Asia Pacific Journal of Education

ISSN: 0218-8791 (Print) 1742-6855 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cape20

Youth in a global world: attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship among university students in Hong Kong

Wing Hong Chui & Elliot W.Y. Leung

To cite this article: Wing Hong Chui & Elliot W.Y. Leung (2014) Youth in a global world: attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship among university students in Hong Kong, Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 34:1, 107-124, DOI: 10.1080/02188791.2013.810143

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2013.810143

Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 2014
Vol. 34, No. 1, 107–124, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2013.810143

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Youth in a global world: attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship among university students in Hong Kong

Wing Hong Chui* and Elliot W.Y. Leung

Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

(*Received 2 April 2012; final version received 15 August 2012*)

Despite the wealth of theoretical literature on globalization and global citizenship, empirical studies on the topic are lacking, especially in the context of pedagogical needs in relation to global citizenship education. In order to address this gap, a study was conducted in Hong Kong to investigate the attitudes of university students towards various dimensions of globalization and global citizenship. The initial results indicate that Hong Kong university students are generally quite aware of globalization's impact on the economy and personal consumption choices and that while there is considerable apathy towards international affairs, there is also a great interest in cross-cultural service learning opportunities that is not being met by the available programmes. Moreover, this study finds almost no association between age, gender, and religion and any of the measured dependent variables on attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship, the only exception being the factor of past intercultural experiences, where a significant difference in measured attitudes was found between respondents who had and respondents who had not participated in such experiences before. Explanations of the findings and the implications of findings for policy and future research are discussed.

Keywords: global citizenship; youth and globalization; attitudes toward globalization; university students; Hong Kong

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to report and discuss the findings of a study conducted in early 2011 on university students' attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship in the context of Hong Kong. As reviewed below, although theoretical monographs abound on the topics of globalization and global citizenship, there are relatively few empirical studies and even fewer studies so based on an Asian context. Where studies have been conducted, they have focused more on youths of secondary school age, with little mention being made of university-aged youths. Given the exigency to prepare university students for careers not only in local but also in international and global contexts, the need for evidence-based educational practice is greater than ever. Before implementing such evidence-based educational practice, it is of paramount importance to first map out students' attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship and to identify gaps in knowledge in order to guide pedagogy and curriculum design aimed at equipping young people with the abilities required to navigate with ease in the global world of today and tomorrow.

In light of the above, this paper first reviews the core concepts of globalization and global citizenship and then international and local studies and key works on these topics. The aims and questions of the current study and the methods and instruments used in it are

*Corresponding author. Email: ericchui@hku.hk

explicated, and then the study's findings are reported. The paper concludes by providing reflections on the study and discussing its implications for the tertiary education sector and the possibilities of a wider research agenda in the future.

Measuring globalization and global citizenship in Hong Kong

Various theorists have produced different definitions of globalization, but common to all of them is the idea that globalization involves the blurring of both the tangible and intangible barriers separating nation states and societies, allowing goods, services, and various forms of capital (including human capital) to flow across and even transcend these barriers. As discussed in Held (2004), among drivers of this process are the changing technological infrastructures and possibilities; the internationalization of security, global health, and environmental crises; the development of global markets and trade liberalization; the increased migration and movement of people; and the development of multi-layered levels of political power. Bartelson (2000) further theorized globalization into three conceptual (not necessarily chronological) "stages", namely "transference", "transformation", and "transcendence". The first stage involves merely an increased exchange between "units" such as individuals and nation states without these units changing in nature; the second stage entails a shift in how these units and systems operate; and the third stage refers to this unit and system distinction becoming completely obsolete, veering towards literal cosmopolitanism, a truly "one-world" scenario.

Key to this study's rationale is that globalization happens not only on a macro world-systems level that is "out there" in the world but also on a more micro, agent-centred, phenomenological level involving alterations in life chances, consumption patterns, mentality, and even worldview among individuals. As Waters (2001) commented, not only are the "constraints of geography [receding]" under globalization but also people are becoming "*increasingly aware* that they are receding" (Waters, 2001, p. 5, emphasis added). It is the *awareness* of the processes observed in the last century, the change in attitudes towards globalization, that is key to what makes these processes different from the previous modus operandi. After all, global trade and cultural fusion have existed since the times of the Silk Road – it is the shift in the attitudes and awareness, and even the deliberate actions, of individuals that distinguishes this new stage of human history.

Attempts have been made to quantify globalization, although these efforts have focused mostly on "economic globalization" – taken by many to be synonymous with globalization – without paying due attention to the social, cultural, and political aspects of globalization. For example, Ernst and Young (2011) Globalization Index reported that Hong Kong tops the world in terms of "degree of globalization", leading the world in the areas of trade, capital movement, and cultural integration; unfortunately the cultural integration measure of the index only measures tourism, net international communication, and "openness of national culture to foreign influence", and does not pay due attention to the exchange of ideas, the acceptance of diversity and difference, and the degree of multiculturalism and/or racism. Two social science informed studies are worth noting, namely Kluver and Fu (2008) and Raab et al. (2008), both of which seek to integrate "the actual social and cultural practices of nations" that are usually omitted (Kluver & Fu, 2008, p. 335). Kluver and Fu (2008), for example, took the admirable step of measuring cultural globalization by factoring imports and exports in both print and film media, while in compiling their "Global Index", Raab et al. (2008) adopted an even more holistic

approach which takes into account a wide range of over 30 factors, from the number of embassies in a country to the number of McDonald's restaurants.

