



Check for updates

Психологические технологии в образовании

УДК 159.9

EDN XZSZYP

<https://www.doi.org/10.33910/2686-9527-2023-5-3-458-472>

Research article

## Constructive patriotism questionnaire (adolescent version): Psychometric characteristics

S. V. Vasileva <sup>1</sup>, A. V. Miklyaeva <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, 48 Moika Emb., Saint Petersburg 191186, Russia

### Authors

Svetlana V. Vasileva, SPIN: 9387-8525, Scopus AuthorID: 57221043888, ResearcherID: N-3380-2019, ORCID: 0000-0002-6052-3431, e-mail: [vasilevasv@herzen.spb.ru](mailto:vasilevasv@herzen.spb.ru)

Anastasia V. Miklyaeva, SPIN: 9471-8985, Scopus AuthorID: 53984860100, ResearcherID: D-4700-2017, ORCID: 0000-0001-8389-2275, e-mail: [a.miklyaeva@gmail.com](mailto:a.miklyaeva@gmail.com)

**For citation:** Vasileva, S. V., Miklyaeva, A. V. (2023) Constructive patriotism questionnaire (adolescent version): Psychometric characteristics. *Psychology in Education*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 458–472. <https://www.doi.org/10.33910/2686-9527-2023-5-3-458-472> EDN XZSZYP

**Received** 11 June 2023; reviewed 19 June 2023; accepted 19 June 2023.

**Funding:** The study was supported by the Russian Science Foundation (RSF), grant no. 23-28-00482.

**Copyright:** © S. V. Vasileva, A. V. Miklyaeva (2023). Published by Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia. Open access under CC BY-NC License 4.0.

### Abstract

**Introduction.** The article presents an adolescent version of the constructive patriotism questionnaire. The theoretical and methodological basis of the study was the approach by R. Schatz et al. based on the social identity theory by G. Tajfel and J. Turner.

**Materials and Methods.** The tested adolescent version of the constructive patriotism questionnaire included 12 items. The content validity and obvious validity of the items were assessed using focus group methods and cognitive interviews. We also tested the construct validity, internal consistency of the scales, concurrent validity, criterion validity and retest reliability. The study involved 17 expert teachers with higher pedagogical education and experience of working with adolescents, and 510 adolescents aged 14–18 years, of which 28 participated in a cognitive interview, and 482 were involved in a written survey to test the psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire.

**Results.** We developed the adolescent version of the constructive patriotism questionnaire which includes 12 items making up two scales: “constructive patriotism” and “blind patriotism”. The content validity and obvious validity of the items were substantiated using the methods of focus groups and cognitive interviews. The items showed satisfactory indicators of construct validity (confirmatory factor analysis:  $\chi^2/df = 1.41$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , CFI = 0.951, RMSEA = 0.046), concurrent validity (correlation analysis:  $r \geq 0.53$  for both scales of the questionnaire and the indicator “civic identity”,  $0.34 \leq r \leq 0.48$  for the constructive patriotism scale and assessments of various forms of prosocial behavior as elements of patriotism), internal consistency of the scales ( $\alpha = 0.794$  for the constructive patriotism scale and  $\alpha = 0.816$  for the blind patriotism scale) and their retest reliability ( $r = 0.47$  for the constructive patriotism scale and  $r = 0.51$  for the blind patriotism scale).

**Conclusion.** To conclude, the article discusses the possibilities of using the questionnaire in psychological and pedagogical work and the prospects for further research of its characteristics.

**Keywords:** patriotism, adolescents, constructive patriotism, blind patriotism, questionnaire, psychometric characteristics

## Научная статья

# Опросник конструктивного патриотизма (подростковая версия): психометрические характеристики

С. В. Васильева <sup>1</sup>, А. В. Микляева<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup> Российский государственный педагогический университет им. А. И. Герцена, 191186, Россия, г. Санкт-Петербург, наб. реки Мойки, д. 48**Сведения об авторах**Светлана Викторовна Васильева, SPIN-код: 9387-8525, Scopus AuthorID: 57221043888, ResearcherID: N-3380-2019, ORCID: 0000-0002-6052-3431, e-mail: [vasilevasv@herzen.spb.ru](mailto:vasilevasv@herzen.spb.ru)Анастасия Владимировна Микляева, SPIN-код: 9471-8985, Scopus AuthorID: 53984860100, ResearcherID: D-4700-2017, ORCID: 0000-0001-8389-2275, e-mail: [a.miklyaeva@gmail.com](mailto:a.miklyaeva@gmail.com)**Для цитирования:** Васильева, С. В., Микляева, А. В. (2023) Опросник конструктивного патриотизма (подростковая версия): психометрические характеристики. Психология человека в образовании, т. 5, № 3, с. 458–472. <https://www.doi.org/10.33910/2686-9527-2023-5-3-458-472> EDN XZSZYP**Получена** 11 июня 2023; прошла рецензирование 19 июня 2023; принята 19 июня 2023.**Финансирование:** Исследование выполнено за счет гранта Российского научного фонда № 23-28-00482.**Права:** © С. В. Васильева, А. В. Микляева (2023). Опубликовано Российским государственным педагогическим университетом им. А. И. Герцена. Открытый доступ на условиях [лицензии CC BY-NC 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).**Аннотация****Введение.** В статье представлены результаты исследования, направленного на разработку подростковой версии опросника конструктивного патриотизма. Теоретико-методологические основания исследования составил подход к трактовке патриотизма и его форм Р. Шатца и соавт., разработанный с опорой на положения теории социальной идентичности Г. Тэджфела и Дж. Тернера.**Материалы и методы.** Апробируемая версия опросника конструктивного патриотизма, предназначенная для подростков, включала 12 пунктов, оцениваемых по 7-балльной шкале Лайкерта. Содержательная и очевидная валидность пунктов опросника оценивались с помощью методов фокус-групп и когнитивного интервью, конструктивная валидность — с помощью эксплораторного и конфирматорного факторного анализа, внутренняя согласованность шкал — с помощью коэффициента Кронбаха, конкурентная валидность (на основе сопоставления с результатами диагностики по методикам «Патриограмма» и «Валентность гражданской идентичности») и ретестовая надежность — с помощью коэффициента корреляции Пирсона. В исследовании приняли участие 17 педагогов-экспертов в возрасте от 24 до 56 лет, в том числе 12 женщин и 5 мужчин, имеющих высшее профессиональное педагогическое образование и опыт работы с подростками от 3 до 24 лет, а также 510 старших подростков в возрасте 14–18 лет, из которых 28 участвовали в когнитивном интервью, а 482 были привлечены к письменному опросу для проверки психометрических характеристик опросника.**Результаты.** Разработан опросник конструктивного патриотизма, предназначенный для работы с подростками, включающий 10 пунктов, составляющих две шкалы: «конструктивный патриотизм» и «слепой патриотизм». Содержательная и очевидная валидность пунктов опросника обоснованы с помощью методов фокус-групп и когнитивного интервью. Получены удовлетворительные показатели конструктивной валидности (конфирматорный факторный анализ:  $\chi^2/df = 1,41$ ,  $p < 0,01$ , CFI = 0,951, RMSEA = 0,046), конкурентной валидности ( $r \geq 0,53$  для обеих шкал опросника и показателя гражданской идентичности,  $0,34 \leq r \leq 0,48$  для шкалы конструктивного патриотизма и оценок различных форм просоциального поведения как элементов патриотизма), внутренней согласованности шкал ( $\alpha = 0,794$  для шкалы конструктивного патриотизма и  $\alpha = 0,816$  для шкалы слепого патриотизма) и их ретестовой надежности ( $r = 0,47$  для шкалы конструктивного патриотизма и  $r = 0,51$  для шкалы слепого патриотизма).**Заключение.** Обсуждаются возможности использования опросника в психолого-педагогической практике, а также перспективы дальнейших исследований его характеристик.**Ключевые слова:** патриотизм, подростки, конструктивный патриотизм, слепой патриотизм, опросник, психометрические характеристики

