

---

# Constructive and Blind Patriotism: Relationship to Emphasis on Civil Liberties, National Security, and Militarism in a Korean and an American University

Eun Jung Oh

(Department of Teacher Education, Mokwon University, South Korea)

Robert L. Williams, Stacy L. Bliss, and Katherine R. Krohn

(Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, The University of Tennessee, USA)

---

**Abstract:** The objective of this study was to compare the relationship of two forms of patriotism to important sociopolitical values in a Korean and an American University. Constructive patriotism represents a commitment to the ideals of one's country and a willingness to question current societal actions in a society that appear inconsistent with those ideals. On the other hand, blind patriotism reflects allegiance to the current policies of one's government, irrespective of their lack of consistency with the ideals of that country. The two measures of patriotism were correlated with emphasis on civil liberties, national security, and militarism. The latter values have been heavily emphasized in American society since the occurrence of 9/11.

In the current study, college students in an American University ( $n = 222$ ) and a Korean University ( $n = 215$ ) were administered a 50-item survey measuring five sociopolitical dimensions: constructive patriotism, blind patriotism, respect for civil liberties, emphasis on national security, and militarism. The two samples obtained similar means for emphasis on national security and constructive patriotism, but the American sample scored significantly lower ( $p < .001$ ) on respect for civil liberties and higher ( $p < .001$ ) on blind patriotism and militarism than the Korean sample. Although the correlations between patriotism measures and the remaining sociopolitical constructs were directionally consistent across the two samples, the correlations were substantially stronger in the American sample. Few gender differences were evident in the findings for either sample.

**Key words:** Constructive Patriotism, Blind Patriotism, Respect for Civil Liberties, Emphasis on National Security, and Militarism

## I . Introduction

Patriotism is a cherished value in most societies, especially societies having a democratic form of government. Although patriotism appears conceptually linked to a variety of societal institutions, no patriotic linkage appears as strong as support for the military. Participation in military service is often portrayed as the highest manifestation of patriotism. Plus, giving one's life in military combat is regarded as the ultimate act of patriotism. Berns (1997) described the common understanding of patriotism as "love of country and ... a willingness to sacrifice for it, fight for it, and perhaps even die for it" (p. 19). In portraying patriotism as a deadly form of group attachment, Kateb (2000) claims that patriotism represents a "readiness to die and kill for one's country ..." (p. 901).

Discussions of the connection between patriotism and the military typically incorporate the notions of national security and civil liberties. In times when both national security and civil liberties are on the line, security often trumps liberty. Martin (2004) laments that "national security is of paramount concern and always outweighs other interests" (p. 8). Baker (2003) observed that "another product of wartime is that civil liberties are generally categorized as luxury items, like silk stockings during World War II" (p. 548). Some authorities claim that "although the war against terrorism entails a genuine threat, to allow security to trump liberty in every case would corrode the civilized world's sense of itself" ("Civil liberties: The real price of freedom," 2007, p. 17).

The major objective of the current study was to determine whether the strength of patriotism measures and their relationship to kindred sociopolitical values would be similar in two geographically distant cultures: the American and South Korean

cultures. South Korea and America were selected as comparisons cultures because they have both important cultural similarities and differences. The two societies are democracies, allies, and members of the Iraqi military coalition. In addition, Korea is host to American troops, who presumably provide a protective barrier between North and South Korea (Kim, 2009).

Despite important commonalities between the Korean and American cultures in the early 21st Century, South Korea experienced considerable anti-American sentiment during that period. The discontent with the U.S. appeared to center on the inclusion of Koreans in the U.S.-led coalition in Iraq, the kidnapping and subsequent beheading of a Korean in Iraq, and the presence of 36 U.S. Army posts and 29,000 American troops in South Korea ("List of United States Army installations in South Korea," n.d.; "Military of South Korea," n.d.; "Roh Moo-hyun," n.d.). In addition, South Korea historically has had an authoritarian form of government and only in recent decades a democratic system of government, possibly affecting both the strength and inter-relationships of the sociopolitical perspectives targeted in the current study.

### **1. Delineation of Patriotism and Kindred Constructs**

Some earlier research defined patriotism as a singular construct representing overall dedication to one's country (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989). Subsequent research (e.g., Schatz, Staub, & Lavine, 1999) delineated different forms of patriotism—namely, blind and constructive patriotism—both of which entail dedication to one's country. Blind patriotism has also been referred to as uncritical patriotism and authoritarian patriotism, whereas constructive patriotism has also been labeled democratic patriotism (Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Westheimer, 2006). Given this fundamental distinction in types of patriotism, it is more appropriate

to ask how a particular person is patriotic than how patriotic that person is. Potentially, one could be high on one form of patriotism but low on the other.

Blind patriotism has been defined as unconditional support for the current policies of one's country (Schatz et al., 1999). Baker and Oneal (2001) have suggested that this form of patriotism is most strongly emphasized when a nation is at war. On the other hand, constructive patriotism represents a willingness to question whether the policies and actions of one's nation are consistent with its highest ideals (Schatz et al.). Paradoxically, constructive patriotism also appears most important when one's nation is involved in war, reflecting citizens' willingness to publicly question whether the war is just and in the best interest of the country. Overall, constructive patriotism is characterized by open discussion of whether current government policy is consistent with constitutionally guaranteed human rights (e.g., freedom of speech, freedom of religion, due process, and humane treatment of all detainees).

