

Asian Students' Citizenship Values and their Relationship to Civic Understanding: An Exploratory Study Comparing Thai and Hong Kong Students

Abstract

Comparisons of students from Thailand and Hong indicate significant differences on key values. The results are more subtle and more revealing of students' citizenship values than the original international analyses. Yet much remains to be explained. The models proposed seem to be more explanatory of the Thai students results than those of Hong Kong so that additional explanations need to be found for the latter's achievement. This study has been only able to account for about 32% of the variance in student achievement. It is only the beginning of seeking a fuller explanation of students' civic learning in different societies.

Author:

Kerry J Kennedy

Contact:

Email address:

kerryk@ied.edu.hk

Phone:

852 29488525

Fax:

852 29487995

Institution:

The Hong Kong Institute of Education

10 Lo Ping Street

Tai Po, Hong Kong SAR

Research interests:

Civic and citizenship education; Secondary data analysis; Comparative education

Declaration:

This article has not been published in any language before; it is not being considered concurrently for publication elsewhere; and the research reported in the manuscript was conducted in accordance with general ethical guidelines.

Acknowledgements

The research reported in this chapter was supported by a Public Policy Research project funded by the Hong Kong Research Grants Council: *Hong Kong Students' Attitudes to Citizenship: Monitoring Progress Ten years after Hong Kong's Return to China* (HKIEd 8001-PPR-5)

Schultz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr & Losito (2010a, p 22) have identified a number of key social changes that highlighted the importance of citizenship issues in recent times :

- Changes in the external threats to civil societies;
- Migration of peoples within and across continents and countries;
- People, in many countries, according greater value to democracy as a system of government;
- An increase in the importance of non-governmental groups serving as vehicles through which active citizenship can be exercised; and
- Ongoing modernization and globalization of societies

How these issues are understood within and across specific national and cultural contexts is not well understood. Even more perplexing is how young citizens within a specific society should be prepared to face such challenges. Civic and citizenship education is firmly located within the boundaries of nation states so that responses to the issues outlined above are likely to be local in nature and a reflection of priorities as seen by local governments and policy makers. Citizenship issues may well be universal in nature as outlined above, but their solution is embedded in within national boundaries. Exploring the embedded nature of citizenship is a key concern of this article.

The particular focus of this article will be citizenship values within Asian contexts. The interest of this focus lies in the distinctive characteristics of 'Asian citizenship', especially compared to the way citizenship is viewed in predominantly Western contexts (Kennedy & Fairbrother, 2004). While the Western/Asian dichotomy has been explored, little attention has been paid to whether within Asia there is a common way of viewing citizenship. Is it possible, for example, to talk about 'Asian citizenship' as a single construct? Little empirical research has been conducted on this issue although some notable attempts have been made in the philosophical literature (Lee, 2004). One of the purposes of this article, therefore, is

to investigate the views of young people from different parts of Asia about citizenship issues and values and the relationship of these to civic knowledge. It will be of particular interest to see whether these views reflect distinctive identities or whether they might reveal a more common identity among Asia's young people.

Concern for citizenship is now clearly part of the international policy agenda, especially in relation to young people. Rutkowski & Engel (2010, p.381) highlighted the importance of the International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS) signalling a shift from traditional concerns of school educators with Mathematics, Science and Literacy into the social arena with the possibility of “developing hard measures for citizenship”. They also pointed to the multilateral nature of such studies involving national governments, supranational entities such as the European Union and international agencies such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). This highlights the point that citizenship issues are now embedded in the international education landscape. Yet international large scale assessments such as ICCS are not just technical endeavours. Rather, they are embedded in social, political and cultural contexts and therefore can illuminate those contexts as well as provide valid and reliable measures of them. This paper will draw on data generated by ICCS.

ICCS was a large scale assessment of civic knowledge and attitudes conducted in 2009 by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). It has been described by Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr & Losito, (2010, p.9):

The International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) studied the ways in which countries prepare their young people to undertake their roles as citizens. It investigated student knowledge and understanding of civics and citizenship as well as student attitudes, perceptions, and activities related to civics and citizenship. It also examined differences among countries in relation to these outcomes of civic and citizenship education, and it explored how differences among countries relate to student characteristics, school and community contexts, and national characteristics.