## Introduction

While the research on adolescent patriotism is proliferating, there is an obvious dearth of relevant diagnostic research tools. This is, primarily, due to the absence of a single theoretical and methodological approach to understanding patriotism, which is especially true for psychological research. Some of the possible interpretations include: patriotism as a personality trait (Potemkin 2009); a voluntary desire to follow the accepted rules of social behavior (Ippolitova et al. 2022); emotional attachment to the nation or its people (Huddy, Khatib 2007); a form of social identity based on national / civic identity (Kravchenko 2015; Schatz 2020). All these examples indicate a lack of a single theoretical and methodological framework of psychological research on patriotism. Numerous approaches to patriotism create a perspective where patriotism is seen as a multi-faceted phenomenon which integrates a range of components. Among them are affective (love for one's country); conative (readiness to put public interest ahead of personal ones); behavioral (showing relevant behavior); and identity-related (identification with one's country) (Zhuravlev, Yurevich 2016). Importantly, the primary focus is in on the affective nature of patriotism as a social feeling and its manifestation through different forms of social behavior (Lebedev, Gordyakova 2016). Along with that, studies approach patriotism as a heterogeneous phenomenon that can take different forms, e. g., national ("parochial") or critical (Zhuravlev, Yurevich 2016); ideological, problem-based or conformal (Gordyakova, Lebedev 2017); blind or constructive (Schatz et al. 1999), etc.

The lack of a single theoretical and methodological framework in research on patriotism challenges overall research methodology as valid and reliable research methods are limited. Most empirical studies use questionnaires (Gogiberidze 2022; Lebedev 2014; Svinareva et al. 2014; etc), with some questionnaires being quite popular in psychological and pedagogical research, e. g., "My Motherland is Russia" (Grigorev, Stepanov 2011) and "What Is Patriotism?" (Osnovin 2016). Among other popular methods are those based on psychosemantics. These include associative experiments and different modifications of a semantic differential (Kostrigin, Vigand 2019; Tarasov 2020; etc.). Despite being popular, these methods are primarily used to obtain data on the respondents' ideas about and attitudes to patriotism. However, no matter which approach to patriotism a particular study supports, these data are not reliable enough

to analyze the psychological core of patriotism. At the same time, questionnaires that focus on individual aspects of patriotism within the structure of personality traits are much less popular. Among them are the "Patriogram" (Potemkin 2009) and "Diagnosis of Patriotism Types" (Gordyakova, Lebedev 2017). However, the open-access literature on these methods does not provide detailed enough psychometric rationale in their support. Besides, when it comes to exploring the psychology of patriotism, both questionnaires follow the logic of their authors, which limits the possibilities of interpretation.

Modern social psychology is a system of categories. From this perspective, of all the psychological interpretations of patriotism listed above, patriotism seen as social identification seems to be the most all-encompassing. For more on the difference between the approaches see (Miklyaeva, Rummyantseva 2008; 2011). In this light, we view the theory of social identity as the most rational theoretical and methodological framework for psychological research on patriotism. So far, we have not found any Russian questionnaires that could effectively accommodate the social identity theory in psychological research on patriotism. An effective methodology, as we see it, would balance different aspects of social identity (national and civic) and embrace affective, conative, and behavioral components of patriotism. These characteristics are found in "Blind and Constructive Patriotism Scale" (Schatz et al. 1999). The scale takes into account the leading modality of identification (national and civic for blind and constructive patriotism, respectively), the level of emotional attachment to one's country (correlates positively with both blind and constructive patriotism), and readiness to act for the benefit of one's country (through the juxtaposition of one's country and other countries in case of blind patriotism; through the improvement of life in one's country without looking back at other countries in case of constructive patriotism). Empirical studies have shown that constructive patriotism prioritizes development based on constructive / action-based criticism, while blind patriotism is underpinned by national conservatism (Sekerdej, Roccas 2016). The studies also indicate links between constructive patriotism and different forms of pro-social behavior (Rupar et al. 2021).

To our knowledge, the "Blind and Constructive Patriotism Scale" has no Russian version. In this regard, the reported study primarily aimed to adapt the scale for the Russian sample, not only adult (like the original version), but also adolescent.

However, expert evaluation of the scale showed that its original version was no longer applicable to current forms of constructive patriotism showed by Russian adolescents. See more in (Vasileva, Miklyaeva 2023). This entailed a change in the aim of the study which now focused on the development of adolescent version of the constructive patriotism questionnaire based on the theoretical and methodological provisions of the original scale designed by R. Schatz et al.

