

**On the Move: Explorative Research on the Correlation
between Travel Experience and Social Activism from Comparative Perspective**

Jiyeon Kim, PhD Student

Graduate School of Interdisciplinary Information Studies

The University of Tokyo, Japan

ABSTRACT

People on the move, in this paper, are understood as the globalized individuals as well as the potential actors who perform alternative globalization, namely, globalization from below. Relying on the data analysis of AsiaBarometer survey and literature review, this paper aims to examine the connection between individual global experience and social activism, as an active means of political participation. This paper will argue that the experience of others and other culture may promote political subjectification, thereby facilitating political actions which can be developing to social activism toward alternative globalization. Travel, notably physical, performative, and interactive encounters with other people and cultures, is selected as a representative case on the one hand, and three different forms of political actions are chosen to estimate the correlation with social activism on the other hand. Although this data analysis cannot explain the concrete process of transformation, if such a transformation indeed exists, it can reveal conceivable links between travel and social activism and suggest areas for the future research.

Keywords: global civil society, alternative globalization, people-centered development, new tourism, social activism

INTRODUCTION

For the last two decades, there have been many different approaches to understanding what is called globalization. It can be explained as the process of expanding free trade and lowering national barriers to enable the growth of multinational corporations and foreign investment in the economic sense; as the emergence of global governance and the increased power of international institutions in political ways; and is also described as a “shrunk” world through time-space compression owing to

innovations in transportation and communication technology which also enables the imagination of one world or 'global village' and brings an increase of mobility and migration at the individual level. However, these conventions might be too out-dated and banal to describe more contemporary society. Many pundits have mentioned the changes people encounter in everyday life using the term globalization, which has become a "buzzword" (Bhagwati 2004:3) in the intellectual world.

This paper focuses on individuals' global experience from a micro perspective and investigates people on the move, questioning if they can be understood as the potential actors who perform alternative globalization, namely, globalization from below. As a cornerstone to step forward to the more specific comparative study, this paper aims to isolate a general tendency from the data analysis of AsiaBarometer survey, in relation to the correlation between travel experience – among other direct and indirect, interpersonal or mediated global experiences, and political actions – as indicators of social activism in this paper. Furthermore, it attempts to explain how global experiences, travel in particular, and social activism can be connected, bypassing the theoretical concepts such as global civil society, cosmopolitanism, and multiculturalism.

Even though the global recession in 2008 and 2009 caused a temporary decline, international tourism has continuously increased as every indicator of tourism, including tourist arrivals, tourism receipts and expenditure presents. According to the statistics by the World Tourism Organization (2011), Asia and the Pacific were the strongest growing regions in 2010 and East Asian and Pacific regions are forecasted to be the second biggest region for tourism in the near future. Against this background, it is necessary to investigate how individual tourists, travelers, and backpackers interact with the local societies they visit and how they might cause some changes in their own societies and broader global society from sociological perspective. However, many tourism researches seem to be conducted within the discipline of tourism studies, which arguably lacks an interdisciplinary or comparative perspective, on the one hand, and which has been performed by Western researchers without considering historical or socio-cultural contexts. Therefore, one of the significance of this research is the prospects for the travel activities of Asian people, which have been overlooked in other studies.

This paper argues that the experience of others and other culture may provoke the awareness of cultural diversity and promote political subjectification, thereby facilitating political actions, which can be developed into social activism toward alternative globalization. Travel, which is a more performative and direct way of encounter and interaction with other people and cultures, is selected as a representative case. In the broader sense, it attempts to observe the relations between individuals and social change, but to be more specific, it aims to question how globalization is experienced by individuals and possibly linked to the cultural practices, social activism in particular, and can be

performed in the pursuit of alternative globalization or can collude with other power relations. Thus, this paper might help point to future changes in society of mass tourism and global mobility.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

First of all, four relevant theoretical concepts will be discussed in literature review: globalization and alternative globalization, global civil society, cosmopolitanism, and multiculturalism. Given that all the notions are very broad and complex, even more inclusive and interconnected to one another, relatively recent theories will be reviewed in this paper.

To begin with, it is necessary to illustrate generic changes in global society and review theoretical debates about globalization and anti-globalization, or alternative globalization. Two main points will be emphasized: increased attention and argument on counter-forces, namely anti-globalization or anti-globalization movement, and more recent changes that influenced on world order and social movements. Globalization¹ was introduced as a term to understand social change and explain new environment in the late twentieth century in the first place. Some scholars interpreted it as significant transition from the past and others criticized it as an exaggeration, myth or ideology itself from the historical perspective. Bourdieu (2003), for example, criticized it as a pseudo-concept which is descriptive and prescriptive and is in fact a euphemistic modernization: so to speak, the imperialism of the universal.

On the other hand, anti-globalization, the antithesis of globalization so that initially entails the meaning of reaction to it, illustrates certain tendency and opinion that resists or objects to trends of globalization or flaws embedded in it. These theories are constructed with different layers in positions from modifiers to radicals, but in common all shares the need for alternative ways against capitalist/neo-liberalist globalization. Sklair (2002) explains that it seemed evident of the triumph of capitalism, global capitalism and the transnational capitalist class in the decade of the 1990s especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union. However, he writes, “by the beginning of the twenty-first century, in the aftermath of the battle of Seattle and many other challenges to capitalist hegemony, it is difficult to deny the centrality of the struggle between the forces for and against capitalist globalization” (Sklair 2002:1-5). In other words, the debates on globalization necessarily became to embrace counter-forces as parallel power to be considered, including both general ideas of anti-

¹ It is problematic whether to presume the term, globalization, as visible process and actual phenomenon of the late twentieth century is distinctive from previous era or is a discursive terminology used in academic, economic, and political field as rhetoric and strategic tools. But these are not entirely exclusive so is hard to clarify the conceptual boundary.

globalization and more concrete activism so-called anti-globalization movement. This shift can be the first turning point of the 'on-going' globalization theory.

