

Pancasila And Citizenship In Indonesia: Constitutional Values, Pluralism, And Digital Civic Responsibility

Joice Soraya^{1*}

¹ Politeknik Negeri Malang, Indonesia

Nandaru Ramadhan, S.H., M.H.²

² D-III Electrical Engineering Study Program, Politeknik Negeri Malang, Indonesia

Miya Savitri, M.Hum³

³ Public Administration Study Program

Corresponding Author: Joice Soraya (joice.soraya@polinema.ac.id),
joice.soraya@polinema.ac.id, nandaru.ramadhan@polinema.ac.id, lovesingo22@gmail.com

Abstract

Pancasila is Indonesia's philosophical foundation and a normative reference for public life, while citizenship determines legal membership, constitutional entitlements, and responsibilities. Yet the relationship between Pancasila and citizenship is frequently reduced to memorizing national principles or obeying formal rules. This article examines how these concepts may instead inform inclusive, rights-based, and participatory citizenship in a plural and digitally connected society. Using qualitative doctrinal and conceptual analysis, the study interprets the Preamble and relevant provisions of the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 12 of 2006 on Citizenship, Law No. 20 of 2003 on the National Education System, and Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education alongside selected scholarship on civic education and digital citizenship. The analysis distinguishes nationality as legal status from citizenship as democratic practice, relates the five principles of Pancasila to constitutional safeguards, and develops an educational framework that integrates civic knowledge, dialogue, media literacy, and public participation. The article argues that Pancasila contributes most effectively to democratic citizenship when its principles are interpreted together with constitutional equality, freedom of belief, deliberation, and social justice—not as a substitute for those guarantees. Practical implications are proposed for interdisciplinary higher education, particularly professional and vocational settings. The article offers a normative framework rather than evidence of measured instructional effectiveness.

3259



Keywords: Pancasila; citizenship; constitutional democracy; civic education; pluralism; digital citizenship.

INTRODUCTION

Citizenship is sometimes described as a relationship between a person and a state. That definition is indispensable but incomplete. A citizen may possess an identity document, vote in an election, and enjoy a formal right to equal protection, yet still lack the knowledge, opportunity, or confidence to participate meaningfully in public decision-making. The distinction matters in Indonesia, where citizenship is shaped not only by the legal rules of nationality but also by Pancasila, a set of constitutional principles intended to guide relations among the state, communities, and individuals.

Pancasila is stated in the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution through commitments to belief in the One and Only God, just and civilized humanity, Indonesian unity, democracy through deliberation and representation, and social justice. These principles are frequently invoked as a shared ethical orientation in a country characterized by linguistic, cultural, and religious diversity. Their practical significance, however, depends on how abstract values are translated into enforceable rights, institutional procedures, and civic habits. A reference to unity, for example, cannot alone settle a disagreement concerning minority rights; likewise, an appeal to public morality cannot by itself justify restricting constitutional freedoms (Republic of Indonesia, 1945).

The educational stakes are considerable. The National Education System Law makes citizenship education part of curricula, while the Higher Education Law expressly lists both Pancasila and citizenship among the required subjects for diploma and undergraduate programs (Republic of Indonesia, 2003, 2012). A legal requirement creates a place for instruction but cannot guarantee democratic understanding. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) explain that citizenship programs can cultivate very different kinds of participation, ranging from individual responsibility to collective engagement and attention to structural injustice. This distinction invites reflection on what Indonesian civic education should enable learners to know and do.

Digital environments complicate these questions. Political discussion, identity formation, community organizing, and misinformation increasingly intersect through online communication. Digital citizenship, therefore, cannot be equated with courteous use of technology. Choi (2016) conceptualizes it through ethical conduct, media and information literacy, participation, and



critical resistance. Such an approach is especially relevant when rapid online exchange rewards immediate reaction over reasoned public deliberation.

This article addresses three questions: how are citizenship and Pancasila situated within Indonesia's constitutional and statutory framework; how may the five principles support inclusion, democratic participation, and social justice without displacing individual rights; and which educational practices can connect these values to civic problems, including problems in digital spaces? Its central argument is that Pancasila and citizenship are mutually reinforcing only when ideological commitments are read through constitutional guarantees and translated into critical, participatory learning. The objective is not to claim that one teaching model has been empirically proved superior, but to offer a defensible conceptual basis for its future design and evaluation.