Another key concept in this study is global citizenship, which is comprised of two equally complex terms: global and citizenship. The first term "global" has been considered in the discussions above on the trends and facets of globalization, while "citizenship" needs to be qualified further. A frequent source of confusion is that citizenship can be both a *descriptive* concept stating what passport an individual holds, where s/he pays taxes, and so on and a *normative* concept outlining the level of the "should" and "should nots" governing a citizen's actions and commitments. In short, citizenship is one's responsibility towards one's polity. The difficulty, of course, is that there is no "global state" or "global government" to speak of in the social contract, traditional sense of citizenship that is bounded by clearly defined national borders and state institutions. It is for this reason that scholars such as Parekh (2003) have expressed their dislike of the term "global citizenship", preferring alternatives such as "global-oriented citizenship", because one cannot literally be a "citizen of the world" in the descriptive sense. The key to citizenship therefore rests on the *normative* sense of global citizenship, which posits that insofar as rights and responsibilities are two sides of the same coin, one's geographical boundaries of responsibility need to be congruent in some way with the boundaries of the rights and benefits received. The acceptance of a global citizen's boundaries of responsibility must therefore be based upon an acknowledgement of the same boundaries of rights and benefits received through the processes of globalization discussed above, thus increasingly transcending national borders. It is therefore important that norms, responsibilities, and attitudes are measured in any survey designed to measure global citizenship. It is only by recognizing the interconnectedness of the world, of being part of this "global world", that a sense of obligation towards the international community in a rights-and-responsibility manner can make sense. Therefore, in urging students to contribute to the world as "good global citizens", it is important to gauge their reaction to the formation of supra-national boundaries and their sense of contributing towards this process – information for educators that will be central to any pedagogical endeavour.

The formulations of what exactly global citizenship involves can be categorized as being either "attitude-centered" or "action-centered" or as lying some point between these two archetypal poles of a spectrum. That is to say, while some scholars find the prerogatives of global citizenship in matters of awareness and concern such as paying attention to international news, others see global citizenship as legitimated only through action and active participation, through "walking the talk". For example, Falk's (1993) pivotal statement on the four dimensions of global citizenship falls on the "attitude" end of the spectrum, which includes aspects such as an "attitude of necessity" towards sustainable development and an awareness of the global backdrop itself (Falk, 1993), whereas more action-oriented scholars like Davies (2006) underline that "one can have the emotions and identities without having to do much about them [–] citizenship implies a more active role" and that, "citizenship clearly has implications both of rights and responsibilities, of duties and entitlements" (Davies, 2006, p. 6). The Oxfam (1997) "Curriculum for Global Citizenship", a widely used and re-used document, is instructive in its combination of both attitude and action components. According to this document, a global citizen is one who (1) is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen; (2) respects and values diversity; (3) has an understanding of how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically, and environmentally; (4) is outraged by social injustice; (5) participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from the local to the global; (6) is willing to act to make the world a more

equitable and sustainable place; and (7) takes responsibility for their actions (Oxfam, 1997).

As noted by Philips and Smith (2008), empirical studies based on primary data lag behind the depth and breadth of the theoretical literature on the topic. A few exceptions stand out. First, Myers (2010) provides a fruitful discussion in documenting the discursive understanding of global citizenship of students in Pennsylvania through a series of in-depth interviews, bringing out the dispute about whether or not global citizenship is innate (i.e., membership belongs to all humans) or acquired, whether it is a moral commitment or a legal status, and whether or not it is compatible with national citizenship. Roudometof (2005) took note of this tension early on in his discussion on "rooted cosmopolitanism", where global and local are seen as reconcilable through the emergence of "glocalization" as an expression of manifestations of the global in the context of the local (Robertson, 1994). Woodward, Skrbis, and Bean (2008) and Yashima (2010) sought to apply statistical analyses to quantify attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship. Yashima (2010), in particular, compared students in Japan who had participated in international volunteer projects with those who had not and found that the former group registered higher levels of intercultural competence compared to the control group. Similarly, by using a larger sample, Woodward et al. (2008) employed secondary data from the 2004 Australian Election Survey and found only a modest association between socioeconomic status and measured attitudes towards globality and cosmopolitan culture. Both of the above studies were used as benchmarks for the present study; questions in the present survey were adopted from and compared against these studies.

Locally in Hong Kong, two local non-governmental organizations, namely the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups (HKFYG) and the Chinese Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) of Hong Kong, have pioneered global citizenship themed programmes for youths. Ngai (2009) reported on the positive effects of the HKFYG's Global Citizenship Programme, while the Chinese YMCA of Hong Kong conducted a survey of over 2,000 secondary school students which revealed that Hong Kong secondary school students pay little attention to international news and have a low sense of accountability and responsibility with regard to global problems; for example, out of a list of 12 earmarked priorities, "global warming" was listed by students as the top concern, yet surprisingly, "leading a low-carbon lifestyle" was ranked 12th out of the 12 priorities (Chinese Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) of Hong Kong, 2010).

In addition, two notable cross-cultural comparative studies have shed more light onto the discussion. Lee and Leung (2006) compared attitudes and approaches towards global citizenship and global citizenship education (GCE) among secondary school teachers in Hong Kong and Shanghai. They found that (a) Shanghainese teachers are comparatively more interested in global affairs and find it easier to teach across a number of areas in the local GCE curriculum and (b) Hong Kong students are perceived by their respective sampled teachers to be more interested in local issues rather than in global issues, while the opposite is true for Shanghainese students. Law (2004) assessed Hong Kong's and Taiwan's efforts to adapt their secondary education curricula to suit the needs of globalization, and he found that in both regions, the "global" turn in the secondary education curricula had merely translated into a heightened emphasis on Mainland China, with little corresponding awareness and emphasis on other regions of the world. Interestingly, generic skills such as English proficiency and information technology continue to be emphasized in both places without a corresponding emphasis on global realities and global issues.