In the meantime, it is agreed in general (Held & McGrew 2007; Sklair 2002), that there have been significant changes in global society in the 2000s. Due to the failure of war in Iraq and sporadic terrorism, among others, the sympathy to anti-globalization and doubts regarding global and national governance or the hegemonic power have increased enough to gather scattered public opinion to make voices for counter-hegemonic and transnational movement. Besides overall discontents to the neo-liberalist economic system, which has brought about another global recession, high unemployment, and other uncertainties gave another reason to demand for an alternative development. These incidents and recent changes functioned as a watershed for the enhancement of anti-globalization (movement) and related debates. It has gradually changed to contain various issues not only limited to the objection to structural exclusion and inequality resulting from market-led globalization but also cultural, social, ideological, and political issues such as cultural diversity, human rights, non-violence, and environmentalism. As Held and McGrew (2007: 173) writes: "contemporary globalization concerns the ethical and the political." In this sense, the Global Justice Movement is often adapted as more proper expression to describe this form of transnational social movement. The Global Justice Movement, which is loose but comprehensive, emphasizes transnational networks and solidarity, is also can be translated to the 'globalization from below.' Whatever it is called, these new forms of alternative globalization share ideas such as solidarity, responsibility, sustainability, human rights, justice, equality, cultural diversity, and alternativeness. These are value-oriented notions rather than thoughts led by radical ideology, which reflects more universal and common interest than did other movements before.

Unlike traditional globalization theory, which postulates nation-state, multinational companies, international organizations as main political and economic actors who lead change, anti-globalization or alternative globalization theories seem more focused on non-state or non-governmental actors who often restrain and resist dominant agencies. The concept of global civil society can be deployed in this discussion. In his understanding of contemporary global society, Keane (2003) refers to the "global civil society" than "world civil society" because the latter is lied on the assumption of state-centeredness or governmentality (Kumar 2007: 416). He also claims global society as a "vast, interconnected, and multi-layered social space that comprises many hundreds of thousands of self-directing or non-governmental institutions and ways of life", likening it to the complex and vulnerable biosphere, in fact "social processes" (Keane 2003: 23-24). According to him, it cannot be said to be a totally new worldview, since a vision of worldliness or cosmopolitanism² arose from local civil

² Cosmopolitanism, in his argument, is explained as "the other-regarding, outward-looking openness of local

societies in the eighteenth-century, but the current development is marked by its regard of its networks of transnational, non-governmental activities. He, however, points out the over-determined characteristic of global civil society, citing the constraining and enabling forces of market what he calls turbo-capitalism on the one hand and “the state or inter-state action, or inaction”, that regulate and influence global civil society on the other hand (Keane 2003: 28-37).

Kumar (2007) also reflects on global civil society as a concept but places more stresses on movement as its immanent characteristic. He emphasizes continuity from the older term, civil society, in terms of its public dimension. Global civil society, an expansion and revision of civil society, signifies free participation in public discourse, whereas civil society developed public sphere within states and societies. He clarifies its conceptual duality as it appears in the three related concepts: civil society, global civil society, and globalization. According to him, “*as in the order term (civil society), global civil society mixes descriptive and normative, politics and ethics, history and rhetoric, in almost equal measure, and with something of the same problematic consequences*”, and globalization, the “further concept of global civil society”, also “generally serves both as a description of contemporary reality and a certain aspiration for the future” (Kumar 2007: 413-416). In other words, global civil society can be understood not only as a descriptive term for identifying contemporary society but also as a process of or attitude toward active participation. Institutions and agents of global civil society confront and regulate with the “destructive and divisive effects of global capitalism.” (420) Social movements including the anti-globalization movement participate in this process, and this is the scene where the idea of globalization and alternative globalization resonates with the notion of global civil society and where the theory meets the actual field. However, as Kumar and Keane also point out, it is more complicated in reality if the function of market and nation-state are to be considered (Kumar 2007: 428).

The theories reviewed above are more centered on the process of transition, highlighting the “non-governmental social sphere” (Keane 2003: 20-23) as the main actors. In comparison to it, cosmopolitanism is arguably defined as a normative and constructive way of thinking in respect to values, outlooks, and orientations on the world from individual perspectives (Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward 2004; Roudometof 2005; Delanty 2009). Delanty (2006; 2009), in his comprehensive assessment of the idea of cosmopolitanism in social and political thought, explains cosmopolitanism as “the capacity for self-problematization and new ways of seeing the world that result when diverse peoples experience common problems,” which endows or requires ‘a cosmopolitan imagination’ in response to the experience of globality (Delanty 2009: ix). His view also arises from the postulation

civil societies – their glimpse of themselves as part of a wider, complex world – constantly tempted them to engage that enlarged world.” (Keane 2003: 28)

of globalization as a *process* ‘that intensifies connections, enhances possibilities for cultural translations and deepens the consciousness of globality’ (Delanty 2009: 71-72). It implies that the cosmopolitan imagination enables people to change how they themselves relate to others and the world. Hence it can be interpreted as methodology, and globalization is interpreted as transformative moment.

Quoting Ulrich Beck’s (2000) description of reality as *transnational social spaces*, Roudometof (2005) remarks on the necessity of conceptualizing transnational interactions that influence the internal globalization, the connection with social activism in the form of transnational networks, and the transnational interactions involve routines as mediated communication, international tourism, and participation in international organizations and non-governmental groups as well (Roudometof 2005: 119). However, he suggests that not all transnational experience reflects internal globalization, but the degree to which cosmopolitanism is related to the presence or absence of transnational experience exists, relies on the locality or inter-state variation in the process. In other words, the continuum between locals and cosmopolitans might vary with respect to the degree of attachment to a locality or to a state or country, attachment to and support of local culture, and economic, cultural and institutional protectionism (Roudometof 2005: 121-126). In short, cosmopolitanism is inevitably oriented as context-specific, namely specific national contexts. Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward (2004), meanwhile, partially criticize the idealistic sentiment and unspecified empirical sociological dimensions of cosmopolitanism, and purging it of its political utopianism, propose to make cosmopolitanism a more productive analytical tool that is ‘pinned down empirically’ and grounded in the context of nation-state structures. In addition to it, Delanty (2009), who problematizes euro-centrism in the cosmopolitan, urges the development of intercultural dialogue in a post-Western world, and from the Asian perspective in particular.³