## Materials and methods

The reported questionnaire is based on the “Blind and Constructive Patriotism Scale” (Schatz et al. 1999). To begin with, we used double translation to render the 18 items of the original questionnaire into Russian. The initial testing of the translated questionnaire involved 17 experts in education aged from 24 to 56, including 12 female and 5 male experts with a degree in teaching and a track record of 3 to 24 years in patriotic education of adolescents. The experts evaluated the content validity of the questionnaire that was originally developed for adults and found that more than 50% of its items were irrelevant to the types of activity that reveal patriotic beliefs of adolescents. The experts were encouraged to reword the items to accommodate a range of social and civic activities relevant to adolescents, including educational, career-related, environmental, volunteer and socially-relevant activity. See more in (Vasileva, Miklyaeva 2023). This approach is in line with new promising psychological research on patriotism with its substantive focus on the behavioral components of patriotism (Korz, Karimova 2022).

The new adolescent version of the patriotism questionnaire is based on the consolidated opinion of the experts. It includes 12 items assessed on a 7-point Likert scale. Items 1 to 6 describe blind patriotism, while items 7 to 12 constructive patriotism:

- 1) Russia can only be inhabited by those who love this country wholeheartedly.
- 2) Those who are critical of Russia's historical past cannot be considered true patriots.
- 3) We should not try to change the way of life established in Russia.
- 4) Russians must not break Russian laws because these are the laws of their country.
- 5) There is so much criticism of Russia in the world that we, Russian citizens, should not criticize our country.

- 6) It is not patriotic to criticize the country you live in.
- 7) It is necessary to study hard to get an in-demand profession and contribute to the development of Russia.
- 8) Those who truly love Russia are striving to become professionals capable of resolving the country's challenges.
- 9) Love for Russia, among other things, is taking care about its environment.
- 10) Patriotism is about volunteering and helping those compatriots who need it most.
- 11) Those who take part in pro-Russian government rallies are Russia's patriots.
- 12) The progress of Russia is down to people and their readiness to engage in events and activities that improve everyday life (celebrations, community clean-ups, etc.).

Face validity of the questionnaire items was evaluated through a cognitive interview (Latcheva 2011) followed by content analysis of the results and calculation of statistical stability of content analysis units (Eremeev 1996). The interview involved 28 adolescents aged 14–18 (17 females and 11 males).

The discriminating power of the questionnaire items as well as the range of mean values on the scales were characterized using descriptive statistics ( $M \pm S$ ). The construct validity was assessed using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. The internal consistency of the scales was assessed using the Cronbach's coefficient, while the concurrent validity and retest reliability were assessed using the Pearson correlation coefficient ( $r$ ). To assess the criterion validity of the questionnaire, the battery of tests was supplemented with A. N. Tartarko's “Valence of Civic Identity” method and the “Patriogram” questionnaire developed by S. I. Kudinov and A. V. Potemkin. As regards the latter, we only used primary assessment scales that describe the content of patriotic behavior rather than personal traits. Quantitative psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire were tested on 482 adolescents aged 14–18 ( $16.33 \pm 0.77$ ), including 62.4% females and 37.6% males studying at general military schools, vocational schools and universities of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Oblast, Russia. The empirical data were obtained through an online survey. The respondents aged 16 or older provided their informed consent, while parents' / guardians' informed consent was obtained from those aged below 16. The calculations were performed using applied statistical software IBM SPSS Statistics Ver. 23 with the AMOS module.

## Results and discussion

### *Obvious validity of the questionnaire items*

The obvious validity of the questionnaire items was assessed through the content analysis of cognitive interviews. The content analysis revealed relevant and irrelevant interpretations of questions that

the adolescents answered during the interview. The results (Table 1) indicate that the majority of items were interpreted correctly: 6 items out of 12 were interpreted correctly, while 4 more items were interpreted correctly in over 90% of cases.

Irrelevant interpretations in item 1 and item 8 were considered random as the calculated statistical significance for their occurrence was low.

Table 1. The results of the content analysis of the interpretation of the questionnaire items by adolescents who participated in the cognitive interview

Item	Examples of relevant interpretations of items	Number of irrelevant interpretations
1	+ “For a country to develop, people who live in it must love it”. – “If a person does not love his or her country, should he or she be deported to another country by force? I believe that this is wrong”.	1
2	+ “If you love the country, then you love its past”. – “Patriotism is love for the Motherland, not for its history. It seems to me it is enough to love the current period, not history, to be a patriot”.	—
3	+ “I support the order that now exists in our country”. – “You always need to strive for the best and you need to change something”.	—
4	+ “If you do not comply, it means you do not respect your country, you do not respect the place where you were born, where you are growing up”. – “You must obey all laws, even if you are not on the territory of your country”.	5
5	+ “Why criticize the country in which you were born and live? There are bad times, but you just need to strive for the best”. – “People abroad hardly know what life in this country is like, citizens know more and criticism from them is more appropriate”.	—
6	+ “By criticizing, you are just betraying the Motherland”. – “This criticism can help quite a lot in the development of the country”.	—
7	+ “If you get admitted, learn a profession and then work, you will be useful”. – “In our country, many have studied well, but now they are not working in the profession, but they still benefit the country”.	2
8	+ “It is good if there is a specialist who can solve difficult issues, because there are few specialists right now who solve something, there is a need for more of them, and they should come to an agreement, helping the country”. – “You can help the Motherland without learning a profession”.	1
9	+ “We must start with ourselves and our country in order to improve the ecology in the world as a whole. There are many countries that improve the environment, and if you love Russia, you should also support its ecology for the benefit of the country’s development”. – No example.	—
10	+ “Now we have a difficult moment, and there are a lot of volunteers, but we still do not have enough volunteers, and volunteering is also a manifestation of patriotism”. – “For me, volunteering and patriotism are not connected”.	2
11	+ “These events are intended to help Russia, to give them additional strength”. – “It is not necessary to go to such events to support the country; patriots can sit quietly at home and relax — it does not affect the love for the country in any way”.	3
12	+ “The opportunity to be actively involved in any such activity indicates that you are not indifferent, and you can do something good for the state. This is an active position”. – “Volunteer community clean-ups will not affect people’s lives in any way”.	—

Note: “+” — an example of a comment on the answers expressing agreement with the questionnaire item, “-” — an example of a comment on the answers expressing disagreement with the questionnaire item; the number of irrelevant interpretations is given in absolute units (max = 28).