Two other values, presumably linked to patriotism in some fashion, are protection of civil liberties and protection of a society's safety. Ironically, civil liberties are often regarded as protection *from* one's government and national security as protection *by* one's government ("Civil liberties," n.d). The right to due-process is perhaps the most debated civil liberty in democratic societies, especially in the time of war. Due process presumably entails "the presumption of innocence, the writ of habeas corpus, and the rights to counsel, a speedy and public jury trial ..." (Baker, 2003, p. 555). In contrast to citizens of authoritarian states, citizens in democratic states have the responsibility to insist on the preservation of civil liberties presumably guaranteed by the constitution and the laws of those states ("Civil liberties"). In other words, citizens must publicly protest the apparent erosion of any civil liberties.

National security is often pitted against respect for civil liberties within democratic societies. Some proponents of national security in the U.S. advocate compromising selected civil liberties to enhance the nation's ability to identify and punish those who might threaten national security (Johnson & Locy, 2003). As a result, the U.S. government has passed legislation and used detainment procedures that may violate both the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and certain provisions of the Geneva Conventions. Somewhat similar to recent actions of the U.S. government, the South Korean government passed a National Security Law in 1988, whose objective was "to suppress anti-State acts that endanger national security and to protect the nation's safety and its people's life and freedom" ("National Security Act," n.d., p. 1). This law made criminal any speech that supported communism or the government of North Korea.

Militarism represents a belief in the nobility and efficacy of the military in one's country. It involves support for both the military as an institution and the personnel who serve in the military. This support for the military has been defined in various ways. For example, Eckhardt and Newcombe (1969) defined militarism as "the belief in military deterrence, or the reliance on military strength to defend one's nation and its values, or aggressive foreign policy in general" (p. 210). Mann (1987) defined militarism "as a set of attitudes and social practices which regards war and the preparation for war as a normal and desirable social activity" (p. 1). As a general orientation in society, militarism requires neither participation in the military nor tangible sacrifices for the military (Mann).

## **2. Cross-cultural Comparisons of Patriotism and Sociopolitical Variables**

A recent poll of 34 countries ("US National Pride: Highest

among 34 countries-poll ” 2006) revealed that the U.S. ranked first, whereas South Korea ranked near the bottom (31st) in national pride, a concept that appeared to combine patriotism and nationalism. The U.S. also ranked highest in five specific categories: democracy, political influence, economy, science, and the military. Bacevich (2005) claimed that Americans tend to equate military power with national greatness. In contrast to high-profile American pride, Asian societies such as South Korea reportedly consider bragging about one’s country as reflecting poor manners and bringing bad luck (“US National Pride”).

Although patriotism has not been widely investigated in Asian countries, a factor-analytic study (Karasawa, 2002) of Japanese citizens’ responses to a national-attitudes survey found that the values of patriotism, nationalism, and internationalism were strongly embedded in participant responses to the survey, much as is the case in sociopolitical surveys conducted in Western societies. However, one factor that appeared somewhat unique to the Japanese culture was commitment to national heritage (emphasis on the historical aspects of Japanese culture dating back several centuries). Scores on this value were related to right-wing conservatism, including the deletion of the prohibition against war in the Japanese constitution. Furthermore, the national-heritage value was related to minimal knowledge about international affairs. On the other hand, the patriotism factor was only weakly correlated with any of the ideological variables investigated in the study.

Some international research on levels and patterns of patriotism has differentiated blind from constructive patriotism. For example, Depuisset and Butera (2003) examined French citizens’ levels of blind and constructive patriotism after exposure to bogus laws favoring immigrants, nationals, or both. The researchers found that blind patriotism was relatively stable across the three conditions, whereas constructive patriotism varied across the

conditions. This pattern suggests that blind patriotism may function more as a psychological trait and constructive patriotism as a psychological state that varies with circumstances. Although Cohrs' (2004) study of German university students reported that constructive patriotism was associated with tolerance of foreign immigration and diminished hostility toward foreigners, that relationship could be muted by a high level of threat to safety and job security posed by foreign immigration.

In one of few empirical studies about sociopolitical values in South Korea, Lee (2003) found that political cynicism was particularly high among individuals with higher education. Although direct measures of patriotism were not included in Lee's study, the definition of political cynicism sounds conceptually aligned with constructive patriotism. In a rare study that compared the U.S. and South Korea on sociopolitical values, Bliss, Oh, and Williams (2007) found that American college students reported stronger patriotism and militarism scores than did Korean students but weaker emphasis on civil liberties. Plus, general patriotism (dedication to one's country) was more strongly correlated with militarism among American than Korean students. However, the Bliss et al. study did not make a distinction between blind and constructive patriotism. Nonetheless, their general description of patriotism appears more similar to blind than constructive patriotism.