Finally, multiculturalism, ‘the politics of recognition’ as Taylor (1992) argues, can suggest a means of understanding the process of how cosmopolitan imagination can be activated to political participation and social activism in global civil society. In general, multiculturalism, which is employed to explain the diversity of human society, demographic and cultural diversity in particular, is defined as the coexistence of multiple cultures in a nation or society. In a modest sense, it often includes multicultural consumption of food, music, fashion, and religion arising from various localities and ethnicities on the one hand, and moreover, is understood as multiculturalism ideology or

³ Global civil society theorists (Kumar 2007; Keane 2003), on the other hand, tend to refer cosmopolitanism as earlier concept civil society from European tradition and to understand current cosmopolitanism with more emphasis on the aspects of federation and association of people or on its meaning as ‘global public sphere.’ This envisages the shared idea of global citizenship and cosmopolitanism.

the politics of recognition in pursuit of perceiving multicultural reality and conflicts and resolving them via the reflexive and political activities. The latter problematizes the notions and criteria of an existent nation-state, society and individual, and community (Martiniello 1997). Therefore, multiculturalism does not function as a mere academic notion to sketch reality but indeed operates as an engine to transform society, and the premise of transformation is the recognition and experience of others and the respect of cultural diversity or pluralism.⁴

To sum up, the theories reviewed above share ideas of global social change in the sense that it is not merely operated by one-way forces but rather two-way, complex interactions among many different agencies. These notions are embed in the dual characteristics of politics and ethics, descriptive and normative aspects, and it can be roughly presumed that the normative and ethical side, such as alternative globalization, cosmopolitan imagination, and global citizenship, are connected to the counteraction or resistance against the dominant hegemony. They may coincide with one another in the realm so-called transnational social space, in which the encounter of otherness, cosmopolitan imagination, and political subjectification can be nurtured. However, these theories mostly developed from conceptual mapping rather than empirical research. This paper locates the actors, tourists, and their activities, such as social activism, within the theoretical context above and attempts to illustrate the correlations through the evidence form empirical analysis.

RESEARCH METHOD AND DATA

To explore the correlations between travel experience and social activism and to explain how these two factors can be linked to each other, this paper analyzes the AsiaBarometer survey, which was conducted in thirty two countries from 2003 to 2008. As its first objective is to find out general tendencies among all travelers, and later to discover national differences, it uses data from all of the countries at first and analyzes into two sections, including some selected countries. <Appendix 1> presents the overall sample information. According to the statistics of UNWTO (World Tourism Organization), from 2006 to 2008, seven Asian countries were ranked in international tourism's top thirty populations and expenditures: Hong Kong, China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, India, and Singapore, in order of population. Among them, this paper attempts to refer to the cases from East Asian countries, including China, Japan, South Korea, Singapore and Hong Kong. Singapore and Hong Kong have been because they present the highest two rate in travel population within the seven

⁴ The idea is also related to the understanding of identity from the cultural studies perspective, which answers that the cultural identity is formed through the confrontation with otherness and in-between the relationship with others.

countries list above, according to the AsiaBarometer data (Appendix 1), and are often considered as multicultural and globalized societies in Asia.

The AsiaBarometer survey asked respondents questions about global experience in relation to diaspora, travel, intercultural networks, foreign media viewing, interpersonal communication, and international business.⁵ Above all, this research concentrates on travel experience. On the other hand, it examines social activism based on the questionnaire about the political actions of three different levels of positivity, namely a) *signing a petition to improve conditions*, b) *joining in boycott*, and c) *attending lawful demonstrations*.⁶ The selective answers are divided into four parts, *have done*, *might do*, *would never*, and *don't know*, which is counted as a missing value in the results. Cross tabulation analysis between travel experience and political actions is applied to compare the change and difference of people who have travel experience in the previous three years with the people who do not.

Next, this paper also finds a correlation between the global experience and the perception of multiculturalism and a correlation between the latter and social activism, referring to the question that asks the opinion about social equality. The relevant question is *Areas where equality should be most eagerly promoted*,⁷ which is multiple choice question containing the options of gender, age, education, occupation, income/wealth, religion, family origin, and color or race (ethnicity).⁸ Although it may not explain clear causal relations, the variable of the sense of inequality in ethnicity is assumed as the mediating or triggering factor to link travel (global experience) to social activism (political actions).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Results

⁵ The exact questionnaires are as follows: *A member of my family or a relative lives in another country; I have traveled abroad at least three times in the past three years, on holiday or for business purposes; I have friends from other country who are in [your country]; I often watch foreign-produced programs on TV; I often communicate with people in other countries via the Internet or email; My job involves contact with organizations or people in other countries.*

⁶ This question was not asked in Brunei, China, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam in 2004, in Vietnam in 2006, and in Laos and Myanmar in 2007 due to the political reason in those countries.

⁷ This question was asked from 2006 to 2008 and the full question was as follows: *every society has some kinds of inequality. In which of the following areas do you think equality should be most eagerly promoted in your society?*

⁸ This question was asked from 2006 to 2008, and the choice of answer was 'Ethnicity' in 2006 and 2007 and 'Color or Race' in 2008.

The fundamental determinant is assumed as the travel experience, so the two following hypotheses were built upon it: 1) people who have travel experience will participate in political action more than who have not; 2) travel experience may affect the increase of sensibility of ethnicity issues among others. Results from the selected five countries will be also introduced as an explorative cross-national analysis.

First of all, regarding the first hypothesis, the percentage of participation in total, adding ‘have done’ and ‘might do’ answers, does not show a distinctively higher share than that of group who did not have travel experience in the previous three years. However, it does show an increase in actual participation (‘have done’) and a decrease in potential participation (‘might do’) in every form of political actions, which implies that those who have some intention to engage in political activities are likely to transform themselves into actual participants through the travel experience (Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3).