The study “gathered data from more than 140,000 Grade 8 (or equivalent) students in over 5,300 schools from 38 countries. These student data were augmented by data from more than 62,000 teachers in those schools and by contextual data collected from school principals and the study’s national research centers (Schulz, et al., 2010, p.9). ICCS was the third major international civic study – the other two having been conducted in 1971 (Torney, Oppenheim, & Farnen, 1975) and 1999 (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001). The first of these studies did not contain any Asian countries, the second involved only Hong Kong, by then a Special Administrative Region of China, but ICCS contained five Asian societies: Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong SAR, Indonesia and Thailand. Thus for the first time it is possible to use data generated by representative samples of Asian students to understand better from a comparative perspective students’ citizenship identity and its impact on civic understanding.

The Study

The purpose of this article is report on the use secondary data analysis based on the ICCS to compare two Asian societies - Hong Kong and Thailand – on a range of measures related to citizenship values and civic understanding. This secondary analysis uses the raw scores of the selected measures obtained by students in the two societies rather than the country scale scores reported in the international study (Schulz et al., 2010 a,b). This will provide a more nuanced view of country level results and enable a range of comparisons not possible from the international analysis. In addition, new regression analyses will be conducted to explore the relationship between the selected measures of citizenship values used in this study and their influence on students’ civic knowledge in both Hong Kong and Thailand.

Hong Kong and Thailand were purposely selected from the five Asian societies included in the ICCS. Differences in history culture, politics and religion suggested a rich source for comparison. At both macro and micro levels they also represented societies with present day differences that could provide significant comparisons. Table 1 shows how Hong Kong and Thailand compared on a range of demographic and economic characteristics:

Insert Table 1 about here

These are stark contrasts between two Asian societies on significant indicators. Differences can also be shown at a micro level as shown in Table 2 that indicates how civic and citizenship education is carried out in the respective school systems:

Insert Table 2 about here

As well as these differences, there are also indicators that suggest the social fabric of the two societies is not dissimilar. The adult literacy rate is 93.5% in Hong Kong and 94.1% in Thailand. Public expenditure on education is 3.9% of and 4.2% of GDP in Hong Kong and Thailand respectively. There are 813,980 internet connections in Hong Kong and 1,231,000 in Thailand (Shultz et al., 2010a, p. 42). Taken together, the cases of Hong Kong and Thailand provided the possibility of exploring similarities and differences between two societies within the Asian region.

Method

Sample

A two stage cluster sample design was used and is reported in Schulz et al., 2010a). Schools were randomly selected and one intact class at target grade level was then selected within schools. 2902 Hong Kong students from 76 schools and 5263 Thai students from 149 schools participated in the international survey (Schulz et al., 2010b, p.96). All students were from the targeted grade (usually, Grade 8) where students turned 14 in the year of testing. For the purposes of this study 500 students were chosen at random from each group for analysis.

Measures

The measures used in this study were selected scales developed by ICCS and validated with international an international sample of students. For the purposes of this study, Cronbach's α was computed separately for sample to provide a measure of scale reliability at the country/system level. Six scales were chosen representing a range of personal values held by students.

Students' perceptions of the value of participation at school (5 items, $\alpha_{\text{Hong Kong}}=.75$, $\alpha_{\text{Thai}}=.65$; e.g. “Student participation in how schools are run can make schools better”). *Students' support for democratic values* (5 items, $\alpha_{\text{Hong Kong}}=.70$, $\alpha_{\text{Thai}}=.59$; e.g. “Everyone should always have the right to express their opinions freely”). *Students' interest in politics and social issues* (5 items, $\alpha_{\text{Hong Kong}}=.87$, $\alpha_{\text{Thai}}=.77$; e.g. “Political issues within your local community”). *Students sense of internal political efficacy* (6 items, $\alpha_{\text{Hong Kong}}=.81$, $\alpha_{\text{Thai}}=.71$; e.g. I know more about politics than most people my age). *Students' citizenship self-efficacy* (5 items, $\alpha_{\text{Hong Kong}}=.86$, $\alpha_{\text{Thai}}=.77$; e.g. “Discuss a newspaper article about a conflict between countries). *Students' attitudes towards the influence of religion on society* (5 items, $\alpha_{\text{Hong Kong}}=.86$, $\alpha_{\text{Thai}}=.68$; e.g. “Religion is more important to me than what is happening in national politics”). For the multiple regression analysis, the students' score on the civic knowledge test was chosen as the dependent variable.