RESEARCH METHOD

This article employs qualitative doctrinal and conceptual analysis. Its primary legal materials are the Preamble and citizenship-related provisions of the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 12 of 2006 concerning Citizenship of the Republic of Indonesia, Law No. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System, and Law No. 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education. These sources are treated as normative texts: they establish legal concepts and curricular obligations but do not directly measure how citizens behave or how students learn.

The conceptual component draws on selected academic studies of democratic citizenship, diversity, national identity, digital citizenship, and Indonesian civic education. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) inform the distinction among forms of civic action; Banks (2008) informs the analysis of diversity and inclusive membership; Choi (2016) and Kahne and Bowyer (2017) help frame digital literacy and misinformation; and Indonesian educational studies provide relevant institutional context (Hastangka & Ediyono, 2023; Sunarso et al., 2024; Fajar Pratama et al., 2026). UNESCO's (2015) citizenship education guidance is used as a comparative pedagogical resource rather than as binding Indonesian law.

Analysis proceeds in three steps. First, the article identifies constitutional rights, duties, and legal definitions of citizenship. Second, it interprets the five Pancasila principles in relation to those constitutional norms and evaluates tensions that can arise between solidarity and freedom. Third, it synthesizes learning objectives and examples of assessment for classroom and community application. Sources were purposively chosen for relevance and accessibility; this is



not a systematic review, a field study, or a quantitative impact assessment. Accordingly, the proposals presented below are interpretive conclusions and recommendations, not observations from interviews, surveys, or classroom experiments.

CITIZENSHIP: LEGAL MEMBERSHIP AND DEMOCRATIC PRACTICE

The legal meaning of citizenship should be distinguished from its social and political meanings. Article 26 of the 1945 Constitution identifies who qualifies as a citizen and provides that matters of citizenship and residence are regulated by law. Law No. 12 of 2006 then addresses the acquisition, loss, and reacquisition of Indonesian nationality. This legal status provides a formally identifiable connection to the Republic and a framework for determining rights and obligations. It should not be confused with an assumption that all citizens share the same ethnicity, religion, cultural experience, or political opinion (Republic of Indonesia, 1945, 2006).

Constitutional citizenship is broader than passport possession. Article 27(1) states the equality of citizens before the law and government, and Article 28D(1) recognizes rights to legal recognition, guarantees, protection, and certainty as well as equal treatment before the law. Article 28D(4) recognizes the right to citizenship status. Meanwhile, Article 28E protects several civil freedoms, and Article 28I includes guarantees concerning fundamental rights and freedom from discriminatory treatment. These provisions must be read together: some protections apply to everyone, while others specifically concern citizens. Educational discussion should not collapse that important legal distinction.

Citizenship also entails participation in collective affairs. Representation, deliberation, association, public criticism, and community problem-solving are means through which formal membership becomes democratic agency. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) distinguish personally responsible, participatory, and justice-oriented citizens. Their categories offer an analytical rather than a prescriptive hierarchy for the Indonesian context. Obeying rules and assisting others are socially valuable; nevertheless, a democratic curriculum should also help learners investigate why exclusion or unequal access persists and how lawful public institutions can address it.

The relationship between rights and responsibilities is equally important. Article 28J recognizes duties to respect the rights of others and permits limitations on rights by law for constitutionally specified purposes under democratic conditions. It does not provide an unlimited permission to silence dissent or to treat majority discomfort as sufficient justification for restricting a minority. Rights and obligations should therefore be taught as a structured



constitutional relationship, not as interchangeable moral slogans. Claims about public duties require identification of the relevant legal basis and a defensible explanation of their proportionality.

PANCASILA AS A CONSTITUTIONAL AND CIVIC FRAMEWORK

Pancasila is foundational in the constitutional Preamble, which states the Republic's commitment to public welfare, education, peace, and social justice. The five principles must be understood in relation to that broader constitutional design. They are neither ordinary statutory provisions with self-executing sanctions nor merely ceremonial expressions. Their interpretive role lies in orienting civic purposes, while their concrete application requires institutions, legislation, reasoned public argument, and adherence to constitutional rights (Republic of Indonesia, 1945).

