

Progressivism Civic Education in Indonesia: An Ontological, Epistemological, and Axiological Framework for Students' Adaptive Nationalism

Rini Setiyowati^{1,*}, Rr. Siti Murtiningsih¹, Armaidy Armawi¹

¹ Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received Oct 30, 2025
Revised Dec 17, 2025
Accepted Jan 09, 2026
OnlineFirst Jan 26, 2026

Keywords:

Adaptive Nationalism
Civic Education
Progressivism

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: This study examines how civic education based on the philosophy of progressivism can strengthen adaptive nationalism in the digital era. Civic education is outlined within a philosophical framework of ontology, epistemology, and axiology and transformed into pedagogical principles.

Methodology: This research is a philosophical hermeneutic study based on document analysis. Academic and policy texts are selected purposively, interpreted interactively through a hermeneutical circle to clarify the ontological, epistemological, and axiological foundations of progressive civic education, and then derived into pedagogical principles. The validity of the interpretation is maintained through data triangulation.

Main Findings: Progressive civic education, ontologically, frames students as Pancasila-grounded citizens operating in global contexts. Epistemologically, it prioritizes experiential learning, with project- and problem-based approaches cultivating critical reasoning and media literacy. Axiologically, it promotes pluralistic, constitutional, ethically grounded critical patriotism, guiding civic participation toward responsible engagement, democratic accountability, and respect for diversity in both offline and digital public spheres.

Novelty/Originality of this study: This research offers a philosophical framework for progressive civic education by outlining its ontology, epistemology, and axiology. Its main novelty is the integrative concept of adaptive nationalism, which unites the principles of Pancasila in state governance, public participation, and critical discourse.

*This is an open access article under the [CC BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license
© 2026 by the author(s)*



Corresponding Author:

Rini Setiyowati,
Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Gadjah Mada,
Bulaksumur, Depok, Sleman Regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia
Email: rinisetiyowati@mail.ugm.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Civics Education plays a strategic role in shaping the character and identity of citizens, this is in line with the mandate of Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System [1]. Civic Education aims to develop the potential of students to become democratic, responsible citizens, and have high social awareness, especially in the digital era and the very rapid technological revolution [2], [3]. Thus, Civics Education not only emphasizes mastery of knowledge, but also strengthening character and civic values holistically to form a young generation that is adaptive to contemporary developments [4].

It is not only technological developments that influence the dynamics of Civic Education, but socio-political developments also have a major influence on the Civic Education curriculum. Along with changing times, the Civic Education curriculum has undergone adjustments influenced by political, social, and cultural conditions. Shifts in political regimes and governance have had a significant impact on the configuration of the Civic Education curriculum [5]. In Indonesia, the dynamics of curriculum change are influenced by the acceleration of developments in society and technology [3],[6], so this can be understood as a logical consequence of the transformation of the political system, socio-cultural life, the economy, and the development of science and technology in national life.

The dynamics of the Civic Education curriculum influenced by the country's socio-political developments make the reconstruction of Civic Education important so that the curriculum is in line with technological developments and global challenges, so that learning is more relevant and effective [7]. In practice, innovative civic-learning models such as Project Citizen illustrate how civic values can be internalized through participatory, project-based activities [5]. The digitalization of everyday life has a role in forming a flexible and adaptive learning environment, therefore the Civic Education approach needs to utilize advances in information and communication technology (ICT) to improve students' understanding of citizenship and facilitate interactive and experience-based learning [8]. In digital contexts, civic learning also requires students' capacity to evaluate the credibility of online information and sources as a core condition of informed participation [9]. Technology also opens up opportunities for students to be involved in a broader civic context, both at the local and global levels [10], [11]. This condition emphasizes that Civic Education needs to encourage critical thinking skills, active involvement, and understanding of the mandala of contemporary socio-political challenges.

In the context of the dynamics of changes in the Civic Education curriculum, the study of the philosophical foundations of Civic Education becomes relevant, especially through the perspectives of ontology, epistemology, and axiology, so that curriculum development rests on a solid and contextual philosophical foundation [12]-[14]. An adequate understanding of the three philosophical dimensions of Education will provide a new concept for curriculum designers in formulating learning strategies that are not only oriented towards mastering knowledge, but also towards the development of character and civic values holistically.

Philosophy of Education provides a conceptual framework for understanding how students learn and how citizenship can be effectively transitioned [15]. One relevant approach is progressivism, which places student experience at the center of learning and encourages a holistic understanding of the social context of citizenship [16]. Through progressivism, Civic Education does not merely transmit theory but engages students in contextual learning experiences, thereby fostering critical thinking, social participation, and an adaptive national orientation.

Ontologically, Civic Education needs to examine the nature of citizenship regarding the meaning of being a citizen, in the context of globalization and digitalization [17]. From an epistemological perspective, Civic Education must foster students' critical thinking skills so they are able to analyze and evaluate information meaningfully, including assessing the credibility of digital information and sources [18], [19]. From an axiological perspective, Civic Education needs to embody civic virtues and dispositions to become responsible digital citizens [20]. This framework reinforces the urgency of learning that is not only informative, but also transformative and relevant to the needs of education in the digital era.