Table 1. Travel Experience and Social Activism (a)

Travel experience	Signing a petition to improve conditions			Total	Pearson Chi-Square	Cramer's V	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
	Have done	Might do	Would never do				
Not mentioned	5777	13294	10797	29868	100.625	0.055	0
	19.30%	44.50%	36.10%	100.00%			
Apply	826	1185	1092	3103			
	26.60%	38.20%	35.20%	100.00%			

Table 2. Travel Experience and Social Activism (b)

Travel experience	Joining in boycotts			Total	Pearson Chi-Square	Cramer's V	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
	Have done	Might do	Would never do				
Not mentioned	1743	10051	17582	29376	14.919	0.021	0.001
	5.90%	34.20%	59.90%	100.00%			
Apply	231	988	1825	3044			
	7.60%	32.50%	60.00%	100.00%			

Table 3. Travel Experience and Social Activism (c)

Travel experience	Attending lawful demonstrations			Total	Pearson Chi-Square	Cramer's V	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
	Have done	Might do	Would never do				
Not mentioned	2591	11195	15804	29590	19.509	0.024	0
	8.80%	37.80%	53.40%	100.00%			
Apply	318	1037	1653	3008			
	10.60%	34.50%	55.00%	100.00%			

Second, regarding the correlation between travel experience and opinions on the alleviation of equality, ‘ethnicity (color or race)’ issue is more highly correlated to travel experience than in other areas, as it is shown in <Table 4>. It also presents that people who have direct or indirect global

experiences tend to think that the reduction of ethnic inequality should be most eagerly promoted in their own society. This is more evident when it is compared to the low correlation with the group who chose ‘none of the above’ answers regarding global experience. These results support the assumption that not only travel but also global experience in general, and more direct and interpersonal interaction in particular, might encourage the perception of multiculturalism, especially in the realm of ethnicity.

Table 4. Global Experience and Equality Issues (32 Countries)

Global Experience and Equality Issues		Gender	Age	Education	Occupation	Income/wealth	Religion	Family Origin	Color or Race	Other
A member of my family or a relative lives in another country	Pearson Correlation	.027**	.003	.025**	-.002	-.022**	.052**	-.014*	.037**	-.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.679	.000	.748	.001	.000	.042	.000	.925
	N	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203
I have traveled abroad at least three times in the past three years.	Pearson Correlation	.012	.028**	-.017*	-.030**	-.014*	-.014*	-.030**	.055**	.015*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.078	.000	.014	.000	.049	.048	.000	.000	.024
	N	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203
I have friends from other country.	Pearson Correlation	.066**	.049**	-.055**	-.090**	-.048**	-.004	-.005	.123**	.019**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.586	.435	.000	.007
	N	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203
I often watch foreign-produced programs on TV	Pearson Correlation	-.009	-.035**	.089**	.038**	-.029**	.104**	-.026**	.032**	-.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.200	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.547
	N	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203
I often communicate with people in other countries via the internet or email	Pearson Correlation	.062**	.035**	-.039**	-.070**	-.039**	.001	.006	.095**	.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.882	.367	.000	.231
	N	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203
My job involves contact with organizations or people in other countries	Pearson Correlation	.041**	.033**	-.020**	-.038**	-.037**	-.012	-.001	.068**	.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.003	.000	.000	.071	.828	.000	.205
	N	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203
None of the above	Pearson Correlation	-.014*	.021**	-.058**	-.014*	.046**	-.088**	.016*	-.058**	-.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.036	.002	.000	.040	.000	.000	.023	.000	.898
	N	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203
Don't know	Pearson Correlation	-.015*	-.007	-.023**	-.007	-.010	.002	.009	-.003	-.005
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.026	.311	.001	.287	.128	.776	.198	.710	.473
	N	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203	21203

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Furthermore, as <Table 5> shows, correlations between ‘ethnicity (color or race)’ and political actions appear considerably significant. This shows that the ethnicity issue is highly correlated to the participation in every form of political action. Thus, the two hypotheses are verified. Namely, the correlation between travel and ethnicity issues is also significant, and equality of ethnicity is closely related to political actions as well; however, it cannot be decisively concluded that travel experience

correlates to the political actions, concerning the uneven results shown in <Table 6> which in some sense, contradicts the results of the crosstab analysis.

Table 5. Equality Issues and Political Actions (32 Countries)

Social Equality and Political Actions		Gender	Age	Education	Occupation	Income/wealth	Religion	Family Origin	Color or Race	Other
Petition	Pearson Correlation	.102**	.092**	-.067**	-.106**	-.105**	-.056**	.034**	.099**	.019*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.015
	N	17058	17058	17058	17058	17058	17058	17058	17058	17058
Boycott	Pearson Correlation	.085**	.058**	-.027**	-.049**	-.039**	-.029**	.021**	.074**	.018*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.007	.000	.017
	N	16844	16844	16844	16844	16844	16844	16844	16844	16844
Demo	Pearson Correlation	.076**	.038**	-.019*	-.061**	-.029**	-.010	.022**	.077**	.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.015	.000	.000	.180	.004	.000	.304
	N	16787	16787	16787	16787	16787	16787	16787	16787	16787

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 6. Global Experience and Political Actions (32 Countries)

		Petition	Boycott	Demo
A member of my family or a relative lives in another country	Pearson Correlation	.028**	.012*	.034**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.025	.000
	N	32971	32420	32598
I have traveled abroad at least three times in the past three years.	Pearson Correlation	.033**	.007	.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.180	.828
	N	32971	32420	32598
I have friends from other country.	Pearson Correlation	.088**	.053**	.042**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	32971	32420	32598
I often watch foreign-produced programs on TV	Pearson Correlation	-.027**	-.002	.018**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.748	.001
	N	32971	32420	32598
I often communicate with people in other countries via the internet or email	Pearson Correlation	.082**	.057**	.055**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	32971	32420	32598
My job involves contact with organizations or people in other countries	Pearson Correlation	.069**	.037**	.044**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	32971	32420	32598
None of the above	Pearson Correlation	-.023**	-.012*	-.035**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.024	.000
	N	32971	32420	32598
Don't know	Pearson Correlation	-.016**	-.010	-.014*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.075	.010
	N	32971	32420	32598

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It is more clearly seen in the data of all countries (Appendix 2), the group who has travel experience presents higher, also statistically significant, correlation between the ethnicity issue and

political actions. However, the result varies with the countries and the areas of equality (Appendix 3, 4, 5, 6, 7). For example, the results of China, Hong Kong, and South Korea are not only statistically insignificant but also display no relevance, in overall, in the ethnic issues with political participations. On the other hand, in Singapore, whereas there is evidence of general indifference to political actions (Appendix 8), a high correlation between ethnicity and political actions is notable, which is also larger in the traveler's group. However, Japan shows a strong correlation between the two issues is observed in people who did not travel in the past three years. The reasons for these differences might reflect political structures, economic conditions, socio-cultural or historical contexts of each country, and are not suggested in this paper for this time; however, the dissonance between global civil society and national civil society can be posited about as a conceivable reason. <Appendix 8>, in which distinctive tendencies of participating in political actions are observed, support the idea of the immanently different political structures in each country.