Табл. 1. Результаты контент-анализа интерпретации пунктов опросника подростками, участвовавшими в когнитивном интервью

№ п/п	Примеры содержательно релевантных трактовок	Количество нерелевантных трактовок
1	+ «Чтобы страна развивалась, в ней должны жить любящие ее люди». – «Если человек не любит свою страну, то его надо депортировать в другую страну насильно? Я считаю, что так нельзя».	1
2	+ «Если ты любишь страну, значит, ты любишь ее прошлое». – «Патриотизм — это любовь к Родине, а не к ее истории, мне кажется достаточно любить данный период, а не историю, чтобы быть патриотом».	—
3	+ «Я поддерживаю порядок, который сейчас есть в нашей стране». – «Всегда нужно стремиться к лучшему и нужно что-то менять».	—
4	+ «Если ты не будешь выполнять, значит, ты не уважаешь свою страну, не уважаешь то место, где ты родился, где растешь». – «Все законы нужно соблюдать, даже если ты находишься не на территории своей страны».	5
5	+ «Зачем страну, в которой ты родился и живешь, критиковать. Бывают плохие времена, но нужно просто стремиться к лучшему». – «За рубежом вряд ли знают, как в этой стране живет, граждане знают больше и критика от них более уместна».	—
6	+ «Критикуя, ты просто изменяешь Родине». – «Эта критика может довольно сильно помогать в развитии страны».	—
7	+ «Если ты поступишь на какую-то профессию, обучишься и будешь работать, то будешь пользу приносить». – «В нашей стране многие хорошо учились, но работают сейчас не по профессии, и все равно приносят пользу стране».	2
8	+ «Это хорошо, если есть специалист, который может решить трудные вопросы, ведь сейчас мало специалистов правильно решающих что-то, нужно чтобы их было больше, и они приходили к общему мнению, помогая стране». – «Не выучившись на профессию тоже можно помогать Родине».	1
9	+ «Надо сначала начать себя и своей страны, чтобы в целом в мире потом улучшить экологию. Есть множество стран, которые улучшают экологию, и если ты любишь Россию, ты должен на благо ее развития также поддерживать ее экологию». – Нет примера высказывания.	—
10	+ «Сейчас у нас трудный момент, и волонтеров много, но нам все равно не хватает волонтеров, и в этом патриотизм тоже проявляется». – «Волонтерство и патриотизм для меня не связаны».	2
11	+ «Эти мероприятия сделаны для того, чтобы помочь России, чтобы дать им дополнительные силы». – «Не обязательно ходить на такие мероприятия, чтобы поддержать страну, патриоты могут спокойно сидеть дома, отдыхать, это никак не влияет на любовь к стране».	3
12	+ «Возможность активно включаться в любую деятельность такого рода говорит о равнодушии, и ты можешь что-то сделать хорошее для государства. Это активная позиция». – «Субботники никак не повлияют на состояние жизни людей».	—

*Примечание:* «+» — пример комментария к ответам, выражающим согласие с пунктом опросника, «–» — пример комментария к ответам, выражающим несогласие с пунктом опросника; количество нерелевантных трактовок приведено в абсолютных единицах (max = 28).

Irrelevant interpretations in item 4 are due to the shift in the respondents' focus and their attempt to evaluate laws on the grounds of fairness. Hence, such answers as, e. g., "It is only just that some laws are constantly broken"; "None of our laws are one hundred percent fair. I think that it is ok to break some of such laws". Irrelevant interpretations in item 7 are related to an idea that education does not guarantee success in life, e. g., "To get an in-demand profession means having a relevant education, however, you can succeed in life without any education. Singing, dancing or playing a musical instrument can bring you to fame in your country or worldwide". Irrelevant interpretations in item 10 are due to personal attitudes to volunteering, e. g., "We have to help anyone who needs it and, actually, help everyone — it won't hurt anyone". Some irrelevant interpretations in item 11 were caused by the misunderstanding of the word combination "pro-Russian government rallies". Here, the answers could go along the lines of "I'm not a big expert in such things. I've never taken part in such initiatives", etc. These results were taken into account during

the quantitative assessment of the questionnaire characteristics.

### Descriptive statistics of the questionnaire items

The descriptive statistics indicate high differentiating power of all the 12 items of the questionnaire (Table 2). Accordingly, the questionnaire structure accommodated the data on all the items offered to respondents for evaluation.

### Construct validity and internal constituency of the questionnaire

The questionnaire structure was determined by the exploratory factor analysis using the principal component method with Varimax rotation (Kaiser normalization). This approach allowed to identify two factors explaining 53.3% of the total variance based on the Kaiser and Cattell criteria (Table 3). The first factor (F1) embraces 5 questionnaire items with factor loadings varying from 0.65 to 0.81. Based on their content, the 5 items in question were referred to as "constructive patriotism".

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for questionnaire items

Item	Average	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Deviation
1	3.37	3.00	1.00	7.00	1.77
2	2.80	2.00	1.00	7.00	1.63
3	2.97	3.00	1.00	7.00	1.63
4	5.23	6.00	1.00	7.00	1.73
5	3.70	4.00	1.00	7.00	1.83
6	3.54	4.00	1.00	7.00	1.97
7	5.09	5.00	1.00	7.00	1.62
8	4.61	5.00	1.00	7.00	1.73
9	5.89	6.00	1.00	7.00	1.30
10	4.94	5.00	1.00	7.00	1.65
11	4.58	5.00	1.00	7.00	1.66
12	5.13	5.00	1.00	7.00	1.55

Табл. 2. Описательные статистики для пунктов опросника

№ п/п	Среднее	Медиана	Минимум	Максимум	Стандартное отклонение
1	3,37	3,00	1,00	7,00	1,77
2	2,80	2,00	1,00	7,00	1,63
3	2,97	3,00	1,00	7,00	1,63

Таблица 2. Продолжение

4	5,23	6,00	1,00	7,00	1,73
5	3,70	4,00	1,00	7,00	1,83
6	3,54	4,00	1,00	7,00	1,97
7	5,09	5,00	1,00	7,00	1,62
8	4,61	5,00	1,00	7,00	1,73
9	5,89	6,00	1,00	7,00	1,30
10	4,94	5,00	1,00	7,00	1,65
11	4,58	5,00	1,00	7,00	1,66
12	5,13	5,00	1,00	7,00	1,55

Table 3. Results of exploratory factor analysis

<b>Item</b>	<b>Factor 1</b>	<b>Factor 2</b>
1	0.26	0.55
2	0.08	0.73
3	0.02	0.65
4	0.51	0.40
5	0.17	0.84
6	0.10	0.80
7	0.73	0.12
8	0.67	0.21
9	0.81	-0.10
10	0.65	0.19
11	0.58	0.39
12	0.74	0.24
Expl.Var	3.31	3.08
Prp.Totl	27.6%	25.7%

Note: fragments of the factor matrix reflecting the composition of factors are marked in bold; variables that are not included in any factor are marked in italics.