Progressive education not only emphasizes the transfer of knowledge, but also encourages active involvement through social interaction, discussion, and problem solving related to everyday life. Within this framework, progressive civic education has the potential to foster adaptive nationalism, namely a national orientation that remains rooted in Pancasila and national identity, but is flexible in facing global-digital changes, characterized by critical, inclusive, collaborative attitudes, and responsible civic participation in offline and online spaces [21], [22]. Thus, civic education and nationalism are crucial aspects to equip the younger generation to face the challenges of globalization [23], [24].

However, studies of Civic Education in the digital era still show several important gaps. First, many studies emphasize digital literacy, character education or digital citizenship, but have not formulated a coherent philosophical foundation, especially within the framework of progressivism, systematically through the dimensions of ontology, epistemology, and axiology as the basis for curriculum design. Second, the discourse on nationalism and national identity in the digital space often stops at the conceptual level, and has not been translated into operational and replicable Civic Education learning design principles [25]. Third, the integration of progressivism in Indonesian Civic Education still requires a more contextual articulation rooted in Pancasila while being responsive to global and digital challenges so that nationalism does not fall into indoctrination, but develops as adaptive nationalism [26].

Starting from this gap, this study offers a philosophical synthesis (ontology, epistemology, axiology) of progressivism for Civic Education and reduces it to the principles of curriculum/pedagogical design as a conceptual tool for strengthening adaptive nationalism. This study aims to examine Educational progressivism as a basis for the development of Civic Education curriculum that strengthens adaptive nationalism through a hermeneutic-philosophical approach by analyzing texts on Civic Education, progressivism and adaptive

nationalism, and examining the challenges of its implementation in the digital era. As well as examining the challenges of its implementation in the digital era. The research question posed is how progressivism reorganizes the dimensions of ontology, epistemology, and axiology of Civic Education in the Indonesian context in the digital era to strengthen students' adaptive nationalism?

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses philosophical hermeneutics operationalized through literature study and systematic document analysis to interpret academic and policy texts on civic education, progressivism, and adaptive nationalism. Hermeneutics emphasizes the formation of meaning through the hermeneutical circle, namely: pre-understanding, interactive interpretation, and the fusion of horizons, so that the dimensions of ontology, epistemology, and axiology can be formulated coherently along with their implications for curriculum design and learning practices [27], [28]; and operationalized in a hermeneutic literature search/selection [29]. To ensure traceability and replicability, the literature search and selection follow the PRISMA-ScR (identification, screening, eligibility, inclusion) flow and are supported by an audit trail [30]. Furthermore, the text is interpreted through philosophical hermeneutics to formulate a framework of ontology, epistemology, and their derivatives in pedagogical principles.

The analysis corpus consists of 53 documents, including 50 journal articles (publication range 2015-2025) and three purposively selected policy documents, namely: Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System; Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture (Permendikbud) Number 59 of 2014; and Regulation of the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology Number 12 of 2024. These three documents were selected because they represent (a) the normative basis of national education, (b) the curriculum policy framework relevant to Civics, and (c) the contemporary historical dimensions of policy change that are important for understanding the shifting challenges of citizenship in the digital era.

Article searches were conducted in DOAJ, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar using phrase queries and Boolean operators, for example: "civic education" OR "citizenship education", AND "progressivism", AND (hermeneut* OR curriculum OR learning), AND (nationalism OR "adaptive nationalism"). Search dates, query strings, and filters were recorded as an audit trail [31], [32]. The search results were then deduplicated and screened through two stages: (1) title/abstract screening and (2) full-text eligibility review, with inclusion/exclusion decisions recorded for traceability. Inclusion criteria included: (a) direct relevance to the research focus (civic education, progressivism, adaptive nationalism, and/or digital-age citizenship), (b) full-text availability, and (c) verifiable scholarly quality (indexed and/or having a DOI). Exclusion criteria included: (a) duplication, (b) opinion pieces without adequate academic support, and (c) unverified secondary sources.

The analysis was conducted in four stages: (1) building a pre-understanding and O-E-A framework; (2) in-depth reading to identify units of meaning, key claims, and normative assumptions; (3) cross-text comparison (research articles, conceptual studies, and policy documents) to test for coherence, tensions, and differences in emphasis; and (4) synthesis through a fusion of horizons to formulate principles for progressive civics curriculum and pedagogy design that are relevant to strengthening adaptive nationalism in the digital era. The validity of interpretations is maintained through triangulation of sources and perspectives, peer debriefing, and an audit trail that documents search, selection, coding, and synthesis decisions. Reporting of validity refers to the criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability [33].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Ontology of Civic Education within the Framework of Progressivism

Based on a hermeneutic synthesis of policy texts, classical works, and scientific articles, the ontology of Civic Education within a progressivism framework needs to be read as a basis for restructuring how to view the nature of citizenship, students, and learning objectives in the context of Indonesia in the digital era. Paradigmatically, PKn rests on the unity of the ontology-epistemology-axiology framework as the philosophical foundation of civic education [34]. In the ontological dimension, PKn studies include objects of study and objects of development [35]. The objects of study include ideological, instrumental, and practical dimensions that support the curriculum and the PKn teaching and learning process, both in schools and in the wider social space. The ideological dimension is rooted in Pancasila and the goals of national education as emphasized in Law No. 20 of 2003; from here the values and orientation of PKn in Indonesia are derived. The instrumental dimension translates ideal values into curriculum tools and pedagogical strategies, while the practical dimension emphasizes the embodiment of citizenship in real-life experiences. The object of civics development is students as citizens who have cognitive, affective, and psychomotor potential [36].