A number of Korean journals have published treatises on predominant cultural values in South Korea from the 1980s to the present. However, these articles are based mainly on ideological analysis, rather than empirical research. For example, Kim (2003) addressed the relationship between the western idea of patriotism and the traditional notion of Confucian loyalty within South Korean society. Kim represented American patriotism as rooted in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution, whereas Korean patriotism as mainly influenced by

the Confucian notion of loyalty to one's family, friends, and rulers. Given the geographic proximity of North to South Korea, national security has been a very important issue in South Korea in recent years. The emphasis on the dangers posed by North Korea has contributed somewhat to a militaristic mentality in South Korea. Kwon (2005) described the student anti-military movement in South Korea during the 1980s as using military-type tactics to resist the military regime of South Korea, which often invoked popular cultural values such as nationalism, national defense, militarism, and patriotism to defend their position in society. Lim and Kim (1998) underscored the influence of North Korea's military might on South Korea's conception of national security. Lim and Kim argued that national security can best be enhanced under a strong democracy, with the need for society to focus on social and political issues as well as military issues.

Many countries have passed legislation since 2001 to protect themselves from terrorist threats but few to the extent of the U.S. and Great Britain ("Civil liberties: The freedom paradox," 2006). The U.S. has incurred international criticism for its national security and human rights abuses since 2001. It has been accused of abandoning the civil liberties the nation reputedly is trying to protect. The oratory of U.S. leaders in the period from 9/11 through 2007 gave far more emphasis to protecting the safety of Americans than the liberties of Americans. Public opinion appears to have supported restriction of civil liberties to strengthen national security, with most people feeling the government should do even more to stop terrorism.

### **3. Cross-cultural Gender Differences on Patriotism**

Most of the gender differences found in previous studies on sociopolitical variables addressed in the current study have re-



lated to militarism, a value that may be differentially related to blind and constructive patriotism. Not surprisingly, these studies generally indicate a stronger level of militarism among males than females. For example, Heaven (1985) found that Australian militarists were more likely to be males than females; Federico, Golec, and Dial (2005) reported that American college males more strongly supported military action against Iraq than did college females; and Nelson (1999) also found significantly higher militarism scores for males than females in an American college sample. In contrast to the findings on militarism, scores on a variety of human-rights scales have been significantly higher for females than males in American college and adult samples (Diaz-Veizades, Widaman, Little, & Gibbs, 1995).

One recent study on militarism that included an assessment of gender differences on a variety of sociopolitical variables (patriotism, nationalism, internationalism, respect for civil liberties, and tolerance of dissent) in an American college sample found no significant gender differences on any of these variables (Bliss et al., 2007). Although the correlations between militarism and most of the other variables were significantly stronger for males than females, the correlation between patriotism and militarism did not differ by gender. No gender data were reported for the Korean sample included in the Bliss et al. study.

#### **4. Framework for the Current Study**

The current study is a continuation of research on sociopolitical variables published by researchers at American and Korean Universities. Three of these published studies (Bliss et al., 2007; McCleary, Nalls, & Williams, in press; Williams, Foster, & Krohn, 2008) provide a historical frame of reference for the current study. Bliss et al. showed that militarism was more strongly related, either positively or negatively, to a set of socio-

political variables (nationalism, internationalism, patriotism, respect for civil liberties, and tolerance of dissent) in an American than a Korean university. However, some instruments used in assessing these variables in the Bliss et al. study appear more psychometrically limited than those used in the current study. Most importantly, the Bliss et al. study did not assess the distinction between blind and constructive patriotism.

Neither of the most recent studies by the current research group included cross-cultural comparisons. Using an American sample, Williams et al. (2008) reported that both blind and constructive patriotism were significantly related to critical thinking, as well as to respect for civil liberties and emphasis on national security; however, the correlations were directly opposite for the two types of patriotism and stronger for blind than constructive patriotism. In the most recent study by this research team (McCleary et al., in press), path analysis underscored a direct path from blind patriotism to support for the Iraq War. The addition of other possible predictors of support for the Iraq War (militarism, national security, constructive patriotism, and respect for civil liberties) actually detracted from the beta weight attained when blind patriotism was used as the sole predictor of support for the War in Iraq.

The primary focus of the current study was to compare students attending American and Korean Universities on (1) the strength of blind and constructive patriotism measures, respect for civil liberties, emphasis on national security, and militarism and (2) the pattern of relationships between the patriotism measures and the other targeted sociopolitical variables. In addition, the study examined differences between males and females in both the American and Korean samples on the strength of the selected variables and the relationships among these variables. Similar to many studies that have examined relationships between patriotism and sociopolitical variables in university sam-

ples (e.g., Bliss et al., 2007, McCleary et al., in press, McFarland, 2005; Schatz et al., 1999; Williams et al., 2008), the current study sampled students attending American and Korean universities. Because some evidence (Williams, 2006) suggests that American college samples tend to be somewhat skewed toward political liberalism, these political tendencies may weaken some of the relationships between sociopolitical variables examined in the current study.

## **II. Method**

### **1. Respondents**

The total sample consisted of students from two universities: a major state university in the Southeastern U.S. and a major private university in South Korea. The American sample consisted of 222 students enrolled in a human development course required for admission to the Teacher-Preparation Program. With respect to gender, 23% of the American participants were males and 77% were females. As to educational classification, approximately 17% were freshmen, 38% sophomores, 30% juniors, 11% seniors, 4% masters, and 1% doctoral students. The Korean sample consisted of 215 students enrolled in the Teacher-Education Program at a university located in Chungcheong-do. Approximately 36% of these students were males and 64% were females. Academically, 38% were second-year students, 62% third-year students, and 1% fourth-year students.