In summary, several points should be kept in mind. First, an understanding of the term "global" and the supra-national frontiers of one's rights and responsibilities is key to understanding citizenship. Second, global citizenship can be assessed in terms of both attitudes and actions; the attitude components, being more psychometric in nature, are inherently more measurable, and therefore they constitute the focus of the present study. Third, although comparable cross-sectional and even quasi-experimental studies exist in the field, data on Hong Kong youth, especially university-aged youths, are still lacking. Building on the logic and findings of previous studies, this study thus has the following aims:

(1) to test a set of psychometric scales that together provide a statistically robust and replicable measurement of young people's attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship values in a local context;
(2) to investigate the possible correlations between the measured attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship, with various demographic variables; and
(3) to pinpoint both the demographic patterns and certain prior experiences among university students in Hong Kong that may better inform higher education professionals in creating and improving education curricula to better suit their focus and objectives.

Method

Participants and procedures

For this study, a convenience sample of first-year undergraduate students was recruited in early 2011 from four inter-faculty courses offered at the University of Hong Kong (HKU). As part of the so-called Common Core Curriculum, these courses bring together students from all faculties and disciplines, thus making them an ideal cross-section sample of HKU's student body. Assistance from the course coordinators was sought beforehand. Surveys were distributed and completed in class, with instructions given by the researchers highlighting the anonymity of respondents, the purpose of the research, the voluntary nature of participation in the study, the withdrawal option, and other basic information about the study. Students were given 10 minutes to complete the survey.

A total of 292 surveys were returned, giving a response rate close to 78%, which is satisfactory. About 60% of the respondents were female and 40% were males. The sample represented almost 10% of the total first-year undergraduate population at HKU. In this study, females were slightly over-represented, the ratio of 147 females to 100 males compared to the HKU ratio of 108 females to 100 males. The majority of the student respondents were non-religious (67.9%), the rest of the sample reporting that they were Christians, Buddhists, or Muslims. The respondents came from various HKU faculties, including Arts, Social Sciences, Science, Engineering, and Business and Economics. About 88.9% of the respondents were Hong Kong students; the rest were non-Hong Kong students, including fee-paying students and students on study abroad and exchange programmes. Table 1 shows the past intercultural experiences of the respondents; it appears that the majority of them had not participated in such experiences.

Measures

As shown in Appendix A, a total of 24 items were included in the survey questionnaire to measure students' attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship. The questionnaire

Table 1. Past intercultural experiences of the participants ($N = 292$).

Intercultural experience	*N*	Percentage
Exchange study programme		
Yes	33	11.3%
No	259	88.7%
Internship programme		
Yes	25	8.6%
No	267	91.4%
Local service learning / volunteer services		
Yes	119	40.8%
No	173	59.2%
International volunteer projects		
Yes	18	6.2%
No	274	93.8%
Home-stay experience		
Yes	32	11.0%
No	260	89.0%
Studying in international school		
Yes	35	12.0%
No	257	88.0%

had two parts. The first part, "Attitudes towards Globality and Cosmopolitan Culture", consisted of 11 items with response categories arranged along a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Three composite scales were used: the "*Ethnocentric Tendency*" scale, which was adapted by Yashima (2010) from Gouran and Nishida (1996) and Gudykunst (1991, 1993), assessed the respondents' willingness to work with individuals of different origins and their level of comfort in a multicultural work environment; the "*Interest in Foreign Affairs*" scale, which was adapted by Yashima from previous writings (Yashima, 2002; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004), with new items being added in Yashima (2009), measured the respondents' interest in and exposure to international news and events; the "*Orientation towards International Volunteer Activities*" scale, which was created by Yashima (2009), measured the respondents' willingness to participate in volunteer work both in their home country and internationally.

The second part of the survey questionnaire, "Attitudes towards Dimensions of Globalization Process", which was adapted from Woodward et al. (2008), contained 13 items which were divided into three dimensions: "National Economy", "Personal Consumption and Choice", and "Culture, Diversity and Global Rights". The respondents were asked to rate (from "very good" to "very bad") their perception of the effect of globalization on each item, which were developed by Bean, McAllister, Gibson, and Gow (2005) and subsequently tested in Woodward et al. (2008). Tables 2 and 3 show the internal reliability of all of the above-mentioned scales.

Lastly, basic demographic and biographical information about the students was collected: age, gender, religious affiliation, and past intercultural experiences, which included: participation in exchange study programmes, internship programmes, local service learning/volunteer services, international volunteer projects, home-stay experiences, and studying in an international school. Information on the students' degree

Table 2. Students' attitude towards globality and cosmopolitan culture.

Description	Strongly disagree (*N*)	Disagree (*N*)	Neither agree nor disagree (*N*)	Agree (*N*)	Strongly agree (*N*)	Total percentage (*N*)
Ethnocentric tendency						
1. I enjoy collaborating with people who have different customs or values. (R)	24.2% (70)	56.4% (163)	16.6% (48)	2.8% (8)	0% (0)	100% (289)
2. I sometimes feel uncomfortable with what foreigners do or say.	9.7% (28)	33.1% (96)	31.7% (92)	24.5% (71)	1% (3)	100% (290)
3. I would rather work with someone who is like me than with someone who is different.	5.2% (15)	24.1% (70)	34.8% (101)	32.4% (94)	3.4% (10)	100% (290)
4. I prefer to work with people who have similar ways of thinking and values to mine.	2.4% (7)	9.6% (28)	24.1% (70)	53.6% (156)	10.3% (30)	100% (291)
5. I do not particularly enjoy being with people who have different customs or values.	8.2% (24)	40.9% (119)	36.8% (107)	13.4% (39)	0.7% (2)	100% (291)
Interest in foreign affairs						
6. I often read and watch news about foreign countries.	2.1% (6)	15.5% (45)	32.3% (94)	42.3% (123)	7.9% (23)	100% (291)
7. I often talk about situations and events in foreign countries with my family and/ or friends.	2.1% (6)	21% (61)	35.7% (104)	36.1% (105)	5.2% (15)	100% (291)
8. I have a strong interest in international affairs.	1% (3)	15.2% (44)	39.1% (113)	35.6% (103)	9% (26)	100% (289)
9. I am not very interested in overseas news. (R)	2.1% (6)	14.1% (41)	28.9% (84)	45% (131)	10% (29)	100% (291)
Orientation towards international volunteer activities						
10. I am very interested in volunteer work in developing countries.	2.4% (7)	8.6% (25)	35.4% (103)	40.9% (119)	12.7% (37)	100% (291)
11. I plan to be involved in international volunteer activities in one way or another.	2.1% (6)	10% (29)	33% (96)	44.7% (130)	10.3% (30)	100% (291)

(R) indicates that the item was a reverse item.

