
AI translation · View original & related papers at
chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202102.00026

A Cultural Psychological Interpretation of the Globalization Paradox

Authors: Hu Xiaomeng, Peng Kaiping, Xiaohua Chen, Hu Xiaomeng

Date: 2021-02-08T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Multicultural collisions afford individuals diverse perspectives, abundant intellectual resources, and enhanced opportunities for innovation, yet simultaneously engender identity confusion, cultural exclusion, and unethical conduct. This article elaborates on several pivotal issues, including folk theories of globalization, the double-edged sword effect of globalization experiences, the impact of globalization on individual identity development, psychological strategies for navigating globalization, and the moral scrutiny thereof. The paper endeavors to offer a cultural-psychological interpretation of the globalization paradox, delineating both the positive and negative ramifications of the globalization process, and deconstructing the associative patterns between various dimensions of globalization and psychological domains.

Full Text

Cultural Psychological Interpretations of the Globalization Paradox

Xiaomeng Hu¹, Kaiping Peng², Sylvia Xiaohua Chen³

¹ Department of Psychology, Renmin University of China, Beijing, 100872

² Department of Psychology, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084

³ Department of Applied Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong

Abstract

The collision of multicultural perspectives offers people diverse viewpoints, rich intellectual resources, and greater opportunities for innovation, yet it also brings identity confusion, cultural exclusion, and immoral behavior. This article focuses on several critical issues: folk theories of globalization, the double-edged

sword effects of globalization experiences, the impact of globalization on individual identity development, psychological strategies for coping with globalization, and the moral examination of globalization. We attempt to provide a cultural psychological interpretation of the globalization paradox, highlighting both its positive and negative impacts on individuals and deconstructing how different dimensions of globalization relate to various psychological domains.

Keywords: Globalization; Multicultural experience; Identity development; Large-scale cooperation; Moral foundation

Classification Number: B849:C91

Social psychologists define globalization as the interaction and integration among peoples, governments, and corporations across different countries worldwide (Chiu et al., 2011; Leung, Qiu, & Chiu, 2014). An increasing number of empirical studies in psychology have begun examining how macro-level globalization processes reshape micro-level psychological processes and behavioral patterns (Chiu & Hong, 2006; Leung, Qiu, & Chiu, 2014). Globalization has profoundly reshaped individuals' lifestyles, mobility patterns, cultural identities, and value systems (Chiu, Gries, Torelli, & Cheng, 2011; Leung, Qiu, & Chiu, 2014; Marsella, 2012; Yang et al., 2011). Economists have proposed the "globalization paradox," which posits that global economic integration and free trade do not necessarily lead to large-scale economic prosperity (Rodrik, 2011). Interestingly, this phenomenon is also reflected in cultural psychology, where globalization's impact on human psychology and behavior appears complex and seemingly contradictory (Gelfand, Lyons, & Lun, 2011).

Specifically, at the societal level, on one hand, mainstream cultures are becoming increasingly homogeneous due to globalization and modernization—for example, the rise of individualism in Japan and China (Hamamura, 2012; Yu, et al., 2016). On the other hand, traditional value systems persist in culturally specific ways and continue to exert influence, sometimes even producing a backlash effect (Walter, 2021), such as India's caste system and China's filial piety culture (Inglehart & Baker, 2000). At the individual level, globalization's shaping effects show tremendous individual differences. Some view globalization as a rare life opportunity that provides unprecedented space for developing personal potential, while others see it as a grave threat to their existing identity systems (Gelfand, Lyons, & Lun, 2011). This article attempts to integrate existing research to examine the multifaceted impacts of globalization on psychological processes and behavioral patterns, while also reviewing the contributions and limitations of previous work, with the aim of promoting more diverse, nuanced, and in-depth future research on the dynamic construction between different dimensions of globalization and psychological and behavioral outcomes.

What Are the Core Issues in the Psychology of Globalization?