### **2. Description and Administration of Subscales**

The subscales were initially developed on a conceptual basis, with each subscale designed to represent a coherent theme (e.g., respect for civil liberties, emphasis on national security). Five

10-item subscales were subsumed in a larger questionnaire, "Cultural Perspectives Questionnaire," without delineation of the subscales within the questionnaire. For the American students, the questionnaire was posted at the course web site at the beginning of the semester, and students entered their responses on scan forms on an out-of-class basis. The Korean students took a Korean translation of the instrument in class and also indicated their answers on scan forms.

*Several steps were involved in developing the Korean translation:* (1) a professional translator in Korea translated the questionnaire into the Korean language; (2) a professor in Korea who had gotten his degree in an American university translated the Korean translation back into English; and (3) two other professional educators in Korea, one of whom teaches English at the college level in Korea, compared the translation back into English with the original English version to resolve any inconsistencies between the wording of the two versions.

All of the 10-item subscales (blind patriotism, constructive patriotism, respect for civil liberties, emphasis on national security, and militarism) have been used in previous publications (McCleary et al., in press; Williams et al., 2008). Students reported their responses to items on a 5-point Likert scale: *strongly agree* = 5 points, *agree* = 4 points, *neutral* = 3 points, *disagree* = 2 points, and *strongly disagree* = 1 point. All items were worded in a direction supportive of the construct being assessed. Because of the conceptual antithesis between various subscales, students were likely to agree with items in some subscales but disagree with items in other subscales. Thus, students were unlikely to consistently agree or disagree with items across the subscales in the larger questionnaire.

Virtually all of the items in the constructive and blind patriotism subscales represented adaptations of items from the Schatz

et al. (1999, p. 159) patriotism scales, which were constructed through a combination of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Items included in the civil liberties, national security, and militarism scales were initially developed conceptually and used in recent publications (McCleary et al., in press; Williams et al., 2008). Some items in the militarism subscale also were similar to items included in previous measures of militarism (Bliss et al., 2007; Williams, Bliss, & McCallum, 2006), but other items were added to include more timely issues regarding the role and performance of a nation's military (e.g., admission of defeat, withdrawal of the military from combat) and used in the McCleary et al. study. (A listing of items for all subscales, as well as Korean and American means for all items, can be obtained by e-mail correspondence with the senior author.)

### **III. Results**

This section includes a psychometric analysis of the subscales used in the study and a presentation of differences between the American and Korean subscale means, gender differences in subscale means within each sample, differences between the two samples in correlations between the two measures of patriotism and the other sociopolitical variables, and gender differences within each sample in correlations between the measures of patriotism and the other sociopolitical variables.

#### **1. Psychometric Coherence of Subscales**

Although all of the subscales have been used in previous studies (McCleary et al., in press; Williams et al., 2008), we re-examined their psychometric coherence based on participant responses in the current sample. Subscale coherence was examined in three ways: internal consistency, exploratory factor analy-

sis, and confirmatory factor analysis.

Cronbach's alpha was used as the measure of internal consistency for each subscale. Internal consistency coefficients for the American sample were as follows: blind patriotism = .89, constructive patriotism = .84, civil liberties = .76, national security = .80, and militarism = .83. All of these internal consistency measures were judged to be highly acceptable for research purposes. In contrast, the Cronbach's alphas for the Korean sample were marginal for research purposes: blind patriotism = .69, constructive patriotism = .51, civil liberties = .59, national security = .53, and militarism = .66.

An exploratory factor analysis was done on student responses to items placed in each subscale. For an item to be identified with a particular factor, the item had to load at least .30 on that factor and load higher on that factor than on any other factor. Actually, most of the items associated with each factor loaded in the .50 to .70 range. Exploratory factor analysis for the various subscales revealed quite different results for the American and Korean samples. For the American sample, each subscale had no more than two exploratory factors: civil liberties = due process (7 items) and prisoner rights (3 items); national security = safety of one's country (6 items) and prerogatives of the government (4 items); militarism (one factor); blind patriotism (one factor); and constructive patriotism = two equal factors (constructive love for one's country and criticism of government policies). The Korean sample yielded several factors within each subscale: civil liberties = four factors; national security = four factors; militarism = three factors; blind patriotism = three factors; and constructive patriotism = three factors. (A document identifying the item loadings for each factor within the American and Korean samples can be obtained through an e-mail request to the senior author.)

Confirmatory factor analysis involved computing a goodness-of-fit metric based on the ratio between chi-square and de-

grees of freedom (Hoelter, 1983). Kline (1998) suggested that this ratio be no more than 3.0 to represent adequate quantitative clustering of items within a scale. The confirmatory analysis was done only for the American sample: blind patriotism = 2.83, constructive patriotism = 3.83, civil liberties = 2.38, national security = 1.25, and militarism = 2.09. The multiplicity of exploratory factors within each of the Korean subscales rendered the confirmatory factor analysis non-productive for that sample.

## 2. Differences between American and Korean Samples' Subscale Means

Table 1 shows that the two samples differed significantly on three of the five subscales: Americans scored significantly lower on civil liberties,  $t(437) = -5.10, p < .001$ , but significantly higher on militarism,  $t(438) = 7.70, p < .001$ , and blind patriotism,  $t(439) = 5.56, p < .001$ , than the Korean sample. The two samples did not differ significantly on national security and constructive patriotism. For all sociopolitical variables, the variability within samples was lower for the Korean than the American sample.