Табл. 3. Результаты эксплораторного факторного анализа

<b>№ п/п</b>	<b>Фактор 1</b>	<b>Фактор 2</b>
1	0,26	0,55
2	0,08	0,73
3	0,02	0,65
4	0,51	0,40
5	0,17	0,84



Таблица 3. Продолжение

6	0,10	0,80
7	0,73	0,12
8	0,67	0,21
9	0,81	-0,10
10	0,65	0,19
11	0,58	0,39
12	0,74	0,24
Общая дисперсия	3,31	3,08
Доля общей дисперсии	27,6%	25,7%

Примечание: полужирным шрифтом отмечены фрагменты матрицы факторных нагрузок, отражающие состав факторов; курсивом отмечены переменные, не вошедшие ни в один из факторов.

The second factor (F2) of 5 variables with factor loadings varying from 0.55 to 0.84 was labeled “blind patriotism”. Items 4 and 11 were not included in any of the factors as the difference between F1 and F2 for them was less than 0.2 (Nasledov 2004). Importantly, items 4 and 11 produced the biggest number of irrelevant interpretations (see Table 1 for the results of the cognitive interview), hence, their exclusion increased the content validity of the questionnaire.

As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, the questionnaire items were grouped into two scales: “constructive patriotism” (5 items, range of scores from 5 to 35) and “blind patriotism” (5 items, range of scores from 5 to 35). To test the correspondence

of empirical data to the questionnaire structure, we conducted the confirmatory factor analysis. It showed that, provided that the covariance between the residual items 7–10 and 12 (Table 4) is taken into account, the two factor solution that covers 10 questionnaire items is more effective than the similar initial solution with 12 items.

The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was 0.794 for the constructive patriotism scale and 0.816 for the blind patriotism scale. These results indicate sufficient consistency of the items on both scales. The scales are moderately positively correlated with each other ( $r = 0.38$ ), which corresponds to the data obtained with the original questionnaire (Schatz 2020).

Table 4. Adequacy indicators of the analyzed models

Model	$\chi^2/df$	p	CFI	RMSEA
Two-factor, 12 items	2.87	>0.05	0.863	0.110 (0.087–0.120)
Two-factor, 10 items	2.06	<0.05	0.876	0.091 (0.074–0.113)
Two-factor, 10 items with covariances (final)	1.41	<0.01	0.951	0.046 (0.032–0.068)

Табл. 4. Показатели пригодности проанализированных моделей

Модель	$\chi^2/df$	p	CFI	RMSEA
Двухфакторная на основе 12 пунктов	2,87	>0,05	0,863	0,110 (0,087–0,120)
Двухфакторная на основе 10 пунктов	2,06	<0,05	0,876	0,091 (0,074–0,113)
Двухфакторная на основе 10 пунктов с учетом ковариаций (итоговая)	1,41	<0,01	0,951	0,046 (0,032–0,068)

*Concurrent validity and retest reliability*

The analysis of concurrent validity (Table 5) showed that the indicators of blind and constructive patriotism correlate positively with such indicators as civic identity, protection of one's country and enhancement of patriotism in others. These results match the available literature data on the interrelations between

both forms of patriotism and components of civic identity based on the sense of belonging to one's country and actions aimed at maintaining positive identity through the differentiation of in- and out-groups and ingroup favoritism (in our case, the scales "protection of one's country" and "enhancement of patriotism in others", respectively).

Table 5. Correlations between the scales of blind and constructive patriotism, the scale of civic identity and the "Patriogram"

Scales of questionnaires for criteria validity testing		Significant correlations ( $r < 0.30$ at $p < 0.01$ ) with the scales of:	
		blind patriotism	constructive patriotism
civic identity		0.54	0.53
The focus of patriotism on:	protecting the country	0.39	0.36
	solving important problems for the country and society	—	0.48
	enhancing patriotism in others	0.41	0.34
	raising the country's profile by any available means	—	0.37
	improving the standard of living	—	0.42
	arranging public life	—	0.46
	acquiring new knowledge and life experience	—	0.36
	striving to be useful to others	—	0.42

Табл. 5. Взаимосвязи шкал слепого и конструктивного патриотизма с показателями шкалы гражданской идентичности и «Патриогаммы»

Шкалы методик, посредством которых проверялась критериальная валидность		Значимые корреляции ( $r < 0,30$ при $p < 0,01$ ) со шкалами	
		слепого патриотизма	конструктивного патриотизма
Гражданская идентичность		0,54	0,53
Направленность патриотизма на:	защиту своей страны	0,39	0,36
	решение задач, нужных для страны и общества	—	0,48
	повышение патриотизма у окружающих людей	0,41	0,34
	повышение статуса своей страны любыми доступными способами	—	0,37
	улучшение уровня жизни окружающих людей	—	0,42
	обустройство общественной жизни	—	0,46
	приобретение новых знаний и жизненного опыта	—	0,36
	стремление быть полезным для окружающих людей	—	0,42

Besides, the indicator of constructive patriotism correlates substantially with the “Patriogram” scales that describe community-centered activity of individuals that we see as lacking in case of blind patriotism. Theoretical expectancy and explainability of the identified correlations indicate satisfactory concurrent validity.

Retest reliability was assessed at the interval of five weeks between the initial and follow-up interviews (n = 42, 69.0% females). The correlation coefficients were  $r = 0.51$  for the blind patriotism scale and  $r = 0.47$  for the constructive patriotism scale. The results suggest satisfactory retest reliability.

### Conclusion

The study resulted in the development of the adolescent version of the constructive patriotism questionnaire. The questionnaire includes two scales: constructive patriotism scale and blind patriotism scale. The content validity and obvious validity of the questionnaire items were assessed using focus group methods and cognitive interviews. Construct and concurrent validity as well as inter-

nal consistency of the scales and their retest reliability were determined by statistical methods. The questionnaire can be recommended for use among adolescents to test the content of their patriotic ideas and encourage the development of constructive patriotism.

The limitations of our study include a relatively small methodological toolset used to assess the concurrent validity of the questionnaire. Another limitation is the heterogeneous sample that included older adolescents from different levels of education and different types of educational institutions (general education schools, general military schools, vocational schools, and universities). In this respect, follow-up research will focus, primarily, on the assessment of differential validity of the questionnaire. This will provide data on sociodemographic and context-dependent variables. Another avenue of future research is continuous assessment of correlations between constructive and blind patriotism scales using a broader range of relevant methods, e. g., those that identify different components of social identity more precisely or provide data on personal traits of respondents.