First, social psychologists have examined folk beliefs about globalization among ordinary people (Chiu, Hong, & Dweck, 1997; Yang et al., 2011). Social psychologists argue that people construct their imagination of future society through lay theories of social change (Kashima, 2011). These lay theories represent general knowledge structures about how society changes, integrating specific information about society's past and present conditions (Kashima et al., 2011). According to cultural anthropologist Alan Fiske's theoretical framework, people believe future societies will be more based on market pricing rather than community sharing (Fiske, 1992). Interestingly, research finds that whether in Australia, Japan, or China, ordinary people predict that future social trends will involve better economic development and stronger human capabilities, but lower warmth and worse morality (Kashima et al., 2011). While investigations of folk theories provide a naive psychological perspective symbolizing how people view historical trends in social development, future research should further distinguish among audience groups, such as beneficiaries and victims of globalization, as individual differences in globalization experiences may lead to divergent implicit theories about globalization and social change.

Second, social psychologists have investigated whether globalization makes people more parochial or more generous. Using a multilevel sequential cooperation experiment paradigm, researchers examined cooperative behavior among ordinary people in six industrialized countries—the United States, South Africa, Iran, Argentina, Russia, and Italy. The results showed that participants with richer and more diverse globalization experiences tended toward cooperation at the global level among the three levels of individual, community, and global. In other words, these participants could cross intergroup boundaries to allocate resources and contribute to broader outgroups (Buchan, et al., 2009). These findings partly demonstrate that rich and diverse multicultural experiences can indeed foster a “community with a shared future for mankind” and promote large-scale cooperation among different groups. This is particularly important when facing global threats to humanity, such as global warming, COVID-19, and extreme poverty, as multicultural experiences can strengthen human solidarity and collaborative efforts to improve public goods.

Third, social psychologists have examined how globalization processes rewrite people's identity systems. Research shows that globalization has a tremendous impact on individual identity development, reshaping how people view themselves and others (Arnett, 2002; Hermans & Dimaggio, 2007). Scholars contend that globalization's influence on identity systems is a complex, multidimensional, and dynamic process (Gleibs & Reddy, 2016). On one hand, when human destinies become closely interconnected, people develop global human identification (Stephen, 2020), seeing themselves as members of global citizens who care about the welfare and future of all humanity, while their original national or ethnic identities may weaken (McFarland & Hornsby, 2015). Multiple measurement in-

struments have been developed to capture the factor structure of global human identification, including Identification With All Humanity (McFarland, Webb, & Brown, 2012), Psychological Sense of Global Community (Hackett, Omoto, & Matthews, 2015), Global Citizenship Identification (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013), and Global Social Identification (Reese, Proch, & Cohrs, 2014). These scales effectively predict humanitarian concerns and behaviors, such as global poverty, international charity, wealth gaps, international justice, and helping behavior (McFarland & Hornsby, 2015). On the other hand, people also perceive potential threats from globalization to local cultural identity and social cohesion. This cultural identity threat can trigger closure responses to foreign cultures (Morris, Mok, & Mor, 2011). Meanwhile, in the intertwined pattern of globalization and localization, individuals may develop bicultural (Arnett, 2002) or multicultural identities (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2010) to cope with complex and diverse cultural contextual demands.

