Marxists argue that consumers worldwide now have more choice available to them than ever before. They do not believe that this is negative, instead provides people with more choice and less restrictions. Pluralists believe that the fact there is even more choice with all the different countries products, this makes it difficult for one single country to dominate the entire world. This leads to more democracy and cultural diversity through hybridisation and further opens up doors in other countries through ideas which are spread world wide, leading to increased efficiency and innovation. In addition, new media means that some countries actively resist Western consumer values. This could be shown as in China, the use of Facebook is not allowed as they must use their own social media systems to interact with each other. Postmodernists argue that globalised cultures have allowed ‘pick n’ mix’ identities to blossom. They see this diversification as more choice in consumption for the population to live their lives as they would choose and see it in a positive light. The media brings global awareness of other countries and greater opportunities for their identities to grow, instead of being constrained by their local countries. These points therefore, argue that cultural and media imperialism are not threats to indigenous countries due to the domination of the West, and instead see it as more choice and opportunities available for the smaller countries, allowing them to develop further with this accessibility.

In conclusion, the ideas of cultural homogenisation, cocacolisation, consumerism and multinational corporations, all argue that cultural and media imperialism are indeed threats to smaller, indigenous countries. On the other hand, the beliefs of the Pluralists, Marxists and Post-Modernists of glocalisation, hybrid cultures and pick n’ mix identities do not cause a threat but instead increased choice can be beneficial to the smaller country and its population.