The first principle, belief in the One and Only God, affirms an important dimension of Indonesia's public philosophy. In educational and administrative practice, however, this principle should be approached together with constitutional provisions on freedom of religion and belief. Article 28E and Article 29(2) are especially relevant. A civic interpretation that protects conscience and coexistence is more consistent with constitutional pluralism than an interpretation that reduces national belonging to one uniform expression of religious identity.

The second principle, just and civilized humanity, provides an ethical vocabulary for dignity and equal treatment. It resonates with the Constitution's guarantees against discrimination and its commitment to legal protection. Yet ethical recognition and legal enforcement serve distinct functions: a respectful attitude can improve civic relationships, but it cannot replace due process, accessible public services, or effective remedies when rights are violated.

The third principle, the unity of Indonesia, conveys the significance of a common political community across social differences. Unity is strongest as a commitment to shared constitutional membership, not the erasure of local cultures or the expectation of political unanimity. Banks (2008) argues that citizenship education should take seriously the experiences and group identities of diverse learners. In Indonesia, that insight supports teaching national solidarity alongside recognition of local languages, traditions, and histories.

The fourth principle connects democracy to wisdom, deliberation, and representation. Deliberation should mean that participants provide reasons, listen to disagreement, test claims,



and remain accountable to procedures. It should not be reduced to consensus without scrutiny. Reasonable disagreement is compatible with political unity, while criticism of policy can be an expression of civic responsibility rather than its negation. The fifth principle, social justice for all Indonesians, directs attention to the distribution of opportunity, vulnerability, and the capacity to exercise rights. Civic teaching can use questions of accessibility, local public services, environmental burdens, or educational inclusion to translate social justice from a memorized aspiration into a subject of reasoned investigation.

The principles therefore operate best as a connected interpretive framework. Humanity constrains coercive appeals to unity; democratic deliberation tests competing accounts of the common good; and social justice asks whether formal equality is made meaningful in everyday institutions. This is a normative synthesis advanced by this article, not a claim that the Preamble by itself resolves every constitutional dispute.

Table 1. Pancasila principles and possible citizenship learning outcomes

Pancasila principle	Civic competency	Illustrative learning activity
Belief in the One and Only God	Respect for conscience and religious diversity	Analyze a case concerning equal treatment in public services
Just and civilized humanity	Dignity, empathy, and non-discrimination	Evaluate a rights-related dispute using constitutional safeguards
Unity of Indonesia	Solidarity across different identities	Design an inclusive campus or community initiative
Deliberative and representative democracy	Evidence-based dialogue and public accountability	Hold a structured deliberation with reasoned opposing views
Social justice for all Indonesians	Fair access and attention to structural inequality	Assess who benefits from a local policy and who may be excluded

Source: authors' conceptual synthesis of the 1945 Constitution and civic education literature; the learning activities are proposed examples, not empirically evaluated interventions.

CITIZENSHIP AND PANCASILA EDUCATION IN INDONESIA

Indonesia's educational statutes establish a legal rationale for treating citizenship as a cross-cutting learning objective. Article 37 of Law No. 20 of 2003 includes citizenship education within basic, secondary, and higher education curricula. Article 35(3) of Law No. 12 of 2012 specifically lists religion, Pancasila, citizenship, and Indonesian language among the courses required in higher education; Article 35(5) addresses diploma and undergraduate programs. The provisions establish curricular presence, not a single mandated pedagogy or uniform evidence of effectiveness (Republic of Indonesia, 2003, 2012).

Studies of Indonesian civic education indicate why learning design deserves attention. Hastangka and Ediyono (2023) examine debates around Pancasila education in the post-Reform era, including questions of legitimacy, recognition, and institutionalization. Sunarso and colleagues (2024) analyze Pancasila and civic education curricula at junior secondary level in relation to civic identity. A recent comparative study identifies Pancasila as a central reference for the Indonesian orientation of civic education and nation-building (Fajar Pratama et al., 2026). These studies differ in scope and method, but together illustrate that curriculum content cannot be evaluated independently from its political and institutional context.

One instructional risk is to treat successful learning as the ability to recite the five principles or reproduce legal definitions verbatim. Such knowledge provides a starting point, but it is not sufficient to demonstrate judgment in a difficult civic situation. A learner who recalls the principle of justice may still be uncertain how to evaluate a discriminatory procedure; a learner who knows the value of unity may struggle to explain why constitutionally protected criticism matters. The distinction between knowledge and competent action is consistent with UNESCO's (2015) cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral dimensions of global citizenship education.