Finally, social psychologists have focused on the psychological and behavioral consequences of multicultural experiences (Maddux, Lu, Affinito, & Galinsky, 2020), proposing the “double-edged sword effect” of multicultural experiences, whereby the breadth and depth of individuals’ multicultural experiences simultaneously lead to both positive and negative consequences (Hu, Han, Yu, & Peng, 2020). On the positive side, multicultural experiences bring people more intellectual resources (Chiu & Cheng, 2007), absorbing knowledge and insights from global cultures, which helps enhance creative problem-solving (Leung & Chiu, 2008; Leung & Chiu, 2010; Cheng, Leung, & Wu, 2011; Lu, 2018; Maddux, Lu, Affinito, & Galinsky, 2020), increase cognitive flexibility (Gino & Ariely, 2012; Ritter, et al., 2012), embrace organizational change (Fu et al., 2016), increase generalized trust (Cao, Galinsky & Maddux, 2013), improve workplace success (Maddux, 2014), reduce intergroup bias (Tadmor, Hong, Chao, Wiruchnipawan & Wang, 2012), enhance openness personality (Sparkman, Eidelman, & Blanchar, 2016), and increase intergroup helping behavior (Bao et al., 2020). On the negative side, research finds that multicultural experiences do not always inspire cultural integration, enhance cultural creativity, or increase cultural learning motivation; in some cases, the psychological and behavioral effects are precisely the opposite. Cultural psychologists have found that because cross-cultural contact may increase people’ s cultural defense psychology, multicultural experiences can also lead to more rigid thinking styles and greater intergroup bias (Chao, Kung, & Yao, 2015), as individuals defend their original values and worldviews. Especially when two or more cultural elements are presented simultaneously, this cultural mixing largely triggers exclusionary reactions to foreign cultures (Chiu & Cheng, 2007; Chiu, Mallorie, Keh, & Law, 2009). Cultural exclusionary reactions refer to people’ s instinctive, automatic, and rapid responses to foreign cultures during multicultural contact, motivated by cultural heritage protection and cultural identity verification, accompanied by negative emotional experiences (such as disgust, anger, fear, envy, pity, etc.), which further lead to alienation, rejection, and aggression toward foreign cultures (Cheon, Christopoulos, & Hong, 2016; Wu, Yang, & Zhao, 2014). This occurs because

under bicultural priming effects, people perceive greater cultural differences and their original cultural stereotypes become solidified (Wu, Yang, & Zhao, 2014).

When Globalization Meets Morality: Is Globalization Moral?

People develop a “global consciousness” during globalization, which contains not only implicit knowledge about human commonalities and differences but also the will to implement moral action (Liu & Macdonald, 2016). Therefore, the psychology of globalization cannot be separated from normative psychology. Unfortunately, the theoretical framework of globalization psychology suffers from an absence of moral dimensions (Gelfand, Lyons, & Lun, 2011). Within the discourse system of moral psychology, psychologists have not yet examined whether globalization, as an integrative process, may transcend cross-cultural comparative perspectives and dynamically rewrite humanity’s moral psychological spectrum. Within the discourse system of globalization psychology, psychologists have also failed to consider and evaluate macro-level social phenomena such as social change and mobility triggered by globalization from the perspective of moral psychology.

So, is globalization moral? Cultural psychologists believe that different aspects, levels, and dimensions of globalization are closely related to moral categories (McKenzie, 2020). For example, on one hand, the globalization process advocated by Western mainstream society promotes universal obligations and individual rights, such as global justice and gender equality. On the other hand, this process may also trigger polarized moral disagreements or value conflicts after the hybridization of traditional societies and the modern world, such as the divide between elites and common people and the prioritization of value orientations (Hu et al., 2018). Therefore, extensive and frequent cross-cultural contact can both enhance dialogue and integration between different cultures and intensify “clashes of civilizations” (e.g., between Islamic and Western cultures) stemming from historical legacies or belief system differences (Huntington, 1997; Yang, 2011).

At the theoretical level, the cross-cultural difference perspective in moral psychology is being challenged by the globalization perspective. To understand the dynamic construction between culture and morality, future entry points will no longer be simple East-West cultural comparisons or based on certain social psychological dimensions within cultures (such as urban-rural dual structure, social class, regional culture, etc.). Instead, the focus will be on how people’s moral judgments and behaviors are rewritten and shaped by multiculturalism in the context of globalization, and whether they change dynamically due to individuals’ cultural migration or cultural learning. It is worth noting that individuals’ cultural learning can occur through direct multicultural experiences, such as immersing in foreign cultures while studying abroad (e.g., international students) (Pacheco, 2020), or through indirect multicultural exposure, such as younger generations encountering Western mainstream culture or Chinese niche

cultures through the internet and social media.

