Global Exposure and Global Perceptions:
A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Students in
China, Japan, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, and the USA

Deirdre Johnston
Hope College, USA
Rika Hanamitsu
Waseda University, Japan

Abstract: This study compares the global perceptions and exposure of students who have come to age in the era of global communication, across ideologically and economically different nations: China, Japan, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, and the USA. To examine the type and level of their global exposure and the impact of type and level of global exposure on perceptions of global communication, 21 global exposure items and 31 global communication impact items were used to comprise scales for a survey, which was administered to 1360 college students in six countries. The results show significant differences by country in all five types of Global Exposure: Intercultural Curiosity, International Internet, Global Engagement, International Travel, and International Immersion. The results also reveal significant relationships between level and type of Global Exposure and perceptions of threat, prosperity, and justice. Threat perceptions appear to be fueled by higher international internet use, lower overall intercultural curiosity, and less travel experience. With the exception of students from Saudi Arabia, respondents perceive that global communication promotes prosperity. Students from China and the USA are highly optimistic about the impact of global communication on issues of world justice.

Keywords: Global communication, global exposure, global perceptions, cultural values, intercultural communication

1. Introduction

Competing theories of the impact of globalization have permeated the literature for 20 years, but few impact studies have explored the point-of-view of the young adults who have come of age in this period of rapid global technological development. Globalization is defined by Lechner (2005) as the "worldwide diffusion of practices, expansions of relations across continents, organization of social life on a global scale, and growth of a shared global consciousness" (p. 330). In this exploratory study, we will use the term 'global communication' to refer to communication that promotes global consciousness, facilitates the diffusion of ideas across countries, and is the outcome of globalization. Through interpersonal global engagement via new internet, shared lifestyle products, and diffusion of entertainment media across the globe, individuals and social groups – as opposed to governments – now have the ability to

engage in global interaction, and to create virtual cultural communities. Hafiz (2014) specifies three channels of global communication for acquiring information from another country or culture: interpersonal mediated communication; communication services produced by another country or culture; and information distributed via journalism. Current university-age students, born in the early to mid-1990's, have been shaped by global communication, which has impacted their education, socio-economic security, political awareness, consumer images and products, and personal relationships. Yet, as Hafiz (2014) notes, there is yet no empirical research addressing: "Who goes on-line regularly to inform him- or herself or others across borders? …and what epistemological and informational processes are set in motion through this particular type of long-distance communication…? What are the likely social consequences?" (p. 654).

For the purposes of this study, we will use the term 'global exposure' to represent the type and level of information about cultural Others received through both mediated and interpersonal contexts. This study seeks to identify the level and type of exposure to global information shaping the ideals of this generation, as well as the impact of exposure to global information on students' perceptions and attitudes toward global communication.

1.1. Exposure to Global Information

There are more people now, than at any other point in history, engaging in the transfer of cultural content and consciousness. Internet and related-technologies cross borders more easily than traditional TV, radio and print, and are more difficult to censor and control. Language software translation programs overcome many of the national language barriers that impeded personal intercultural communication in the past.

While there is the potential for global exposure to promote transnational cultural transfer of ideas, ideology and lifestyles, we cannot assume that people will actively seek this information. Halavais (2000) found that international hyperlinks are fewer than national; up to 90 percent of USA hyperlinks and 60-70 percent of European hyperlinks are within national borders, and 70 percent of Europe's international hyperlinks are to the USA. Even if the student generation utilizes new global media opportunities, Margolis and Resnick (2000) found that internet (within the USA) is used primarily for entertainment and lifestyle management. We cannot presume, therefore, that the global generation is motivated to engage global learning.

The 'McPhail Paradox,' coined by McPhail (2014), asserts that although the USA has the greatest economic interest in global communication, the American public and government refuse to embrace reciprocal global exchange or recognize the imposition of US media and value exports on others. In his book, *The Post-American World*, Zakaria (2008) makes a similar observation: "Generations from now, when historians write about these times, they might note that, in the early decades of the twenty-first century, the United States succeeded in its great and historic mission — it globalized the world. But along the way, they might write, it forgot to globalize itself" (p. 48). In sum, the literature fails to inform us how increased access to global information is utilized by the citizenry in various countries, or how motivation to learn about other cultures may mediate levels of exposure to global communication.

1.2. Impact of Exposure to Global Communication: Global Convergence or Global Fragmentation?

Theories of the impact of globalization fall on a continuum from proponents speculating that globalization will lead to a global world system that transcends the existence of nation-states, to those citing recent ethnic conflicts as evidence of movement toward a more fragmented heterogeneous world broken into increasingly smaller identity groups (Appadurai, 1996; Friedman, 2000).

Convergence theorists, consistent with Lechner's (2005) concept of "shared global consciousness" (p. 330), claim that cultures are converging due to the pervasive presence of internet communication. Hyperlink studies reveal that internet traffic is routed through the USA and Europe; indeed, there is no direct connection between Islamic countries (Barnett & Park, 2005). Thirty-six percent of users are reading and writing English (Barnett, 2009), and 30 % are interacting in Asian languages: Chinese, 12%, Japanese 9.5%, Korean, 4%, and Arabic 1.2% (Internet World Stats, 2014b). As hyperlink traffic and language-usage converge, so too do global identities. Many scholars predict that cultures will converge around individualism and liberal Western values (Barnett 2009; Legrain, 2003; Rosen, Barnett & Kim, 2011), and that the perpetuation of common structures and symbols will lead to the development of global identities that transcend nation-states (Kiely, 2005). Some theorists predict a convergence of values around a 'global civic society,' promoting trans-national cooperation (Lin, 2014; Hafiz, 2014).

One's perception of cultural convergence depends, of course, on whose culture is the standard upon which others converge. Electronic colonialism is the subjugation of another culture through displacement of traditional cultural practices with new values, lifestyles and consumer behaviors that infiltrate the culture through the importation of technology and media (McPhail, 1987). Multinational corporations and media conglomerates disproportionately own the message content as well as the means for distributing global messages, and thereby, according to electronic colonialism theory, wield a great deal of power over the consciousness of people in developing nations (McPhail, 1987, 2014). In 2005, 148 nations, organized by UNESCO Convention for Cultural Diversity, signed an agreement to protect diverse cultural expression and voices within their countries. Specifically, the agreement allows for the use of subsidies and screen quotas to protect media production within a country against the growing market dominance of US media exports. The USA and Israel stood alone in rejecting the agreement.

World System Theory (Wallerstein, 2004) explicates the electronic imperialistic influence with a model of three concentric circles: the core nations, semi-peripheral nations, and peripheral nations, and proposes that core nations own and produce media content and technology that is distributed outward toward the semi-peripheral and peripheral nations. For example, core nations include the USA and Japan, semi-peripheral nations include Mexico, South Korea and China, and peripheral nations include Saudi Arabia (Dunn, Kawano & Brewer, 2000; Babones & Alvarez-Rivadulla, 2007). Dependency theorists assert that modernization, industrialization and economic development are promoted through global communication, and toward that end, peripheral nations become dependent upon the communication exports of core nations (Lechner

& Boli, 2005; Wallerstein, 2004; Tausch & Heshmati, 2009). The existence of increasing economic gaps between industrial and developing nations is used to support claims that global communication disproportionately flows from the core to the periphery, and economic revenues flow from the periphery to the core (Cardoso & Font, 2001). Due to differential access to technology, some theorists contend that the 'digital divide' is creating an ever-widening knowledge gap between industrialized and developing countries (Lin, 2014).

On the other side, there are theorists who claim that the convergence claims are overstated, or even that the effects of global communication will be the quite the opposite – fragmentation. Critics claim that convergence theories posit a nationally-bounded world that ignores: within-nation diversity, the liberating effects of global communication on identities, the resistance of active audiences to messages, and the powerful context of local culture and values on interpretation of global messages (van Elteren, 2014). Even if global communication has an influence on recipients, the impact may be moderate or even minimal, according to Salwen (1991). An audience may adapt to trends in language or consumer goods, but is unlikely to fundamentally change their cultural values, identities and attitudes (Salwen, 1991).

More information about cultural Others may even push cultures and countries further apart. Tibi (2014) demonstrates how Western and Islamic worldviews are pitted against each other, despite greater cultural communication between Euro-centric, modern, rationalist, and secular ideology peoples, and Islamic, pre-industrial, relational, and theocentric ideology peoples. Tibi contends that the lack of acceptance of cultural and religious pluralism is rife in both Islamic and Western ideologies. The Euro-centric motivation is to perpetuate Western ideology in Islamic states, and the Islamic motivation is to replace Western dominance with Islamic dominance. Though we may be in an era of unprecedented global exchange, mere exposure to ideas and values does not necessarily promote liking, particularly if common values that bridge cultures are not emphasized.

