Introduction: Political Culture and Democracy. Dlm Daimond L. J., (pnyt.), *Political Culture and Democracy in Developing Countries*. Boulder, Colo: L. Rienner Publishers.
- Dollah, R., Sakke, N., Wan Hassan, W. S., Omar, M. A., & Jafar, A. (2018). Peranan Belia Dan Pru-14 Di Sabah: Kajian Kes Di P.188 Silam: The Role Of Youth and Ge-14 In Sabah: Case Study In P.188 Silam. *Jurnal Kinabalu*, 319.

- Doob, L. W. (1964). *Patriotism and Nationalism: Their Psychological Foundations*. London: Yale University Press.
- Druckman, D. (1994). Nationalism, Patriotism, and Group Loyalty: A Social Psychological Perspective. *Mershon International Studies Review*, 38(1), 43–68.
- Haminah Suhaibo. (2007). *Pemupukan Patriotisme dalam Pendidikan Sejarah Tingkatan Satu*. Universiti Malaya.
- Hand, M. (2011). Patriotism in Schools. *Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain (IMPACT)*, 2011(19), 1–40.
- Hasnah Hussiin, Jamal Rizal Razali, Mohd Azam Mouhd Akhir & Imaduddin Abidin. (2009). Tahap Kesedaran Pelajar Terhadap Aspek-Aspek Kenegaraan: Kajian Kes di UMP. Dlm Hasnah Hussiin (pnyt.), *Artikel Kenegaraan dan Hubungan Etnik* (ms. 83–101). Kuantan: Universiti Malaysia Pahang.
- Ho Ying Pong. (2020). Chinese and Hongkonger: An Analysis of the Changing Trend of the Identity Consciousness of Hong Kong Youth from the 1960s to 1970s by the Chinese Student Weekly. *Hong Kong Journal of Social Sciences*, 56 Autumn/Winter.
- Huntington, S. P. (2008). *Siapa Kita? Cabaran Identiti Nasional Amerika*. (Terjemahan oleh Azman Ayub, Ed.). Kuala Lumpur: Institut Terjemahan Buku Malaysia.
- Kasmila A. (1980). *Politik Sabah Tahun 80an (Sabah tanpa Syed Kechik)*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Keller, S. (2007). How Patriots Think, and Why It Matters. Dlm Igor Primoratz and Aleksander Pavkovic (pnyt.), *Patriotism Philosophical and Political Perspectives* (ms. 63–74). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Khoo Kay Kim. (2005). Patriotisme di Malaysia. Dlm Mustafa Ishak, Izani Zain & Rohana Yusof (pnyt.), *Prosiding Kongres Patriotisme Negara* (ms. 30–36). Putrajaya: BTN & Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Ku Hasnita Ku Samsu. (2007). *Patriotisme di Kalangan Generasi Muda Malaysia: Kajian Kes Ke Atas Mahasiswa Bukan Melayu di Institusi Pengajian Tinggi*. Universiti Malaya.
- Ku Hasnita Ku Samsu. (2014). Polemik Konotasi Patriotisme. Dlm Abdul Rahman Abdul Aziz, Ahmad Zaharuddin Sani Ahmad Sabri & Muhamed Nor Azman Nordin (pnyt.), *Isu-isu Ketahanan Nasional Malaysia* (ms. 153–162). Kuala Lumpur: ITBM & Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Kok, C. T. (2004). *Justice without Borders Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism and Patriotism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee Kuok Tiung. (2016). Dinamik Persoalan Patriotisme Masa Kini- Ke Mana Arah Hendak Tuju? Dlm Ronald Kiandee & Sivamurugan Pandian (pnyt.), *Patriotisme Malaysia Sejarah, Isu dan Cabaran* (ms. 166–174). Pulau Pinang: Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Lee, Y. F. (2009). Memahami Proses Membina Bangsa Malaysia: Satu Perspektif Sosiologi. Dlm Azrina Husin, Azeem, Chua Soo Yean, P. Sivamurugan & Abdul Rahim Ibrahim (pnyt.), *Membina Bangsa Malaysia* (hlm. 254–270). Putrajaya: Jabatan Perpaduan Negara dan Integrasi Nasional & Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Macedo, S. (2011). Just patriotism? *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 37(4), 413–423.
- Mateusz Kamionka. (2020). Patriotisme of the Young Generation in Ukraine in the Era of Hybrid War. *Lithuanian Annual Strategic Review*. 8: 221-239
- Merle Curti. (1946). *The Roots of American Loyalty*. London: Columbia University Press.
- Mohammad Agus Yusof. (2002). Politik Federalisme di Malaysia: Pengalaman Sabah. *JATI (Journal of Southeast Asian Studies)*, 7: 1–20.
- Mohd Hairul Anuar Razak. (2011). *Pengetahuan, Persepsi dan Pemahaman Terhadap Penghayatan Patriotisme dan Nasionalisme Dalam Kalangan Pelatih Program Latihan Khidmat Negara di Malaysia*. Universiti Putra Malaysia.