At the empirical level, existing evidence shows that people' s multicultural experiences are positively correlated with post-conventional morality in Kohlberg' s stages of moral development (Narvaez & Hill, 2010). Individuals with richer multicultural experiences are more likely to transcend pre-conventional stage rewards and punishments or specific social norms in moral reasoning, adopting more universal moral principles such as global justice that favor individual rights or cultural equality. Interestingly, however, research finds that people with broader multicultural experiences (i.e., those with living experience in multiple countries) are more likely to engage in immoral behaviors such as lying and cheating. Researchers suggest that one explanatory variable is that rich foreign experiences lead to increased moral relativism (Lu et al., 2016).

How Do People Respond to Globalization?

To capture individual differences in psychological strategies for coping with globalization, Chen et al. (2016) proposed the construct of “Global Orientations,” which consists of two relatively independent psychological dimensions: “multicultural acquisition” and “ethnic protection.” Individuals scoring higher on multicultural acquisition tend to actively participate in multicultural interaction, communication, and learning, promoting cross-cultural understanding. Those scoring higher on ethnic protection tend to preserve their own ethnic cultural heritage to prevent it from being contaminated by foreign cultures. Global orientations have been validated as having good predictive utility for a range of cultural attitudes and behavioral outcomes, including (but not limited to) psychological adaptation, attitudes toward foreign cultures, multicultural ideology, personality traits, and coping strategies (Chen et al., 2016). Moreover, research shows that the two-factor model applies to both majority and minority groups, multicultural and monocultural individuals, Westerners and Easterners, and immigrants and sojourners (Chen et al., 2016). Specifically, individuals with higher multicultural acquisition tendencies show higher adaptation levels, less acculturative stress, stronger cross-cultural competence, and hold positive attitudes toward foreign cultures. In contrast, those with higher ethnic protection tendencies suffer from higher levels of depression, anxiety, and cultural adaptation stress, and hold negative attitudes toward foreign cultures (Chen et al., 2016).

Through cross-cultural comparative analysis of Sino-American cultural differences, results show that multicultural acquisition is highly correlated with individualizing foundations of morality, meaning that those who actively learn foreign cultures value care and fairness more highly (Hu, 2017; Hu, et al., 2020). At the same time, multicultural acquisition is also moderately correlated with binding foundations of morality, meaning that those who actively learn foreign cultures also value loyalty, authority, and sanctity (Hu, 2017; Hu, et al., 2020). Ethnic protection is highly correlated with binding foundations of morality, meaning that those who preserve ethnic cultural heritage value loyalty,

authority, and sanctity more highly, but its relationship with individualizing morality is moderated by ethnic group. Specifically, for European American college students, ethnic protection is negatively correlated with care and fairness, whereas for Asian Americans and Chinese international students, ethnic protection is not correlated with care and fairness (Hu, 2017; Hu, et al., 2020). We speculate that because European Americans are the dominant group in the globalization process, cultural heritage protection among mainstream cultural groups involves maintaining their cultural high ground (such as conservative ideology, Christian traditions, etc.), thus requiring moral tradeoffs that sacrifice care and fairness values toward outgroups. In contrast, Asian Americans and Chinese international students are subordinate cultural groups in globalization, occupying lower positions in the world cultural system (such as Asian Confucian traditions, etc.), and therefore do not require moral tradeoffs when protecting their cultural heritage but instead need to strengthen the loyalty, authority, and sanctity values endowed by their own cultural systems. Of course, these theoretical speculations require further empirical support.