The literature on the impact of global communication discussed thus far is based on broad cultural and transnational patterns, with little or no focus on the individual. Intercultural communication applications of Uncertainty Reduction Theory (Gudykunst, 1985), which posits that we are motivated to engage in communication to reduce uncertainty about others, would at first glance seem to predict that exposure to information about global others should reduce uncertainty, and according to the theory, predict individual communication effectiveness. Further analysis of this theory suggests, however, that the impact of uncertainty reduction is mediated by levels of anxiety (Gudykunst, 2005), and while exposure to global information may reduce uncertainty about 'Others,' the lower level of anxiety when encountering global 'Others' through mediated, as opposed to interpersonal contexts, may result in little motivation or mindfulness (Langer, 1989) to promote individual change.

Selective exposure theory (Fischer, 2011) would suggest that individuals might only expose themselves to confirmatory information, further solidifying, as opposed to broadening their perceptions of global Others. The Pew Research Global Attitudes Study (2007) reports that, "Many perceive global media as perpetuator of Western cultural values, beliefs and lifestyle," and that "35/42 nations said spread of American ideas and customs to their countries was a bad thing."

The only empirical evidence of the effect of global exposure on the individual appears to be a study of US high school students. Clarke (2004) found that students' level of global

exposure was significantly correlated with having broader global perspectives: recognizing that the USA is not culturally superior; believing the USA should offer economic or military assistance to foreign nations; and desiring to work or study abroad. Clarke (2004) concludes that increased global exposure through taking courses, foreign language study and travel were positively related, and exposure to media was negatively related, to the above stated global perspectives.

A complex model begins to emerge in which perceptions of global communication are affected by core/periphery nation status, whether one's ideology is at the core or periphery of cultural convergence, and whether one has access to and motivation to seek global information. As there is little consensus on cultural analyses of global communication, it is time to turn to individual analyses of global exposure. The purpose of this exploratory study is to compare global-generational students, across ideologically and economically different nations, on type and level of global exposure and perceptions of global communication:

RQ1: Do university students vary in their type and level of global exposure by country?

RQ2: Do university students vary in their perceptions of global communication by country?

RQ3: Does level and/or type of global exposure predict differences in perceptions of the impact of global communication?

2. Methodology

The assessment of global exposure and perceptions of global communication was accomplished in three stages: a focus group, a pilot survey, and an international survey. A focus group of 10 international college students was conducted to ascertain the ways in which college students were exposed to global information, cultures and ideas, and to ascertain their perceptions of global communication. Global communication was defined for the respondents as: "the diffusion of products, ideas, practices and relationships across national and cultural boundaries" (Lechner, 2005, p. 330). Focus group responses produced 60 global communication perception items which were placed on five-point Likert scales, anchored by (5) Strongly Agree and (1) Strongly Disagree, and 30 global exposure items, on five-point scales ranging from (5) "almost always" to (1) "never," and pre-tested in a pilot survey, administered to 200 undergraduate students in the USA and Mexico. Two separate principal components factor analyses with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation were run for the global exposure and global impact items. For all scales constructed in this study, items were retained if they loaded greater than .60 on a single factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1, and not more than .40 on any other factor, and scale reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha \geq .70$). Thirty global exposure and 36 global communication impact items were retained for the final survey, which was administered to 1360 participants in six countries. The focus group (completed July, 2010) and pilot-study (completed July, 2011)procedures were very important for new scale construction, as they allowed researchers to identify the practices and perceptions of university-aged students, which were in turn refined and validated by an international pilot survey (completed July, 2012). The final survey administration to 1360 participants in six countries (completed November, 2013) provides an adequate sample for analysis of cultural differences.

2.1. Participants

University students comprised the sample for this study as this generation is most impacted by the unprecedented cultural exchange and access to intercultural ideas and information. The countries represented in the study were selected to represent different areas of the world and to include countries with comparable economic standing (all are in the top 20 GDP and top 14 GNP). Countries represent core (USA and Japan), semi-peripheral (Mexico, South Korea, and China), and peripheral (Saudi Arabia) nations (Dunn et al., 2000).

The USA home institution IRB approved the research study, and the international institutions had varying procedures, which were followed, for research approval. Student participants came from 9 institutions, ranging from small private liberal arts colleges (USA and Saudi Arabia), to small public universities (Mexico), to moderate (USA) to large public (China) and private universities (Japan, Korea). With the exception of all but one of the USA institutions, these institutions were all located in large urban areas with over 1 million inhabitants. Native language speakers were hired to translate surveys into the primary language for each country. Faculty contacts agreed to send the online survey link to students, and the data from all countries were merged into one file for analysis.

Participants reside in the USA (32%, n = 435), Mexico (32%, n = 435), Japan (14%, n = 190), Saudi Arabia (11%, n = 150), China (7%, n = 95) and South Korea (4%, n = 54). A number of participants' country of origin differed from their country of residence (14%, n = 188), and these participants identified their home country or continent as the Netherlands, Europe, United Kingdom, Australia, Africa or Canada. These participants were removed from any analyses involving cross-country comparisons as it is unclear whether they identify with the culture of their national home or country of residence. Almost a third of these non-citizen residents were residing in Saudi Arabia (n = 58).

The sample was balanced by biological sex (49.4% male and 50.6% female), although the Saudi Arabian respondents were all female, enrolled in a women's university. The age of respondents ranged from 18 to over 23 (M = 20.5 years), and the years in university ranged from first-year students to sixth-year students (M = 2.6 years). Political perspective reflected a normal distribution with 38.2% identifying as moderate, but religious affiliation was heavily skewed toward Christian (53%, n = 720), followed by Atheist or Agnostic (24%, n = 326), Muslim (14%, n = 190), Buddhist (5%, n = 68), Hindu (1%, n = 14), and other (3%, n = 41).

2.2. Scale Construction

Factor analysis using Principal Components Analysis and Varimax (orthogonal) rotation of the 30 Likert-style Global Exposure items yielded seven factors. Six factors with eigenvalues greater than one and total variance greater than five percent were retained. The six Global Exposure factors account for 60.09 % of the total variance (Table 1). KMO (.84) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (χ^2 = 13,103, p = .000) indicates that the items are adequately related for factor analysis.

Table 1. Factor Loadings for Global Exposure (N=1360)

Global Exposure Item Exposure to "…other nations and cultures"	Factor 1 Intercultural Curiosity	Factor 2 International Internet	Factor 3 Engagement	Factor 4 International Travel	Factor 5 Immersion Travel	Factor 6 Language Study	Communi- calities
Watch films or TV programs about…?	.74						.59
Read books about…?	.72						.55
Listen to music from…?	.69						.56
Watch world TV news about…?	.67						.60
Read world news in a newspaper or magazine?	.65						.57
Attend international/intercultural arts events?	.64						.60
Talk, study, or work with people from…?	.63						.66
Watch films or TV programs from…?	.62						.52
Purchase ethnic/cultural items (clothing, souvenirs, music)?	.62						.44
Personal communication (email, Skype, instant messenger) with…?		.80					.70
Internet information (Wikipedia, movie database, maps, etc.) about…?		.79					.69
Entertainment via Internet (films, TV, video, music, etc.) from or about…?		.72					.60
Social networking sites (Facebook, MySpace, LinkedIn, Twitter, etc.) with…?		.72					.73
Internet news sources from or about…?		.66					.65
Internet research databases from or about…?		.66					.58
Invite people from …to your own home?			.82				.79
Traveled outside of your country for work?			.78				.80
Watch international Podcasts			.64				.64
Traveled outside of your country?				.89			.86
Traveled outside country for vacation?				.89			.81
Traveled outside country for mission/study?				.75			.62
Sought culturally different accommodations?					.92		.85
Visited areas that are not typical tourist sites?					.91		.85
Length of time secondary language study?						.76	.60
Studied a second language?						.73	.59
Eigenvalues	4.72	4.11	2.83	2.52	1.71	1.54	
Percentage Variance	16.27%	14.00%	9.75%	8.69%	5.90%	5.30%	
Number of Items	9	6	3	3	2	2	

Note. Items loading $\geq$ .60 on primary factor and $\leq$ .40 on secondary factors.