**Table 1.** Differences between American and Korean Subscale Means and Standard Deviations

Subscale	American			Korean			Statistical Differences	
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Probability
Constructive <sup>a</sup>	223	37.63	5.54	215	37.10	3.76	1.16	<i>ns</i>
Blind <sup>b</sup>	226	27.22	7.40	215	23.91	4.72	5.56	$p < .001$
Civil <sup>c</sup>	224	33.75	6.13	215	36.48	5.00	-5.10	$p < .001$
Security <sup>d</sup>	225	32.00	6.16	215	31.12	4.76	1.68	<i>ns</i>
Militarism	225	28.96	6.68	215	24.57	5.14	7.70	$p < .001$

<sup>a</sup>Constructive = Constructive patriotism, <sup>b</sup>Blind = Blind patriotism, <sup>c</sup>Civil = Civil Liberties,

<sup>d</sup>Security = National security.

Within each sample, males and females obtained similar scores on most subscales (see Table 2). The only significant gender difference in the American sample was obtained for national security, with males scoring higher on this dimension,  $t(217) = 2.24, p < .05$ , than females. In the Korean sample, males scored significantly higher than females on both blind patriotism,  $t(213) = 2.45, p < .05$ , and militarism,  $t(213) = 2.45, p < .05$ . Thus, in 7 of 10 gender comparisons across the two samples, males and females obtained similar means, indicating more similarities than differences between males and females on the target variables.

**Table 2.** Gender Differences in Means and (Standard Deviations) of Sociopolitical Variables

Sociopolitical variable	Gender		Difference	
	American sample	Males ( $n = 49$ ) <sup>a</sup>		Females ( $n = 170$ ) <sup>a</sup>
Constructive patriotism		38.69 (5.13)	37.28 (5.56)	<i>ns</i>
Blind patriotism		27.46 (7.14)	27.04 (7.37)	<i>ns</i>
Civil liberties		32.92 (7.18)	33.88 (5.53)	<i>ns</i>
National security		33.73 (6.45)	31.54 (5.94)	$p < .05$
Militarism		29.94 (7.12)	28.66 (6.47)	<i>ns</i>
<b>Korean sample</b>		Males ( $n = 37$ ) <sup>a</sup>	Females ( $n = 138$ ) <sup>a</sup>	
Constructive patriotism		36.65 (3.41)	37.36 (3.93)	<i>ns</i>
Blind patriotism		24.75 (4.68)	23.44 (4.70)	$p < .05$
Civil liberties		36.34 (5.67)	36.56 (4.60)	<i>ns</i>
National security		31.91 (5.36)	30.67 (4.35)	<i>ns</i>
Militarism		25.70 (5.20)	23.93 (5.01)	$p < .05$

<sup>a</sup>Some students did not indicate their gender.



### 3. Correlations between Patriotism Measures and Other Sociopolitical Variables

Table 3 shows that the relationships between the patriotism and comparison measures were directionally the same across the two samples. Also, in both samples, correlations involving blind patriotism were stronger than those involving constructive patriotism and directionally opposite from those involving constructive patriotism. For example, constructive patriotism was positively correlated with respect for civil liberties, whereas blind patriotism was negatively correlated with respect for civil liberties. The strongest correlation within both samples was between blind patriotism and militarism (.76 for the American sample and .60 for the Korean sample).

**Table 3.** Correlations between Two Measures of Patriotism and Comparative Variables in American and Korean samples

<b>American Sample</b>			
Patriotism	Comparative variables		
	Civil liberties	National security	Militarism
Blind patriotism	-.44 (all)**	.64 (all)**	.76 (all)**
	-.29 (males)*	.60 (males)**	.76 (males)**
	-.49 (females)**	.66 (females)**	.76 (females)**
Constructive patriotism	.33 (all)**	-.34 (all)**	-.41 (all)**
	.41 (males)**	-.38 (males)**	-.31 (males)*
	.29 (females)**	-.36 (females)**	-.45 (females)**
<b>Korean Sample</b>			
Patriotism	Comparative variables		
	Civil liberties	National security	Militarism
Blind patriotism	-.10 (all)	.30 (all)**	.60 (all)**
	-.15 (males)	.22 (males)	.49 (males)**
	-.07 (females)	.33 (females)**	.65 (females)**
Constructive patriotism	.15 (all)*	-.12 (all)	-.14 (all)*
	.10 (males)	.11 (males)	-.17 (males)
	.19 (females)*	-.16 (females)	-.11 (females)

\*Correlations significant at the .05 level.

\*\*Correlations significant at the .01 level.

In addition to similarities in the cross-cultural correlation patterns, some important differences in these patterns also emerged (Table 3). Within the American sample, all six of the total-sample correlations were statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ), whereas only four of six of the total-sample correlations were statistically significant ( $p < .05$  and  $p < .01$ ) in the Korean sample. The American and Korean total-sample correlations differed significantly on all comparisons:  $p < .001$  for blind patriotism correlations and  $.05$  to  $.001$  for constructive patriotism correlations, with the American correlations consistently stronger than the Korean correlations. The smaller correlations for the Korean sample may partly be attributable to the lower variability on all variables in the Korean than the American sample.

