Thai Arts and Culture Review

Original Research Article

Received: 4 April 2026 **Revised:** 9 April 2026 **Accepted:** 12 April 2026

STRATEGIC CULTURAL ADAPTATION IN ASIA: NAVIGATING IDENTITY DURING THE SLOWBALIZATION ERA

Nasipat CHANCHAIPITIPHAT[1], Rueangsak NAMDET[1], Kittisak WONGMAHESAK[2] and Thanaporn SRIYAKUL[3]

1 Faculty of Political Science, North Bangkok University, Thailand; 681500089@northbkk.ac.th (N. C.); 681500097@northbkk.ac.th (R. N.)

2 Faculty of Political Science, North Bangkok University, Thailand; Publication Research Institute and Community Service, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Indonesia; kittisak.wongmahesak@gmail.com

3 Business School, Mahanakorn University of Technology, Thailand; ajbamut@gmail.com

Handling Editor:
Professor Dr.Ismail Suardi WEKKE UM BARRU, Indonesia
(This article belongs to Theme 2: Heritage and Wisdom in the Digital Age)

Reviewers:
1) Associate Professor Dr.Kovit WONGSURAWAT Royal Society, Thailand
2) Dr.Pannika NGAMCHAROEN Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand

Abstract

This comprehensive study examines the intricate dynamics between local, national, and global cultures across Asia from 2001 to 2025, a critical transitional epoch shifting from intense hyperglobalization into the era of "Slowbalization". Adopting a rigorous qualitative comparative multi-case design, the research analyzes structural divergences in cultural adaptation across South Korea, Japan, China, Indonesia, and Laos. Challenging the traditional paradigm of unilateral cultural imperialism, the empirical findings fundamentally recontextualize Asian nations not as passive victims, but as highly strategic "negotiating actors" capable of generating significant cultural counter-flows. The analysis reveals that sustainable success in the global arena relies heavily on three structural pillars: state-driven industrial and diplomatic integration, the dynamic hybridization of indigenous traditions with digital ecosystems, and robust grassroots community empowerment to mitigate unregulated commercial commodification actively. To navigate critical emerging threats in the next quarter-century—specifically, artificial intelligence-driven cultural mimicry, polarizing identity politics, and systemic digital inequality—this paper formally proposes the Five-Dimensional Cultural Adaptation Framework (FDCAF). This synergistic roadmap equips policymakers to transform invaluable cultural heritage into lasting geopolitical and highly resilient economic advantages for the future.

Keywords: Slowbalization, Cultural Adaptation, Cultural Commodification, Asian Dynamics, Creative Industries

Citation Information: Chanchaipitiphat, N., Namdet, R., Wongmahesak, K., & Sriyakul, T. (2025). Strategic Cultural Adaptation in Asia: Navigating Identity During the Slowbalization Era. *Thai Arts and Culture Review, 1*(2), Article 4. https://doi.org/10.14456/tacr.2025.9

Introduction

Over the past two and a half decades, the currents of globalization have profoundly impacted cultural structures across all regions of the world, particularly in Asia, a region characterized by intense cultural diversity and a civilization heritage spanning millennia. Consequently, scholars, policymakers, and local communities grapple with a pressing dilemma: the capacity of local and national cultures to preserve their distinct identities and vitality against the pervasive influence of global markets, particularly from the West. Rather than posing this merely as a question of survival, contemporary inquiry must critically examine the specific mechanisms of successful cultural resistance alongside the root causes underlying cultural erosion (Taptiani et al., 2024; Sanmee, 2024; Wheatley, 2024).

Furthermore, since the 2008 global financial crisis, the world has entered an era that The Economist weekly, in its January 26, 2019 issue, featured on its cover and termed "Slowbalization"—a deceleration and transformation of globalization. The flows of trade, investment, and human mobility have not ceased but have undergone a major restructuring, marked by the decline of multilateralism, the rise of nationalism, and the elevated role of the state as a regulator of global value chains. This condition has inevitably impacted cultural dimensions, inseparable from economic and political spheres. This complexity was further exacerbated by the COVID-19 crisis (2020-2022), which led to an abrupt and severe process of deglobalization (Helleiner, 2021; Schmalz, 2022; Smith, 2023).