Reflections and Future Directions

Contributions and Implications

First, researchers have provided clear conceptual definitions of globalization and proposed that its impact on individual psychology and behavior is complex, multidimensional, and dynamic. Second, previous research has focused on how ordinary people construct globalization processes at the implicit belief level, rather than merely extracting views from social scientists' theoretical systems representing elite knowledge classes, because folk theories have more universal significance for how ordinary people perceive and respond to globalization and social change and how these affect the public' s thoughts, emotions, and behaviors. Third, existing work has unfolded a rich and diverse panorama, examining globalization' s reshaping effects on different psychological domains such as identity, thinking, trust, personality, and morality, providing ideas and inspiration for exploring broader fields in the future. Finally, previous research has keenly captured the complexity and diversity of globalization' s impacts on psychology and behavior, including both positive and negative psychological effects. These seemingly contradictory empirical findings provide us with theoretical frameworks and empirical accumulation for interpreting the psychology of globalization, helping researchers further deconstruct globalization' s temporal dimensions, spatial dimensions, and different domains to examine more comprehensive, nuanced, and rigorous research hypotheses.

Limitations and Future Directions

Overall, the psychology of globalization, as an interdisciplinary exploration and attempt, has begun to take shape (Chiu, Gries, Torelli, & Cheng, 2011). However, research quantity remains limited, theoretical construction is incomplete,

empirical evidence is insufficient, covered populations are quite narrow, and research methods are relatively single. Looking ahead, we hope future work can advance theoretical innovation and frontier exploration in the psychology of globalization from four perspectives. First, further establish close connections between macro-level social factors and micro-level psychological processes, focusing on social and cultural changes triggered by globalization, such as how macro-social indicators like economic development, legal order, generalized trust, Gini index, and civic norms relate to people's psychology and behavior (Buchan, et al., 2009). Second, transcend the identity ambiguity of audience groups by further distinguishing between dominant majority groups (such as liberal individuals in European and American countries) and subordinate minority groups (such as those in Latin American and African countries) (Chao, Kung, & Yao, 2015), identifying differences between beneficiaries and victims in a certain sense, and examining how globalization triggers different psychological and behavioral consequences for beneficiaries versus victims. Third, confront controversies about globalization among different groups. The resurgence of Western populism (Haidt, 2016), especially the tremendous impact of COVID-19, may trigger localized deglobalization waves. Future research should investigate what psychological costs and social turmoil deglobalization trends will bring to people in different regions, thereby providing psychological theoretical explanations and empirical references for humanity's future development direction. Finally, the psychology of globalization should integrate different research methods and experimental paradigms, such as combining qualitative and quantitative research, employing big data, computational models, and cognitive neuroscience approaches to corroborate or complement questionnaire surveys and behavioral experiments.

Looking forward, as the world's second-largest economy, China is participating in and leading the fourth wave of globalization. Coupled with China's outstanding performance in fighting COVID-19, Chinese people's role in the globalization process is becoming increasingly important, even playing a world leadership role. These complex and changing international situations have spawned more socially significant and highly challenging social psychological issues, such as how Chinese people understand and respond to globalization at the implicit theory level, how to enhance Chinese people's cultural confidence, how to tell good Chinese stories in social psychology, how to promote Chinese wisdom of "harmony in diversity" and "beauty in shared beauty," and how to promote cross-cultural understanding and large-scale cooperation to reduce clashes of civilizations. We look forward to Chinese social psychologists telling wonderful Chinese stories on the international stage, demonstrating a positive international image, sharing more Chinese wisdom, and making due contributions as social psychologists to solving many challenges in today's world and building a community with a shared future for mankind.