### Appendix

#### Constructive patriotism questionnaire (adolescent version)

Please, rate how much you agree with each of the following statements on a seven point scale, where 1 – *Completely disagree*; 2 – *Disagree*; 3 – *Rather disagree than agree*; 4 – *Neither agree nor disagree*; 5 – *Rather agree than disagree*; 6 – *Agree*; 7 – *Completely agree*

1. Russia can only be inhabited by those who love this country wholeheartedly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Those who are critical of Russia's historical past cannot be considered true patriots	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. We should not try to change the way of life established in Russia	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. There is so much criticism of Russia in the world that we, Russian citizens, should not criticize our country	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. It not patriotic to criticize the country you live in	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. It is necessary to study hard to get an in-demand profession and contribute to the development of Russia	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Those who truly love Russia are striving to become professionals capable of resolving the country's challenges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Love for Russia, among other things, is taking care about its environment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Patriotism is about volunteering and helping those compatriots who need it most	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. The progress of Russia is down to people and their readiness to engage in events and activities that improve everyday life (celebrations, community clean-ups, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Calculating the score:

No	Scale	Items
1	Blind patriotism	1+, 2+, 3+, 4+, 5+
2	Constructive patriotism	6+, 7+, 8+, 9+, 10+

Range of mean values:

No	Scale	Min	Max	M ± S
1	Blind patriotism	5	35	16.39 ± 16.50
2	Constructive patriotism	5	35	25.66 ± 26.00

Приложение

### Опросник конструктивного патриотизма (подростковая версия)

**Инструкция.** Пожалуйста, прочитайте утверждения и выберите ответ, наиболее точно отражающий степень Вашего согласия или несогласия с ними по шкале от 1 до 7: 1 — совершенно не согласен; 2 — не согласен; 3 — скорее не согласен, чем согласен; 4 — нейтрален / не могу определить; 5 — скорее согласен, чем не согласен; 6 — согласен; 7 — полностью согласен

1. На территории России должны жить только те граждане, которые любят ее всем сердцем	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Люди, критически оценивающие историческое прошлое России, не могут считаться истинными патриотами	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Не стоит стремиться менять сформировавшийся в России уклад жизни	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. В мире так много критики в адрес России, что мы — ее граждане — не должны критиковать свою страну	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Непатриотично критиковать страну, в которой ты живешь	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Нужно упорно учиться, чтобы, получив востребованную профессию, помогать нашей стране двигаться по пути позитивных изменений	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Тот, кто по-настоящему любит Россию, стремится стать специалистом, который может разрешать возникающие в стране трудности	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Любовь к России выражается, в том числе, в заботе о ее экологическом благополучии	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Патриотизм проявляется в готовности включаться в волонтерскую работу, направленную на помощь тем соотечественникам, которые в ней нуждаются	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Позитивное развитие России зависит от готовности людей активно включаться в мероприятия, которые улучшают повседневную жизнь (праздники, субботники и т. д.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

«Ключ» для подсчета баллов:

№ п/п	Шкалы	Пункты
1	Слепой патриотизм	1+, 2+, 3+, 4+, 5+
2	Конструктивный патриотизм	6+, 7+, 8+, 9+, 10+

Диапазон средних значений:

№ п/п	Шкалы	Минимум	Максимум	Диапазон M ± S
1	Слепой патриотизм	5	35	16,39 ± 16,50
2	Конструктивный патриотизм	5	35	25,66 ± 26,00

## Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest, either existing or potential.

## Конфликт интересов

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии потенциального или явного конфликта интересов.

## Ethics Approval

The authors declare that the study complies with all ethical principles applicable to human and animal research.

## Соответствие принципам этики

Авторы сообщают, что при проведении исследования соблюдены этические принципы, предусмотренные для исследований с участием людей и животных.

## Author Contributions

The authors have made an equal contribution to the preparation of the manuscript of the article.

## Вклад авторов

Авторы внесли равный вклад в подготовку рукописи статьи.

## Acknowledgements

The authors express their sincere gratitude to I. A. Gorkovaya, A. Yu. Butkevich, M. S. Lytkin and K. Yu. Vilde for their invaluable assistance in organizing the collection of empirical data.

## Благодарности

Авторы выражают искреннюю признательность И. А. Горьковой, А. Ю. Буткевич, М. С. Лыткину и К. Ю. Вильде за неоценимую помощь в организации сбора эмпирических данных.

## References

- Eremeev, B. A. (1996) *Statisticheskie protsedury pri psikhologicheskom izuchenii teksta [Statistical procedures in the psychological study of the text]*. Saint Petersburg: Obrazovanie Publ., 54 p. (In Russian)
- Gogiberidze, G. M. (2022) Grazhdansko-patrioticheskoe vospitanie kak tselevoj orientir vzaïmodeïstviya sotsial'nykh institutov sem'i i shkoly [Civic-patriotic education as a target for the interaction of social institutions of the family and school]. *Gertsenovskie chteniya: psikhologicheskie issledovaniya v obrazovanii — The Herzen University Studies: Psychology in Education*, iss. 5, pp. 122–130. <https://doi.org/10.33910/herzenpsyconf-2022-5-15> (In Russian)
- Gordyakova, O. V., Lebedev, A. N. (2017) Chuvstvo patriotizma i tipy patrioticheskogo povedeniya molodykh grazhdan Rossii [Feeling of patriotism and types of patriotic behavior of young citizens of Russia]. In: A. A. Demidov, L. I. Surat (eds.). *Psikhologicheskie i psikhoanaliticheskie issledovaniya. Ezhegodnik 2017 [Psychological and psychoanalytic studies. Yearbook 2017]*. Moscow: Moscow Institute of Psychoanalysis Publ., pp. 307–327. EDN: [YXBRRT](https://doi.org/10.33910/herzenpsyconf-2022-5-15) (In Russian)
- Grigorev, D. V., Stepanov, P. V. (2011) *Vneurochnaya deyatelnost' shkol'nikov. Metodicheskij konstrukt [Extracurricular activities of schoolchildren. Methodical constructor]*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie Publ., 223 p. (In Russian)
- Huddy, L., Khatib, N. (2007) American patriotism, national identity, and political involvement. *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 63–77. (In English)
- Ippolitova, N. V., Kachalova, L. P., Pererva, O. Yu. (2022) Professional'nyj patriotizm v strukture obshchej ego klassifikatsii [Features of the formation of professional patriotism among pedagogical university students]. *Mir nauki, kul'tury, obrazovaniya — World of Science, Culture, Education*, no. 2 (93), pp. 209–212. <https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2022-293-209-212> (In Russian)
- Korzh, N. V., Karimova, L. F. (2022) Problema patriotizma sredi sovremennoj molodezhi v usloviyakh geopoliticheskoy napryazhennosti [The problem of patriotism among modern youth in the context of geopolitical tensions]. *Nauka. Obshchestvo. Gosudarstvo — Science. Society. State*, vol. 10, no. 4 (40), pp. 80–89. <https://doi.org/10.21685/2307-9525-2022-10-4-9> (In Russian)
- Kostrigin, A. A., Vigand, A. M. (2019) Predstavlenie i otnoshenie k patriotizmu u molodezhi [Representation and attitudes to patriotism in youth]. *Vestnik po pedagogike i psikhologii Yuzhnoj Sibiri*, no. 1, pp. 63–80. EDN: [CUFIHE](https://doi.org/10.21685/2307-9525-2022-10-4-9) (In Russian)
- Kravchenko, V. A. (2015) Patriotizm kak odna iz form samoidentifikatsii lichnosti v Rossii [Patriotism as one of personal self-identification forms in Russia]. *Kul'turnaya zhizn' Yuga Rossii — Cultural Studies of Russian South*, no. 4 (59), pp. 42–46. (In Russian)
- Latcheva, R. (2011) Cognitive interviewing and factor-analytic techniques: A mixed method approach to validity of survey items measuring national identity. *Quality and Quantity*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 1175–1199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-009-9285-0> (In English)