Figure 1 Cover of The Economist weekly, January 26, 2019
Source: The Economist (2019)

Amidst these dynamics, Asian countries have responded in significantly diverse ways. Some East Asian nations, such as South Korea, Japan, and China (Liu, 2022; Wang, 2022; Xie, 2024), have successfully transformed their national cultures into strategic capital on the global stage. Conversely, certain Southeast Asian countries, such as Indonesia in some dimensions (Mudana et al., 2025) and Laos (Leong et al., 2016), face intense pressure from cultural hegemony or identity loss through mechanisms including commercial tourism and unprotected exposure to digital media. This structural divergence between cultural "winners" and "losers" in the global arena constitutes the core of this research.

Accordingly, this research paper aims to address three key research questions: (1) What are the status, adaptation strategies, and interactions between local/national cultures and the forces of globalization-Slowbalization in Asia during 2001-2025? (2) What factors determine the cultural success or failure of Asian countries within this context? Moreover, (3) What adaptive

frameworks are suitable for policymakers and communities to address these trends in the second quarter of the 21st century (2026-2050)?

Therefore, this research paper has three main objectives: (1) To review and synthesize the overview of the status, adaptation, and interactions between local and national cultures of Asian countries and the currents of globalization-Slowbalization in the first quarter of the 21st century (2001-2025). (2) To synthesize and comparatively analyze case studies of countries that have both succeeded and failed in confronting globalization-Slowbalization, based on economic, social, and cultural criteria. Moreover, (3) To analyze lessons learned from these case studies and propose an adaptive framework for policymakers and communities in the second quarter of the 21st century (2026-2050).

To systematically address the research objectives, this study adopts a rigorous qualitative research design centered on comprehensive documentary analysis and secondary data synthesis. The dataset encompasses a curated selection of academic monographs, peer-reviewed journal articles, and institutional research published between 2001 and 2025. To ensure analytical validity, sources were systematically retrieved from top-tier international databases (Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, PubMed) as well as regionally significant repositories (TCI-indexed) and supplementary global indices, such as Google Scholar.

The synthesized empirical data are subjected to critical descriptive analysis, strategically grounded in an interdisciplinary theoretical framework that intersects cultural anthropology, international political economy, and comparative public policy. To operationalize this theoretical lens, the study constructs a comparative multi-case design. By juxtaposing the cultural trajectories of South Korea, Japan, China, Indonesia, and Laos, the analysis effectively illuminates the structural divergences—and varying degrees of adaptive success—across national policy frameworks, grassroots community strategies, and the maturation of cultural industries.

Between Global Currents and Local Roots: Cultural Dynamics in Asia's Globalized Arena (2001-2025)

Theoretical Framework: From Hegemony to Negotiation and Hybridization

Understanding the relationship between local cultures and the currents of globalization requires a theoretical framework that comprehensively captures these complex dynamics. Initially, in the 1980s and 1990s, the dominant discourse often viewed this process through the lens of "cultural imperialism," implying the expansion of Western culture, particularly American culture, to the point of overwhelming and eroding local cultures. However, this perspective has been critically challenged by subsequent theorists (Zrazhevska, 2015).

Arjun Appadurai proposed the "scapes" framework, comprising ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, financescapes, and ideoscapes, to explain that the currents of globalization do not flow uniformly or linearly. Instead, they exhibit constant "disjuncture" and fragmentation between various flows, allowing local cultures space to negotiate and construct their own unique meanings (Wu et al., 2024; Agarwal et al., 2025). Concurrently, Roland Robertson (2012) coined the concept of "glocalization" to illustrate that globalization is a process where global and local forces are not contradictory but rather merge into new forms (Yaqoub et al., 2023). Similarly, García Canclini developed the notion of "hybrid cultures" to describe how contemporary cultures are products of the amalgamation of the old and the new, the local and the global (Kipng'etich, 2024; Quiña, 2025).