A more demanding approach combines constitutional literacy with issue-based inquiry. Students can identify relevant constitutional provisions, compare plausible interpretations, distinguish fact from judgment, listen to stakeholders, and defend a reasoned conclusion. The role of the lecturer is neither to prescribe a single political preference nor to pretend that all arguments are equally supported. It is to create a disciplined setting in which legality, evidence, and reason-giving are visible standards. Assessment could use policy briefs, structured deliberations, case analyses, reflective portfolios, or documented community projects.

This approach also fits vocational and professional education. Students in engineering, business administration, and public administration encounter civic questions through the



ordinary use of professional competence: accessibility of public infrastructure, safety standards, responsible handling of personal information, equitable service delivery, and the public consequences of technological design. An electrical engineering student, for instance, can assess unequal access to safe infrastructure; an administrative student can examine transparency and respectful treatment in public services. These are suggested teaching applications, not claims that a particular institution or program has already implemented them.

DIGITAL CITIZENSHIP AND DEMOCRATIC DELIBERATION

Digital citizenship connects longstanding democratic questions with the circumstances of networked communication. The relevant issue is not simply whether people behave politely online, but whether they can identify reliable information, participate without excluding others, respect personal rights, and scrutinize powerful claims. Choi (2016) identifies four interrelated dimensions: ethics, media and information literacy, participation or engagement, and critical resistance. This framework is useful because it recognizes that online civic action is continuous with, rather than detached from, offline public life.

A Pancasila-informed interpretation of digital conduct can draw on respect for dignity, social cohesion, deliberation, and justice. Dignity requires attention to harassment, humiliating speech, and the treatment of marginalized persons. Deliberation requires an ability to distinguish reasons and evidence from popularity or repetition. Social justice raises questions about unequal connectivity, accessibility, and who can participate in digital public discussion. At the same time, a commitment to harmony must not become a blanket rationale for suppressing legitimate disagreement. The relationship between public responsibilities and constitutional freedoms remains central in digital contexts.

Misinformation provides a practical learning case. Kahne and Bowyer (2017), studying young people's evaluations of controversial online posts, found that judgments about accuracy were affected by prior political positions and examined the role of media literacy education. Their research was not conducted in Indonesia, so it cannot be used as direct evidence of Indonesian student behavior. Its transferable lesson is methodological: learners should practice verifying sources and examining claims even when those claims confirm their preferred position. Good citizenship requires the capacity to question persuasive information as well as the intention to be responsible.



A campus learning exercise could present students with an invented claim about a municipal service or an election-related administrative procedure, clearly labeled as a simulation. Teams would establish what evidence would be necessary, locate authoritative primary materials, identify uncertainties, and draft a correction that avoids reproducing misleading claims as established facts. A second exercise could simulate a public hearing on the design of an accessible technological service, with students assigned stakeholder roles and asked to make reasoned compromises. Both activities translate civic values into observable performance while reducing the temptation to grade students on ideological conformity.

Digital education must also acknowledge constraints. Not every student enjoys reliable network access, comparable digital skills, or the same sense of safety in public expression. An inclusive curriculum therefore permits equivalent offline participation, avoids unnecessary disclosure of personal information, and evaluates the quality of argument rather than audience size or social-media visibility. These safeguards are practical consequences of the commitment to equal participation advanced in the constitutional and Pancasila framework.

DISCUSSION

The central finding of this conceptual analysis is a conditional relationship. Pancasila can strengthen citizenship when it connects shared political belonging to individual dignity, transparent public institutions, deliberation, and social justice. The same vocabulary can become less useful when its principles are detached from constitutional protections or deployed as final answers to questions that require legal interpretation and empirical evidence. A constructive curriculum should therefore teach students both the principles and the limits of appealing to them.

This argument helps reconcile two objectives that are sometimes treated as competing: national solidarity and democratic pluralism. Solidarity supplies reasons to recognize fellow citizens as members of a common political community; pluralism recognizes that equal members are not required to agree about religion, culture, public policy, or the meaning of fairness. Banks (2008) cautions against citizenship frameworks that overlook group identity and inequality. In this view, shared national identity is more credible when public institutions provide equal standing and opportunities for groups whose lived experiences differ.