The literature synthesis yielded the following four ontological findings. First, progressive civics positions citizens (students) as agents and subjects of citizenship capable of interpreting, assessing, and acting in

democratic life, not merely recipients of value socialization. This finding aligns with progressivism, which views education as a dynamic life process, not merely preparation [37]. Second, the basic values of civics (Pancasila, democracy, unity, and justice) are understood as life values that need to be continuously reinterpreted contextually in the currents of globalization and digitalization, so as not to fall into static doctrine. Third, in this context, adaptive nationalism can be positioned as the ontological orientation of civics in the digital era: a national commitment rooted in Pancasila and diversity, yet flexible in the face of global-technological change, and encouraging inclusive and responsible civic participation. Fourth, the ontology of progressive civics emphasizes the relationship between nationalism and egalitarianism and social justice. The idea of inclusive socio-nationalism [38], [39] and the historical relationship between nationalism and egalitarianism in the Indonesian experience [40] strengthens the argument that adaptive nationalism is not narrow nationalism, but rather a national commitment that demands welfare, equal dignity, and respect for plurality.

To demonstrate the relevance of these ontological findings, a contemporary context can be used as an illustration: Collective student and community actions at the end of August 2025, triggered by issues of inequality and a crisis of trust in the political elite, demonstrated the dynamics of civic participation and demands for public accountability [41], [42]. The government's response through adjustments to some legislative facilities/allowances emphasized that the values of social justice and political responsibility are not enough to stop as slogans [43]. In a progressive ontological reading, such events are understood as "civic learning spaces" that demand that Civics relate values (Pancasila, democracy, justice) to actual public problems in a reflective and ethical manner.

The ontological implication is that progressive civics needs to design learning that starts from real issues and the life experiences of students, so that nationalism is understood as a practice of public virtue (justice, solidarity, respect for diversity), not just a symbolic identity. Operationally, the curriculum/pedagogy needs to: (1) position students as subjects who argue and take moral-political positions based on Pancasila values; (2) link the theme of nationalism to contemporary public issues in both offline and online spaces; and (3) emphasize the ethical boundaries between democratic criticism and violence, and between love of the homeland and hostility towards differences. The implementation challenge that needs to be anticipated from the outset is the risk of reducing nationalism to indoctrination or, conversely, value relativism due to the flood of digital information; therefore, learning must combine contextual experiences with the normative framework of Pancasila through accountable reasoning and argumentation exercises.

3.2 Epistemology of Civic Education within a Progressivist Framework

Departing from the ontological findings in section 3.1, namely that students are positioned as subjects of citizenship and PKn values are understood as life values that are continuously interpreted through hermeneutic synthesis, it shows that PKn epistemology within the framework of progressivism demands a way of building civic knowledge that does not stop at the transmission of information, but rather at the construction of meaning through inquiry, dialogue, and experience-based action. civic education epistemology concerns how civic knowledge is formed and acquired [44]. Traditionally, civic education epistemology is multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary because its object of study is multidimensional civic behavior and practice. Therefore, the development of civic education science bears two mandates: (1) building a body of knowledge about citizenship and (2) transforming concepts, values, and civic skills through curriculum development and learning. Winataputra emphasized that civic education research can combine quantitative (measurement and generalization) and qualitative (holistic understanding and theory formation) approaches. In addition, development research is oriented towards designing pedagogical paradigms and curriculum engineering to foster students' social attitudes and skills [45], [46]. Within the framework of progressivism, this epistemological mandate is directed at ensuring that civic knowledge is not merely "known", but understood, debated, and practiced in real contexts.

The literature synthesis yielded three key epistemological findings. First, progressive civics education places inquiry and problem-solving as the primary modes of constructing civic knowledge. In line with Dewey, learning by doing makes direct experience and real-life problem-solving central learning media [47]. In the context of civics education, civic knowledge is constructed through student engagement in current public issues, simulations of democratic practices, reflective discussions, and directed social action projects. Thus, civic concepts are understood through a process of inquiry, not simply memorization.

Second, progressive epistemology demands dialogic learning that shifts the teacher-student relationship from passive recipients to active dialogue partners. Referring to Freire, the "banking education" model is replaced by dialogic learning and problem-posing, which encourage students to critically analyze social reality [48]. Consequently, civics education not only conveys concepts (e.g., corruption or justice), but also facilitates deliberation on values (honesty, fairness, responsibility) and trains argumentation based on reason and evidence. Here, the epistemology of civic education is not merely "knowledge about citizenship," but rather "how to reason as a citizen" in a democratic public space.

Third, in the digital era, civics epistemology must integrate critical media literacy and digital citizenship ethics as prerequisites for the formation of civic knowledge. Civic knowledge is now largely acquired through social media, online news portals, and virtual communities; without adequate literacy, the flow of information risks obscuring the formation of national identity and weakening the internalization of Pancasila values [49], [50]. Therefore, the integration of digital literacy in civics includes the ability to critically evaluate information, understand the rights and ethics of digital citizens, and use technology for positive participation. Strengthening nationally oriented digital citizenship infrastructure is necessary so that Pancasila and Indonesian values can be transmitted and “brought to life” in the digital generation [51].

