the United States. In D. V. Tanno & A. Gonzales (Eds.), *Communication and identity across cultures* (Vol. 21, pp. 34–55). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kraidy, M. (2002). Hybridity in cultural globalization. *Communication Theory, 12*(3), 316–339.

Patterson, O. (1995). The culture of caution. *New Republic, 213*, 22–26.

Regis, H. (1989). A theoretical framework for the investigation of the role and significance of communication in the development of the sense of community among English-speaking Caribbean immigrants. *Howard Journal of Communications, 2*, 57–80.

Robotham, D. (1998). Transnationalism in the Caribbean: Formal and informal. *American Ethnologist, 25*, 307–321.

Shome, R. (2003). Space matters: The power and practice of space. *Communication Theory, 13*, 39–56.

GLOBAL VILLAGE

The *global village* develops when technologies collapse physical and perceptual time and space, a collapse in which cultural and spatial differences collide and epistemologies of human otherness change. Travel technologies such as roads, boats, cars, trains, and planes and information technologies such as books, radio, television, and the Internet allow people to move faster and easier, physically and perceptually, to places once considered far away. When this collapse happens, when human relations to geography blur, one culture—the village—begins to emerge.

Marshall McLuhan developed and popularized the concept of the global village during the 1960s and 1970s. Influenced by James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* and Wyndham Lewis's *America and Cosmic Man,* McLuhan devoted much of his career to understanding how technologies influenced human interaction, perception, and cultural change. The emergence of the global village was one measure of technological influence. Ironically, McLuhan died on December 31, 1980, well before the advent and rampant use of the Internet, the technology that makes an ever more connected virtual village possible.

There are benefits to the development of a global village. Being in constant physical and perceptual connection with different others can allow for a blurring of cultural differences. The global village thus accommodates an assimilationist, "melting pot" philosophy of difference, a philosophy that welcomes the emergence of one (or a few) cultural ideal(s) and, as such, encourages people to adhere to a dominant set of views and values; individual and cultural differences are erased or made tangential. Any attempt at making English the dominant language—a move that, consequently, makes other languages secondary—is an example of assimilationist philosophy. And there are benefits to assimilation: People transcend barriers of cultural difference and relate with ease; fewer get "lost in translation."

The development of a global village also makes physical travel no longer a necessity to experience "other" spaces. Such exposure and access can cultivate respect for human difference and allow people to learn innovative ways to accomplish everyday tasks (e.g., cooking, farming, shopping). Such exposure and access can also benefit individuals who lack the physical and economical resources for travel. For instance, it is difficult for people using wheelchairs, visually impaired persons, or economically disadvantaged individuals to physically travel. However, with the assistance of technologies like television, film, and the Internet, individuals can experience, albeit virtually, distant areas with little effort; the technologies provide alternate and inexpensive routes for perceptual interaction with a place.

However, there are consequences to the global village. When the physical and perceptual boundaries of cultural groups blur, culture-specific views and values begin to disappear; local heritage, relational bonds, and unique customs can get lost or forgotten. A liberationist, "tossed salad" philosophy—a philosophy that embraces multiple, often contradictory views and values and a philosophy that allows individual and cultural differences to flourish—thus becomes difficult to maintain. The emergence of one global village encourages people to meet and mold together, transcend differences, and develop a dominant set of views and values; there is little room for multiple villages.

A liberationist philosophy warrants other concerns as well. Powerful people and nations may decide to change or obliterate a culture's views and values for ones considered better and more advanced (e.g., implementing democracy as the most ideal ruling philosophy, Christianity as the most important religion, or capitalism as the best

economic system). Powerful people and nations may also consider particular culture-specific practices unworthy, animalistic, and in need of eradication (e.g., male and female circumcision, hunting whales for food and killing seals for fur, female foot-binding, and arranged marriages). In the global village, powerful people and nations may force "inferior" others to conform to "superior" views and values and, in so doing, may motivate new kinds of conflict.

Increased virtual connection—a condition of the global village—also turns face-to-face interaction into a commodity. As a medium of communication, it is often assumed that this kind of interaction has inherent value. Thus, when face-to-face interaction becomes less frequent, a market for this kind of interaction emerges, motivating companies like Starbucks to cultivate and fulfill embodied, relational and communal needs.

The global village will continue to develop and solidify as technologies like satellites, GPS locators, cell phones, and the Internet improve; as disciplines traditionally constituted by material space (e.g., sociology, anthropology, and geography) are redefined in terms of globalization, postcolonial, transnational, diasporic, and indigenous studies; and as corporations embrace slogans like "Your World. Delivered" (AT&T), "One World. One Vision" (ACN), "The World's Online Marketplace" (eBay), and "Cover the Earth" (Sherwin Williams). As such, the benefits—cultivating assimilation, democratizing physical and virtual travel, learning about human difference—and the consequences—inhibiting human difference, a dominance of a few voices, a disintegration of face-to-face interaction—will heighten. It will thus remain important to recognize the ways increasingly sophisticated technologies influence social interaction, cross-village relations, and human difference.

Tony E. Adams

See also Clan Identity; Diaspora; Globalization; Modernity and Postmodernity; Technology; Transnationalism; Transworld Identity

Further Readings

Couldry, N., & McCarthy, A. (Eds.). (2004). *MediaSpace: Place, scale and culture in a media age.* New York: Routledge.

Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Smith, L. T. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goldberg, K. (Ed.). (2000). *The robot in the garden: Telerobotics and telepistemology in the age of the Internet.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

McLuhan, M. (1962). *The Gutenberg galaxy: The making of typographic man.* London: Routledge.

McLuhan, M., & Fiore, Q. (1968). *War and peace in the global village.* New York: Bantam.

Putnam, R. D. (2001). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Schivelbusch, W. (1986). *The railway journey: The industrialization of time and space in the 19th century.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

GROUP IDENTITY

Group identity exists when a relatively small number of people view themselves collectively as comprising an entity that is distinct from other entities. Whereas group identity is a group-level construct that references the extent to which members collectively view themselves as a distinct group (and are viewed as such by nonmembers), *group identification* is an individual-level construct that signifies the degree to which individual members attach significance to their association with a group (and its identity). Group identification has three components: (1) cognitive (a person categorizing himself or herself as a member of a group), (2) affective (a person's attraction to a group and its members), and (3) behavioral (a person's perception of the joint effort required among members to reach a common group goal). Although group identity and group identification are inherently related (as an individual cannot identify with a group that does not exist) and the concepts often go together when assessed along a relevant continuum (e.g., strong group identity among work team members coupled with members' strong identification with the team), these constructs also can be relatively independent (e.g., strong group identity among team members but weak identification with the team by an individual member). This entry explains the relationship between individual and group