Intercultural Curiosity reflects global exposure through films, books, music, news, cultural events, personal interaction, and purchasing ethnic or cultural items (range nine to 45; M=20.16, SD=4.86, α = .86). International Internet reflects utilization of the Internet to access international content, from information or research databases to social media (range six to 30; M=17.98, SD=6.03, α = .86). Engagement included inviting people from other cultures to your home, utilizing international podcasts, and traveling outside one's country for work (range three to 15, M=4.88, SD=2.91, α = .71). Travel included three items including the frequency with which a person had traveled outside of his or her own country for study, mission work or vacation (range three to 15, M = 5.17, SD = 3.73, α = .85). Immersion Travel included how frequently

a person had visited areas that were not typical tourist attractions when traveling abroad, and how frequently a person had stayed in accommodations that were culturally different than his or her own culture (range two to 10, M = 4.94, SD = 2.73). Language Study did not produce a reliable scale (α < .70).

A Principal Components factor analysis was run on the 36 Likert-style Global Perceptions for both data reduction and concept structure analysis. The Promax rotation (oblique) was used because persons' perceptions about the implications of global communication are likely to be interrelated. The factor analysis yielded six factors, accounting for 52 % of total variance; however, three of the factors had only two items each and did not account for over five percent of the total variance. Five items did not meet the .60/.40 factor-loading rule and were deleted: "exploits economically developing nations", "promotes too much tolerance", "challenges the power of political leaders in my country", "increases life satisfaction", and "holds national government accountable to higher standards". For these reasons, a three-factor solution was run, which accounted for 38.55 % of the variance and yielded three factors with eigenvalues greater than one, and each accounting for more than five percent of the total variance (Table 2). KMO (.84) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (χ^2 =13, 103, p = .000) indicates that the items are adequately related for factor analysis. Threat included 12 items reflecting the degree to which respondents believed that global communication is a threat to their identity, financial well-being, future, culture and country (range12 to 60, M = 33.32, SD = 7.56, α = .86). Justice included eight items reflecting beliefs that global communication promotes peace, decreased violence, global problem solutions, and democracy (range 8 to 40, M = 27.36, SD = 4.19, α =.76). Prosperity included six items associated with promotion of free market economies, greater freedom of expression, developments in science and technology, and diversity of entertainment and news media (ranging from nine to 30, M = 22.05, SD =3.48). The item, "global communication comes at the expense of local businesses," was deleted as it did not add reliability of the scale according to Cronbach's alpha.

Table 2. Factor Loadings for Perceptions of Global Communication (N = 1360)

Perception of the Impact of Global Communication Item	Factor 1 Threat	Factor 2 Prosperity	Factor 3 Justice	Communi-calities
GC undermines the ideas and customs of my culture	.72			.52
GC leads to lower standard of living	.71			.51
GC promotes moral decline	.69			.48
GC is a threat to the well-being of my country	.68			.52
GC lower quality life for next generation	.67			.48
GC danger single world government	.65			.44
GC threatens my identity	.65			.49
GC undermines national patriotism	.65			.43
GC contributes to Western dominance in the world	.59			.35
GC undermines national sovereignty	.58			.35
GC promotes corporate monopolies	.55			.37
GC leads to a loss of local culture	.48			.36

GC promotes free market business practices and values		.70		.48
GC promotes scientific and technological development in my country		.64		.45
GC increases the diversity of entertainment and news media in my culture		.63		.44
GC promotes freedom of expression throughout the world		.63		.46
GC expense of local business		.52		.37
GC impacts the world's politics		.52		.26
GC increases the accurate representation of countries and cultures around the world		.47		.27
GC will make our world a better place			.74	.55
GC promotes peace			.67	.43
GC decreases religious and ethnic violence			.64	.41
GC helps reduce global inequality			.56	.34
GC positively impacts the cultures of the world			.49	.38
GC helps solve global problems (environmental, hunger, poverty, educational, health)			.47	.40
The positive aspects of GC outweigh the negative aspects			.45	.32
GC promotes democracy			.43	.39
Eigenvalue	5.17	4.13	1.94	
Percentage of Variance	19.16%	15.30%	7.19%	
Number of Items	12	7	8	

Note. Items loading > .60 on primary factor and < .40 on secondary factors.

3. Results

3.1. Global Exposure by Country

A one-way ANOVA showed significant differences in all five types of Global Exposure by country. Scheffe' Post-hoc criteria for significance are presented in Table 3. Saudi Arabian, Korean and Mexican students utilize International Internet significantly more than Japanese students, and Japanese students utilize International Internet more than American and Chinese students. Global exposure via Intercultural Curiosity is much more frequently pursued by Korean and American students, with Japanese and Mexican students engaging in moderate levels of curiosity. Saudi Arabian and Chinese students utilize foreign films, news, music, etc., at a significantly lower rate, but similarly to each other. Global Engagement (through work, hosting people in one's home, and podcasts) is utilized by Saudi Arabian students with much greater frequency than any of the other cultures, followed by Mexican, Korean, American students, with Japanese and Chinese students utilizing this method of global exposure the least. International travel is a means of global exposure for Japanese, Koreans and Americans. Mexican and Saudi Arabian students engaged in less international travel, but more than Chinese students. International Immersion travel experiences are most utilized by Americans, slightly less so by Saudis and Japanese. Mexican and Korean students utilize immersion experiences even less so, and immersion is engaged only minimally by Chinese students.

Table 3: Mean Comparisons of Type of Global Exposure by Country (N = 1302)

		USA[a]	China[b]	Mexico[c]	Korea[d]	Japan[e]	Saudi Arabia[f]
International Internet	F= 63.96* (5, 1085)	M=15.51[c,d,e,f,]	M=13.26[c,d,e,f]	M=21.01[a,b,e]	M=20.53[a,b,e]	M=17.62[a,b,c,d]	M=20.00[a,b]
Intercultural Curiosity	F=12.02* (5,1078)	M=21.37[b,c,e,f]	M=18.50[a,d]	M=19.33[a,d]	M=21.71[b,c,f]	M=19.80[a]	M=18.37[a,d]
Engagement	F=258.78* (5, 1086)	M=3.94[b,c,f]	M=2.90[a,c,d,e,f]	M=4.62[a,b,e,f]	M=4.12[b,f]	M=3.79[b,c,f]	M=11.68[a,b,c,d,e]
International Travel	F=59.48* (5,1101)	M=6.54[b,c,f]	M=.90[a,c,d,e,f]	M=4.28[a,b,d,e]	M=6.69[b,c,f]	M=7.21[b,c,f]	M=4.51[a,b,d,e]
Immersion Travel	F=11.17* (5, 996)	M=5.68[b,c,d]	M=3.54[a,c,e,f]	M=4.71[a,b,]	M=4.19[a]	M=5.02[b]	M=5.24[b]

Note. *p = .001; There are multiple significant differences among the six countries' means; major comparison groups reflecting statistically significant differences are indicated by superscript alphabet letters.

An overall Global Exposure Index (ranging from 29 to 108, M = 63.54, SD = 12.85, α = .94) is limited in that it gives each global exposure item equal weight, and it ignores the orthogonal dimensions of global exposure. Furthermore, as there are different numbers of items representing each of these dimensions, more weight is given in the overall index to media and internet exposure than to travel, for example. However, it is helpful for sense-making to see that overall Global Exposure, reflecting the sheer number of global exposure opportunities realized, across multiple modalities, was highest for Saudi Arabian students (M = 72.62, SD = 9.04), followed by Korean students (M = 69.71, SD = 11.17). The Mexican students reported moderate levels of overall Global Exposure (M = 65.26, SD = 11.91), followed by Japanese (M = 64.44, SD = 10.34) and US students (M = 62.75, SD = 13.46). The lowest level of overall Global Exposure was reported by Chinese students (M = 49.81, SD = 8.96). Type of global exposure can also be further explicated by analyzing demographic characteristics of persons who utilize particular types and amounts of global exposure.[1]

Standardized z-scores were computed for the Global Exposure scales for within country comparisons. The top three sources of global exposure for each country were determined by comparing the mean z-scores for each global exposure scale. Sources of Global Exposure were similar for the USA (travel, M = .34; curiosity, M = .29; and immersion, M = .27) and Japan (travel, M = .47; immersion, M = .03; and curiosity, M = -.08). Mexico (internet, M = .47;

---

[1] ANOVA with Scheffe' post-hoc analyses of means revealed that global exposure through Intercultural Curiosity and Engagement was significantly higher among those respondents who reported being somewhat or very politically liberal, compared to those who reported being somewhat or very politically conservative. Engagement was also higher among Muslims than Christians. Males had higher means on Intercultural Curiosity, and females had higher means on Engagement. Global exposure through International Internet was higher among females and political conservatives, as well as being higher among Muslims than Christians. Travel Immersion was higher among political conservatives (see Appendix C).

engagement, M = -.09; and immersion, M = -.09) was similar to Saudi Arabia (engagement, M = 2.44; internet, M = .41; and immersion, M = .04) in sources of global exposure, and similar to South Korea in reliance on internet as the primary source of global exposure. South Korea utilized internet (M = .42), travel (M = .41) and curiosity (M = .32) most frequently. China, with minimal pursuit of any kind of global exposure, utilized curiosity (M = -.32), immersion (M = -.52) and engagement (M = -.66) more frequently than other sources of global exposure.