The implications of these epistemological findings are that the design of a progressive civics curriculum/pedagogy needs to prioritize: (1) problem-based and project-based learning that links current public issues to targeted social action; (2) dialogic classes that train argumentation, deliberation, and evidence-based reasoning; and (3) the integration of digital literacy (information evaluation, digital ethics, and responsible online participation) as core components of learning. Implementation challenges that need to be anticipated include the disparity in digital literacy competencies between teachers and students, the risk of polarization/hoaxes in class discussions, and the limited availability of assessment tools capable of measuring civic reasoning and digital participation fairly; therefore, the development of rubrics and evaluation instruments that are consistent with the goals of progressive civics is necessary.

3.3 Axiology of Civic Education within the Framework of Progressivism

Hermeneutic synthesis shows that the axiology of Civic Education within the framework of progressivism is inadequate if understood merely as “value teaching”, but must be read as an educational orientation to form citizens who are able to act ethically-democratically for the common good. Axiology is related to the goals, benefits, and practical value of knowledge/education for life [52], [53]. The main axiological question of Civic Education is: for what purpose is Civic Education developed and what moral values are to be realized? Normatively, Civic Education in Indonesia is directed to form good and intelligent citizens, with knowledge, attitudes, and skills that are in line with Pancasila and constitutional democracy [1]. Various studies emphasize the strategic role of Civic Education in the formation of national character and identity, including through value learning models such as Project Citizen, service learning, constitutional/policy debates, and other approaches that encourage the internalization of values in practice [54].

In the perspective of progressivism, education is considered axiologically successful when it contributes to solving social problems and improving the common good. Literature synthesis shows that the axiology of progressive civics is oriented towards social transformation: forming civic behavior that is critical of injustice, proactive in improving the social environment, and adaptive in facing contemporary challenges without losing national identity. In line with Biesta, democratic education needs to go beyond the transmission of knowledge (qualification) and socialization towards developing independence and subjectification so that students are able to act as responsible citizens. In the context of civics, this means that the learning objective does not stop at “knowing Pancasila,” but rather “experiencing and operationalizing Pancasila” in decision-making and public action.

In an era of rapid change and increasingly digitalized public spaces, adaptive nationalism has become a central instrumental value in the axiology of Civics. Adaptive nationalism refers to a patriotism that is strong but not narrow: open to diversity, capable of collaborating globally, and resilient in the face of technological disruption and transnational ideologies [55]. Armawi [56], emphasized that in the digital era, nationalism is increasingly crucial for national resilience, but its form must be in harmony with the current context. Literature findings also show that some Generation Z tend to consider nationalism less relevant, especially when the digital space is flooded with a cosmopolitan-consumeristic global culture and lacks examples of love for local culture [57], [58]. Therefore, the axiological urgency of progressive Civics is to instill national values in a contextual, egalitarian, and inspiring manner, not through indoctrination, but through critical awareness that national values can be a source of solutions to real problems.

Based on this synthesis, the strengthening of adaptive nationalism in Civics can be operationalized through the following three axiological indicators. First, orientation towards the common good (social justice, solidarity, mutual cooperation). Second, digital citizenship ethics (responsibility, anti-hoax, respect for human dignity, and deliberative politeness). Third, democratic-constitutional participation (reason- and evidence-based argumentation, respect for the law, and peaceful conflict resolution). These three indicators can be realized through strategies such as Project Citizen, service learning, policy/constitutional debates, deliberation simulations, and evidence-based digital campaign projects to counter disinformation or intolerance. To be measurable, the curriculum needs to include a civic participation assessment rubric that assesses the quality of argumentation, collaboration, integrity, and digital responsibility, for example through project portfolios, ethical reflection, and assessment of ethically agreed-upon online participation tracks (e.g., criteria for source transparency, discussion etiquette, and adherence to privacy rules).

As an illustration of relevance, the wave of student demonstrations at the end of August 2025 can be read ambivalently for the axiological learning of Civics. On the one hand, these actions demonstrated the capacity of citizen participation that was sensitive to injustice and dared to voice public interests; on the other hand, the escalation of conflict and loss of life emphasized the importance of strengthening substantive democratic values of respect for the law, peaceful conflict resolution, and restoring trust between citizens and the state [59]-[61]. Within the framework of adaptive nationalism, patriotism is understood as a commitment to the common good, not a legitimacy for violence. Therefore, progressive Civics needs to build the capacity for ethical deliberation and clear normative boundaries between democratic criticism and anarchy, so that social change is fought for constitutionally and with dignity.

In short, the axiological reading of progressive civics emphasizes that learning does not stop at the transmission of values, but rather the formation of civic agents capable of acting ethically and democratically for the common good. Adaptive nationalism is therefore understood as a value that must be operationalized in civic practice within society, not merely a symbolic identity. However, to avoid reducing nationalism to indoctrination or, conversely, value relativism in the digital public sphere, this axiological commitment needs to be translated into an operational and measurable curriculum/pedagogy design. Therefore, the following section presents a progressive civics design toolkit derived from the synthesis of ontology-epistemology-axiology, including design principles, core learning strategies, and an adaptive nationalism assessment package.