Table 3. Students' attitude towards dimension of globalization process.

Description	Very bad (*N*)	Bad (*N*)	Good (*N*)	Very good (*N*)	Total percentage (*N*)
National economy					
12. Consumers like you	0.3% (1)	7.3% (21)	75.6% (217)	16.7% (48)	100% (287)
13. Hong Kong companies	1% (3)	12.5% (36)	71.4% (205)	15% (43)	100% (287)
14. The Hong Kong economy	0.7% (2)	11.2% (32)	68.2% (195)	19.9% (57)	100% (286)
15. Our own standard of living	0.3% (1)	11.5% (33)	71.1% (204)	17.1% (49)	100% (287)
16. Creating jobs in Hong Kong	1.4% (4)	19.5% (56)	63.1% (181)	16% (46)	100% (287)
Personal consumption and choice					
17. Your range of choice in things such as food, films, and TV	0.3% (1)	7.7% (22)	48.3% (138)	43.7% (125)	100% (286)
18. Your ability to sample different cultures	0.3% (1)	12.6% (36)	58.7% (168)	28.3% (81)	100% (286)
19. Your ability to learn about cultures other than your own	1.4% (4)	7% (20)	60.5% (173)	31.3 (89)	100% (286)
20. Your access to goods and services outside Hong Kong	0.4% (1)	6.3% (18)	57.2% (163)	36.1% (103)	100% (285)
Culture, diversity, and global rights					
21. Democracy and human rights abroad	0.7% (2)	8.5% (24)	73.9% (209)	17% (48)	100% (283)
22. Maintaining cultural diversity in the world	4.6% (13)	27.4% (78)	54.7% (156)	13.3% (38)	100% (285)
23. The environment	6.3% (18)	33.7% (96)	53% (151)	7% (20)	100% (285)
24. Hong Kong culture	3.2% (9)	30.2% (86)	58.9% (168)	7.7% (22)	100% (285)

programme and academic history was also collected in order to investigate whether academic background would produce different outcomes in the measured scales.

Findings and discussion

In terms of descriptive statistics, the surveyed students score favourably on the ethnocentric tendency scale (see Table 2). Most respondents (80.6%) reported that they enjoyed collaborating with people who have different values and customs (Item 1), with only 2.8% disagreeing with the statement and none strongly disagreeing. However, when worded inversely (i.e., "I do not particularly enjoy being with people who have different customs and values" [Item 5]), 14.1% of the respondents answered "strongly agree" or "agree", as opposed to the 2.8% above. The main difference between the two items is the key words, "collaborating" (Item 1) – which suggests working on a professional level – as opposed to simply "being with" (Item 5), which is indicative of more informal social settings. Finally, a considerable majority (63.9%) of the respondents expressed a preference for working with people who have similar ways of thinking and values (Item 3). The variety of responses here shows that rather than assuming that a monolithic ethnocentric tendency is adequate to capture university students' attitudes, in-group and out-group dynamics along ethnic-racial lines need to be contextualized and nuanced.

In their responses to the items in the interest in foreign affairs scale, students showed a modest degree of concern, with 50.2% indicating that they read/watched news about foreign countries on a regular basis (Item 6). Interestingly, this figure was slightly higher than the percentage of respondents who expressed a strong interest in international affairs (44.6%, Item 8) – a difference of almost 6% which reflects some degree of passive and indiscriminate interest in news consumption that occurs even without genuine interest. Reading and watching international news (Item 6) was also more prevalent than talking about these events with friends and/or family (Item 7) by a margin of 9%, showing that contact with international news is more an individualistic act of consumption rather than a locus of social life and peer learning. Lastly, a surprisingly large number of students, close to 40%, chose "neither agree nor disagree" with regard to interest in foreign news (Item 8), illustrating a great apathy towards international affairs. Seen in another light, this also means there is great potential for educators to guide students to becoming more internationally aware. This 40% catchment group of apathetic students can be seen as a target group for educators and a good baseline figure to work from.

With regards to the orientation towards international volunteer activities scale, the findings showed that 55% of the students planned "to be involved in international volunteer activities in one way or another" (Item 11), with 53.6% even showing an interest in volunteering in developing countries (Item 10). Unfortunately, only 6.2% of the students had had the chance to take part in international volunteering (see Table 2). This gap of over 45% between intention and actualization reflects a huge gap between demand and supply.

Universities in Hong Kong, particularly HKU, are witnessing a scaling-up of international-oriented service programmes and internships to provide overseas opportunities to their students, but the data above suggests that there is still much room for resource input and service provision as demand is far from being saturated. Internationally speaking, this also implies that the university-aged youths in Hong Kong constitute a hitherto untapped source of valuable human assets in the international volunteering scene, with much potential for growth in the near future.

In the second part of the survey, "Attitudes toward Dimensions of Globalization Process", the students were asked to rate whether they thought globalization is good or bad for a range of listed items (see Table 3). First, with regard to the "National Economy" dimension, the respondents showed great enthusiasm: 92.3% said that globalization is "good" or "very good" for consumers like themselves (Item 12) and 86.9% said that it is good for Hong Kong companies (Item 13), compared to 87% and 76% respectively for the Australian sample reported in Woodward et al. (2008); 88.1% said that it is good for the Hong Kong economy (Item 14); and 88.2% also thought that globalization raises their own standard of living (Item 15). A slightly lower percentage (79.1%) thought that globalization aids job creation in Hong Kong (Item 16), which is higher than the 64% in the Australian data. Whether these differences are due to inherent differences between the two regions or simply to the fact that the sampled base in the Australian Election Study encompassed a much wider age and occupation range remains to be investigated.