Discussion

According to the data analysis, travel and other global experiences can encourage people to be aware of the issues of social equality, particularly relating to ethnicity (color or race); while ethnicity issues play a crucial part in social activism as well, but this does not necessarily mean that travel directly promotes social activism due to other variables, for example the distinctiveness of political structures or the maturity of the public sphere. In other words, the impact of traveling experience on changes of attitude toward politics, which is possibly transformed into another terms such as political subjectification or global citizenship, is perceivable, and the sensibility to otherness, estimated through the attitudes toward social equality of ethnicity in this paper, can indirectly influence the process. As it is explored in this paper, the recognition of otherness through the encounter of other cultures in an individual's global experience, travel in particular, can be activated to political participation.

In the realm of tourism studies and social movement theories, the debates concerning new tourism⁹ and transnational social activism can be connected to the main argument of this paper.

⁹ Arguing that "tourism is both cause and consequence within globalization" and that "the reality of globalization is considerably more complex and is characterized by uneven and unequal development", Mowforth and Munt (2003: 8-17) define *new tourism* as new forms of tourism which "share a concern for 'development', take account of the environmental, economic and socio-cultural impacts of tourism, and share an expressed concern, again with varying levels of commitment, for participation and control to be assumed by 'local people' and the degree to which they engage and benefit the poor." The 'new' in tourism, at the same time, means the relationships with new types of consumer (the new middle classes), new types of political movements (ranging from new socio-environmental movements to the so-called anti-globalization movements), and new forms of economic organization (known as post-Fordism).

Recent discourses and criticism are not fully discussed in this research, but they can suggest a framework and critical viewpoint to understand the agencies of travelers and the political activities they perform. Whereas the discussion of global civil society and cosmopolitanism is inclined to macro understanding or non-state organization, that of new transnational activism or new tourism concerns the other side from the micro perspective; in a manner of speaking, how globalization is culturally practiced in everyday life. For example, in tourism studies, the approach to new tourism varies from its primary focus to as follows: ecotourism, sustainable tourism, community-based tourism, fair trade and ethical tourism, and pro-poor tourism (Mowforth and Munt 2003: 94-95). The possibility of interpreting it as a form of social activism seems to be highlighted in the recent academic studies. Spencer (2010), for example, describes tourist engagement in social change, globalized social movements and endogenous development in Cuba based on the term of “rights-based tourism”, and “volunteer tourism” (Benson 2011) is also a case that can be approached through the trend.

On the other hand, travelers might be assessed as one of transnational activists in the discussion of social movement theory. Lim and Kong (2006) approach ‘transnational social movement organizations (TSMOs)’ within the dynamics of ‘Inter State System’, ‘World Capitalist Economy’, and ‘Global Civil Society’, which respectively function as conflicting, competitive, and collaborative environments, and they assume those TSMOs are significant in terms of their role of transnational mobilization as brokers that challenge and compete with the regime and vitalize global civil society. As such, there are many relevant aspects to consider in the relationship of transnational activism and global civil society per se. Many researches question how ‘non-state actors’ are involved and associate with each other in the process of resonating democratization and globalization, but still the actors are inclined to a level of organization and institutions. Therefore it is meaningful to reveal possible determinants and recover the individual’s narrative, which is one of this paper’s objectives.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper attempted to combine empirical studies with macro theories and to find certain tendencies of attitude and activities of individual travelers in Asian countries. Despite the difficulty of clearly identifying the causality and concrete process, due to the questionnaires which are difficult to gain detail information or sometimes contain distinctive behaviors in a single question,¹⁰ this paper suggested correlations among three relevant factors. Finally, as discussed in the results of analysis, national differences of the results imply the influential role of national civil society, which can collide

¹⁰ For example, it is hard to identify the type of travel and the values supported by political actions.

with global civil society. As Kumar (2007: 413) writes, “the fate of civil society is likely to affect that of the other, global civil society.” Global civil society, cosmopolitan imagination, or global citizenship, which is nurtured in ‘transnational social spaces’, cannot be separated from the public sphere, multiculturalism practices, the structure, function, and history of national civil society: namely, national context of the civil society is crucial. At the same time, “non-Western expressions of cosmopolitanism” need to be more investigated (Delanty 2009). Therefore, for the future research, it is quintessential to conduct more deepened cross-national analysis as well as a qualitative research to scrutinize the process or transformation through cultural interactions and to understand them within the different socio-cultural contexts.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Ayres, Jeffrey M. 2004. “Framing Collective Action Against Neoliberalism: The Case of the “Anti-Globalization””. *Journal of World-Systems Research*. X (I): 11-34.
- Benson, Angela M. 2011. *Volunteer tourism: theoretical frameworks and practical applications*. Taylor & Francis.
- Bhagwati, Jagdish. 2004. *In Defense of Globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2003. *Firing Back: Against the Tyranny of the Market 2*. Translated by Loic Wacquant. London: Verso.
- Chen, Kuan-Hsing. 2010. *Asia as method: toward deimperialization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Delanty, Gerard. 2009. *The cosmopolitan imagination: the renewal of critical social theory*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Delanty, Gerard. 2006. “The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitanism and social theory.” *The British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 25-47.
- Held, David and McGrew, Anthony. 2007. *Globalization/Anti-globalization: Beyond the Great Divide*. Cambridge. 2nd ed. U.K.: Polity.
- Hannam, Kevin. 2010. *Beyond backpacker tourism: mobilities and experiences*. Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Keane, John. 2003. *Global civil society?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Korten, David C. 1990. *Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda*. Connecticut: Kumarian Press.
- Kumar, Krishan. 2007. “Global Civil Society.” *European Journal of Sociology*. 48 (3): 413-434.
- Lim, Hyun Chin and Kong, Sukki. 2006. “The Logic of Global Civil Society: Transnational Mobilization Strategy of SMOs (social movements organizations) in Korea”, *Journal of Korean Sociology* 40 (2): 1-36. (임현진, 공석기. 2006. 지구시민사회의 작동원리와 한국 사회운동의

초국적 동원전략, 한국사회학)

Martiniello, M. 1997. *Sortir des ghettos culturels*. 윤진 역. 2002. 「현대사회와 다문화주의: 다르게, 평등하게 살기」. 서울: 한울.