In the Asian context, these theoretical frameworks hold significant implications, affirming that cultures in this region are not mere "victims" of globalization. Instead, they are active "negotiating actors" capable of selectively adopting, adapting, and re-producing global trends in their own distinct ways (Xudayberganovich et al., 2025). Crucially, the success or failure of this process hinges on structural variables, including state policies, the development level of cultural industries, social capital, and access to digital technologies (Magu, 2015).

The Era of Hyperglobalization (2001-2008): Cultural Impacts and Repercussions in Asia

The period of 2001-2008 is considered the golden age of hyperglobalization, driven by three significant factors. First, China's accession to the WTO in 2001 opened the floodgates for a massive expansion of global trade. Second, the first wave of the digital revolution led to the widespread adoption of the internet and mobile phones across Asian populations. Third, the growth of international tourism brought both revenue and pressure on local cultures (Witt et al., 2021).

In the cultural dimension, the most significant impact of this era was the phenomenon of "Englishization," where English became the lingua franca of higher education, business, and digital media across Asia. Educational systems in many countries adjusted their curricula to meet global market demands, systematically marginalizing local and minority languages (Khramchenko, 2025; Sumartana et al., 2025). Concurrently, the proliferation of transnational mass media, spearheaded by Western television networks and film companies, exerted considerable pressure on indigenous popular cultures in countries lacking robust cultural industries (Osman et al., 2013).

Nevertheless, this era also marked the emergence of significant counter-flows, cultural movements that ran counter to the dominant trends. Beyond the West-to-Asia flow, there was also a notable rise in intra-Asian cultural exchange, exemplified by the Korean Wave (Hallyu), which began spreading across Asia in the late 1990s and gained global traction in the 2000s. This phenomenon demonstrated that Asian countries possessed the capacity to produce and export culture internationally with significant power, rather than merely being passive recipients of global trends (Jang & Paik, 2013; Komilovich, 2025).

Policy Responses: International and National Mechanisms

Confronted with the pressures of globalization, the international community responded with several key legal and policy frameworks. UNESCO promulgated the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity in 2001, affirming cultural diversity as a common heritage of humanity. This was followed by the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003, a crucial international legal instrument for the protection of intangible cultural heritage. Regionally, ASEAN issued the Declaration on ASEAN Unity in Cultural Diversity in 2011 and adopted the ASEAN Strategic Plan for Culture and Arts 2016-2025 in 2016 to promote a shared regional identity. However, challenges related to uneven institutional capacity among member states persist (Rohman & Bandau, 2025).

At the national level, Asian governments adopted diverse strategies tailored to their respective contexts. Typically, Asian countries opted for state-centric approaches, such as media control, the enforcement of local content quotas in broadcasting, and the integration of local culture into educational curricula (Xudayberganovich et al., 2025). However, the success of these approaches varied significantly between resource-rich and high-capacity nations like South Korea and Japan (Jang & Paik, 2013) and developing countries in Southeast Asia (Mudana et al., 2025).

The Era of Slowbalization (2008-2025): Reshaping Globalization and its Cultural Implications

The 2008 global financial crisis marked a pivotal turning point, signaling the end of intense globalization and the dawn of the Slowbalization era. Global trade expanded more slowly, cross-border investment contracted, and economic nationalism began spreading across numerous countries (Manzi, 2019). Subsequently, the COVID-19 crisis (2020-2022) further intensified this trend, accelerating a return to self-sufficiency in both supply chains and culture (Botelho et al., 2021; Helleiner, 2021; Schmalz, 2022).

In the cultural dimension, the Slowbalization era presented interesting contradictions. On one hand, the slowdown of globalization created opportunities for states and communities to revitalize and reinforce their cultural identities. The strengthening current of cultural nationalism in many Asian countries aligned with this period (Smith, 2023). On the other hand, the accelerating second digital revolution during Slowbalization, encompassing social media, streaming platforms, and AI, paradoxically generated new, more complex, and pervasive forms

of cultural domination. This was due to the direct access of tech giants like Netflix, YouTube, and TikTok to Asian youth, often bypassing state control (Coker, 2023).