With regard to the "*Personal Consumption and Choice*" dimension, the students in this study responded positively to the effects of globalization on a range of factors, with over 90% of the respondents responding "very good" or "good" to three of the four named areas, the corresponding percentage for the fourth area, "ability to sample different cultures" (Item 18), being slightly lower (87.4%). Finally, globalization's effect on the "*Culture, Diversity and Global Rights*" dimension had a mixed reception. While 90.9% of the respondents thought that globalization is good for the advancement of democracy and human rights abroad (Item 21), this seemed to be bogged down by less positivity towards globalization's effect on the environment (Item 23) and maintaining cultural diversity in the world (Item 22). Finally, a significant portion (33.4%) of the respondents felt that globalization is bad for Hong Kong culture (Item 24), illustrating a rather strong conception among the students that as the world "becomes one", cultural diversity and local peculiarity might be at risk, leading to worries about homogenization or "Americanization", both of which are brilliantly discussed and countered in Turner and Khondker (2010).

After analysing the descriptive statistics above, the next analytical step was to tease out any statistically significant relationships between the independent variables (demographic and biographic information) and the dependent variables of the measured attitudes. Independent samples t-tests were carried out to establish significant relationships (e.g., between respondents' age and orientation towards volunteering, between respondents' gender and ethnocentric tendency, and so on). The matrix is laid out in Tables 4 and 5 to reflect all of these combinations. One point of caution is that any differences observed might be due to some prior disposition before coming to university which may have led the students to choose different degree programmes and different courses. In this study, there was *no* significant difference observed in any of the measured variables that was attributable to course choice and degree programme. One reason for this surprising homogeneity is that the sampled students were all first-year students; hence, the differentiation into degree programmes and the characteristics of, and training involved in, these programmes had an effect on the students' attitudes, and also their pre-university backgrounds were not yet contributing to their self-selection and self-screening of course choice.

The first thing to note in this part of the analysis is that there was almost *no* statistical association between the demographic variables of age, gender, and religion and the measured scales. Due to the small sample size in this study, the independent variables were coded binomially (e.g., religion = 1; no religion = 0). Despite this, it is worth pointing out that respondents with a religious belief scored higher on orientation towards volunteering

Table 4. Mean and standard deviation for the observed variables: demographic variables.

	Religion		Age		Gender	
	Yes ($N = 52$)	No ($N = 110$)	Age 17–19 ($N = 141$)	Age 20 or above ($N = 116$)	Male ($N = 113$)	Female ($N = 167$)
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Ethnocentric tendency	13.94 (3.45)	13.96 (2.82)	14.13 (3.20)	13.86 (2.85)	13.79 (3.29)	14.05 (2.86)
Interest in foreign affairs	13.46 (2.99)	13.60 (2.63)	13.18 (2.82)	13.57 (2.90)	13.45 (2.85)	13.40 (2.83)
Orientation towards international volunteer activities	7.35* (1.40)	6.77 (1.70)	6.89 (1.74)	7.07 (1.59)	6.46 (1.86)	7.39*** (1.37)
National economy	15.19 (2.15)	15.19 (1.74)	14.94 (1.98)	15.35 (2.01)	15.11 (2.16)	15.20 (1.83)
Personal consumption and choice	12.67 (2.00)	13.06 (1.92)	12.65 (2.10)	13.35* (1.91)	12.89 (2.02)	13.04 (2.03)
Culture, diversity, and global rights	11.27 (1.95)	11.26 (1.66)	11.04 (2.12)	11.30 (1.89)	11.20 (1.92)	11.14 (2.02)

*$p < .05$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 5. Mean and standard deviation for the observed variables: intercultural experiences.

	Exchange study programme		Internship programme		Local service learning/ volunteer service		International volunteer projects		Home-stay experience		Studying in international school	
	Yes ($N = 33$)	No ($N = 259$)	Yes ($N = 25$)	No ($N = 267$)	Yes ($N = 119$)	No ($N = 173$)	Yes ($N = 18$)	No ($N = 274$)	Yes ($N = 32$)	No ($N = 260$)	Yes ($N = 35$)	No ($N = 257$)
Description	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Ethnocentric tendency ($\alpha = 0.72$)	12.85 (3.03)	14.04* (3.03)	13.24 (2.31)	13.97 (3.10)	13.64 (2.99)	14.09 (3.08)	12.67 (2.93)	13.99 (3.04)	13.06 (3.22)	14.01 (3.01)	12.94 (3.15)	14.04* (3.01)
Interest in foreign affairs ($\alpha = 0.78$)	13.94 (2.77)	13.34 (2.83)	15.12** (3.05)	13.24 (2.75)	13.71 (2.70)	13.20 (2.90)	15.44** (2.75)	13.27 (2.78)	14.47* (3.26)	13.27 (2.74)	14.83** (2.92)	13.21 (2.76)
Orientation towards international volunteer activities ($\alpha = 0.82$)	7.58* (1.50)	6.97 (1.66)	7.96** (1.49)	6.95 (1.64)	7.45*** (1.48)	6.76 (1.70)	8.22** (1.56)	6.96 (1.63)	8.06*** (1.44)	6.92 (1.63)	7.34 (2.04)	7.00 (1.59)
National economy ($\alpha = 0.73$)	15.97* (2.14)	15.03 (1.94)	15.75 (2.21)	15.08 (1.95)	14.70 (2.04)	15.31 (1.92)	15.53 (2.03)	15.11 (1.98)	15.09 (2.20)	15.15 (1.95)	15.76 (2.14)	15.06 (1.95)
Personal consumption and choice ($\alpha = 0.81$)	13.70* (2.11)	12.85 (2.05)	14.33** (1.74)	12.83 (2.05)	12.94 (2.11)	12.96 (2.05)	13.76 (1.68)	12.90 (2.08)	13.59 (2.34)	12.87 (2.02)	13.79* (2.06)	12.84 (2.05)
Culture, diversity, and global rights ($\alpha = 0.72$)	11.18 (1.99)	11.13 (1.97)	11.35 (2.08)	11.12 (1.96)	11.01 (2.01)	11.22 (1.94)	12.00 (2.03)	11.09 (1.95)	11.19 (2.34)	11.13 (1.92)	11.41 (2.60)	11.10 (1.87)