The pattern of correlations for both males and females generally approximated the pattern of correlations for their respective total samples (Table 3). Correlations by gender in the American sample were directionally consistent with the total-sample correlations and similar in strength to the latter correlations. Plus, none of the differences between correlations for males and females in the American sample proved statistically significant. Similarly, in the Korean sample, the gender correlations were generally analogous to the total-sample correlations, and only one significant ( $p < .05$ ) gender differences emerged in the correlations between the patriotism measures and the comparison sociopolitical variables: blind patriotism and militarism (males =  $.49$ , females =  $.65$ ).

#### 4. General Conclusions from Findings

The subscales used in this study appear psychometrically stronger for the American than the Korean sample: the subscale internal consistency coefficients were higher in the American than in the Korean sample; the exploratory factor analysis of sub-

scales revealed only one or two factors per subscale in the American sample but several factors in each subscale in the Korean sample; and the confirmatory factor analysis showed generally satisfactory goodness of fit ratios for each subscale in the American sample. The stronger subscale psychometric features in the American sample could be attributed to some slippage from the intended item meanings in the Korean translation and to the very strong affective responses of the American students to 9/11 and the immense problems associated with the Iraq War. Thus, American students may have more definite responses than the Korean students to many of the sociopolitical items.

On all measures, the variability of scores was less in the Korean sample than the American sample. One possible explanation is that the Korean society, including the higher education sector, encourages more conformity to mainstream sociopolitical variables than does the American society. It could be that the polarity and diversity in American society regarding sociopolitical variables allowed for greater range of views than was the case in Korean society. It appears from some of the reports cited earlier in this study that even teachers in Korea may feel greater pressure to conform to mainstream societal values than would be the case in American society. Whatever the explanation for less variation in the Korean scores, the diminished variation likely weakened the correlations among those variables in the Korean sample.

The patterns of correlations in the two cultures suggest a more conservative sociopolitical orientation in American than Korean society. In addition to achieving higher means on militarism and blind patriotism plus a lower mean on civil liberties, the American sample produced stronger correlations for both blind and constructive patriotism than the Korean sample. Thus, one's views about the military, civil liberties, and national security are more strongly yoked to patriotism measures in

American than Korean society. Despite the cultural differences, gender differences were minimal both within and across cultures.

## IV. Discussion

American students scored higher than Korean students on blind patriotism and militarism but lower on respect for civil liberties. The two samples did not differ significantly on constructive patriotism and emphasis on national security. Although gender made little difference in the pattern of scores for the two samples, American males scored higher than American females on national security, and Korean males scored higher than Korean females on blind patriotism and militarism. Correlation patterns in both samples showed that constructive and blind patriotism were linked in opposite directions with respect for civil liberties, emphasis on national security, and militarism. However, most of these relationships were stronger for the American than the Korean sample.

### 1. Cultural Context for the Findings

Undoubtedly, cultural differences between American and Korean societies in the early 21st Century may have contributed to differential strength in some sociopolitical variables and relationships between those variables. American students' higher scores on blind patriotism and militarism may partly be affected by the U.S.'s continuing involvement in Iraq War II and the widespread societal emphasis on supporting the troops. Although South Korea did commit some troops to Iraq War II (the largest contributor behind the U.S. and Great Britain), the South Korean investment in the War was minuscule compared to the American investment. Plus, South Korean involvement has only been in non-combat roles, with many Koreans opposed even to that level

of involvement. Certainly, the Korean level of identity with the War has been negligible compared to the American identity.

Concomitant with the War in Iraq was continuing concern in the U.S. and South Korea about the prospect of North Korea's developing nuclear weapons that could be used against both South Korea and the U.S. North Korea's extremely large army and threats to develop nuclear weapons, combined with its geographic proximity to South Korea, may have created a sense of vulnerability in South Korea on par with the U.S. apprehension about possible terrorist attacks. Certainly, both societies had reason to be concerned about the strength of their military in defending their homeland from external threats. The 680,000 active troops in South Korea backed up by 4,500,000 regular reserves and 29,000 American troops stationed in South Korea would certainly create a sense of military presence in the culture ("Military of South Korea," n.d.; "US stealth fighters arrive in South Korea," 2007). Nonetheless, blind patriotism (including unconditional support for government policies during war) and a militaristic mentality were significantly stronger in the American than the Korean university.

The lower American scores on respect for civil liberties suggest that American students may be more willing to compromise some civil liberties in the interest of national security than are the Korean students. This differential regard for civil liberties may relate in part to the age and perceived vulnerability of the two democracies, with the Korean democracy being much younger than the American democracy. Only since 1992 has South Korea freely elected civilian presidents. Even in the early 21st Century, teachers in Korea were reported to be less comfortable in emphasizing human rights than in promoting conformity to social norms (Kang, 2002). Both teacher and student rights still appear tenuous in a society that has historically emphasized authoritarian government control. Consequently, Korean students may be more

vigilant in preserving newly won civil liberties than American students, who may be inclined to believe that valued civil liberties will endure across time and circumstances.

The study also showed some important cross-cultural differences in the relationships among the targeted variables. These differences related mainly to the strength rather than the directionality of the relationships. In fact, there were no cross-cultural differences in the directionality of the relationships. Although most of the relationships were weaker in the Korean than the American sample, the relationship between blind patriotism and militarism was very strong in both samples. Thus, unconditional support for government policy was strongly yoked to support for the military in both samples. It could be that blind patriotism naturally extends to a strong military as an expression of that patriotism, or that a strong military requires unconditional support for that military.