Mowforth, Martin and Munt, Ian. 2003. *Tourism and Sustainability: Development and New Tourism in the Third World*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Piper, Nicola and Uhlin, Anders. 2004. *Transnational activism in Asia: problems of power and democracy*. London: Routledge.

Porta, Donatella Della, and Sidney G. Tarrow. 2005. *Transnational protest and global activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Porta, Donatella della. 2007. *The Global Justice Movement: Cross-national and Transnational Perspectives*. Boulder: Paradigm.

Roudometof, Victor. 2005. "Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Glocalization." *Current Sociology* 53 (1): 113 -135.

Tarrow, Sidney G. 2005. *The new transnational activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, Charles. 1992. *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition: An Essay*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

Turner, Bryan S. 2002. "Cosmopolitan Virtue, Globalization and Patriotism." *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (1-2): 45 -63.

Sklair, Leslie. 2002. *Globalization: Capitalism & Its Alternatives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skrbis, Zlatko, Gavin Kendall, and Ian Woodward. 2004. "Locating Cosmopolitanism: Between Humanist Ideal and Grounded Social Category." *Theory, Culture & Society* 21 (6): 115 -136.

Spencer, Rochelle. 2010. Rights-based tourism – tourist engagement in social change, globalized social movements and endogenous development in Cuba, in *Tourist experience: contemporary perspectives*. Sharpley, Richard, and Philip R. Stone eds. London: Routledge.

www.unwto.org

Appendix 1. Sample Information

Country	Sample Size	"I have traveled abroad at least three times in the past three years."	
		Not mentioned	Apply
Afghanistan	874	832 (95.2%)	42 (4.8%)
Australia	1000	805 (80.5%)	195 (19.5%)
Bangladesh	1008	1006 (99.8%)	2 (0.2%)
Bhutan	801	653 (81.5%)	148 (18.5%)
Brunei	804	258 (32.1%)	546 (67.9%)
Cambodia	1824	1749 (95.9%)	75 (4.1%)
China	4800	4685 (97.6%)	115 (2.4%)
Hong Kong	1000	827 (82.7%)	173 (17.3%)
India	3112	3061 (98.4%)	51 (1.6%)
Indonesia	1825	1815 (99.5%)	10 (0.5%)
Japan	3697	3352 (90.7%)	345 (9.3%)
Kazakhstan	800	759 (94.9%)	41 (5.1%)
Kyrgyzstan	800	764 (95.5%)	36 (4.5%)
Laos	1800	1466 (81.4%)	334 (18.6%)
Malaysia	2600	2431 (93.5%)	169 (6.5%)
Maldives	821	474 (57.7%)	347 (42.3%)
Mongolia	800	750 (93.8%)	50 (6.3%)
Myanmar	2600	2576 (99.1%)	24 (0.9%)
Nepal	800	724 (90.5%)	76 (9.5%)
Pakistan	1086	1035 (95.3%)	51 (4.7%)
Philippines	1800	1688 (93.8%)	112 (6.2%)
Russia	1055	996 (94.4%)	59 (5.6%)
Singapore	1838	961 (52.3%)	877 (47.7%)
South Korea	2642	2517 (95.3%)	125 (4.7%)
Sri Lanka	1613	1544 (95.7%)	69 (4.3%)
Taiwan	1006	921 (91.6%)	85 (8.4%)
Tajikistan	800	723 (90.4%)	77 (9.6%)
Thailand	2600	2518 (96.8%)	82 (3.2%)
Turkmenistan	800	752 (94.0%)	48 (6.0%)
United States	1002	844 (84.2%)	158 (15.8%)
Uzbekistan	1600	1389 (86.8%)	211 (13.2%)
Vietnam	2607	2562 (98.3%)	45 (1.7%)
Total	52215 (100%)	47437 (90.8%)	4778 (9.2%)

Appendix 2. Travel Experience and Equality Issues (32 Countries)

			Gender	Age	Education	Occupation	Income/ wealth	Religion	Family Origin	Color or Race	Other
Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson Correlation	.182**	.018	-.106**	-.143	-.146**	-.009	.036	.158**	.069**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.475	.000	.000	.000	.717	.142	.000	.005
		N	1650	1650	1650	1650	1650	1650	1650	1650	1650
	Boycott	Pearson Correlation	.125**	.032	-.101**	-.105**	-.058	-.020	.043	.166**	.029
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.201	.000	.000	.020	.424	.082	.000	.249
		N	1619	1619	1619	1619	1619	1619	1619	1619	1619
	Demo	Pearson Correlation	.127**	.000	-.063*	-.104**	-.034	-.007	.029	.155**	.009
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.995	.012	.000	.173	.785	.250	.000	.732
		N	1615	1615	1615	1615	1615	1615	1615	1615	1615
No Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson Correlation	.092**	.098**	-.061**	-.100**	-.099**	-.060**	.035**	.089**	.011
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.161
		N	15408	15408	15408	15408	15408	15408	15408	15408	15408
	Boycott	Pearson Correlation	.081**	.060**	-.019*	-.042**	-.036**	-.029**	.019	.062**	.017
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.021	.000	.000	.000	.017	.000	.037
		N	15225	15225	15225	15225	15225	15225	15225	15225	15225
	Demo	Pearson Correlation	.069**	.042**	-.013	-.055**	-.029**	-.010	.022**	.066**	.008
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.103	.000	.000	.205	.007	.000	.344
		N	15172	15172	15172	15172	15172	15172	15172	15172	15172