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

activities compared with those without ($t = 2.12$, $p < .05$) (see Table 4). A possible contributory factor to this result is the historical internationalness of both Buddhism and Christianity – the two most prevalent religions in Hong Kong – alongside the emphasis on pro-social values such as altruism and responsibility for the common good found in both religions. In many respects, previous empirical studies have found that involvement in a religious organization instils generativity and positive attitudes towards volunteering and helping behaviour in people; and predicts a higher level of civic engagement and community participation (Bekkers & Schuyt, 2008; Einolf, 2011; Perks & Haan, 2011; Son & Wilson, 2011; Tao & Yeh, 2007; Webber, 2012). In terms of age, the results showed that compared to the students aged 19 or under, the students over the age of 20 had a more positive view towards globalization's benefits in relation to "personal consumption and choice" ($t = -2.59$, $p < .05$). The reasons for this are unclear, but given the narrow age range of the sampled students (all in their first year), the result will surely need to be revalidated using a sample with a wider age range. With regard to gender, only one measured variable showed significance: females were more oriented towards international volunteer activities than males ($t = -4.55$, $p < .001$).

The fact that the demographic variables did not affect any of the measured outcomes except the three mentioned above is as counterintuitive as it is instructive, showing that the criss-crossing of identities and demographic belongings make it difficult to single out one specific demographic variable as a certain predictor of dispositions towards globalization and global citizenship. Unfortunately, quantitative literature on the comparison of demographic data is scant. The few studies that do exist address the issues only tangentially. For example, Burgoon and Hiscox (2004) found that women are more likely than men to be more anti-immigration and protectionist when it comes to cross-border trade (the so-called "mysterious case of gender protectionism") but then provided no comment on other dimensions of globalization and global citizenship. With regard to religion, Ruhr and Daniels (2003) found that compared to respondents of other religions, Jewish respondents in the US are more likely to favour an increase of immigrants in the US, but they made little mention of religious affiliation's link with other aspects of the transnational movement of tangible and intangible assets aside from immigraton. Given this lack of research, not only on a local scale but also on an international scale, further qualitative, quantitative, and theoretical research would be most beneficial to further explore the relationships between demographic characteristics, and attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship.

Despite the slight surprise at the lack of correlation between age, gender, religion, and the dependent variables, there is one other factor that jumps out in the data – namely, past intercultural experiences, which are further broken down into exchange study programmes, internship programmes, local service learning/volunteer services, international volunteer projects, home-stay experiences, and studying in international schools. Unlike age, gender, and religion, many significant associations were established between the above six aspects of past intercultural experiences and the various measured scales (see Table 5). First, students who had joined overseas exchange study programmes measured higher on the orientation towards international volunteer activities scale ($t = 1.99$, $p < .05$). These students were also less ethnocentric ($t = -2.22$, $p < .05$) and more likely to think that globalization is good both for the national economy ($t = 2.37$, $p < .05$) and for personal consumption and choice ($t = 2.11$, $p < .05$). Similarly, respondents who had already joined volunteer programmes demonstrated a greater interest in foreign affairs ($t = 3.19$, $p < .01$), a greater sense of globalization's benefits on personal consumption and choice ($t = 3.46$, $p < .01$), and a more pronounced orientation towards (further)

international volunteer activities ($t = 2.95$, $p < .01$). Students with prior home-stay experiences also measured higher on interest in foreign affairs ($t = 2.23$, $p < .05$) and orientation towards international volunteer activities ($t = 3.80$, $p < .001$). Last but not least, studying in an international school was also highly associated with a greater interest in foreign affairs ($t = 3.19$, $p < .01$) and the likelihood that students would see globalization as a good thing for personal consumption and choice ($t = 2.62$, $p < .01$), reflecting, perhaps, a greater exposure to the cultural and material consumption of international brands and services in these international school settings, hence the more favourable perceptions.

The positive results above regarding the merits of intercultural experiences can be attributed to the fact that contact with and the impact of physical exposure to foreign cultures, values, and people – especially in a university campus setting – expose students to issues and viewpoints that they have never encountered before. However, Behrnd and Porzelt (2012) have rightly pointed out that having been abroad increases "intercultural competence in interaction with the duration of the stay" (p. 213); in their study, they found that students with at least six months experience abroad scored higher in problem-solving, individual, and social intercultural competences than those who had had less experience abroad. Unlike the passive consumption of cross-border knowledge through the print media and the Internet, the ideas cultivated and explored in actual intercultural encounters occur in a dialogical manner and force young people to challenge their own viewpoints and confront those of others; examples in a Hong Kong case study are given in Chan and Chui (2003). Yashima (2010) expanded on this in relation to the intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954), although how to specifically measure change as a result of such contact, especially when it comes to attitudes towards globalization, is still open to debate. Given the increased trend of intercultural exchange in tertiary institutional settings, it would be highly fruitful to systematically look at before-and-after changes in and cross-group comparisons of students who have experienced different types of exposure so as to guide and inform providers of these services.