3.2. Perceptions of Global Communication by Country

A One-Way ANOVA showed significant differences in all three Perceptions of Global Communication by country. Scheffe' Post-hoc analyses reveal that Threat perceptions were highest for Saudi Arabian students, followed by Korean and Mexican students, and lowest for Chinese, American and Japanese students. Beliefs that global communication will bring Prosperity were significantly less likely to be embraced by Saudi students than students in any other country. Beliefs in the influence of global communication on world Justice were most likely to be embraced by students in China and the USA, and less likely to be embraced by students in Mexico, Japan, Korea and Saudi Arabia. Due to the large contrast effects in global perceptions by Saudi Arabian students, compared to students from other countries represented in the study, an additional ANOVA without Saudi respondents was conducted, and the results indicate that the three Global Perceptions still significantly differed by country: Threat ($F_{(4, 1020)}$ = 14.87, p = .000), Justice ($F_{(4, 1020)}$ = 7.43, p = .000), and Prosperity ($F_{(4, 1012)}$ = 3.60, p = .006).

Stepwise regressions with Global Communication Perceptions as the dependent variables and Global Exposure variables as the predictors, revealed significant relationships between level and type of Global Exposure and perceptions of the impact of Global Communication (Table 5).

Demographics were also significantly associated with particular perceptions about global communication.[2]

Table 4. Mean Comparisons of Perceptions of Global Communication by Country (N = 1302)

Perception		Country					
		USA[a]	China[b]	Mexico[c]	Korea[d]	Japan[e]	Saudi Arabia[f]
Threat	F=30.12*** (5, 1076)	M=30.52[(c,f)]	M=29.88[(c,f)]	M=34.08[(a,b,e,f)]	M=33.44[(f)]	M=30.07[(c,f)]	M=40.83[(a,b,c,d,e)]
Justice	F=7.31*** (5, 1076)	M=27.98[(c)]	M=29.19[(c,e,f)]	M=26.92[(a,b)]	M=27.06	M=26.92[(b)]	M=26.12[(b)]
Prosperity	F=19.97*** (5, 1073)	M=14.96[(f)]	M=13.84[(f)]	M=16.00[(f)]	M=16.51[(f)]	M=14.36[(f)]	M=16.18[(a,b,c,d,e)]

Note. ***p < .001; There are multiple significant differences among the six countries' means; statistically significant comparison groups are indicated by superscript alphabet letters.

---

2 Males, political liberals and non-Muslims were more likely to perceive that global communication promotes Prosperity. Conservatives and Muslims were more likely to perceive that global communication is a Threat to their well-being. Political liberals were more likely to embrace hopes for Justice (see Appendix D).

A stepwise regression equation with Threat as the dependent variable revealed that students' global exposure through International Internet and Engagement predicted perceptions of Threat. Lower international Travel experience and Intercultural Curiosity also predicted perceptions that Global Communication is threatening to well-being. These four global exposure variables accounted for 16% of the total variance in Threat. Perceptions that global communication promotes world Justice is predicted by greater global exposure through Intercultural Curiosity and less exposure through Immersion Travel. These two global exposure variables account for three percent of the variance in perceptions of Justice. Perceptions that global communication promotes Prosperity were predicted by global exposure through Intercultural Curiosity and International Internet usage. Prosperity was also predicted by less Engagement (global exposure through work travel, podcasts and inviting people into one's home). These three variables accounted for 14 % of the variance in perceptions of Prosperity.

Table 5. Multiple Regression of Global Exposure on Perceptions of Global Communication (N = 1360)

Perception	Type of Global Exposure						
Dependent Variable	Significant Predictors	B	t	p	F	p	Total R^2
Threat	Engagement	.98	(1343) 11.62	.000	(1, 912) 146.50	.000	.14
	Travel	-.19	(1343) -2.88	.004	(2, 911) 79.02	.000	.15
	Curiosity	-.28	(1343) -3.75	.000	(3, 910) 55.43	.000	.16
	Internet	.14	(1343) 2.95	.003	(4, 909) 44.09	.000	.16
Justice	Curiosity	.13	(1345) 4.33	.000	(1, 1058) 18.58	.000	.02
	Immersion	-.10	(1345) 12.12	.002	(2, 1057) 14.25	.002	.03
Prosperity	Engagement	-.32	(1341) -10.37	.000	(1, 1057) 53.72	.000	.05
	Internet	.23	(1341) 7.01	.000	(2, 1056) 67.97	.000	.11
	Curiosity	.15	(1341) 5.10	.000	(3, 1055) 55.07	.000	.14

Note. Predictors listed in order of entry into stepwise regression equation.

4. Discussion

4.1. Global Exposure

The results indicated that type and level of Global Exposure varies by country. Several patterns emerged. Exposure to international information via the internet was most frequently and extensively utilized by Saudi Arabian, South Korean and Mexican Students. Global exposure via Intercultural Curiosity is much more frequently pursued by South Korean and American students, and less frequently pursued by Saudi Arabian and Chinese students, and Global Engagement (through work, hosting people in one's home, and podcasts) is utilized by Saudi Arabian students with much greater frequency than any other culture. International travel is a means of global exposure for Japanese, South Koreans and Americans, and Travel Immersion is most frequently utilized by Americans, and slightly less so by Saudis and Japanese.

4.1.1. International Internet

International Internet appears to be an important source of global exposure for most university students. One of the more surprising results here is that American students are comparatively low in their use of international internet information – almost as low as Chinese students. The low utilization of internet for international information by Chinese students is likely explained by international internet filters and internet utilization in the culture. The Press Freedom Index (2014), ranking from one (free) to 180 (highly restricted) indicates that China scores very high on information censorship, compared to the other countries in this study: China, 175; Saudi Arabia, 164; Mexico, 152; Japan, 59; South Korea, 57; and the USA, 46. In addition, general internet usage is low in China (*Internet Live Stats*, 2014): Mexico, 41%; China, 46%; Saudi Arabia, 59%, Japan, 86%; the USA, 87%; and South Korea, 92%, although internet penetration among the university students comprising the sample for this study should be similarly high for all countries. YouTube, Facebook and Twitter are not accessible in China, and the sheer number of international sites that are accessible and translated into Chinese is much lower in China than in the other countries in the study (Liebelson, 2014; Bamman, O'Connor, & Smith, 2012). Regarding low global exposure via the internet in the USA and Japan, one possible explanation is that university students in the USA and Japan may not be highly motivated to access international information due to the sheer quantity and variety of domestic information available.

The highest usage of international internet for global exposure was reported by Saudi Arabian, South Korean and Mexican students. Saudi Arabia has a high Press Freedom Index (high domestic press censorship) which may prompt quests for international internet information, assuming students are finding ways to circumvent the filters (*OpenNet Initiative*, 2009; Teitelbaum, 2011).

Although Mexico has a low overall internet penetration and a poor Press Freedom Index, Mexico does have low internet censorship (*Internet World Stats*, 2014a), prompting Mexican students to utilize internet for international information. By contrast, China — which shares low internet penetration and a poor Press Freedom Index — has high internet censorship. Chinese students are impeded by both internet censorship and language barriers. The desire for translated international information is evidenced by embattled *Yeeyan*, a website that offers English to Chinese translation of news articles, but is intermittently closed down by the government (*The Guardian*, 2009). In Mexico, South Korea, Japan, Saudi Arabia and the USA there is simply more foreign information translated for consumption.

4.1.2. Intercultural Curiosity

The high level of Intercultural Curiosity demonstrated by South Korean students parallels the cultural diplomacy in the country. The phenomenal increase in Korean popular culture exports, called 'The Korean Wave' ('*Hallyu*' in Korean), has resulted in greater freedom of expression in Korean arts (Dator & Seo, 2004), as well as more cultural exchange with other countries (Jang & Paik, 2012). There appears to be a cultural climate promoting global curiosity in Korea, from the focus on foreign-language acquisition beginning in kindergarten, to the prevalence of foreign films, books, music and cultural events.