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix 3. Travel Experience and Equality Issues (Japan)

			Gender	Age	Education	Occupation	Income/ wealth	Religion	Family Origin	Color or Race	Other
Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson Correlation	.104	.057	-.055	-.033	-.008	.055	.113	-.093	.077
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.141	.419	.436	.645	.905	.435	.108	.190	.276
		N	202	202	202	202	202	202	202	202	202
	Boycott	Pearson Correlation	.053	.044	-.043	.066	.071	.186**	.046	.028	.081
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.462	.543	.550	.365	.328	.010	.527	.701	.262
		N	192	192	192	192	192	192	192	192	192
	Demo	Pearson Correlation	.118	.053	-.091	.067	-.017	.152	.037	.101	-.012
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.105	.471	.210	.358	.811	.037	.613	.166	.872
		N	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190
No Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson Correlation	.048	-.023	-.006	-.029	-.022	.019	.071**	.074**	-.003
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.045	.344	.799	.231	.360	.435	.003	.002	.911
		N	1736	1736	1736	1736	1736	1736	1736	1736	1736
	Boycott	Pearson Correlation	.016	-.001	.001	.046	.009	.017	.074**	.077**	-.023
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.513	.968	.963	.060	.710	.488	.002	.002	.340
		N	1679	1679	1679	1679	1679	1679	1679	1679	1679
	Demo	Pearson Correlation	.039	-.008	-.026	.021	.001	.049	.072**	.060**	-.018
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.113	.754	.278	.396	.974	.044	.003	.014	.455
		N	1685	1685	1685	1685	1685	1685	1685	1685	1685

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix 4. Travel Experience and Equality Issues (China)

			Gender	Age	Education	Occupation	Income/ wealth	Religion	Family Origin	Color or Race	Other
Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson	.100	.030	-.039	-.054	.054	.013	-.174	-.194	.036
		Correlation	.404	.803	.742	.655	.652	.913	.144	.102	.763
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.72	.72	.72	.72	.72	.72	.72	.72	.72
	Boycott	Pearson	-.137	-.051	.029	.033	.081	-.103	.039	.080	.103
		Correlation	.254	.673	.810	.787	.504	.392	.745	.507	.390
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.71	.71	.71	.71	.71	.71	.71	.71	.71
	Demo	Pearson	-.089	.056	-.075	-.063	.178	-.103	-.140	.069	.061
		Correlation	.463	.647	.536	.605	.139	.396	.247	.572	.617
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
No Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson	-.006	.019	-.002	-.045	.018	.021	.023	.038	-.024
		Correlation	.752	.323	.918	.021	.368	.274	.231	.050	.225
		Sig. (2-tailed)	2641	2641	2641	2641	2641	2641	2641	2641	2641
	Boycott	Pearson	-.010	-.016	.019	-.012	.003	.011	.030	.017	.005
		Correlation	.616	.404	.330	.544	.879	.588	.119	.392	.796
		Sig. (2-tailed)	2627	2627	2627	2627	2627	2627	2627	2627	2627
	Demo	Pearson	.014	-.026	.011	.019	.048	-.009	-.017	.013	-.011
		Correlation	.468	.192	.564	.344	.016	.635	.383	.512	.581
		Sig. (2-tailed)	2571	2571	2571	2571	2571	2571	2571	2571	2571

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix 5. Travel Experience and Equality Issues (Hong Kong)

			Gender	Age	Education	Occupation	Income/ wealth	Religion	Family Origin	Color or Race	Other
Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson	-.012	.046	.022	.063	-.006	-.042	-.119	-.047	^a
		Correlation	.873	.550	.772	.416	.938	.581	.120	.539	.
		Sig. (2-tailed)	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171
	Boycott	Pearson	-.089	-.023	-.114	.106	.142	.081	-.085	.106	^a
		Correlation	.253	.765	.141	.173	.066	.297	.274	.171	.
		Sig. (2-tailed)	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168
	Demo	Pearson	.027	-.038	.006	.022	-.038	.055	-.036	.059	^a
		Correlation	.723	.622	.939	.780	.621	.480	.639	.446	.
		Sig. (2-tailed)	169	169	169	169	169	169	169	169	169
No Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson	.017	.108 ^{**}	.045	-.008	.016	-.060	.007	.003	.005
		Correlation	.618	.002	.193	.809	.646	.088	.836	.929	.885
		Sig. (2-tailed)	820	820	820	820	820	820	820	820	820
	Boycott	Pearson	.047	.064	.012	.021	-.002	.010	.057	-.050	.055
		Correlation	.182	.069	.743	.544	.958	.786	.108	.153	.117
		Sig. (2-tailed)	805	805	805	805	805	805	805	805	805
	Demo	Pearson	.086 ^{**}	.018	.106 ^{**}	-.068	-.015	.078	.048	-.034	.045
		Correlation	.014	.619	.003	.054	.676	.026	.173	.331	.198
		Sig. (2-tailed)	809	809	809	809	809	809	809	809	809

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix 6. Travel Experience and Equality Issues (South Korea)

			Gender	Age	Education	Occupation	Income/ wealth	Religion	Family Origin	Color or Race	Other
Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson	.091	-.343 [*]	-.274 [*]	-.091	.128	-.025	.179	.120	^a
		Correlation	.515	.011	.045	.515	.355	.859	.196	.388	.
		Sig. (2-tailed)	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54
	Boycott	Pearson	.042	-.331 [*]	-.200	-.141	.246	.020	.135	.134	^a
		Correlation	.762	.014	.143	.303	.070	.883	.326	.330	.
		Sig. (2-tailed)	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55
Demo	Pearson	-.004	-.345 [*]	-.128	-.052	.224	.015	.200	.132	^a	
	Correlation	.976	.011	.355	.710	.104	.912	.147	.341	.	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	
No Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson	-.007	.030	-.009	-.043	-.011	.031	.065	-.026	-.002
		Correlation	.845	.374	.786	.191	.751	.354	.051	.435	.959
		Sig. (2-tailed)	904	904	904	904	904	904	904	904	904
	Boycott	Pearson	.083	-.025	-.076 [*]	-.047	-.049	.035	.080	.028	.016
		Correlation	.013	.460	.023	.155	.140	.291	.016	.405	.637
		Sig. (2-tailed)	903	903	903	903	903	903	903	903	903
Demo	Pearson	.076 [*]	.016	-.053	-.038	-.043	.041	.038	.003	.013	
	Correlation	.023	.628	.111	.249	.191	.223	.249	.935	.702	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	907	907	907	907	907	907	907	907	907	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix 7. Travel Experience and Equality Issues (Singapore)