One implication of this study is that even in the absence of funds for setting up cross-border learning experiences for students, it seems that past volunteering in general, be it local or global, is significantly associated with future plans and general orientation towards international volunteerism; that is to say, local volunteering leads to an interest in and plans to participate in future *international* volunteering. This may be due to the incubation of the values of humanitarianism and altruism in the positive feedback mechanism generating an even greater desire for future volunteering engagements, or what Snyder and Omoto (2009) refer to as the "antecedents of volunteerism". As reported above, once students have volunteered, this volunteering is, in turn, associated with a greater interest in foreign affairs and a reduced ethnocentric tendency, leading to indirect but desirable outcomes (Marx & Moss, 2011).

Last but not least, the interest in foreign affair scale was surprisingly *not* associated with prior experiences of international exchange programmes, but it did show a significant association with past international school education – at least given the present *n*-number. If further supported in subsequent re-runs, this suggests that exposure to foreign cultures and environments (such as exchange study programmes) does not in itself lead to an increase in interest in foreign affairs; rather, it is the *curriculum* offered in particular schools (local international schools in this case) that is associated with the greatest degree of interest. If this is true, then there is much educators can do, even given the lack of adequate funding and networks, to meet all of the demand for study-abroad experiences given that the successful promotion of locally based global citizenship education and

global issues learning has already shown so much promise. Of course, local and study-abroad programmes are very different experiences, but at least in terms of spurring interest in foreign affairs and promoting awareness of global citizenship, there seems to be much support for both. Furthermore, one hopes that the recently implemented liberal studies curriculum in the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education (HKDSE), which includes a separate module on "Globalization" (Education and Manpower Bureau, 2007), will alongside extant curricula such as the International Baccalaureate (IB), which is gaining popularity locally, bring out a heightened sense of global accountability and stewardship. The scaling up of global citizenship and foreign service learning programmes in universities in Hong Kong in recent years can certainly be seen as a partner in this process of bringing about positive dispositions among students.

Concluding remarks

Overall, the results of this study are illuminating. The obvious limitation of the study is its small sample size; hence, there is restriction on the depth of statistical analysis afforded. Another limitation is the lack of a comparison group in this study, which recruited undergraduate students from the top institution in Hong Kong. This homogenous group of young people explains why there is such similarity in the survey's responses. Thus, this study is not able to discuss global citizenship as a characteristic or goal of the majority of young people in the world. But in terms of setting the scene for future research, the study has managed to prepare the ground and has identified areas for future research and the need for a more broadly representative replication of the present survey. In terms of educational purposes, the implication is that students seem to enter into university on relatively equal grounds, highlighting the overwhelming positive effect of past intercultural experiences on a wide range of the measurements included in the study. Focusing funds and manpower on developing intercultural programmes in universities is therefore a much-advised and evidence-backed way forward. It is noted that some experiences associated with intercultural programmes are not challenging and are not able to support intercultural development and that very often they are nothing more than a simple overseas tour.

However, educators must be aware that during the process of promoting and developing universities' intercultural exposure efforts, they must be sensitive to not allowing such endeavours to devolve into merely instrumental strategies to boost international rankings for universities or for students to seek "CV capital" in the case of IB implementation in the Netherlands eloquently reported by Weenink (2008).

The state of the future is as uncertain as ever: no one can tell what the world will be like in 20, or even 10, years. Therefore, in seeking to prepare youths for the challenges of tomorrow's global world, finding ways to best equip and empower them will be the utmost priority of any educational regime. This study thus hopes to make some small contribution to exploring channels to foster a sense of global citizenship through suitable curricula, local service learning, and of course direct exposure to action-oriented intercultural experiences. As one of the six earmarked "new industries" of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the time is ripe for the tertiary education sector to capitalize on this opportunity and to bring global education to fruition not just in Hong Kong but also in the wider Asian region.

Acknowledgements

This project is funded by a UGC Teaching Development Grant offered by The University of Hong Kong (Project No. 10100334: The Development of the Common Core Course "Youth in a Global

World"). The authors wish to thank the participants of the study and the respective course coordinators who have graciously spared class time to allow for the administration of these surveys. Also, many thanks go to Jade Chan and Cecilia Li for their research assistance.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bartelson, J. (2000). Three concepts of globalization. *International Sociology*, *15*, 180–196.

Bean, C., McAllister, I., Gibson, R., & Gow, D. (2005). *Australian election study, 2004: User's guide for the machine-readable data file*. Canberra: Australian Social Science Data Archive, Australian National University.

Behrnd, V., & Porzelt, S. (2012). Intercultural competence and training outcomes of students with experiences abroad. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *36*, 213–223.

Bekkers, R., & Schuyt, T. (2008). And who is your neighbor? Explaining denominational differences in charitable giving and volunteering in the Netherlands. *Review of Religious Research*, *50*, 74–96.

Burgoon, B., & Hiscox, M. (2004). The mysterious case of female protectionism: Gender bias in attitudes toward international trade. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Chan, C. L. W., & Chui, E. W. T. (2003). The cultivation of global citizenship through international student exchanges: The Hong Kong experience. In L. Dominelli & W. T. Bernard (Eds.), *Broadening horizons: International exchanges in social work* (pp. 333–350). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Chinese Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) of Hong Kong. (2010). *Who is a global citizen: A report*. Hong Kong: Chinese YMCA of Hong Kong. (In Chinese).

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review*, *58*, 5–25.

Education and Manpower Bureau. (2007). *Liberal Studies: Curriculum and Assessment Guide (Secondary 4–6)*. Retrieved from http://www.edb.gov.hk/FileManager/EN/Content_5999/ls_final_e_070508.pdf.

Einolf, C. J. (2011). The link between religion and helping others: The role of values, ideas, and language. *Sociology of Religion*, *72*, 435–455.

Ernst & Young. (2011). *Hong Kong Tops the 'Globalization Index'*. Retrieved from http://ey.mobi/TW/en/Newsroom/News-releases/2011_Hong-Kong-tops-the-Globalization-Index.