Analyses

Both scale and subscale-level *t-tests* were conducted to determine statistical significance of the difference between Hong Kong and Thai students on each of the measures outlined above. Cohen's *d*, a measure of the actual size of the difference between the two groups was also calculated for each of the differences. Effect sizes at around $d=.20$ are considered small, those around $d=.50$ are considered moderate, and those around $d=.80$ are considered large (Cohen, 1988). A number of ordinary least squares regression analyses was conducted using students' civic knowledge scores as the dependent variable. The independent variables were parental occupation, gender, citizenship and personal efficacy, value of participation in school, support for democratic values, interest in politics and attitudes to religion. Independent variables were entered in three blocks: Block 1: Demographics, Block 2: Efficacy and Block 3: Personal values. Using this method it was possible to assess the extent to which each block of variables added to the predictive power of the model for each sample of students.

Results

Descriptive statistics

Tables 3-8 show the descriptive statistics for each of the scales referred to above. There were four response

categories for each question, with “1” representing the most positive endorsement and “4” representing the most negative endorsement.

As shown in Table 3, both Thai and Hong Kong ‘Students Perceptions of the Value of Participation at School’ were positive with respective scale scores of 1.71 and 1.88. There were statistically significant differences between the groups ($t=6.12$, $p<0.01$) but the effect size was small ($d=.39$). For one item in the scale, ‘All schools should have a school parliament’, there was no difference between the two groups suggesting that this may be a common aspiration of both Thai and Hong Kong students. Given that the effect size of the differences between the groups was small, it seems the key difference between the groups is a matter of emphasis with Thai students being consistently more positive than Hong Kong students.

Insert Table 3 about here

Student support for the value of participation at school is also reflected in their ‘Support for Democratic Values’ as shown in Table 4. On this scale Hong Kong students tend to be somewhat more positive than their Thai peers with respective scale scores of 1.67 and 1.72. There were no statistically significant differences between the groups on this scale ($t=-1.94$). There were statistically significant differences on three items on this scale (‘right to express opinions freely’, $t=5.24$, $p<.01$; ‘freedom to criticize the government’, $t=5.80$, $p>01$; ‘protest against an unjust law’, $t=6.51$, $p<.01$) but the effect sizes are small ($d=.34$, $.37$ and $.41$ respectively). It is of interest to note that the last mentioned item was the only one that Thai students endorsed more positively than Hong Kong students. This suggests that there is a consensus on the part of both Hong Kong and Thai student in their support for democratic values with support from Hong Kong students being somewhat more emphatic than that of Thai students, except when it comes to protest where Thai students are more positive.

Insert Table 4 about here

Thai ‘Students’ Interest in Politics and Social Issues’ tends to be greater than that of Hong Kong students with respective scale scores of 2.15 and 2.40, as shown in Table 4. There is a statistically significant difference between these scores ($t=6.55$, $p<.01$) but the effect size was small ($d=.42$). There were statistically significant differences between three items on this scale (‘political issues in the local

community', $t=7.99$, $p>.01$; 'political issues in the country', $t=10.25$, $p<.01$; 'social issues in the country', $t=8.08$, $p<.01$) and in each case the effect size was moderate ($d=.51$, $.65$ and $.51$ respectively). This suggests that the differences between Thai and Hong Kong students relating to their interests in politics and social issues are important enough to differentiate the two groups on citizenship issues. "Interest in international politics' was the only area in which Hong Kong students indicated they had more interest than Thai students, but there was not a statistically significant difference between the two groups on this item.

Insert Table 5 about here

Thai students 'Sense of Internal Political Efficacy' tends to be higher than that of Hong Kong students, the respective scale scores being 2.28 and 2.53 as shown in Table 5. There was a statistically significant difference between the group on these scores ($t=8.00$, $p<.01$) and the effect size was moderate ($d=.51$). There are statistically significant differences between students on all items but the effect sizes are small in each case. For both groups of students, however, the endorsement of this item is moderate rather than strongly positive suggesting that internal political efficacy at age 14 is still a developing process for these students.

Insert Table 6 about here

The same pattern of endorsement can be seen in Students' Citizenship Self Efficacy as shown in Table 6. Thai students endorsed all items more positively for a scale score of 2.12 while Hong Kong students were somewhat less positive with a score of 2.34. This was a statistically significant difference between the scores of the two groups ($t=6.52$, $p<.01$) but the effect size was small ($d=.42$). There are statistically significant differences on five items but only on one item – concerned with 'organizing students to achieve change at school' - was the effect size moderate ($d=.71$). On all other items the effect size is small. The overall level of endorsement by both groups was moderately positive suggesting that their citizenship self efficacy was at a relatively early developmental stage.