			Gender	Age	Education	Occupation	Income/ wealth	Religion	Family Origin	Color or Race	Other
Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson	.065	-.028	-.058	-.044	-.047	.074	-.014	.129^{**}	^a
		Correlation	.157	.544	.207	.329	.299	.105	.751	.005	.
		Sig. (2-tailed)	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
	Boycott	Pearson	.024	.062	-.124 ^{**}	-.074	.019	.033	.098	.127^{**}	^a
		Correlation	.604	.179	.007	.104	.675	.468	.032	.005	.
		Sig. (2-tailed)	479	479	479	479	479	479	479	479	479
Demo	Pearson	-.051	.012	-.053	-.077	.017	.102	.098	.143^{**}	^a	
	Correlation	.264	.799	.245	.094	.706	.026	.033	.002	.	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	476	476	476	476	476	476	476	476	476	
No Travel Experience	Petition	Pearson	-.061	-.096 [*]	.098	.022	.054	-.004	.003	.053	^a
		Correlation	.188	.038	.035	.643	.248	.933	.946	.257	.
		Sig. (2-tailed)	466	466	466	466	466	466	466	466	466
	Boycott	Pearson	.049	.058	-.080	-.062	-.029	.096	-.041	.061	^a
		Correlation	.295	.208	.086	.181	.537	.038	.379	.191	.
		Sig. (2-tailed)	465	465	465	465	465	465	465	465	465
Demo	Pearson	-.057	-.051	-.040	.003	-.088	.124 ^{**}	.108	.121^{**}	^a	
	Correlation	.222	.273	.394	.951	.059	.008	.020	.009	.	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	462	462	462	462	462	462	462	462	462	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix 8. Travel Experience and Political Actions

Country	Travel experience	Signing a petition to improve conditions			Total	Pearson Chi-Square	Cramer's V	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
		Have done	Might do	Would never do				
China	Not mentioned	159	1663	819	2641	5.385	0.045	0.068
		6.0%	63.0%	31.0%	100.0%			
	Apply	9	40	23	72			
		12.5%	55.6%	31.9%	100.0%			
Hong Kong	Not mentioned	244	263	313	820	2.209	0.047	0.331
		29.8%	32.1%	38.2%	100.0%			
	Apply	60	54	57	171			
		35.1%	31.6%	33.3%	100.0%			
Japan	Not mentioned	1100	944	360	2404	13.999	0.072	0.001
		45.8%	39.3%	15.0%	100.0%			
	Apply	162	94	28	284			
		57.0%	33.1%	9.9%	100.0%			
South Korea	Not mentioned	493	698	402	1593	0.770	0.021	0.681
		30.9%	43.8%	25.2%	100.0%			
	Apply	29	46	21	96			
		30.2%	47.9%	21.9%	100.0%			
Singapore	Not mentioned	27	215	592	834	25.579	0.125	0.000
		3.2%	25.8%	71.0%	100.0%			
	Apply	51	270	475	796			
		6.4%	33.9%	59.7%	100.0%			

Country	Travel experience	Joining in boycotts			Total	Pearson Chi-Square	Cramer's V	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
		Have done	Might do	Would never do				
China	Not mentioned	66	1387	1174	2627	1.108	0.020	0.575
		2.5%	52.8%	44.7%	100.0%			
	Apply	2	33	36	71			
		2.8%	46.5%	50.7%	100.0%			
Hong Kong	Not mentioned	33	237	535	805	26.390	0.165	0.000
		4.1%	29.4%	66.5%	100.0%			
	Apply	8	83	77	168			
		4.8%	49.4%	45.8%	100.0%			
Japan	Not mentioned	65	900	1317	2282	16.351	0.080	0.000
		2.8%	39.4%	57.7%	100.0%			
	Apply	8	141	122	271			
		3.0%	52.0%	45.0%	100.0%			
South Korea	Not mentioned	191	783	615	1589	7.783	0.068	0.020
		12.0%	49.3%	38.7%	100.0%			
	Apply	20	48	28	96			
		20.8%	50.0%	29.2%	100.0%			
Singapore	Not mentioned	1	54	787	842	22.591	0.118	0.000
		.1%	6.4%	93.5%	100.0%			
	Apply	7	98	686	791			
		.9%	12.4%	86.7%	100.0%			

Country	Travel experience	Attending lawful demonstrations			Total	Pearson Chi-Square	Cramer's V	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
		Have done	Might do	Would never do				
China	Not mentioned	104	1329	1138	2571	2.581	0.031	0.275
		4.0%	51.7%	44.3%	100.0%			
	Apply	5	39	26	70			
		7.1%	55.7%	37.1%	100.0%			
Hong Kong	Not mentioned	55	244	510	809	13.218	0.116	0.001
		6.8%	30.2%	63.0%	100.0%			
	Apply	22	63	84	169			
		13.0%	37.3%	49.7%	100.0%			
Japan	Not mentioned	120	786	1385	2291	13.488	0.073	0.001
		5.2%	34.3%	60.5%	100.0%			
	Apply	17	121	132	270			
		6.3%	44.8%	48.9%	100.0%			
South Korea	Not mentioned	193	922	488	1603	2.190	0.036	0.334
		12.0%	57.5%	30.4%	100.0%			
	Apply	15	55	23	93			
		16.1%	59.1%	24.7%	100.0%			
Singapore	Not mentioned	3	81	743	827	14.094	0.094	0.001
		.4%	9.8%	89.8%	100.0%			
	Apply	7	121	652	780			
		.9%	15.5%	83.6%	100.0%			