3.4 Progressive Civics Design Toolkit for Strengthening Adaptive Nationalism

Based on the synthesis of ontology, epistemology, and axiology in Sections 3.1–3.3, this research produces a conceptual output in the form of a progressive civics design toolkit that can be replicated as a curriculum/pedagogy development tool to strengthen adaptive nationalism. This toolkit contains: (a) design principles, (b) core learning strategies, and (c) operational assessment packages, as follows:

Design principles: 1) Students as agents of citizenship: Students are positioned as subjects who interpret, reason, and take moral-political positions based on Pancasila (not passive recipients); 2) Values as life practices: Pancasila, democracy, justice, and diversity are understood as life values interpreted contextually, not static doctrines; 3) Public issues as a starting point: Learning is tied to real-life issues (inequality, intolerance, corruption, hoaxes, digital justice, the environment) in both offline and online spaces; 4) Inquiry-dialogue-action learning flow: Civic knowledge is built through issue investigation, evidence-based deliberation, and directed social action (learning-by-doing); 5) Evidence-based deliberative dialogue: Classes are trained in argumentation, reasoning, and civilized public decision-making (not polarization); 6) Digital citizenship ethics as the core: critical media literacy, information verification, rights/privacy, and online communication ethics are mandatory competencies; 7) Adaptive, pluralistic-egalitarian nationalism: national commitment is understood as an orientation toward the common good, equal dignity, and respect for plurality (rather than narrow nationalism); 8) Accountability through ethical reflection: every participatory activity is followed by ethical reflection and evaluation of the rubric to prevent ceremonial activism or value relativism.

Learning strategies, This toolkit recommends the following combination of strategies as a minimum package for progressive civics: 1) Civic inquiry: Students formulate questions, map actors, gather evidence (documents/policies, data, credible news), and then develop arguments and solution options; 2) Project/Action-Based Learning (Project/Action Civics; PjBL; Project Citizen; Service Learning): Projects are directed at measurable solutions to community/school problems (e.g., policy briefs, service designs, literacy campaigns, advocacy for digital-friendly schools); 3) Policy/Constitutional Deliberation & Debate Simulations: Deliberation forum exercises, data-driven debates, public hearing simulations, and constitutional/policy debates to practice public reasoning and procedural compliance; 4) Media Literacy & Digital Ethics Projects: Practice fact-checking, framing analysis, counter-disinformation/intolerance content creation, and ethical contracts for online discussions (privacy, civility, and anti-hate speech); 5) Structured ethical reflection: Reflection journal, moral dilemma analysis, and after-action review to link Pancasila values with students' decisions and actions.

Adaptive nationalism assessment package (operational rubric), To measure adaptive nationalism, the assessment is structured into three indicator domains (referring to Section 3.3) and drawn from evidence: project portfolio, deliberation/debate performance, digital products, and ethical reflection. Therefore, the assessment rubric can be created as follows: Rating scale (1–4) per domain: 1 = beginning/minimal, 2 = developing, 3 = good 4 = superior/consistent. A total score of 3–12 can be mapped into three levels: 3–5 (low), 6–8 (moderate), 9–12 (high). Domain 1: Orientation towards the common good (social justice, solidarity, mutual cooperation): 1) Issues are viewed as personal opinions; solutions do not consider public impact; 2) Able to identify public problems, but solutions are still superficial/individual; 3) Proposes evidence-based solutions and considers social impacts and vulnerable groups; 4) Integrates Pancasila values and principles of justice/solidarity into measurable collaborative actions (goals, steps, impact indicators). Domain 2: Digital Citizenship Ethics (anti-hoax, dignity, privacy, deliberative ethics): 1) Using unverified information; weak discussion ethics; susceptible to spreading misinformation; 2) Starting to verify sources, but consistency in ethics and accuracy is not yet stable; 3) Consistently using credible sources, maintaining deliberative ethics, and respecting privacy/dignity; 4) Being a

role model for media literacy (clarifying hoaxes, moderating discussions), resulting in constructive and responsible digital participation. Domain 3: Democratic-Constitutional Participation (Evidence-Based Argumentation, Procedural Adherence, Peaceful Resolution): 1) Reactive participation; argumentation without evidence; tends to be polarizing; 2) Argumentation begins to be reason-based, but does not consistently refer to democratic norms/procedures; 3) Evidence-based argumentation, respect for the law, and prioritizes peaceful resolution; 4) Able to lead deliberations, develop policy options, and conduct ethical-constitutional advocacy (clear demands, channels, and limits of action). Briefly, the assessment design can be seen in the following table 1.

Table 1. The assessment design

Dimensions of synthesis results	Key design principles	Minimum strategies	Key evidence/assessments
Ontology: learners as agents; values as praxis	Citizenship agents; contextual life values; ethical limits of criticism	Issue inquiry + deliberation	Rubric Domains 1 & 3; ethical reflection
Epistemology: inquiry, dialog, learning-by-doing	Inquiry, dialogue, action flow; proven argumentation	PjBL/Action Civics; policy debate	Project portfolio; debate performance
Axiology: common good; digital ethics; constitutional participation	Pluralist adaptive nationalism; core digital ethics	Media literacy project; proven campaign	Domain Rubric 2; digital products + source audit

Assessment implementation note: to maintain fairness in online participation assessment, digital footprints are only assessed based on ethically agreed evidence (e.g. transparency of sources, quality of arguments, civility of discussion), not political preferences or affiliations. Overall, the proposed toolkit bridges the philosophical synthesis of ontology–epistemology–axiology into a replicable set of design principles, minimum learning strategies, and adaptive nationalism assessment rubrics. By aligning the inquiry–dialogue–action pathway, digital citizenship ethics, and democratic–constitutional participation, the toolkit provides a practical foundation for developing civics curriculum/pedagogy in the digital age. The following concluding section summarizes the main findings, emphasizes novelty and implications, and outlines limitations and directions for further research.

4. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that progressivism provides a coherent philosophical foundation for strengthening adaptive nationalism through Indonesian Civic Education in the digital era. Hermeneutic synthesis shows that: (1) ontologically, progressive Civic Education positions students as agents of citizenship who interpret and live out the values of Pancasila contextually; nationalism is understood as a democratic egalitarian commitment, not a static doctrine. (2) epistemologically, civic knowledge is built through inquiry, dialogue, and learning-by-doing operationalized through problem-based/project-based learning, with critical media literacy and digital citizenship ethics as the primary epistemic conditions. (3) axiologically, Civic Education is directed at social transformation and the common good by shaping critical, participatory, and responsible civic behavior in both offline and online spaces. The novelty of this article lies in the formulation of a progressive civics design toolkit that operationalizes adaptive nationalism into measurable indicators: orientation toward the common good, digital citizenship ethics, and democratic-constitutional participation, along with learning strategies and assessment rubrics. The limitations of this study are conceptual; further research is recommended through design-based research to test the implementation and validate the indicators/rubrics in various school contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to Indonesian Education Scholarship (BPI), Center for Higher Education Funding and Assessment (PPAPT), Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology of Republic Indonesia, and Indonesia Endowment Funds for Education (LPDP), for funding and supporting this study under Grant Number 010774/PPAPT.1.2/BPI.06/02/2025.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

RS was responsible for the research design, data collection, data analysis, and manuscript preparation. SM and AA, contributed to conceptual development, research methodology guidance, and critical review of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The author(s) declare no conflict of interest.

USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI)-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGY

The authors declare that no artificial intelligence (AI) tools were used in the generation, analysis, or writing of this manuscript. All aspects of the research, including data collection, interpretation, and manuscript preparation, were carried out entirely by the authors without the assistance of AI-based technologies.

REFERENCES

- [1] Republik Indonesia, Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2003 on the National Education System]. Jakarta, Indonesia, 2003.
- [2] Republik Indonesia, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 59 Tahun 2014 tentang Kurikulum 2013 Sekolah Menengah Atas/Madrasah Aliyah [Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 59 of 2014 on the 2013 Curriculum for Senior High Schools/Islamic Senior High Schools]. Jakarta, Indonesia, 2014.
- [3] Republik Indonesia, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi, Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 2024 tentang Kurikulum pada Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar, dan Jenjang Pendidikan Menengah [Regulation of the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia Number 12 of 2024 on Curriculum for Early Childhood Education, Primary Education, and Secondary Education]. Jakarta, Indonesia, 2024.
- [4] A. Trisiana, "Innovation design development of citizenship education model on characters of Indonesian communities in digital media era and technology revolution," *Int. J. Recent Technol. Eng.*, vol. 8, no. 2S9, pp. 322–328, 2019, doi: 10.35940/ijrte.B1074.0982S919.
- [5] R. Raharjo, "Analisis perkembangan kurikulum civic education: Dari Rentjana Pelajaran 1947 sampai dengan Merdeka Belajar [Analysis of civic education curriculum development: From the 1947 Lesson Plan to Merdeka Belajar]," *Civic Education Progresif: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2020, doi: 10.20961/civiceducationp.v15i1.44901.
- [6] OECD, *OECD Digital Education Outlook 2023: Towards an Effective Digital Education Ecosystem*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2023, doi: 10.1787/c74f03de-en.
- [7] N. Erfiana, "Restrukturisasi pendidikan kewarganegaraan sebagai respons terhadap era disruptif [Restructuring civic education as a response to the disruption era]," *Al-Asasiyya: J. Basic Educ.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 80–92, 2020, doi: 10.24269/ajbe.v5i1.3319.
- [8] D. V. Z. Hude, "Pemahaman Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan dalam membangun sifat bangsa Indonesia di era teknologi [Understanding Civic Education in building Indonesian national character in the technological era]," *PENARIK: J. Ilmu Pendidik. Pancasila, Kewarganegaraan dan Hukum*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2025, doi: 10.70134/pakehum.v2i2.615.
- [9] S. McGrew, J. Breakstone, T. Ortega, M. Smith, and S. Wineburg, "Can students evaluate online sources? Learning from assessments of civic online reasoning," *Theory and Research in Social Education*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 165–193, 2018, doi: 10.1080/00933104.2017.1416320.
- [10] M. Murdiono, "Pendidikan kewarganegaraan untuk membangun wawasan global warga negara muda [Civic education to build young citizens' global outlook]," *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 12–25, 2014, doi: 10.21831/cp.v3i3.2379.
- [11] J. A. Banks, Ed., *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives*. San Francisco, CA, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2008.
- [12] E. Rahmadani, "Ontologi, epistemologi, dan aksiologi dalam pendidikan karakter [Ontology, epistemology, and axiology in character education]," *J. Sci. Soc. Res.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 307–311, 2021, doi: 10.54314/jssr.v4i3.1425.
- [13] S. Sunarso, Y. Hidayah, A. Firmansyah, and I. Arpannudin, "Content analysis of Pancasila and Civic Education curriculum at the junior high school level in Indonesia: Philosophical perspectives in affirming civic identity," *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 98–106, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.21831/jc.v21i1.63161.
- [14] S. Pramita, S. Salminawati, M. N. Dayantri, and T. A. Syahputra, "Filsafat Pendidikan Pancasila dalam tinjauan ontologi, epistemologi, dan aksiologi [Pancasila Education philosophy from ontology, epistemology, and axiology perspectives]," *Journal on Education*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 11038–11050, Jan.–Feb. 2024, doi: 10.31004/joe.v6i2.4889.
- [15] J. Dewey, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York, NY, USA: Macmillan, 1916.
- [16] L. Tippett and J. J. Lee, "Understanding Progressive Education in the 21st Century," *J. Appl. Learn. Higher Educ.*, vol. 8, pp. 80–98, 2019, doi: 10.57186/jalhe_2019_v8a5p79-97.
- [17] G. J. J. Biesta, *Learning Democracy in School and Society: Education, Lifelong Learning, and the Politics of Citizenship*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2011, doi: 10.1007/978-94-6091-512-3.
- [18] E. Aprianto, E. Utomo, and S. Surachmi, "Peran epistemologi filsafat dalam mengembangkan berpikir kritis bagi anak sekolah dasar [The role of philosophical epistemology in developing critical thinking for elementary school children]," *Edukatif: J. Ilmu Pendidik.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 307–311, 2023, doi: 10.31004/edukatif.v6i4.6831.
- [19] C. Rapanta, M. Vrikki, and M. Evagorou, "Preparing culturally literate citizens through dialogue and argumentation: Rethinking citizenship education," *Curric. J.*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 475–494, 2021, doi: 10.1002/curj.95.
- [20] K. Mossberger, C. J. Tolbert, and R. S. McNeal, *Digital Citizenship: The Internet, Society, and Participation*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2008.
- [21] A. Armawi, *Nasionalisme Adaptif di Era Digital [Adaptive Nationalism in the Digital Era]*. Bandung, Indonesia: Remaja Rosdakarya, 2020.