Insert Table 7 about here

As shown in Table 8, Thai 'Students Attitudes towards the Influence of Religion on Society' are more positive than those of Hong Kong students with respective scale scores of 1.82 and 2.86. There are statistically significant differences between the scale scores achieved by each group ($t=26.44$, $p<.01$) and the effect size is large ($d=1.71$). This suggests that the differences are very real and mark a distinctive characteristic of these two groups of students - more so than any or the others scales that have been examined.

Insert Table 8 about here

Multivariate analyses

Tables 9 and 10 show the results of ordinary least squares regression analyses using the ICCS civic knowledge scores (NWLCIV) as the dependent variable. Independent variables were entered in three blocks. 'Parental occupation' and 'gender' were entered in Block 1. 'Internal political efficacy' and 'citizenship self efficacy' were added in Block 2. 'Religious influence on society', 'democratic values', 'interest in political and social issues' and 'value in participation in school' were added in Block 3.

The results for Thai students are shown in Table 9. Demographic variables – parental occupation and gender – both exerted a positive and significant effect on civic knowledge ($\beta=.30$ and $.26$ respectively, $p>.001$) accounting for almost 16% of the variance in students' knowledge scores. When the two efficacy variables are added, R^2 increased to 20%. But these variables were negatively related to civic knowledge ($\beta=-.12$ for 'internal political efficacy' and $-.11$ for 'citizenship efficacy', $p>.001$) indicating that the higher students scored on these two scales, the lower their civic knowledge scores. When the additional variables were added, R^2 increased to 33%. The two efficacy variables remained negative in this block and 'Religious influence on society' was also negative ($\beta=-.14$, $p<.01$). The remainder of the variables exerted a positive and significant influence on civic knowledge.

Insert Table 9 about here

For Hong Kong students, as shown in Table 10, the demographic variables were positive but not significant influences on civic knowledge (betas= .09 and .01 respectively) accounting for just .01% of the variance. With the efficacy variables added, R^2 increased to .03%. 'Internal political efficacy' was positively and significantly related to civic knowledge (beta =.16, $p<.01$) but 'citizenship efficacy' was negatively related (beta=.05) although it was not significant. With the additional variables added in Block 3, R^2 increased to 14%. 'Citizenship efficacy' remained negative (beta=-.06, $p>$) and non-significant. 'Religious influence on society' was also negative but significant (beta=-.18, $p>.001$). 'Democratic values' was positive but not significant (beta=.09).

'Interest in political and social issues' and 'value in participation in school' both exerted a positive and significant effect on civic knowledge (.22 and .16, $p>.001$ and .01 respectively).

Insert Table 10 about here

Discussion

This study has sought to understand better Asian students' attitudes to selected citizenship issues and the relationship of these issues to students' civic knowledge. It has drawn on data from the ICCS in which both Thai and Hong Kong students participated.

The demographic variables that were used in the study, 'parental occupation' and 'gender, had differential effects on the two groups. For Thai students they accounted for 16% of the variance in civic knowledge scores but for Hong Kong students their effect was negligible and non significant. The results for Thai students were more consistent with the overall country results for the ICCS than the Hong Kong results. Hong Kong students stand out as those least influenced in their civic knowledge scores by demographic variables. While there is a wide socioeconomic gap within Hong Kong's population, this may not translate into differential influences on students. This may mean that family influences and values in relation to

learning are more similar in Hong Kong, irrespective of the gender and social well being of the students. This remains an important issue to explore further.

The self- efficacy variables were positive in only one instance – Hong Kong ‘Students sense of internal political efficacy’ directly influenced civic knowledge so that, all other variables held constant, a one standard deviation increase in this variable accounted for 16% of a standard deviation increase in civic knowledge. For Thai students the same variable exerted a negative and significant effect on civic knowledge. These results cannot be explained by the degree of efficacy felt by students - Thai students had a greater sense of internal political efficacy than Hong Kong students but this did not translate into improved scores on civic knowledge. These students with higher levels of internal political efficacy had lower civic knowledge scores – although it cannot be assumed that it was internal political efficacy that caused this. It is not clear why internal political efficacy operates differently for these two groups of students but it represents an important area for future research.