Local, National, and Global Cultural Interactions: A Three-Dimensional Dynamic

A review of the literature indicates that the relationship among the three levels of culture—local, national, and global—is not linear or rigidly hierarchical. Instead, it constitutes a complex, fluid, three-dimensional dynamic, meaning that local cultures are neither completely subsumed by global currents nor exist in a perfectly pristine state without adaptation. Each level possesses an arena for negotiation and the creation of distinctive hybrid cultural forms (Magu, 2015; Kipng'etich, 2024).

In Asia, the key variables shaping these interactions include the robustness of national cultural policies, the level of development of creative industries, the capacity to absorb and reproduce global trends, and the extent of community participation in decision-making processes (Xudayberganovich et al., 2025). A salient example is Bali, Indonesia, where local culture has been commodified for the global tourism market, generating both revenue and risks of authenticity loss (Mahendra, 2024; Maharani et al., 2025; Mudana et al., 2025).

Table 1 Status of Local and National Cultures in Asia under Globalizing Currents (2001-2025)

Country	Cultural Policy Strategy	Nature of Interaction with Globalization	Status of Cultural Identity
South Korea (Winner)	State-led; proactive investment in cultural industries	Cultural export; counter-flow	Strong; expanding cultural sphere (Komilovich, 2025)
Japan	Cool Japan; blend of state and private sector	Long-term soft power export	Strong; national culture with global influence (Yang, 2025)
China (Partial Winner)	BRI; Confucius Institutes; state control of media	Export and protection simultaneously	Complex; expanding global influence but facing resistance in some contexts (Tao, 2018; Becard & Filho, 2019)
Indonesia (Partial Loser)	Tourism policy; community-based culture	Culture commodified; some communities resist	Vulnerable; Bali and other areas risk identity loss (Mahendra, 2024)
Laos (Loser)	Low institutional capacity; reliance on UNESCO	Pressured by commercial tourism	Vulnerable; World Heritage sites threatened by tourism development (Leong et al., 2016; 2017)

Winners and Losers in the Global Cultural Arena: Comparative Case Studies from Asia

Analytical Criteria: Defining Cultural 'Winners' and 'Losers'

An assessment of which nation qualifies as a "winner" or "loser" in the global cultural landscape necessitates multi-dimensional criteria, as cultural outcomes are inherently too complex to be captured by a singular metric. This paper proposes four criteria: (1) Economic Criteria: The level of revenue generated from cultural exports, creative industries, and cultural tourism. (2) Social Criteria: The degree of preservation of indigenous languages, traditions, and community lifeways. (3) Identity Criteria: The capacity to maintain cultural distinctiveness and unique identity amidst global integration. Moreover, (4) Symbolic Power Criteria: International recognition and the ability to leverage culture as a tool for soft power.

A "winner" is thus defined as a nation capable of integrating into global currents in a manner that simultaneously fosters economic growth, preserves its cultural identity, and cultivates soft power on the world stage. Conversely, a "loser" refers to a country or community whose culture

is subjected to commodification, leading to a loss of authenticity, or is overwhelmed by other cultures, resulting in identity erosion, without accruing substantial economic or social benefits.

Case Study of a Winner: South Korea - A State-Engineered Cultural Realm

South Korea stands as the most prominent example of a nation that successfully transmuted a cultural crisis into strategic capital. In the late 1990s, following the IMF financial crisis, the South Korean government embarked on aggressive investments in cultural industries and digital content. This was orchestrated through various agencies, such as the Korea Creative Content Agency (KOCCA), and systematic support from chaebol for the production, distribution, and promotion of cultural content (Dannita & Deniar, 2021). This concerted strategy blossomed into the Korean Wave (Hallyu), encompassing K-pop, K-drama, K-movie, K-food, and K-beauty, which diffused across Asia before extending its reach to Europe and America (Jang & Paik, 2013; Komilovich, 2025; Yuniningsih et al., 2025).