The high levels of Intercultural Curiosity reported by US students parallels the initiation of multicultural education. Multicultural scholarship in academe began in the 1980s, working into primary and secondary school curricula in the 1990's (Banks & Banks, 2012). The 2010's college student generation is one of the first to reach the university with formalized multicultural education. This educational initiative may be working effectively, as reflected in the prevalence of Intercultural Curiosity behaviors among American students.

In contrast, Saudi Arabian and Chinese students scored low on Intercultural Curiosity. While both Saudi Arabia and China have high levels of censorship, including restrictions on international information, Saudi Arabian students seem to find alternative channels for intercultural information, as evidenced by their high levels of other types of global exposure. It is difficult to understand Saudi students' low Intercultural Curiosity in light of high levels of overall global exposure, and Basfar's (2007) report of heavy foreign media usage in Saudi Arabia, due to the lack of variety in educational and entertainment programs produced domestically. It could be that female Saudi students' global exposure is highly controlled; internet sites visited, engagement with people you invite into your home or meet through work, and international travel may be perceived as more controlled interactions with Others than the unexpected content one might encounter through foreign films, music, TV, news, or art events. Or, it could be that Saudi students are engaged in high levels of global exposure with similar or neighboring cultures; in other words, the global exposure is motivated by interpersonal connection with the familiar more than intercultural curiosity about the unknown.

When we examine individual items on the Intercultural Curiosity scale, we find that Chinese students do report attending to world news, and getting music, books and TV/film media from other countries. Indeed, pirated international movies and CD's are readily available. However, Chinese students report little utilization of films about other cultures, attending cultural events or talking to foreigners. Chinese students' lower scores on Intercultural Curiosity may be due to lack of accessibility and may or may not be due to a lack of interest (*Freedom House*, 2014).

4.1.3. Global Engagement

Global Engagement (through work, hosting people in one's home, and podcasts) is utilized by Saudi Arabian students with much greater frequency than any other students. Indeed, all three items comprising this measure are highest for Saudi Arabian students. The fact that the Saudi Arabian sample is all female makes this finding even more interesting. It is true that the Saudi government in recent years has attempted to push young people, particularly young women, into the workforce (Knickmeyer, 2012). Due to proximity to other countries, perhaps, university women in Saudi Arabia are, by their reports, engaging in international travel through work. Mexican, Korean and Japanese students report much lower international travel for work, and Chinese and American students report very low international travel for work.

Saudi and Mexican students are also using international podcasts, most likely to circumvent censorship filters. Podcasts appear to be highly utilized within countries exercising domestic press control (Tan, 2011), although podcasts were not utilized by Chinese students, according to this study. One of the ways Saudis are accessing podcasts is via smartphones (Hubbard, 2015); Saudi's have the third highest smartphone penetration in the world (Fox, 2013). It appears that

television, films and music — clearly popular with university students — are available through international podcasts and that it takes governments longer to control this infiltration. Students in other countries reported minimal or no use of international podcasts.

Entertainment in Saudi Arabia, especially for Saudi women, may involve hosting people in one's home due to the limited places for gathering (Le Renard, 2014). Inviting international guests into one's home was second highest for American students. In contrast, in traditional Asian culture, it is relatively unusual to host a person, other than a very close friend or family member (Lee, 2013). Differences in this aspect of Engagement may also be an artifact of the availability of international guests in one's country or region.

4.1.4. International Travel

International travel is a means of global exposure for Japanese, Koreans and Americans. The frequency of international travel directly corresponds with countries' passport and visa access. Japan, South Korea, and the USA have the highest access scores (170, 166, and 172, respectively), followed by Mexico (132), Saudi Arabia (64) and China (43) (Linn, 2014). In addition, Japan, South Korea and the USA have increased expectations for university students to study abroad as part of their preparation for engaging a global society. Students from Korea represent the largest groups of foreign OECD students enrolled in other OECD countries (OECD iLibrary). Saudi Arabian students report relatively lower international travel, with the exception of travel for work. Based on Le Renard's (2014) and Hubbard's (2015) observation on Saudi women, we can speculate that although most Saudi female university students would have the monetary means to travel, some women might report that it is easier to stay in one's own country or similar countries to maintain one's religious practices, roles and values.

4.1.5. International Immersion

International Immersion travel experiences are most utilized by Americans, and slightly less so by Saudis and Japanese. It is perhaps surprising to see that Immersion Travel is as high as it is for Saudi Arabian female students, especially when Saudi Arabia has low visa access. It is possible that the Saudi women respondents perceive greater cultural distance in their international travel experiences, which would prompt them to report that these visits are more atypical of tourist travel; or, it is possible that Saudi women are more likely to stay in homes of friends or relatives when traveling internationally. Whereas the lack of travel immersion is a choice made by Mexican and South Korean students, for Chinese students it may be a reflection of low visa access to travel anywhere.

4.2. Global Perceptions

Level and type of global exposure was related to perceptions of global communication. University students perceived three implications of the diffusion of ideas, practices and relations across national boundaries: Threat, Prosperity and Justice. Threat perceptions were highest for Saudi Arabian students, followed by Korean and Mexican students, and lowest

for Chinese, American and Japanese students. Beliefs that global communication will bring Prosperity were significantly less likely to be embraced by Saudi students than students in any other country. Beliefs in the influence of global communication on world Justice were most likely to be embraced by students in China and the USA, and less likely to be embraced by students in Mexico, Japan, Korea and Saudi Arabia.

4.2.1. Threat

Threat perceptions were highest for Saudi Arabian students, followed by Korean and Mexican students, and lowest for Chinese, American and Japanese students. Threat perceptions appear to be fueled by higher international internet use, lower overall Intercultural Curiosity, and less travel experience. These findings make sense in that internet information may reflect extremist or inaccurate international perspectives, and that understanding of other cultures through films, books, music, artifacts, and news as well as interaction through travel should reduce perceived threats. This supports Clarke's (2004) research that media exposure was negatively correlated with positive global perceptions. It is surprising, however, that Engagement is related to perceived threat of Other. It would seem that the more one invites people into one's home and travels internationally for work, the less threatening the Other would seem. This unusual relationship cannot be fully explained by the female Saudi sample who score very high on Engagement, as Mexico also scores reasonably high on the items comprising this scale. Correlations were run to explore the relationship between the individual items (podcasts, invites and work travel) and perceived threat, to see if one of these items was skewing the connection between Engagement and Threat; however, all three individual items were significantly correlated with Threat (podcast, $r=.36$, $p=.000$; invites, $r=.29$, $p=.000$; and work travel, $r=.35$, $p=000$). This finding supports the theoretical perspectives of Tibi (2014) who argues that global communication may "promote an awareness of cultural other in a negative sense" (p.55).

Threat was also predicted by religion and political perspective, which may explain Saudi Arabia's high scores on Threat. Muslims were significantly more likely than Christians, Buddhists and others to perceive Global Communication as threatening, which may suggest that negative messages about the threat of Others are being reinforced in religious contexts, or it could be that Muslim religious identification is confounded by Saudi national identity as almost all Muslims in the sample were from Saudi Arabia. Basfar (2007) notes the difficult position in which global communication places the Saudis: "… Saudis feel themselves responsible for spreading the message of Islam to the rest of the world. It is this missionary role which had placed Saudi television in such a tough position, because of the inevitable obligation to maintain strict Islamic guidelines [while] still competing with other stations in the Gulf area" (p. 33). It is perhaps not surprising that political conservatives, who embrace the status quo, would see the uncertainty of the historically and culturally unprecedented sharing of ideas and relations across cultural boundaries as threatening. Political conservatives viewed global communication as more threatening, and less likely to promote justice or prosperity.

South Korean students boast one of the highest levels of global exposure, yet report feeling very threatened by global communication. This feeling of threat is noted in Alford's (1999)

observations that globalization and changing culture in Korea may bring about "restructuring," "[changes in] the standards of the market and the bureaucracy," and the "promises [of] dissolution of human ties" (pp.144-145). In contrast, given economic downturns, Japanese students are less likely to stake their future careers and success on the global stage and are focusing more on domestic success (Imoto, 2013). In addition, Robertson (1995) and Nye (2011) give Japan as an example of a culture that has embraced global communication by integrating and adapting global ideas within deeply rooted Japanese social practices and traditions. For these reasons, Japanese students may be less engaged in social and economic comparisons, and therefore report globalization as less threatening.