‘Students' citizenship self-efficacy’ was not a good predictor of civic knowledge for either Hong Kong or Thai students. For the latter it was negative and significant while for Hong Kong students, it was negative but non significant. Both groups of students were confident that they could effectively participate in politics, but this did not enhance their knowledge of civic institutions, values or actions. There has been little research on these political efficacy variables with young students and it may be that age is a key factor here. They may wish to participate in the ways suggested but this does not mean that they have any knowledge of civic institutions or even values concerning them. In this sense, participation may well be an end itself and not based on any specific knowledge or understanding of the purposes of such participation.

Both Thai and Hong Kong students valued participation in school and this has a positive influence on their civic knowledge. With the other variables held constant, for every standard deviation change in ‘Students' perceptions of the value of participation at school’, civic knowledge will increase by approximately 16 – 17 % of a standard deviation for both groups. This suggests that the school environment itself is an important

consideration in civic and citizenship education. It is not just classroom lessons that influence students' civic learning in both Hong Kong and Thailand – it is also the quality of what students experience as part of their daily life in schools.

Students' support for a participatory school culture was reflected in their support for democratic values, but the influence of these values on civic knowledge differed for Hong Kong and Thai students. For the latter, there is a direct impact. With other variables constant, for every standard deviation change in Thai 'Students' support for democratic values', there was a 25% of a standard deviation increase in civic knowledge. For Hong Kong students, however, the impact was negligible and non-significant. Even though Hong Kong students' endorsement of democratic values was quite high (see Table 4) it seems such values are not related to civic knowledge. This raises the interesting question of the relationship between values and knowledge, which is also an issue in the results for 'Students' attitudes towards the influence of religion on society',

For both Hong Kong and Thai students, the relationship between their attitudes to religious influences on society and civic knowledge was negative and significant – the higher their score on this scale the lower their civic knowledge scores. But the effect was different for each group. Thai students scored high on the scale and their civic knowledge scores were low. Hong Kong students scored low on the scale and their civic knowledge scores are high. Thus for Hong Kong students, neither democratic values nor their attitudes to religious influences in society positively influenced their civic knowledge. For Thai students, on the other hand, while their attitudes to religious influences in society actually influenced their civic knowledge negatively, their support for secular values influenced civic knowledge positively. This is an important area for future investigation to understand better why the relationship between civic values and civic knowledge differs across cultural groups and for different types of values.

'Students' interest in politics and social issues' exerted a positive and significant effect on Hong Kong students' civic knowledge but a negligible and non significant effect for Thai students. Yet the latter showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups on this scale with Thai students being generally

more positive than Hong Kong students. Thus like a number of the other scales reported above, positive endorsement has differential effects for each group of students. It maybe that if interest in politics and social issues is all there is, it may not be enough to p provide a solid knowledge base. This maybe the case for Thai students, but for Hong Kong students the situation is reverse. Their moderate support for interest in politics and social issues is maybe all that is needed so that their focus can be more knowledge based. Unlike Thai students, Hong Kong student may not be consumed with interest in these issues, but they do not need to be for their interest to affect their civic knowledge. This is a further area for additional study.

This study has shown the importance of secondary analysis of ICCS data. The results reported here are more subtle and more revealing of students' citizenship attitudes in two different societies than the international analyses. Yet much remains to be explained. The models proposed here seem to be more explanatory of the results for Thai students than Hong Kong students so that additional explanations need to be found for Hong Kong students' achievements. Yet a similar point can be made for Thai students' achievement as well. At best, this study has been only able to account for about 32% of the variance in student achievement. This study, therefore, is only the beginning of seeking a fuller explanation of students' civic learning in different societies.

Perhaps the key issue to emerge in this study has been the relationship between civic values and civic knowledge. It seems that Thai students scored very well on civic values, but this did not translate into high a score on civic knowledge. In general, Hong Kong students scored somewhat lower on most civic values than Thai students, yet their civic knowledge scores were higher. Yet in relation to "Democratic values", the one area where Hong Kong students civic values were stronger than those of Thai students, these had little or no impact of Hong Kong students' civic learning. Intuitively, it would seem that strong civic values should be supported by an equally strong based of civic knowledge. This study has suggested that this is not always the case. A key area for future research, therefore, is to explore the link more thoroughly to reach a better understanding of the relationship between civic knowledge and civic values.