Militarism may be more likely to drive blind than constructive patriotism. In fact, constructive patriotism was negatively related to support for the military in both societies, but that relationship was significantly stronger in the American than in the Korean University. Once again, the maturity of democratic rule in the U.S. may have contributed to the American students' assertiveness in questioning the use of the military in dealing with international problems. Nonetheless, the strength of the negative relationships between constructive patriotism and militarism in both cultures was significantly weaker than the strength of the positive relationships between blind patriotism and militarism. Thus, it appears that in both American and South Korean universities, passionate support for the military is strongly associated with blind patriotism, whereas restrained questioning about the role and performance of the military is more characteristic of constructive patriotism.

We considered the possibility that the strength and relation-

ships of the target variables would differ by gender within each university. However, the results showed minimal gender differences within either sample: one of five comparisons in the American university and two of five comparisons in the Korean university yielded significant gender differences on the strength of the sociopolitical variables. There was no overlap in the specific significant gender differences across the two universities. Plus, the absolute magnitude of the significant gender differences was relatively small in all cases. Consequently, we are inclined to conclude that gender differences in response to the target variables are likely to be inconsistent and weak within and across the two cultures.

## **2. Potential Limitations and Future Research**

Some social-science researchers may question the unidirectional nature of the items within our various subscales. The items for each subscale were stated in the direction of support for that construct, creating the possibility of a response set that affected student responses across items. Given this arrangement, shifts in response sets were required only when students transitioned from one subscale to another (e.g., blind to constructive patriotism, civil liberties to national security). Despite a common psychometric practice of mixing the directionality of items within subscales, some research appears to support keeping the item directionality consistent within subscales (Ahlawat, 1985; Chang, 1993; Chang, 1995). In an extensive study of various combinations of consistent and inconsistent items within scales, Chang (1995) reached the conclusion that directionality of items should not be mixed within scales, even to control for response set. Such combinations, rather than measuring the same construct across items, likely result in a two-factor structure along the lines of directionality of items in the scale.

The strongest limitation of our findings is the marginal internal consistency of subscales in the Korean translation of the instrument and the equivocal exploratory factor analysis of subscale items within the Korea sample. Translation from English into Korean may have contributed to both of these empirical weaknesses. Although we followed accepted protocol in the translation process, undoubtedly some meanings may have been compromised in the translation process. It is likely that some concepts were measured far more cleanly in the American than the Korean university. Although we attempted to make the items culture free by not referring to any specific events that would be unique to either society, conditions in the U.S. since 2001 may have provided a more tangible frame of reference for item interpretation than in Korea.

Generalizability of the findings within the two cultures is considerably limited by the sampling procedures. Only college students from two universities participated in the study. Thus, readers should exercise caution in generalizing the findings to a broader range of college and non-college adults. We suspect that greater diversity in sampling would affect the magnitude of differences in means and correlations more than the directionality of scores and correlations. In fact, broader sampling across college and non-college adults, as well as across universities in all regions of each country, could actually magnify differences in scores and correlations reported in the current study. Both samples could be considered relatively homogeneous with respect to educational level, professional goals, age, and geographic background?similarities that likely attenuated the strength of some findings reported in the study. The more limited variations in subscale scores in the Korean sample most likely diminished the correlations between the patriotism variable and the remaining sociopolitical variables.



### **3. Concluding Observations**

The constructs investigated in the current study represent high-stakes issues in most societies, especially in the American culture during the early 21st Century. One should not assume that the strength and pattern of these constructs within American society generalize to other cultures. Whether the U.S. culture gravitates more toward constructive or blind patriotism will likely have a considerable impact on what sociopolitical values are emphasized in the U.S. society, which in turn could profoundly affect the nation's sense of liberty and safety. Likewise, if the democratic system in South Korea and diplomatic relationships between North and South Korea grow stronger in coming years, levels of patriotism and relationships between patriotism and other sociopolitical variables may also change in South Korea. If both the American and South Korean cultures evolve toward constructive patriotism in the 21st Century, the strength of their democracies and their images in the international community could both be enhanced.

### **References**

- Ahlawat, K. S. (1985). On the negative valence items in self-report measures. *Journal of General Psychology, 112*, 89-99.
- Bacevich, A. J. (2005). *The new American militarism: How Americans are seduced by war*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, N. V. (2003). National security versus civil liberties. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 33*, 547-567.
- Baker, W. D., & Oneal, J. R. (2001). Patriotism or opinion leadership? The nature and origins of the "rally round the flag" effect. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 45*, 661-687.