References

- Hu, X., Han, Y., Yu, F., & Peng, K. (2020). The double-edged sword effect of multicultural experiences: Psychological consequences and boundary conditions. *Applied Psychology*.
- Wu, Y., Yang, Y., & Zhao, Z. (2014). Cultural exclusionary reactions in the context of globalization. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 22(4), 721-730.
- Arnett, J. J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American Psychologist*, 57(10), 774.
- Bao, Y., Yu, D., Li, L., Han, Y., & Qiu, Y. (2021). The Effect of Ingroup-Outgroup Cultural Mixing on Intergroup Helping in Globalization. *Advances in Psychology(In Chinese)*, 10(2), 212-218.
- Benet-Martínez, V. (2012). Multiculturalism: Cultural, social, and personality processes. *Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology*, 623-648.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1), 5-34.
- Cameron, J. E., Kocum, L., & Berry, J. W. (2020). Security and attitudes toward globalization: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 8(2), 805-822.
- Cao, J., Galinsky, A. D., & Maddux, W. W. (2013). Does travel broaden the mind? Breadth of foreign experiences increases generalized trust. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.
- Chen, S. X., Lam, B. C., Hui, B. P., Ng, J. C., Mak, W. W., Guan, Y., . . . Lau, V. C. (2016). Conceptualizing psychological processes in response to globalization: Components, antecedents, and consequences of global orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110(2), 302.
- Cheon, B. K., Christopoulos, G. I., & Hong, Y.Y. (2016). Disgust Associated With Culture Mixing: Why and Who? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47(10), 1268-1285.
- Chiu, C. Y., & Cheng, S. Y. (2007). Toward a social psychology of culture and globalization: Some social cognitive consequences of activating two cultures simultaneously. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1(1), 84-100.
- Chiu, C. y., Gries, P., Torelli, C. J., & Cheng, S. Y. (2011). Toward a social psychology of globalization. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(4), 663-676.
- Fu, J. H.-Y., Zhang, Z. X., Li, F. J., & Leung, Y. K. (2016). Opening the Mind: Effect of Culture Mixing on Acceptance of Organizational Change. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47, 1361-1372. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116652729>

- Gelfand, M. J., Lyons, S. L., & Lun, J. (2011). Toward a psychological science of globalization. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(4), 841-853.
- Gleibs, I. H., & Reddy, G. (2016). The social and political psychology of globalisation and global identities. *The Social Psychology of Everyday Politics*, 75-88.
- Hackett, J. D., Omoto, A. M., & Matthews, M. (2015). Human rights: The role of psychological sense of global community. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 21(1), <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000086>
- Haidt, J. (2016). When and why nationalism beats globalism: And how moral psychology can help explain and reduce tensions between the two. *Policy*, 32, 46-53.
- Hermans, H. J., & Dimaggio, G. (2007). Self, identity, and globalization in times of uncertainty: A dialogical analysis. *Review of General Psychology*, 11(1), 31-61.
- Holton, R. (2000). Globalization's cultural consequences. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 570, 140-152.
- Hu, X. (2017). *Global orientations and moral foundations: a cross-cultural examination among American, Chinese, and international students* (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University- School of Graduate Studies).
- Hu, X., Chen, S. X., Zhang, L., Yu, F., Peng, K., & Liu, L. (2018). Do Chinese traditional and modern cultures affect young adults' moral priorities?. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 1799.
- Huntington, S. P. (1997). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*: Penguin Books India.
- Inglehart, R., & Baker, W. E. (2000). Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values. *American Sociological Review*, 19-51.
- Leung, A. K.-y., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chiu, C.Y. (2008). Multi-cultural experience enhances creativity: the when and how. *American Psychologist*, 63(3), 169.
- Leung, A. K., Qiu, L., & Chiu, C. Y. (2014). The psychological science of globalization. *Handbook of multicultural identity: Basic and applied perspectives*, 181-201.
- Leung, A.-y., Qiu, L., & Chiu, C. (2014). The psychological science of globalization. *Handbook of Multicultural Identity: Basic and Applied Perspectives*, 181-201.
- Liu, J. H., & Macdonald, M. (2016). Towards a psychology of global consciousness through an ethical conception of self in society. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 46(3), 310-334.
- Lu, J., Quoidbach, J., Gino, F., Chakroff, A., Maddux, W. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2016). The Dark Side of Going Abroad: Broad Foreign Experiences Increase

Immoral Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Ma, H. K., & Cheung, C.-K. (1996). A cross-cultural study of moral stage structure in Hong Kong Chinese, English, and Americans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27(6), 700-713.