- Lebedev, A. N. (2014) Problemy patrioticheskogo vospitaniya studentov rossijskogo vuza [Problems patriotic education of students of a Russian university]. *Gumanitarnye nauki. Vestnik Finansovogo universiteta — Humanities and Social Sciences. Bulletin of the Financial University*, no. 2 (14), pp. 60–68. EDN: [SMGQQL](#) (In Russian)
- Lebedev, A. N., Gordyakova, O. V. (2016) Teoreticheskie i metodologicheskie voprosy izucheniya patriotizma kak sotsial'nogo chuvstva i sotsial'no orientirovannogo povedeniya [Theoretical and methodological problems in the study of patriotism as a social feelings and socially oriented behavior]. *Institut psikhologii Rossijskoj akademii nauk. Sotsial'naya i ekonomicheskaya psikhologiya — Institute of Psychology Russian Academy of Sciences. Social and Economic Psychology*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 23–40. EDN: [WDXXPX](#) (In Russian)
- Miklyaeva, A. V., Rumyantseva, P. V. (2008) *Sotsial'naya identichnost' lichnosti: sodержanie, struktura, mekhanizmy formirovaniya* [Social identity of a person: Content, structure, mechanisms of formation]. Saint-Petersburg: Herzen State Pedagogical University Publ., 118 p. (In Russian)
- Miklyaeva, A. V., Rumyantseva, P. V. (2011) Sootnoshenie tsentral'nykh i perifericheskikh komponentov v strukture sotsial'noj identichnosti lichnosti [Balance of central and peripheral components in the structure of person's social identity]. *Psikhologicheskij zhurnal — Psychological Journal*, no. 32 (5), pp. 36–45. EDN: [MSLHVA](#) (In Russian)
- Nasledov, A. D. (2004) *Matematicheskie metody psikhologicheskogo issledovaniya. Analiz i interpretatsiya dannykh* [Mathematical methods of psychological research. Analysis and interpretation of data]. Saint Petersburg: Rech' Publ., 392 p. (In Russian)
- Osnovin, A. V. (2016) *Formirovanie patriotizma starsheklassnikov v obrazovatel'noj srede shkoly* [Formation of patriotism of high school students in the educational environment of the school]. PhD dissertation (Psychology). Karachaevsk, Karachay-Cherkess State University named after W. D. Aliev, 243 p. (In Russian)
- Potemkin, A. V. (2009) *Natsional'no-psikhologicheskie osobennosti proyavleniya patriotizma lichnosti* [National-psychological features of the manifestation of patriotism of the individual]. PhD dissertation (Psychology). Novosibirsk, Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University, 256 p. (In Russian)
- Rupar, M., Jamróz-Dolińska, K., Kołeczek, M., Sekerdej, M. (2021) Is patriotism helpful to fight the crisis? The role of constructive patriotism, conventional patriotism, and glorification amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 862–877. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2777> (In English)
- Schatz, R. T. (2020) A review and integration of research on blind and constructive patriotism. In: M. Sarđoć (ed.). *Handbook of Patriotism*. Cham: Springer Publ., pp. 613–633. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54484-7\\_30](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54484-7_30) (In English)
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., Lavine, H. G. (1999) On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 151–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00140> (In English)
- Sekerdej, M., Roccas, S. (2016) Love versus loving criticism: Disentangling conventional and constructive patriotism. *The British Journal of social psychology*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 499–521. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12142> (In English)
- Svinareva, O. V., Ananyin, O. Yu., Pankratova, E. P. (2022) Patriotizm kak npravstvennaya sostavlyayushchaya lichnosti sotrudnika organov vnutrennikh del [Patriotism as a moral component of the personality of the employee of the internal affairs of the Russian federation]. *Chelovecheskij kapital — Human Capital*, no. 7 (163), pp. 162–173. <https://doi.org/10.25629/HC.2022.07.18> (In Russian)
- Tarasov, M. V. (2020) Obraz Rodiny: obosnovanie i aprobatsiya diagnosticheskogo instrumentariya [Image of Motherland: Justification and approbation of diagnostic tools]. *Ekspperimental'naya psikhologiya — Experimental Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 205–219. <https://doi.org/10.17759/exppsy.2020130415> (In Russian)
- Vasileva, S. V., Miklyaeva, A. V. (2023) Opyt razrabotki podrostkovoj shkaly konstruktivnogo patriotizma: ekspertnye otsenki pedagogov [Experience in developing a teenage scale of constructive patriotism: Expert assessments of teachers]. In: *Sotsial'naya psikhologiya: voprosy teorii i praktiki. Materialy VIII Mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii pamyati M. Yu. Kondrat'eva "Sotsial'naya psikhologiya: voprosy teorii i praktiki" (11–12 maya 2023 g.)* [Social psychology: Questions of theory and practice. Proceedings of the VIII International Scientific and Practical Conference in memory of M. Yu. Kondratiev "Social psychology: Issues of theory and practice" (May 11–12, 2023)]. Moscow: MSUPE Publ., pp. 166–169. (In Russian)
- Zhuravlev, A. L., Yurevich, A. V. (2016) Patriotizm kak ob'ekt izucheniya psikhologicheskoy nauki [Patriotism as an object of psychological research]. *Psikhologicheskij zhurnal — Psychological Journal*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 88–98. EDN: [WAIEZP](#) (In Russian)

## Литература

- Васильева, С. В., Микляева, А. В. (2023) Опыт разработки подростковой шкалы конструктивного патриотизма: экспертные оценки педагогов. В кн.: *Социальная психология: вопросы теории и практики. Материалы VIII Международной научно-практической конференции памяти М. Ю. Кондратьева «Социальная психология: вопросы теории и практики» (11–12 мая 2023 г.)*. М.: Изд-во МГППУ, с. 166–169.