- Mohd Taib Osman. (2004). *Globalisasi, Patriotisme dan Isu-isu Kemasyarakatan*. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya.
- Mohmad Noor Mohmad Taib. (2006). *Kesan Pengajaran Terus Nilai Dalam Pengajaran Dan Pembelajaran Sejarah Bagi Penerapan Patriotisme*. Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Muller. J. W., (2007). *Constitutional Patriotism*. United Kingdom: Princeton University Press.
- Muller. J. W., (2006). On The Origins of Constitutional Patriotism. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 5, 278–296.
- Nathanson, S. (1989). In Defense of “Moderate Patriotism”*. *Ethics*, 99(3), 535–552.
- Nathanson, S. (1993). *Patriotism, Morality, and Peace*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Nazri Muslim & Jamsari Alias. (2004). Patriotisme: Konsep dan pelaksanaannya di Malaysia. Dlm *Seminar Antarabangsa Nilai dalam Komuniti Pasca Modenisme (SIVIC 2004)*. Langkawi.
- Nidzam Sulaiman, Katini Aboo Talib @ Khalis & Suzanna M. Isa. (2017). *Tuntutan Sabah dan Sarawak Keluar Malaysia (SSKM) Dalam Media Massa- Satu Kajian Eksplorasi*. Bangi.
- Noor Sulastry Yurni Ahmad. (2010). 1Semangat Patriotisme Menjana Konsep 1Malaysia: Realiti atau Fantasi. *Malaysian Journal of Youth Studies*, 2, 77–92.
- Parsons, T. & Shils, E. A. (1951). Categories of the Orientation and Organization of Action. Dlm E. A. S. Talcott Parsons (pnyt.), *Toward a General Theory of Action* (hlm. 53–109). Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Primoratz. I & Aleksandar Pavkovic. (2007). Introduction. Dlm Igor Primoratz and Aleksandar Pavkovic (pnyt.), *Patriotism Philosophical and Political Perspectives* (ms. 1–14). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Rashidah Mamat. (2014). Sense of Belonging to the Country: Assessing Patriotism, Loyalty. Dlm *Proceeding of the Social Sciences Research ICSSR* (pp. 561–572). Kota Kinabalu.
- Rosin Pinggaton@Panggaton. (2006). *Kajian Tentang Hubungan Antara Kefahaman Patriotisme Dengan Persepsi Amalan Patriotisme Di Sekolah-Sekolah Menengah Di Daerah Kota Marudu, Sabah*. Universiti Malaysia Sabah.
- Ruslan Zainudin, Mohd. Mahadee & Zaini Othman. (2005). *Kenegaraan Malaysia*. Shah Alam: Penerbit Fajar Bakti.
- Ross, M. H. (2009). Culture in Comparative Political Analysis. Dlm Mark Irving Lichbach & Alan S. Zuckerman (pnyt.), *Comparative Politics Rationality, Culture, and Structure* (hlm. 118–134). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Saifuddin Abdullah. (2005). Patriotisme Alaf Baru: Dari Semangat Kepada Khidmat. Dlm Hussain Mohamad (pnyt.), *Belia & Patriotisme Malaysia* (ms. 70–93). Melaka: IKSEP.
- Saiful Siring, M., & Govindasamy, A. R. (2018 Sabah Sarawak Keluar Malaysia (SSKM): Hala Tuju Selepas Pru-14: Sabah Sarawak Keluar Malaysia (SSKM): Its Direction in The Post Ge-14). *Jurnal Kinabalu*, 411.
- Sarjit S. Gill, Jayum Anak Jawan, Ahmad Tarmizi Talib, Arif Aris Mundayat & Mohd Rahimi Ramli (2014). Laporan *Kajian Pemahaman, Kesedaran Patriotisme dan Cabarannya Dalam Kalangan Belia Bandar di Semenanjung Malaysia*. Jabatan Perpaduan dan Integrasi Nasional, Putrajaya.
- Sarjit S. Gill, A. T. Talib & Mohd Rahimi Ramli (2016). Nilai Patriotisme Dalam Kalangan Masyarakat Multi-Etnik di Sabah. Dlm Ronald Kiandee & Sivamurugan Pandian (pnyt.), *Patriotisme Malaysia Sejarah, Isu dan Cabaran* (ms. 153–165). Pulau Pinang: Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Siu- Keung Cheung. (2017). The Post-colonial Situation of Post- 1997 Hong Kong: A Reflection upon "One Country, Two System" after the First 20 Years. *Hong Kong Journal of Social Sciences*, 50 Autumn/Winter.
- Sivamurugan Pandian & Ronald Kiandee. (2016). Patriotisme Di Malaysia: Pertahanan Menyeluruh Sebagai Psikik Kenegaraan. Dlm Ronald Kiandee & Sivamurugan Pandian (pnyt.), *Patriotisme Malaysia Sejarah, Isu dan Cabaran*

(ms. 1–15). Pulau Pinang: Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Tuan Pah Rokiah, Shamsul Anuar Nasarah & Zaheruddin Othman. (2016). Pembinaan Bangsa Malaysia (1): Kajian Empirikal Tahap Patriotisme Belia. *Geografia- Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 12(10), 159–170.

Wan Hasni Wan Ahmad, Raja Adila Ismail, Wan Ahmad Abd Hakim Wan Dagang, Raja Zaid Raja Kadir & Ghzali Ismail. (2013). Amalan Patriotisme Melalui Unsur-Unsur Sejarah Tanahair Dalam Pendidikan Pra-Sekolah. Dlm *International Conference on Early Childhood Education, Institut Pendidikan Guru Kampus Sultan Mizan*.

Wang, J. & Jia, S. (2015). The Contemporary Value of Patriotism. *Advances in Applied Sociology*, 5, 161–166.

Welch, S. (2013). *The Theory of Political Culture*. Oxford Univeristy Press. United Kingdom.

Zaini Othman, K. M. & I. A. (2010). *Nasionalisme, Etnisiti dan Komuniti Sempadan Negeri Sabah*. Kota Kinabalu: Universiti Malaysia Sabah.