Mexican students' perceived threats may well be economically based. Under NAFTA, China gained economically (Weber, 2004) at the expense of Mexico (Salas, 2002). Mexican students may also be reflecting a general Latin American resistance to the USA neoliberal economic policies. Arnove, Franz, Mollis and Torres (2003) cite the negative impact of global neoliberal economic reform on education, health and social support services in Mexico. The impact of global treaties on the privatization of education and class differences in educational attainment in Mexico may be particularly salient for university students. The data does not support Cowen's (2002) contention that Mexico is "highly resilient to foreign influence" (p. 64) due to vibrant regional art, music and film traditions; students in this study felt threatened by a loss of local culture and identity.

4.2.2. Prosperity

With the exception of Saudi students, respondents perceived that global communication promotes Prosperity. It is interesting that although Saudi students were high (relative to their peers) on global exposure, they consistently perceived the impact of global communication as negative. One might expect significant differences in the degree to which students held perceptions of prosperity in Japan, South Korea, Mexico, the USA and China relative to the economic prosperity of the country and the relative power of the country in engaging world trade and electronic imperialism, yet no significant differences were found.

4.2.3. Justice

Students from China and the USA are highly optimistic about the impact of global communication on issues of world justice. Ironically, there are some shared values in the divergent political, economic and social ideologies of these two countries. Confucian scholar Tu (1997) "discusses a 'Confucian inclusive humanism' model that promotes solving world problems over self-interest" (Yin, 2011, p.573), and the USA's democratic ideology embraces the values of liberty, equality, and justice. Both democratic and Confucian ideologies would embrace what Tibi (2014) proposes as a bridging of global cultural values by embracing rationalism, secular tolerance, and cross-cultural morality. These values do indeed appear to be reflected in US and Chinese students' optimism that global communication will promote world peace and solutions for global problems.

4.3. Core and Peripheral Nations and Global Perceptions

Core and peripheral nation status did have some influence on perceptions of global communication. As one might expect, students from core and semi-peripheral nations were more likely to perceive that global communication promoted prosperity, and students from core nations and China perceived less threat, than did students from the other semi-peripheral and peripheral nations. General optimism about the impact of global communication on global justice was observed in core or peripheral nation status; however, Japanese students did not share the optimistic justice perceptions of US and Chinese students.

In terms of types of global exposure, peripheral and semi-peripheral nation students utilized the internet more to access global content, and global exposure through travel was utilized more by students from core nations. These usage patterns are consistent with world system and dependency theory models; internet information is flowing out from core to peripheral countries, and even people are likewise, flowing from the core to the periphery when we consider which students are engaged in international travel.

5. Conclusions

This exploratory study suggests that in an era of global communication, the type and level of global exposure among university students does vary significantly by culture. One of the contributions of this study is scale development to assess type and level of global exposure and perceptions of global communication. The Global Exposure Scale may well be useful to other researchers exploring intercultural competencies, and colleges and universities assessing the impact of curricular and co-curricular global learning. Although this study demonstrates encouraging predictive validity, content validity and cross-cultural reliability for the new Global Exposure Scale, the next steps for scale development should include analyses of criterion validity (assessing correlations with other related validated scales), and convergent validity (assessing correlation of Global Exposure scores with related constructs, such as intercultural knowledge, understanding, curiosity, self-awareness and social responsibility). There may also be more sophisticated ways to weight the different dimensions (factors) of global exposure, and to identify the sufficient and necessary dimensions for predictive validity. The Global Exposure Scale also does not account for the quality of information, e.g. how do we assess the quality of international travel cultural exposure, or the quality of global internet sites visited? The Perceptions of Global Communication Scale raises questions of content validity -- whether all the elements of perceptions of global communication are reflected in the scale. There are likely other dimensions of beliefs and perceptions about global communication that are not reflected in this instrument. The predictive validity of the Perceptions of Global Communication Scale was adequate for this preliminary study, but not entirely satisfying. Other perceptions, such as perceptions of cultural Others, consumerist ideology, spread of democracy, spread of religious ideology, etc., that did not produce reliable factors and scales during the pilot and pre-test processes, should be explored in future research. In addition, this exploratory study did not adequately address whether Global Perceptions were shaped by Global Exposure, or only correlated with Global Exposure. Do people already have global perceptions that are

already highly integrated with worldview and values that in turn motivate them to pursue or resist exposure to global information, or does exposure to global information shape global perceptions and worldview?

All types of global exposure are not created equal. Information gleaned from some sources may be more personally and culturally controlled (e.g. the case of Saudi women not utilizing films, TV, music, news and books). Moreover, differences in exposure are also affected by both accessibility of international information and experiences, and motivation to avail oneself to other-cultural experiences. It appears that governments and cultures that highly value global perspective and experience, as evidenced by the South Korean Wave campaign, enculturate greater global exposure. The low level of global exposure in China reminds us that even in an era of global communication, governments still control access to global exposure. It is also worth noting that students in the USA and China may be less motivated to seek global exposure as they are more geographically isolated within large countries and are more dependent upon the mass culture industries within their own countries.

Along with the rapid development of global media and technology, careful attention should be paid to newly industrialized countries when refining and extending scales for future study. For example, China is categorized as a semi-peripheral country when conducting the research, however, considering its economic growth, some of the findings can be interpreted differently from the situations of other semi-peripheral countries. Another issue to be considered when looking at data from large countries including China is disparity within the country. People living in the city, where the participants in this study attended university, would have much easier access to various media and more opportunities to experience global interactions compared to those who live in rural areas or in traditional life (Lin, 2014, p. 604).

This study reveals that particular types of global exposure within particular cultural contexts are associated with certain perceptions about globalization and cultural 'Others.' Hafiz (2014) muses that "People who spend a lot of time romping around in the global spaces of the internet can expand their knowledge of the world in all directions, but there is no guarantee of authenticity and of any kind of 'glocalized' and hybrid cultures bringing about meaningful system change" (p. 657). While it may be premature to predict system change, understanding the perceptions of threat, associated with higher international internet use and lower curiosity, held by Saudi, Korean and Mexican students, suggests the unlikelihood of hybrid cultural integration due to greater skepticism of global Others. Perceptions of threat in the same students who also embraced perceptions of global prosperity speaks to the paradoxical impact of global exposure; indeed the greatest system change as a result of global exposure may be the spread of consumerist ideology (Cummings & Gottshall, 2014), rather than any real cultural, political, or economic change. Belief in the 'global civic society,' as reflected in perceptions of justice is, ironically, embraced by US and Chinese students, who had the lowest overall global exposure. In sum, international internet exposure may promote more fragmentation than convergence.

The findings of this study further underscore the importance of being aware of cultural differences in the uses of global communication and access, as there appear to be cultural traditions which dictate what types of global exposure people may rely on. As Wilkins, Straubhaar, and Kumar (2014) ask what "global" means in relation to "communication," the study also raises questions regarding how individuals define "global" – i.e., what are the

perceptual boundaries of people's world? What cultures are people particularly curious about? What cultures do people of a given nation prefer in seeking international information? Knowing where people turn their gaze in seeking "global" information and the cultural distance of this gaze would be revealing. Brown (2006), for example, notes that US high school students turned their gaze to Europe, Iraq, Japan, China and Africa when analyzing the impact and potential threat of global consciousness, whereas Mexican high school students turned their gaze to the USA. Future research is needed to explore how the range or distance of one's global exposure and gaze correlates with various measures of intercultural understanding and sensitivity.

References

Alford, C. Fred. (1999). *Think no evil: Korean values in the age of globalization. Ithaca*. NY: Cornell University Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. (1996). *Modernity at large cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Arnove, Robert; Franz, Stephen; Mollis, Marcela & Torres, Carlos A. (2003). Education in Latin America: Dependency, underdevelopment, and inequality. In Robert. F. Arnove & Calos. A. Torres (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (2nd ed.) (pp.313-337). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bamman, David; O'Connor, Brendan & Smith, Noah A. (2012). Censorship and deletion practices in Chinese social media. *First Monday, 17*(3). doi:10.5210/fm.v17i3.3943

Babones, Salvatore J. & Alvarez-Rivadulla, María J. (2007). Standardized income inequality data for use in cross-national research. *Sociological Inquiry, 77*(1), 3-22.