[22] S. Mihelj and C. Jiménez-Martínez, "Digital nationalism: Understanding the role of digital media in the rise of 'new' nationalism," *Nations Natl.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 340–356, 2021, doi: 10.1111/nana.12685.

[23] J. Westheimer and J. Kahne, "What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy," *Am. Educ. Res. J.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 237–269, 2004.

[24] M. Murdiono and W. Wuryandani, "Civic and nationalism education for young Indonesian generation in the globalization era," *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 158–171, 2021, doi: 10.21831/jc.v18i1.39452.

[25] P. J. Ballard, A. K. Cohen, J. Littenberg-Tobias, J. P. Bow-Don, and M. Damon, "Action Civics for Promoting Civic Development: Main Effects of Program Participation and Differences by Project Characteristics," *Am. J. Community Psychol.*, vol. 58, no. 3–4, pp. 377–390, 2016, doi: 10.1002/ajcp.12103.

[26] K. L. Wong, E. K. M. Chong, W. T. Leung, and Y. W. Leung, "Experiential learning for civic education: Typologies and learning outcomes," *Citizenship Teach. Learn.*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 183–202, 2022, doi: 10.1386/ctl_00090_1.

[27] H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 2nd rev. ed. New York, NY, USA: Seabury Press, 1975.

[28] P. Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth, TX, USA: Texas Christian Univ. Press, 1976.

[29] S. K. Boell and D. Cecez-Kecmanovic, "A hermeneutic approach for conducting literature reviews and literature searches," *Commun. Assoc. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 34, Art. no. 12, 2014, doi: 10.17705/1CAIS.03412.

[30] A. C. Tricco, E. Lillie, W. Zarid, et al., "PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation," *Ann. Intern. Med.*, vol. 169, no. 7, pp. 467–473, 2018, doi: 10.7326/M18-0850.

[31] I. Korstjens and A. Moser, "Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing," *Eur. J. Gen. Pract.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 120–124, 2018, doi: 10.1080/13814788.2017.1375092.

[32] H. Snyder, "Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines," *J. Bus. Res.*, vol. 104, pp. 333–339, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039.

[33] G. A. Bowen, "Document analysis as a qualitative research method," *Qual. Res. J.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 27–40, 2009, doi: 10.3316/QRJ0902027.

[34] L. Luthfiyah and A. Khobir, "Ontologi, epistemologi dan aksiologi filsafat pendidikan [Ontology, epistemology, and axiology of educational philosophy]," *Jurnal Basicedu*, vol. 7, no. 5, 2023, doi: 10.31004/basicedu.v7i5.6150.

[35] U. S. Winataputra, *Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan: Refleksi Historis-Epistemologis dan Rekonstruksi untuk Masa Depan [Civic Education: Historical-Epistemological Reflection and Reconstruction for the Future]*. Tangerang Selatan, Indonesia: Universitas Terbuka, 2015.

[36] R. F. Rosida, L. N. Amaliah, I. K. Mahardika, and Suratno, "The process of forming knowledge: In the study of ontology, epistemology, and axiology," *Int. J. Educ. Vocational Stud.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 13–18, 2023, doi: 10.29103/ijevs.v5i1.12980.

[37] L. Östman and J. Öhman, "A transactional methodology for analysing learning," *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2022, doi: 10.1080/10749039.2022.2042029.