The same reasoning clarifies the place of civic responsibilities. A personally responsible citizen who acts lawfully and assists others contributes to public life. A participatory citizen also



learns how to organize collective action. A justice-oriented citizen asks whether existing arrangements systematically fail some members of the community (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Pancasila-informed education can make space for all three forms without treating civic participation as equivalent to partisan loyalty. Its institutional legitimacy depends on the freedom to investigate public problems critically.

The proposal has consequences for evaluation. Measuring only factual recall misses important competencies; measuring attitudes alone risks rewarding socially desirable answers; and treating online engagement as inherently beneficial ignores misinformation and unequal access. A more credible assessment design would examine constitutional reasoning, quality of evidence, respectful engagement with disagreement, and the feasibility of proposed civic action. Longitudinal and classroom-based research would then be necessary to determine whether this approach improves students' capabilities in practice.

The scope of the argument remains limited. The study analyzes selected laws and literature but does not compare how different Indonesian universities implement the curriculum, assess regional variation, or document the experiences of students and teachers. It does not establish causal effects of Pancasila education on tolerance or democratic participation. Its value is the articulation of a testable normative and pedagogical framework that keeps these empirical questions open.

CONCLUSION

Pancasila and citizenship are connected but not identical. Citizenship law establishes nationality and legal membership; constitutional provisions articulate rights, duties, and institutional limits; and Pancasila offers a shared ethical language for public purposes. The relationship is most democratically productive when these dimensions are interpreted together. Equality before the law, religious freedom, reasonable disagreement, national solidarity, and social justice should function as mutually informing commitments rather than competing slogans.

For education, the implication is to move beyond recitation toward informed civic judgment. Higher education can integrate constitutional literacy, pluralism, evidence-based deliberation, media literacy, and professionally relevant community problems. The article's framework is interpretive and pedagogical, not a claim of empirically demonstrated success. Its central contribution is a defensible account of how Pancasila may support citizenship as both a legally protected status and a meaningful democratic practice.



FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Future studies should examine how students in diploma and undergraduate programs actually understand the relationships among Pancasila, rights, duties, and social participation. Comparative classroom research could assess whether problem-based discussions, source-verification exercises, and structured deliberation improve civic reasoning more effectively than recall-centered instruction. Appropriate measures would include transparent scoring rubrics, pre- and post-instruction assessments, and attention to students' diverse backgrounds.

Research should also investigate the institutional conditions that enable inclusive civic learning: lecturer preparation, access to reliable legal and public information, spaces for respectful disagreement, and protections for students engaging with controversial issues. Cross-disciplinary designs involving engineering, administration, law, and education could clarify how citizenship competencies translate into ethical professional decisions. Such work would test the claims advanced here rather than simply repeating them.

REFERENCES

- Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 129–139. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08317501>
- Choi, M. (2016). A concept analysis of digital citizenship for democratic citizenship education in the Internet age. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(4), 565–607. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2016.1210549>
- Hastangka, H., & Ediyono, S. (2023). Pancasila education in Indonesia: The debate on Pancasila in the post reform era between legitimation, recognition, and institutionalization during 2000–2021. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, 20(1), 167–178. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v20i1.59673>
- Kahne, J., & Bowyer, B. (2017). Educating for democracy in a partisan age: Confronting the challenges of motivated reasoning and misinformation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 3–34. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216679817>
- Fajar Pratama, F., Rachman, F., Nugraha, F., & Heris Mahendra, H. (2026). Nation-building through civic education: A comparative study of Malaysia and Indonesia. *Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan*, 6(1), 56–74. <https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v6i1.1032>



- Republic of Indonesia. (1945). The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (as amended). Secretariat General of the People's Consultative Assembly. <https://jdih.mpr.go.id/dokumen/view?id=496>
- Republic of Indonesia. (2003). Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/43920/uu-no-20-tahun-2003>
- Republic of Indonesia. (2006). Law Number 12 of 2006 concerning Citizenship of the Republic of Indonesia. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/40176>
- Republic of Indonesia. (2012). Law Number 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education. <https://jdih.kemenkeu.go.id/api/download/fulltext/2012/12TAHUN2012UU.htm>
- Sunarso, S., Hidayah, Y., Firmasnyah, A., & Arpanudin, I. (2024). 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*, 21(1), 98–106. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v21i1.63161>
- UNESCO. (2015). Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/DRHC3544>
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237–269. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002237>