- Гогиберидзе, Г. М. (2022) Гражданско-патриотическое воспитание как целевой ориентир взаимодействия социальных институтов семьи и школы. *Герценовские чтения: психологические исследования в образовании*, вып. 5, с. 122–130. <https://doi.org/10.33910/herzenpsyconf-2022-5-15>
- Гордякова, О. В., Лебедев, А. Н. (2017) Чувство патриотизма и типы патриотического поведения молодых граждан России. В кн.: А. А. Демидов, А. И. Сурат (ред.). *Психологические и психоаналитические исследования. Ежегодник 2017*. М.: Московский институт психоанализа, с. 307–327. EDN: [YXBRRT](https://doi.org/10.33910/herzenpsyconf-2022-5-15)
- Григорьев, Д. В., Степанов, П. В. (2011) *Внеурочная деятельность школьников. Методический конструктор*. М.: Просвещение, 223 с.
- Еремеев, Б. А. (1996) *Статистические процедуры при психологическом изучении текста*. СПб.: Образование, 54 с.
- Журавлев, А. Л., Юревич, А. В. (2016) Патриотизм как объект изучения психологической науки. *Психологический журнал*, т. 37, № 3, с. 88–98. EDN: [WAIEZP](https://doi.org/10.33910/herzenpsyconf-2022-5-15)
- Ипполитова, Н. В., Качалова, Л. П., Перерва, О. Ю. (2022) Профессиональный патриотизм в структуре общей его классификации. *Мир науки, культуры, образования*, № 2 (93), с. 209–212. <https://doi.org/10.24412/1991-5497-2022-293-209-212>
- Корж, Н. В., Каримова, Л. Ф. (2022) Проблема патриотизма среди современной молодежи в условиях геополитической напряженности. *Наука. Общество. Государство*, т. 10, № 4 (40), с. 80–89. <https://doi.org/10.21685/2307-9525-2022-10-4-9>
- Костригин, А. А., Виганд, А. М. (2019) Представление и отношение к патриотизму у молодежи. *Вестник по педагогике и психологии Южной Сибири*, № 1, с. 63–80. EDN: [CUFIHE](https://doi.org/10.21685/2307-9525-2022-10-4-9)
- Кравченко, В. А. (2015) Патриотизм как одна из форм самоидентификации личности в России. *Культурная жизнь Юга России*, № 4 (59), с. 42–46.
- Лебедев, А. Н. (2014) Проблемы патриотического воспитания студентов российского вуза. *Гуманитарные науки. Вестник Финансового университета*, № 2 (14), с. 60–68. EDN: [SMGQQL](https://doi.org/10.21685/2307-9525-2022-10-4-9)
- Лебедев, А. Н., Гордякова, О. В. (2016) Теоретические и методологические вопросы изучения патриотизма как социального чувства и социально ориентированного поведения. *Институт психологии Российской академии наук. Социальная и экономическая психология*, т. 1, № 1, с. 23–40. EDN: [WDXXPX](https://doi.org/10.21685/2307-9525-2022-10-4-9)
- Микляева, А. В., Румянцева, П. В. (2008) *Социальная идентичность личности: содержание, структура, механизмы формирования*. СПб.: Изд-во РГПУ им. А. И. Герцена, 118 с.
- Микляева, А. В., Румянцева, П. В. (2011) Соотношение центральных и периферических компонентов в структуре социальной идентичности личности. *Психологический журнал*, № 32 (5), с. 36–45. EDN: [MSLHVA](https://doi.org/10.21685/2307-9525-2022-10-4-9)
- Наследов, А. Д. (2004) *Математические методы психологического исследования. Анализ и интерпретация данных*. СПб.: Речь, 392 с.
- Основин, А. В. (2016) *Формирование патриотизма старшеклассников в образовательной среде школы. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата психологических наук*. Карачаевск, Карачаево-Черкесский государственный университет им. У. Д. Алиева, 243 с.
- Потемкин, А. В. (2009) *Национально-психологические особенности проявления патриотизма личности. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата психологических наук*. Новосибирск, Новосибирский государственный педагогический университет, 256 с.
- Свинарева, О. В., Ананьин, О. Ю., Панкратова, Е. П. (2022) Патриотизм как нравственная составляющая личности сотрудника органов внутренних дел. *Человеческий капитал*, № 7 (163), с. 162–173. <https://doi.org/10.25629/HC.2022.07.18>
- Тарасов, М. В. (2020) Образ Родины: обоснование и апробация диагностического инструментария. *Экспериментальная психология*, т. 13, № 4, с. 205–219. <https://doi.org/10.17759/exppsy.2020130415>
- Huddy, L., Khatib, N. (2007) American patriotism, national identity, and political involvement. *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 63–77.
- Latcheva, R. (2011) Cognitive interviewing and factor-analytic techniques: A mixed method approach to validity of survey items measuring national identity. *Quality and Quantity*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 1175–1199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-009-9285-0>
- Rupar, M., Jamróz-Dolińska, K., Kołeczek, M., Sekerdej, M. (2021) Is patriotism helpful to fight the crisis? The role of constructive patriotism, conventional patriotism, and glorification amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 862–877. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2777>
- Schatz, R. T. (2020) A review and integration of research on blind and constructive patriotism. In: M. Sarđoć (ed.). *Handbook of Patriotism*. Cham: Springer Publ., pp. 613–633. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54484-7\\_30](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54484-7_30)
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., Lavine, H. G. (1999) On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 151–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00140>
- Sekerdej, M., Roccas, S. (2016) Love versus loving criticism: Disentangling conventional and constructive patriotism. *The British Journal of social psychology*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 499–521. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12142>