Conclusion

It should not be surprising that students who experience different education systems, cultural values, social priorities and political systems have different attitudes to citizenship issues. The fact that these students are located geographically in what is known as “Asia”, does not in itself seem to be a variable of any significance. Contextual factors in local contexts are more likely to influence individual students in multiple ways and this is an important lesson to have learnt. Students’ citizenship identity seems to be shaped by influences in the proximal environment than any distal influences. The results reported here have suggested that there is no single “Asian” identity. Yet this is a preliminary finding. Secondary analysis of ICCS data in this study has identified a number of future areas for research. One direction will be to continue to explore the data to identify those variables that have a direct impact on students’ civic learning. In addition, qualitative studies can also be undertaken to delve more deeply into issues that emerged in order to understand better why students respond one way in one context and a different way in another context. These multiple research methods pursuing key research issues have the potential to expand our understanding of civic learning and its construction in different social, political and cultural contexts. This is a challenging agenda for research on students’ citizenship identity in a region of the world attracting more and more attention from the international community.

References

- Cohen, J. (1988) *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kennedy, K. & Fairbrother, G. (2004). Asian Perspectives on Citizenship Education in Review: postcolonial constructions or precolonial values? in W. O. Lee, D. Grossman, K. Kennedy, & G. Fairbrother, (Eds) *Asia-Pacific Perspectives on Citizenship Education: Concepts and Issues*. Hong Kong: Centre for Research in Comparative Education and Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Lee, W. O. (2008) Conceptualizing citizenship and citizenship education in Asia, in J. Arthur, & I. Davies, eds. *Handbook of Citizenship Education*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Rutkowski, D. & Engel, L. (2010) Soft Power and Hard Measures: large –scale assessment, citizenship and the European Union. *European Educational Research Journal*, 9(3), 381-395
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D. & Losito, B (2010a). *International Report: civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower secondary school students in 38 countries* . Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D. & Losito, B. (2010b). *Initial Findings from the IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Torney, J., Oppenheim, A. N. & Farren, R. F. (1975) *Civic Education in Ten Countries: an empirical study*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H. & Schulz, W. (2001) *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries: civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*, Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Table 1:

Selected Demographic and Economic Characteristics of Hong Kong and Thailand

Country/ Territory	Population (Thousands)	Human Development Index			Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita (\$US)
		Value	Rank	Category	
Hong Kong SAR	7,090	0.944	24	Very high	29,912
Thailand	62,348	0.783	87	Medium	3,844

From: Shultz et al., 2010a, p. 40).

Table 2

A Comparison of Approaches to Civic and Citizenship Education in the Curriculum for Lower-Secondary Education in Hong Kong and Thailand

Country/ Territory	Specific Subject (Compul sory)	Specific Subject (Option al)	Integrated into several subjects	Cross curricular	Assemblies & special events	Extra curricular activities	Classroom experience /ethos
Hong Kong SAR				◆	◆	◆	
Thailand			◆		◆	◆	◆

From: Shultz et al., 2010a, p. 47).

Table 3

Comparison of Hong Kong and Thai Students' Perceptions of the Value of Participation at School

ISSC Key	Scale	Hong Kong (n=500)			Thailand (n=500)			Mean Difference	Standard error of difference	t	Cohen's d
		Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
Q19: VALPARTS	<u>Students' perceptions of the value of participation at school</u>										
IS2P19A	Student participation in how schools are run can make schools better	1.97	0.69	480	1.76	0.52	498	0.21	0.04	5.35**	0.343
IS2P19B	Lots of positive changes can happen in schools when students work together	1.90	0.62	480	1.78	0.54	498	0.12	0.04	3.23**	0.207
IS2P19C	Organising groups of students to express their opinions could help solve problems in schools	2.03	0.70	480	1.79	0.54	498	0.24	0.04	6.07**	0.389
IS2P19D	All schools should have a <school parliament>	1.55	0.67	480	1.56	0.60	498	-0.01	0.04	-0.25	-0.016
IS2P19E	Students can have more influence on what happens in schools if they act together rather than alone	1.93	0.75	480	1.64	0.63	498	0.29	0.04	6.49**	0.416
	Scale scores	1.88	0.49	480	1.71	0.37	496	0.17	0.03	6.12**	0.393