Banks, James A. & Banks, Cheryl A. (2012). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (8th ed.) (pp. 3-30). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Barnett, George A. & Park, Han W. (2005). The structure of international internet hyperlinks and bilateral bandwidth. *Annals of Telecommnication*, 1110-1127.

Barnett, George A. (2009). The role of the internet in cultural identity. In Paul S.N. Lee; Anthony Y.H. Fung; & Louis Leung (Eds.), *Embedding into our lives: New opportunities and challenges of the internet* (pp. 347-368). Sha Tin, N.T., Hong-Kong: The Chinese University Press.

Basfar, Hassan O. (2007). The impact of foreign cultures through the video (VCR/ DVD/ VCD) and television (TV) on Saudi Society as perceived by Saudi undergraduate students in Saudi Arabia. *JKAU: Met, Arts and Humanities, 15*(1), 19-61. Retrieved on Sep. 12 2014 from http://ssn.kau.edu.sa/Files/320/Researches/51155_21372.pdf

Brown, Jennifer G. (2006). *High school students' perceptions of and attitudes toward globalization: An analysis of international baccalaureate students in Estado de Mexico, Mexico, and Texas, U.S.A.*. Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University. Texas A&M University. Retrieved on Oct. 14 2014 from http : / /hdl .handle .net /1969 .1 /4945.

Cardoso, Fernando H. & Font, Mauricio (Eds.), (2001). *Charting a new course: The politics of globalization and social transformation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Clarke, Velta. (2004). Students' global awareness and attitudes to internationalism in a world of cultural convergence. *Journal of Research in International Education, 3*(1), 51-70.

China closes Yeeyan website that translated Guardian stories. (2009, December 3). *The Guardian*. Retrieved on Oct. 16 2014 from http://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/dec/03/ yeeyan-china-guardian-media-mandarin

Cowen, Tyler. (2002). *Creative destruction: How globalization is changing the world's cultures*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cummings, Kevin & Gottschall, Cynthia. (2014). Citizenship and consumption: Media theory in the age of Twitter. In Robert S. Fortner & P. Mark Fackler (Eds.), *The handbook of media and mass communication theory* (pp. 612-628). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dator, Jim & Seo, Yongseok. (2004). Korea as the wave of the future: The emerging dream society of icons and aesthetic experience. *Journal of Future Studies, 9*(1), 31-44.

Dunn, Christopher; Kawano, Yukio & Brewer, Benjamin D. (2000). Trade globalization since 1795, *American Sociological Review, 65*(1), 77-95. Retrieved on Oct. 23 2014 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2657290

Fischer, Peter. (2011). Selective exposure, decision uncertainty, and cognitive economy: A new theoretical perspective on confirmatory information search. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 5*(10), 751–762.

Fox, Zoe. (2013, August 27). The 15 countries with the highest smartphone penetration. *Mashable*. Retrieved on Sep.12 2014 from http://mashable.com/2013/08/27/global-smartphone-penetration/

Freedom House. (2014). *Saudi Arabia*. Retrieved on Sep. 12 2014 from https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2014/saudi-arabia#.VVti5KbRcy4

Friedman, Thomas L. (2000). *The lexus and the olive tree*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Gudykunst, William. B. (1985). The influence of cultural similarity, type of relationship, and self-monitoring on uncertainty reduction processes. *Communication Monographs, 52*, 203–217.

Gudykunst, William. B. (2005). *Theorizing about intercultural communication*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Hafez, Kai. (2014). How global is the internet? Reflections on economic, cultural and political dimensions of the networked 'global village.' In Robert S. Fortner & P. Mark Fackler (Eds.), *The handbook of media and mass communication theory* (pp. 645-663). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Halavais, Alexander. (2000). National borders on the World Wide Web. *New Media and Society, 2*(1), 7-28.

Hubbard, Ben. (2015, May. 22). Young Saudis, bound by conservative strictures, find freedom on their phones. *The New York Times*. Retrieved on May 24 2015 from http://www. nytimes.com/

Imoto, Yuki. (2013). Japan: Internationalisation and education and the problem of introspective youth. In Pei-tseng Jenny Hsieh (Ed.), *Education in East Asia* (pp.127-152). London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Internet Live Stats. *Internet users by country, 2014*. Retrieved on Sep. 12 2014 from http:// www. internetlivestats.com/internet-users-by-country/

Internet World Stats. (2014a). *Internet top 10 Spanish speaking countries by penetration rate – December 2013*. Miniwatts Marketing Group. Retrieved on Oct. 23 2014 from http://www. internetworldstats.com/stats13.htm

Internet World Stats. (2014b). *Top 3 internet languages 2013 year-end*. Miniwatts Marketing Group. Retrieved on Sep.12 2014 from http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats7.htm

Jang, Gunjoo & Paik, Wong K. (2012). Korean Wave as tool for Korea's new cultural diplomacy. *Advances in Applied Sociology, 2*, 196-202. doi: 10.4236/aasoci.2012.23026

Kiely, Ray. (2005). *The clash of globalisations: Neo-liberalism, the third way, and anti-globalisation*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Knickmeyer, Ellen. (2012, January 31). Saudis push young people, including women, into jobs. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved on Sep. 12 2014 from http://www.wsj.com/articles/ SB 10001424052970204368104577139762604811028

Langer, Ellen J. (1989). *Mindfulness*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Lechner, Frank. (2005). Globalization. In George Ritzer (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of social theory* (pp. 330-333). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lechner, Frank & Boli, John. (2005). *World culture: Origins and consequences*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lee, Ken. (2013). 20 cultural mistakes to avoid in Korea. *Seoulistic*. Retrieved on May 29, 2015 from http://seoulistic.com/korean-culture/20-cultural-mistakes-to-avoid-in-korea

Legrain, Philippe. (2003). *Open world: The truth about globalization*. London, UK: Abacus.

Le Renard, Amélie. (2014). *A society of young women: Opportunities of place, power, and reform in Saudi Arabia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Liebelson, Donna. (2014, March 28). MAP: Here are the countries that block Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube. *Mother Jones*. Retrieved on Sep. 12 2014 from http://www.motherjones. com/politics/2014/03/turkey-facebook-youtube-twitter-blocked

Lin, Carolyn A. (2014). Global communication divides and equal rights to communicate. In Robert S. Fortner & P. Mark Fackler (Eds.), *The handbook of media and mass communication theory* (pp. 591-611). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Linn, Ricky. (2014, June 20). How powerful is your passport? *Good*. Retrieved on Sep. 4 2014 from http://magazine.good.is/infographics/how-powerful-is-your-passport

Margolis, Michael & Resnick, David. (2000). *Politics as usual: The cyberspace "revolution."* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McPhail, Thomas L. (1987). *Electronic colonialism: The future of international broadcasting and communication* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McPhail, Thomas L. (2014). *Global communication: Theories, stakeholders, and trends* (4th ed.). Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Nye, Joseph S. (2011). *The future of power*. New York: Public Affairs.

OECD iLibrary. (2011). *Education at a glance 2011*. OECD. Retrieved on Sep. 12 2014 from http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/eag_highlights-2011-en/01/10/1-18.html?itemId=/ content/chapter/eag_highlights-2011-12-en&_csp_=090ce41c6fa2f029e3b92fab05b1 8a7d

OpenNet Initiative (2009). *Saudi Arabia*. Retrieved on Oct. 16 2014 from https://opennet. net/research/profiles/saudi-arabia

Robertson, Roland. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In Mike Featherstone, Scot M. Lash & Roland Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25-44). London, UK: Sage. doi: 10.4135/9781446250563.n2

Rosen, Devan; Barnett, George A. & Kim, Jang H. (2011). Social networks and online environments: When science and practice co-evolve. *Social network and mining, 1*, 27-42.

Salas, Carlos. (2002). Mexico's haves and have-nots: NAFTA sharpens the divide. *NACLA report on the Americas, 35*(4), 32-35.

Salwen, Michael B. (1991). Cultural imperialism: A media effects approach. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 8* (1), 29-38.

Tan, Shzr Ee. (2011). 'Harmless' and 'hump-less' political podcasts: Censorship and internet resistance in Singapore. *Music, Sound, and the Moving Image, 5*(1), 39-70.