[38] Y. Latif, *Pancasila di Era Disrupsi [Pancasila in the Era of Disruption]*, Akademi Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia (AIPI), May 31, 2022.

[39] Y. Latif, *Reaktualisasi Pancasila [Reactualizing Pancasila]*. Pusat Pendidikan Pancasila dan Konstitusi Mahkamah Konstitusi RI, 2025.

[40] M. Pabottingi, *Nasionalisme dan Egalitarianisme di Indonesia, 1908–1980: Menelaah Masalah-Masalah Diskontinuitas dalam Diskursus dan Praktik Politik [Nationalism and Egalitarianism in Indonesia, 1908–1980: Examining discontinuities in political discourse and practice]*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia, 2023.

[41] Reuters, "Indonesian police clash with protesters against parliamentarians' salaries," Reuters, Aug. 25, 2025.

[42] ANTARA, "Mess MPR dan gerbang DPRD dibakar, aksi unjuk rasa di Bandung berlangsung ricuh [MPR mess and DPRD gate burned, demonstration in Bandung turned chaotic]," ANTARA News, Aug. 29, 2025.

[43] E. Kramer, "Out of touch: Why an increase in politicians' allowances triggered mass protests," Indonesia at Melbourne, Aug. 29, 2025.

[44] R. Rafzan, A. P. Belladona, and E. Saputra, "Improving critical thinking skills in civic education based on Project Citizen building awareness of environmental issues," *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 359–368, 2024, doi: 10.21831/jc.v21i2.73198.

[45] B. Sumardjoko and M. Musyiam, "Model of civic education learning based on the local wisdom for revitalizing values of pancasila," *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 201–211, 2018, doi: 10.21831/cp.v37i2.18037.

[46] L. R. Halverson, E. Tucker, and G. H. Smith, "Teaching Civics: An overview of instructional strategies using primary sources, role-play and simulations, and academic service learning for teaching civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions," *The Social Studies*, vol. 116, no. 4, pp. 211–231, 2024, doi: 10.1080/00377996.2024.2379908.

[47] M. del M. Ramis Salas, "Contributions of freire's theory to dialogic education," *Social and Education History (HSE)*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 277–299, 2018, doi: 10.17583/hse.2018.3749.

[48] P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 50th Anniversary ed. New York, NY, USA: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018.

[49] A. A. Candra and K. Suryadi, "Building a digital intelligence on millennial generation through strengthening national identity," *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.*, vol. 1469, Art. no. 012098, 2020, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1469/1/012098.

[50] L. W. Anderson, "Civic education, citizenship, and democracy," *Educ. Policy Anal. Arch.*, vol. 31, no. 103, 2023, doi: 10.14507/epaa.31.7991.

[51] A. A. Candra, K. Suryadi, R. Rahmat, and S. Nurbayani, "Digital citizenship infrastructure to foster the reinforcement of national identity in Indonesia," *Kultura-Społeczeństwo-Edukacja (Culture-Society-Education)*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 37–50, 2021, doi: 10.14746/kse.2021.19.3.

[52] G. Biesta, "On the two cultures of educational research, and how we might move ahead: Reconsidering the ontology, axiology and praxeology of education," *Eur. Educ. Res. J.*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2015, doi: 10.1177/1474904114565162.

[53] S. Zahedi, R. Jaffer, C. L. Bryant, and K. Bada, "Service-learning effects on student civic engagement and community: A case study from India," *Educ. Citizenship Soc. Justice*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 3–21, 2023, doi: 10.1177/17461979211041334.

[54] W. Wartoyo and A. Trisiana, "Project citizen: Innovation and challenges of education learning models to improve millennial generation characters," *J. Crit. Rev.*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 750–754, 2020, doi: 10.31838/jcr.07.11.134.

[55] L. Jackson, "Cosmopolitan nationalism: Where is the cosmopolitanism?," *Discourse: Stud. Cult. Polit. Educ.*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 104–118, 2024, doi: 10.1080/01596306.2024.2436340.

[56] A. Armawi, *Nasionalisme dalam Dinamika Ketahanan Nasional [Nationalism in the Dynamics of National Resilience]*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: UGM Press, 2019.

[57] Y. W. Utaya, Khofiyati, L. M. Warner, and K. Hallam, "Learning pancasila values in citizenship education subjects in junior high school," *Journal Evaluation in Education (JEE)*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2024, doi: 10.37251/jee.v5i1.852.

[58] M. Nurman, "Multiculturalism and prior knowledge as the basis for assessing tolerance in civic education," *Journal Evaluation in Education (JEE)*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 1072–1081, Oct. 2025, doi: 10.37251/jee.v6i4.2149.

[59] E. Ryen and E. Jøsok, "Citizenship-as-knowledge: How perspectives from Bildung-centred Didaktik can contribute to European Citizenship Education beyond competence," *Eur. Educ. Res. J.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 39–57, 2023, doi: 10.1177/14749041211045777.

[60] B. Anderson, *Imagined communities*, in The New Social Theory Reader, 2nd ed., S. Seidman and J. C. Alexander, Eds. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2020, doi: 10.4324/9781003060963-46.

[61] R. Nababan, S. Dharma, P. G. Siahaan, Junaidi, U. Fatimah, and W. S. D. M. Faudzi, "Transforming civic education through nationalism projects to strengthen global diversity character in higher education," *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 160–179, Sep. 2025, doi: 10.24114/jk.v22i2.65623.