** p<.01

Table 4
Comparison of Hong Kong and Thai Students' Support for Democratic Values

<i>ICCS Key</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>Hong Kong</i>			<i>Thailand</i>			<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Standard error of difference</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
		<i>(n=500)</i>			<i>(n=500)</i>						
Q20:	<u>Students' support for</u>										
DEMVVAL	<u>democratic values</u>										
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>				
IS2P20A	Everyone should always have the right to express their opinions freely	1.37	0.55	480	1.56	0.54	498	-0.18	0.03	5.24**	-0.336
IS2P20E	All people should have their social and political rights respected	1.55	0.64	480	1.62	0.58	497	-0.06	0.04	-1.56	-0.100
IS2P20F	People should always be free to criticise the government publicly	1.80	0.71	480	2.07	0.74	495	-0.27	0.05	5.80**	-0.372
IS2P20H	All citizens should have the right to elect their leaders freely	1.51	0.62	480	1.58	0.61	497	-0.06	0.04	-1.65	-0.106
IS2P20I	People should be able to protest if they believe a law is unfair	2.11	0.77	480	1.80	0.70	496	0.31	0.05	6.51**	0.417
	Scale scores	1.67	0.45	480	1.72	0.39	493	-0.05	0.03	-1.94	-0.124

**p<.01

Table 5
Comparison of Hong Kong and Thai Students' Interest in Politics and Social Issues

<i>ICCS Key</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>HK</i> <i>(n=500)</i>			<i>Thailand</i> <i>(n=500)</i>			<i>Mean</i> <i>Difference</i>	<i>Standard</i> <i>error</i> <i>of</i> <i>difference</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Cohen's</i> <i>d</i>
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>				
Q22: INTPOLS	<u>Students' Interest in</u> <u>politics and social</u> <u>issues</u>										
IS2P22A	Political issues within your <local community>	2.33	0.82	478	1.94	0.68	499	0.39	0.05	7.99**	0.513
IS2P22B	Political issues in your countries	2.41	0.81	478	1.91	0.70	497	0.50	0.05	10.25**	0.658
IS2P22C	Social issues in your countries	2.27	0.82	478	1.87	0.68	494	0.39	0.05	8.08**	0.519
IS2P22D	Politics in other countries	2.59	0.82	478	2.53	0.77	497	0.05	0.05	1.07	0.069
IS2P22E	International politics	2.44	0.89	477	2.48	0.74	498	-0.04	0.05	-0.80	-0.051
	Scale scores	2.40	0.68	477	2.15	0.52	491	0.26	0.04	6.55**	0.422

**p<.01

Table 6

Comparison of Hong Kong and Thai Students' Sense of Internal Political Efficacy

ICCS Key	Scale	HK (n=500)			Thailand (n=500)			Mean Difference	Standard error of difference	t	Cohen's d
		Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
Q23: INPOLEF	<u>Students sense of internal political efficacy</u>										
IS2P23A	I know more about politics than most people my age	2.70	0.71	480	2.46	0.69	500	0.24	0.04	5.34**	0.341
IS2P23B	When political issues or problems are being discussed, I usually have some	2.64	0.76	480	2.34	0.65	499	0.29	0.05	6.54**	0.418
IS2P23C	I am able to understand most political issues easily	2.46	0.76	480	2.34	0.69	498	0.13	0.05	2.69**	0.172
IS2P23D	I have political opinions worth listening to	2.49	0.73	480	2.24	0.64	497	0.25	0.04	5.64**	0.362
IS2P23E	As an adult I will be able to take part in politics	2.45	0.77	480	2.12	0.68	498	0.33	0.05	7.10**	0.455
IS2P23F	I have a good understanding of the political issues facing this country	2.47	0.72	480	2.17	0.68	498	0.30	0.04	6.62**	0.424
	Scale scores	2.53	0.55	480	2.28	0.43	496	0.26	0.03	8.00**	0.513

** $p < .01$

Table 7
Comparison of Hong Kong and Thai Students' Citizenship Self-Efficacy

<i>ICCS</i> <i>Key</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>HK</i> <i>(n=500)</i>			<i>Thailand</i> <i>(n=500)</i>			<i>Mean</i> <i>Difference</i>	<i>Standard</i> <i>error</i> <i>of</i> <i>difference</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Cohen's</i> <i>d</i>
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>				
Q30: CITEFF	<u>Students' citizenship</u> <u>self-efficacy</u>										
IS2P30A	Discuss a newspaper article about a conflict between countries	2.27	0.70	477	2.05	0.61	497	0.22	0.04	5.14**	0.330
IS2P30B	Argue your point of view about a controversial political or social issue	2.29	0.76	477	2.32	0.70	497	-0.03	0.05	-0.66	-0.042
IS2P30C	Stand as a candidate in a <school election>	2.41	0.82	477	2.03	0.77	496	0.38	0.05	7.43**	0.477
IS2P30D	Organise a group of students in order to achieve changes at school	2.42	0.81	477	1.88	0.68	497	0.53	0.05	11.11**	0.714
IS2P30E	Follow a television debate about a controversial issue	2.25	0.79	477	2.16	0.71	498	0.08	0.05	1.72	0.110
IS2P30F	Write a letter to a newspaper giving your view on a current issue	2.41	0.82	477	2.21	0.73	497	0.20	0.05	3.99**	0.256
IS2P30G	Speak in front of your class about a social or political issue	2.36	0.80	477	2.20	0.77	498	0.16	0.05	3.18**	0.204
	Scale scores	2.34	0.58	477	2.12	0.46	495	0.22	0.03	6.52**	0.419