Maddux, W. W., Bivolaru, E., Hafenbrack, A. C., Tadmor, C. T., & Galinsky, A. D. (2014). Expanding Opportunities by Opening Your Mind: Multicultural Engagement Predicts Job Market Success through Longitudinal Increases in Integrative Complexity. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5, 608-615. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550613515005>

Maddux, W. W., Lu, J. G., Affinito, S. J., & Galinsky, A. D. (2020). Multicultural experiences: a systematic review and new theoretical framework. *Academy of Management Annals*.

Marsella, A. (2012). Psychology and globalization: Understanding a complex relationship. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(3), 454-472.

McFarland, S., & Hornsby, W. (2015). An analysis of five measures of global human identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 45(7), 806-817.

McFarland, S., Webb, M., & Brown, D. (2012). All humanity is my ingroup: A measure and studies of identification with all humanity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(5), 830-853. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028724>

McKenzie, J. (2020). Globalization as a context for moral development. *The Oxford handbook of moral development: An interdisciplinary perspective*.

Morris, M. W., Mok, A., & Mor, S. (2011). Cultural identity threat: The role of cultural identifications in moderating closure responses to foreign cultural inflow. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(4), 760-773.

Narvaez, D., & Hill, P. L. (2010). The relation of multicultural experiences to moral judgment and mindsets. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 3(1), 43.

Nguyen, A. M. D., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2010). Multicultural identity: What it is and why it matters. *The psychology of social and cultural diversity*, 87-114.

Ozer, S., & Schwartz, S. J. (2020). Identity development in the era of globalization: Globalization-based acculturation and personal identity development among Danish emerging adults. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 1-21.

Pacheco, E. M. (2020). Culture learning theory and globalization: Reconceptualizing culture shock for modern cross-cultural sojourners. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 58, 100801.

Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2013). A model of global citizenship: Antecedents and outcomes. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(5), 858-870.

Ritter, S. M., Damian, R. I., Simonton, D. K., van Baaren, R. B., Strick, M., Derks, J., & Dijksterhuis, A. (2012). Diversifying experiences enhance cognitive flexibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(4), 961-964.

Rodrik, D. (2011). *The globalization paradox: democracy and the future of the world economy*. WW Norton & Company.

Shi, Y., Shi, J., Luo, Y. L., & Cai, H. (2016). Understanding exclusionary reactions toward a foreign culture: The influence of intrusive cultural mixing on implicit intergroup bias. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47(10), 1335-1344.

Sparkman, D. J., Eidelman, S., & Blanchard, J. C. (2016). Multicultural experiences reduce prejudice through personality shifts in Openness to Experience. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(7), 840-853.

Stephen, R., Iva, K. M., Quang, L. T., Natalia, A., & Gregolin, M. E. (2020). Perceived Impact of Globalization and Global Citizenship Identification. *Journal of Globalization Studies*, 11(1).

Stimpson, D., Jensen, L., & Neff, W. (1992). Cross-cultural gender differences in preference for a caring morality. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 132(3), 317-322.

Tadmor, C. T., Hong, Y.-y., Chao, M. M., Wiruchnipawan, F., & Wang, W. (2012). Multicultural experiences reduce intergroup bias through epistemic un-freezing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(5), 750.

Walter, S. (2021). The Backlash against Globalization. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 33.

Yang, D. Y. J., Chiu, C. Y., Chen, X., Cheng, S. Y., Kwan, L. Y. Y., Tam, K. P., & Yeh, K. H. (2011). Lay psychology of globalization and its social impact. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(4), 677-695.

Yang, Y.J. (2011). *Clashes of Civilizations: Critical Conditions for Evocation of Hostile Attitude toward Foreign Intrusion of Cultural Space*. Doctoral Dissertation, Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/29633>

Yu, F., Peng, T., Peng, K., Tang, S., Chen, C. S., Qian, X., ...& Chai, F. (2016). Cultural Value Shifting in Pronoun Use. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47(2), 310-316.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv – Machine translation. Verify with original.