- Berns, W. (1997). On patriotism. *The Public Interest*, 127, 19-32.
- Bliss, S. L., Oh, E. J., & Williams, R. L. (2007). Militarism and sociopolitical perspectives among college students in the U.S. and South Korea. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 13, 175-199.
- Chang, L. (1993, June). *Connotatively consistent and connotatively inconsistent items are not fully equivalent*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Society, Chicago.
- Chang, L. (1995). Connotatively inconsistent test items. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 8, 199-209.
- Civil liberties. (n.d.). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved March 27, 2008 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil\\_liberties](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_liberties).
- Civil liberties: The freedom paradox. (2006). *The Economist*, 380, 24.
- Civil liberties: The real price of freedom (2007). *The Economist*, 384, 17-18.
- Cohrs, J. C. (2004). A new vision of constructive patriotism. *Psicologia Politica*, 29, 51-58.
- Depuiset, M. A., & Butera, F. (2003). The stability of patriotism in the face of variation in national laws. *Psychologica Belgica*, 43, 123-138.
- Diaz-Veizades, J., Widaman, K. F., Little, T. D., & Gibbs, K. W. (1995). The measurement and structure of human rights attitudes. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 313-328.
- Eckhardt, W., & Newcombe, A. G. (1969). Militarism, personality, and other social attitudes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 13, 210-219.
- Federico, C. M., Golec, A., & Dial, J. L. (2005). The relationship between the need for closure and support for military action against Iraq: Moderating the effects on national attachment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 621-632.
- Heaven, P. C. L. (1985). Value correlates of student attitudes on social issues. A multinational study. *Personality and Individual*

- Differences*, 6, 263-265.
- Hoelter, J. W. (1983). The analysis of covariance structures: Goodness of fit indices. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 11, 325-344.
- Huddy, L., & Khatib, N. (2007). American patriotism, national identity, and political involvement. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51, 63-77.
- Johnson, K., & Locy, T. (2003, Aug. 15). Patriot Act at heart of Ashcroft's influence. *USA Today*. Posted at [http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-09-15-ashcroft-usat\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-09-15-ashcroft-usat_x.htm).
- Kang, S. W. (2002). Democracy and human rights education in South Korea. *Comparative Education*, 38, 315-325.
- Kateb, G. (2000). Is patriotism a mistake? *Social Research*, 67, 901-924.
- Karasawa, M. (2002). Patriotism, nationalism, and internationalism among Japanese citizens: An etic-emic approach. *Political Psychology*, 23, 645-666.
- Kim, H. C. (2009). 9/11 and Korean American youth: A study of two opposing forces. In A. Sharma (Ed.), *The world's religions after September 11, Religion, war, and peace* (pp. 111-127). Westport, CT, US: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Kim, Y. M. (2003). The political idea of patriotism in Confucian Korea and Liberal America. *Korean Political Science Review*, 37(4), 55-70.
- Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford.
- Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 10, 257-274.
- Kwon, I. S. (2005). How identities and movement cultures became deeply saturated with militarism: Lessons from the pro-democracy movement of South Korea. *Asian Journal of Womens*

*Studies*, 11(2), 7-40.

- Lee, A. R. (2003). Down and down we go: Trust and compliance in South Korea. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84, 329-343.
- Lim, H. C., & Kim, B. K. (1998). Social and political dimension of national security in Korea, 1948-1999. *Asia Perspective*, 22(3), 223-258.
- List of United States Army installations in South Korea (n.d.). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved on April 7, 2008 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_United\\_States\\_Army\\_installations\\_in\\_South\\_Korea](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_United_States_Army_installations_in_South_Korea)
- Mann, M. (1987, March/April). The roots and contradictions of modern militarism. *New Left Review*. Pp. 1-11.
- Martin, K. (2004). Domestic intelligence and civil liberties. *SAIS Review*, 24(1), 7-21.
- McCleary, D. F., Nalls, M. L., & Williams, R. L. (in press). Types of patriotism as primary predictors of continuing support for the Iraq War. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*.
- McFarland, S. G. (2005). On the eve of war: Authoritarianism, social dominance, and American students' attitudes toward attacking Iraq. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 360-367.
- Military of South Korea. (n.d.). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved on April 7, 2008 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military\\_of\\_South\\_Korea](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military_of_South_Korea).
- National Security Act (South Korea), (n.d.). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved on March 28, 2008 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National\\_Security\\_Act\\_\(South\\_Korea\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Security_Act_(South_Korea)).
- Nelson, L. L. (1999). Relationships between problem-solving competencies and militaristic attitudes: Implication for peace education: *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 6, 263-265.
- Roh Moo-hyun. (n.d.). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved on April 8, 2008 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roh\\_Moo-hyun](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roh_Moo-hyun).
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the variety of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism.

- Political Psychology*, 20, 151-174.
- U.S. national pride highest among 34 countries-poll. (2006, June).  
*Dow Jones International News*. Dow Jones & Company, Inc.
- US stealth fighters arrive in South Korea. (Jan. 11, 2007). *Space war: Your world at war*. Retrieved on April 7, 2008 from [http://www.spacewar.com/reports/US\\_Stealth\\_Fighters\\_Arrive\\_In\\_South\\_Korea\\_999.html](http://www.spacewar.com/reports/US_Stealth_Fighters_Arrive_In_South_Korea_999.html).
- Westheimer, J. (2006, April). Politics and patriotism in education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 608-620.
- Williams, R. L. (2006). Academic freedom in higher education within a conservative sociopolitical culture. *Innovative Higher Education*, 31(1), 5-25.
- Williams, R. L., Bliss, S. L., & McCallum, R. S. (2006). Christian conservatism and militarism among teacher education students. *Review of Religious Research*, 48, 17-32.
- Williams, R. L., Foster, L. N., & Krohn, K. R. (2008). Relationship of patriotism measure to critical thinking and emphasis on civil liberties versus national security. *Analysis of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 8(1), 139-156.