**p<.01

Table 8

Comparison of Hong Kong and Thai Students' Attitudes Towards the Influence of Religion on Society

Q36: RELINF	<u>Students' attitudes towards the influence of religion on society</u>	HK (n=500)			Thailand (n=500)			Mean Difference	Standard error of difference	t	Cohen's d
		Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
IS2P36A	Religion is more important to me than what is happening in national politics	2.96	0.76	477	1.69	0.65	491	1.27	0.05	27.80**	1.789
IS2P36B	Religion helps me to decide what is right and what is wrong	2.64	0.88	477	1.58	0.58	490	1.06	0.05	21.98**	1.417
IS2P36C	Religious leaders should have more power in society	3.01	0.75	477	2.09	0.72	489	0.92	0.05	19.36**	1.246
IS2P36D	Religion should influence people's behaviour towards others	2.58	0.90	476	1.89	0.67	491	0.68	0.05	13.38**	0.862
IS2P36E	Rules of life based on religion are more important than civil laws	2.92	0.80	476	2.06	0.73	489	0.85	0.05	17.35**	1.118
	Scale scores	2.82	0.66	475	1.86	0.45	484	0.96	0.04	26.44**	1.711

**p<.01

Table 9

Multivariate analysis of Thai students' civic knowledge scores with demographic, self efficacy and citizenship scales

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i> <i>b</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>R Square</i> <i>Change</i>
<i>Block</i> <i>1</i>				0.159	/
Constant	141.073	1.211			
HISEI	0.200	0.028	0.302***		
Gender	5.206	0.842	0.263***		
<i>Block</i> <i>2</i>				0.199	0.040
Constant	161.609	4.434			
HISEI	0.176	0.028	0.266***		
Gender	4.273	0.848	0.216***		
INPOLEF	-0.196	0.075	-0.127**		
CITEFF	-0.159	0.066	-0.116*		
<i>Block</i> <i>3</i>				0.326	0.127
Constant	156.379	5.372			
HISEI	0.153	0.026	0.231***		
Gender	3.153	0.794	0.159***		
INPOLEF	-0.251	0.074	-0.163**		
CITEFF	-0.217	0.063	-0.158**		
RELINF	-0.252	0.072	-0.142**		
VALPARTS	0.202	0.053	0.166***		
DEMVAL	0.293	0.050	0.252***		
INTPOLS	0.064	0.068	0.042		

Note. $R^2 = .16$ for Block1. $\Delta R^2 = .04$ for Block 2. $\Delta R^2 = .13$. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 10

Multivariate Analysis of Hong Kong Students' Civic Knowledge Scores with Demographic, Self-Efficacy and Citizenship Scales

		<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i> <i>b</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>R Square</i> <i>Change</i>
<i>Block</i> <i>1</i>					0.007	/
	Constant	148.402	1.517			
	HISEI	0.051	0.029	0.085		
	Gender	0.208	0.926	0.011		
<i>Block</i> <i>2</i>					0.027	0.020
	Constant	141.763	3.347			
	HISEI	0.048	0.029	0.081		
	Gender	0.476	0.925	0.025		
	INPOLEF	0.183	0.064	0.160**		
	CITEFF	-0.053	0.059	-0.051		
<i>Block</i> <i>3</i>					0.141	0.115
	Constant	136.212	4.489			
	HISEI	0.057	0.027	0.096*		
	Gender	1.055	0.883	0.055		
	INPOLEF	0.001	0.071	0.001		
	CITEFF	-0.067	0.057	-0.064		
	RELINF	-0.213	0.055	-0.184***		
	VALPARTS	0.165	0.052	0.159**		
	DEMVAL	0.095	0.049	0.095		
	INTPOLS	0.232	0.060	0.219***		

Note. $R^2 = .01$ for Block1. $\Delta R^2 = .02$ for Block 2. $\Delta R^2 = .12$. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$