Falk, R. (1993). The making of global citizenship. In J. Brecher, J. B. Childs & J. Cutler (Eds.), *Global visions: Beyond the new world order* (pp. 39–50). Boston: South End Press.

Held, D. (2004). *Global covenant: The social democratic alternative to the Washington consensus*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gouran, D. S. & Nishida, T. (Eds.). (1996). *Bunkato comyunikeshon* [culture and communication]. Tokyo: Hassakusha.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1991). *Bridging differences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1993). Toward a theory of effective interpersonal and intergroup communication: An anxiety/uncertainty management perspective. In R. L. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication competence* (pp. 33–71). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kluver, R., & Fu, W. (2008). Measuring cultural globalization in Southeast Asia. In T. Chong (Ed.), *Globalization and its counter-forces in Southeast Asia* (pp. 335–358). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Law, W. (2004). Globalization and citizenship education in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *Comparative Education Review*, *48*, 253–273.

Lee, W. O., & Leung, S. W. (2006). Global citizenship education in Hong Kong and Shanghai secondary schools: Ideals, realities and expectations. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, *2*, 68–84.

Marx, H., & Moss, D. M. (2011). Please mind the culture gap: Intercultural development during a teacher education study abroad program. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*, 35–47.

Myers, J. P. (2010). 'To benefit the world by whatever means possible': Adolescents' constructed meanings for global citizenship. *British Education Research Journal*, *36*, 483–502.

Ngai, P. M. W. (2009). The practical experience of nurturing young global citizens. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *12*, 76–82 (In Chinese).

Oxfam. (1997). *A curriculum for global citizenship*. Oxford: Oxfam. Retrieved from http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/gc/curriculum/.
Parekh, B. (2003). Cosmopolitanism and global citizenship. *Review of International Studies*, *29*, 3–17.
Perks, T., & Haan, N. (2011). Youth religious involvement and adult community participation: Do levels of youth religious involvement matter? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *40*, 107–129.
Philips, T., & Smith, P. (2008). Cosmopolitan beliefs and cosmopolitan practices: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Sociology*, *44*, 391–399.
Raab, M., Ruland, M., Schönberger, B., Blossfeld, H., Hofäcker, D., Buchholz, S., & Schmelzer, P. (2008). Global index: A sociological approach to globalization measurement. *International Sociology*, *23*, 596–631.
Robertson, R. (1994). Globalisation or glocalisation? *The Journal of International Communication*, *1*, 33–52.
Roudometof, V. (2005). Transnationalism, cosmopolitanism and glocalization. *Current Sociology*, *53*, 113–135.
Ruhr, M., & Daniels, J. (2003). The relationship between religious affiliation, region, race, and attitudes towards globalization. *Faith and Economics*, *42*, 26–39. Retrieved from http://www.gordon.edu/ace/FandEindextopical.html#otherfields.
Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. (2009). Who gets involved and why? The psychology of volunteerism. In E. Liu, S. C. Holosko & T. W. Lo (Eds.), *Youth empowerment and volunteerism: Principles, policies and practices* (pp. 4–26). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.
Son, J., & Wilson, J. (2011). Generativity and volunteering. *Sociological Forum*, *26*, 644–667.
Tao, H. L., & Yeh, P. (2007). Religion as an investment: Comparing the contributions and volunteer frequency among Christians, Buddhists, and folk religionists. *Southern Economic Journal*, *73*, 770–790.
Turner, B. S., & Khondker, H. H. (2010). *Globalization: East and west*. London: Sage.
Waters, M. (2001). *Globalization* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
Webber, R. (2012). Exploring volunteering of committed young Catholics. *Journal of Beliefs and Values – Studies in Religion and Education*, *33*, 71–82.
Weenink, D. (2008). Cosmopolitanism as a form of capital: Parents preparing their children for a globalizing world. *Sociology*, *42*, 1089–1106.
Woodward, I., Skrbis, Z., & Bean, C. (2008). Attitudes towards globalization and cosmopolitanism: Cultural diversity, personal consumption and the national economy. *British Journal of Sociology*, *59*, 207–226.
Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in L2: Japanese EFL context. *Modern Language Journal*, *86*, 54–66.
Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the idea L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In Z. Dőrnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 144–163). Clevedoon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Yashima, T. (2010). The effects of international volunteer work experiences on intercultural competence of Japanese youth. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *34*, 268–282.
Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L., & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. *Language Learning*, *54*, 119–152.

Appendix A

Part 1: "Attitudes towards Globality and Cosmopolitan Culture"

Ethnocentric tendency

(1) I enjoy collaborating with people who have different customs or values. (R)
(2) I sometimes feel uncomfortable with what foreigners do or say.
(3) I would rather work with someone who is like me than with someone who is different.
(4) I prefer to work with people who have similar ways of thinking and values to mine.
(5) I do not particularly enjoy being with people who have different customs or values.

Interest in foreign affairs

(6) I often read and watch news about foreign countries.
(7) I often talk about situations and events in foreign countries with my family and/ or friends.
(8) I have a strong interest in international affairs.
(9) I am not very interested in overseas news. (R)

Orientation towards international volunteer activities

(10) I am very interested in volunteer work in developing countries.
(11) I plan to be involved in international volunteer activities in one way or another.

Part 2: "Attitudes towards Dimensions of Globalization Process"

National economy

(12) Consumers like you
(13) Hong Kong companies
(14) The Hong Kong economy
(15) Our own standard of living
(16) Creating jobs in Hong Kong

Personal consumption and choice

(17) Your range of choice in things such as food, films, and TV
(18) Your ability to sample different cultures
(19) Your ability to learn about cultures other than your own
(20) Your access to goods and services outside Hong Kong

Culture, diversity, and global rights

(21) Democracy and human rights abroad
(22) Maintaining cultural diversity in the world
(23) The environment
(24) Hong Kong culture

(R) indicates that the item was a reverse item