Tausch, Arno & Heshmati, Almas. (2009, September). Re-Orient? MNC penetration and contemporary shifts in the global political economy. *IZA Discussion Paper*, 4393. Retrieved on Sep. 12 2014 from http://ftp.iza.org/dp4393.pdf

Teitelbaum, Joshua. (2011, February). Saudi Arabia contends with the social media challenge. *Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs. 10*(28). Retrieved on Sep. 12 2014 from http:// jcpa.org/article/saudi-arabia-contends-with-the-social-media-challenge/

The Pew research global attitude study. (2007). Pew Research Center. Retrieved on Oct. 23 2014 from http://www.pewglobal.org/2007/03/14/americas-image-in-the-world-findings-from-the-pew-global-attitudes-project/

The Press Freedom Index. (2014). Retrieved on Sep. 12 2014 from http://rsf.org/index2014/en-index2014.php

Tibi, Bassam. (2014). Global communication and cultural particularism. In Robert S. Fortner & P. Mark Fackler (Eds.), *The handbook of global communication and media ethics* (pp. 54-78). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Tu, Weiming. (1997). Chinese philosophy: A synoptic view. In Eliot Deutsch & Ron Bontekoe (Eds.), *A companion to world philosophies* (pp. 3-23). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

van Elteren, Mel. (2014). Reconceptualizing "cultural imperialism" in the current era of globalization. In Robert S. Fortner & P. Mark Fackler (Eds.), *The handbook of media and mass communication theory* (pp. 400-419). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Weber, Maria (Ed.). (2004). *Welfare, environment and changing US-Chinese relations: 21st century challenges in China.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Wilkins, Karin G; Straubhaar, Joseph D. & Kumar, Shanti. (2014). *Global communication: New agendas in communication*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Yin, Jiafei. (2011). Ancient roots and contemporary challenges. In Robert S. Fortner & P. Mark Fackler (Eds.), *The handbook of global communication and media ethics* (pp. 553-575). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Zakaria, Fareed. (2008). *The post-American world*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Author Note

Appendix 1

Global Exposure Scale Survey Items: Items Retained For 23-Item Scale Indicated by *

How often do you access the following INTERNATIONAL media content?
[Never, Seldom, Occasionally, Often, Almost Never]
*International entertainment via internet (films, television, video, music, etc.)
*International Internet news sources
*International internet information (Wikipedia, internet movie databases, mapquest, etc.)
*International internet research databases
*International personal communication (email, Skype, instant messenger, etc.)
*International people on social networking sites (Facebook, MySpace, LinkIn, Twitter, etc.)
International blogs
*International podcasts

How often do you… [Never, Seldom, Occasionally, Often, Almost Never]
*Purchase ethnic/cultural items (clothing, souvenirs, jewelry, music, books, art/décor/ posters?
*Read world news (about another nation or culture) in a newspaper or magazine?
*Watch world news (about another nation or culture) on television?
Listen to world news (about another nation or culture) on the radio?
*Watch films or television programs *about* other nations and cultures?
*Watch films or television programs *from* other nations and cultures?
*Listen to music from other nations and cultures?
*Read books about other nations and cultures?
*Attend international/intercultural arts events?
Attend international/intercultural sporting events?
*Talk, study, or work with people from nations/cultures other than your own?
*Invite people from nations/cultures other than your own to your own home?

How many times in your life have you…[0, 1-2, 3-4, 5-6, 7 or more times)
*Traveled outside of your country for any reason?
*Traveled outside of your country for work?
*Traveled outside of your country for vacation?
*Traveled outside of your country for education or service opportunities?
Lived outside of your home country? [please specify length of time]

If you have traveled outside your country, how likely are you to…
[5-point scale from Very Likely to Very Unlikely]
*Stay in accommodations that are cultural different in comparison to accommodations in your home country?
*Seek out areas that are not typical tourist sites when you are traveling outside your country?

How many languages do you speak fluently?
1 language (my primary language only)
2 languages (bi-lingual)
3 or more languages

Have you studied a language other than your primary language?
No
Yes, one language
Yes, two or more languages

What is the longest length of time you have studied a secondary language?
Less than 2 years
3 or 4 years
5 or more years

Appendix 2

Global Perceptions Scale Survey Items: Items Retained For 26-Item Scale Indicated by *

For the following set of questions, please note that Global Communication (GC) is the diffusion of products, ideas, practices and relationships across national and cultural boundaries via the use of internet, satellites, and cable. Global Communication has led to an unprecedented cultural exchange of ideas and information.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the effects of global communication? [Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, Strongly Agree]

*GC promotes peace
*GC helps solve global problems (environmental, hunger, poverty, educational, health)
GC leads to lower national security for the next generation.
GC will increase immigration TO my country.
GC is a threat to my way of life.
*GC increases the accurate representation of countries and cultures around the world.
GC exploits economically developing countries.
GC hold national governments accountable to higher standards.
GC promotes too much tolerance in the world.
GC challenges the power of the political leaders in my country.
GC will increase emigration FROM my country.
*GC threatens my identity.
*GC impacts the world's politics.
GC increases life satisfaction.
*GC undermines national patriotism.
*GC contributes to Western dominance in the world.
*GC promotes freedom of expression throughout the world.
*GC is a threat to the well-being of my country.
*GC helps reduce global inequality.
GC promotes corporate monopolies.
*The positive aspects of GC outweigh the negative aspects.
*GC leads to a lower quality of life for the next generation.
*GC positively impacts the cultures of the world.
GC promotes large business at the expense of local business.
*GC decreases religious and ethnic violence.
*GC undermines national sovereignty.
*GC undermines the ideas and customs of my culture.
*GC promotes scientific and technological development in my country.
*GC promotes moral decline.
*GC increases the diversity of entertainment and news media in my culture.
*GC is dangerously promoting a single world government.

*GC will make our world a better place.
*GC promotes democracy.
*GC leads to a lower stand of living for the next generation.
*GC promotes free market business practices and values.
*GC leads to a loss of local culture.

Appendix 3

One-Way ANOVA of Global Exposure by Demographics (N = 1360)

Type Global Exposure	Demographics		
	Sex	Political Perspective	Religion
Intercultural Curiosity	$F (1, 1240) =10.82^{***}$ Male (M=20.63, SD=5.49) Female (M=19.72, SD=4.13)	F=(5, 1234) =7.53*** Liberal (M=21.00, SD=4.55) Conservative (M=19.64, SD=5.35)	$F (8, 1231)$=2.061* Scheffe' Post Hoc: NS
International Internet	$F (1, 1240) = 4.32^{*}$ Male (M=17.64, SD=5.86) Female (M=18.34, SD=6.10)	$F (5, 1227) =4.17^{***}$ Liberal (M=16.63, SD= 6.08) Conservative (M=18.56, SD=5.75)	$F (8, 1221) =4.49^{***}$ Muslim (M=20.20, SD=4.84) Christian (M=17.49, SD=6.03)
Engagement	$F (1, 1246) = 84.12^{***}$ Male (M=4.15, SD=1.65) Female (M=5.60, SD=3.61)	$F (5, 1240) =7.42^{***}$ Liberal (M=4.85, SD=2.18) Conservative (M=3.94, SD=2.03)	$F (8, 1235) =250.24^{***}$ Muslim (M=11.96, SD=3.00) Christian (M=4.22, SD=1.58)
International Travel	NS	NS	$F (8, 1254) =7.02^{***}$ Scheffe' Post Hoc: NS
Immersion Travel	NS	$F (5, 1152) =3.64^{**}$ Liberal (M=4.58, SD=4.56) Conservative (M=5.47, SD=2.95)	$F (8, 1146) =2.428^{*}$ Scheffe' Post Hoc: NS

Note. ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05, NS = not significant

Appendix 4

ANOVA of Perceptions of Global Communication by Demographics (N = 1360)

Perception	Demographics		
	Sex	Political Perspective	Religion
Threat	NS	$F (5, 994) =5.559^{**}$ Liberal (M=30.50, SD=7.75) Conservative (M=35.60, SD=6.98)	$F (8, 988) =25.50^{**}$ Muslim (M=41.52, SD=5.60) Christian (M=33.33, SD=7.60) Buddhist (M=29.17, SD=5.78)
Justice	NS	$F (5, 1220) =4.38^{**}$ Liberal (M=27.71, SD=4.30) Conservative (M=27.11, SD=4.53)	$F (8, 1214) =2.470^{*}$ Scheffe' Post Hoc: NS
Prosperity	$F (1, 1232) =6.00^{*}$ Male (M=22.29, SD=3.37) Female (M=21.80, SD=3.60)	$F (5, 1229) =4.56^{**}$ Liberal (M=22.54, SD=3.43) Conservative (M=22.04, SD=3.33)	$F (8, 1221) =16.44^{**}$ Muslim (M=18.04, SD=3.30) Other Religions (M=22.06, SD=3.49)

Note. **p<.001, *p<.01