The measurable outcomes are both culturally significant and economically impressive. The number of Korean language learners abroad surged from 150,000 in 2012 to 370,000 in 2019 (Ding & Wu, 2023). Furthermore, the export of Korean goods and services in countries where K-drama was prevalent showed a statistically significant positive correlation (Chang, 2019). Beyond economics, Hallyu transformed South Korea's international image from a "divided nation" in the eyes of the world into a globally influential "small cultural powerhouse" (Kim, 2024). Crucially, this strategy did not dilute traditional Korean cultural identity; instead, it leveraged Korean distinctiveness as a global selling point and brand. This positions South Korea as a pivotal example of how counter-flows can effectively dismantle Western cultural hegemony (Chhakchhuak, 2024; Yuniningsih et al., 2025).

Case Study of a Winner: Japan - Cool Japan and the Export of a Soft Image

Japan developed its distinct model through the "Cool Japan Strategy," officially initiated by the government in the early 2000s. This strategy meticulously integrated popular culture (anime, manga, games, fashion) with traditional cultural heritage (Japanese cuisine, architecture, traditional arts) as a unified national brand. The overarching objective was to redefine Japan's global image after the economic stagnation of the 1990s had eroded confidence in the "Japan Brand" (Yang, 2025).

Empirical results unequivocally demonstrate its success. The Japanese anime industry's revenue reached 3.346 trillion yen in 2023, marking the first time that overseas market revenue surpassed domestic sales (Zhang, 2025). Moreover, a survey in Europe revealed that 93% of respondents acknowledged Japan's cultural diversity and depth. Cool Japan contributed to increased tourism, stimulated the export of related products, and elevated Japanese cultural heritage to a new status on digital platforms (Yang, 2025). However, scholars note that Cool Japan has inherent limitations regarding equitable revenue distribution within its value chain and faces the risk of "exoticizing" Japanese culture, potentially transforming it into an overly commercialized product for the global market (Katzenberg, 2020).

Case Study of a Winner (with Caveats): China - BRI and the Construction of Imperial Soft Power

China leveraged its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), announced in 2013, as an integrated instrument intertwining economic, infrastructural, and cultural dimensions (Chiebuka et al., 2025). In the cultural sphere, key strategies included expanding the network of Confucius Institutes, which attracted over 360,000 international students to study in China by 2013, developing the China Global Television Network (CGTN) as an international media platform, and promoting the export of its gaming, film, and music industries (Tao, 2018; Becard & Filho, 2019; Zhu, 2022; Liu, 2025).

China's cultural strategy has achieved some success, particularly in countries with large overseas Chinese communities and those along BRI routes. However, it is crucial to note that this strategy encounters political resistance from Western countries, which often perceive Confucius Institutes as "hard power" masked as "soft power" (Khisamutdinova & Yang, 2024; Zhu & Li, 2024). Thus, China's success in the global cultural arena is distinct from that of

South Korea and Japan, relying primarily on the weight of its economic power and state resources for influence rather than on the intrinsic appeal of its cultural values.

Case Study of a Loser: Indonesia - The Market's Power Overriding Community Voices

Indonesia presents a complex and internally contradictory picture. The most prominent case is Bali, where mass tourism generates substantial income but simultaneously erodes cultural authenticity. Sacred rituals are frequently adapted to tourist expectations, their original meanings often fade, and local communities rarely receive equitable economic benefits (Mahendra, 2024; Mudana et al., 2025). Scholars term this process "cultural commodification," a phenomenon widespread throughout the country rather than exclusively in Bali (Parmadi & Benardin, 2021; Nurhadi et al., 2022; Azizah, 2024; Yusuf et al., 2025).

In the media dimension, the hyper-commodification in Indonesian mass media has fostered a pervasive consumerist culture that diminishes the importance of local cultures in daily life (Shidqi & KN, 2022). Furthermore, the unchecked proliferation of foreign digital media without protective frameworks also significantly impacts youth culture (Utomo & Pandin, 2021). Nevertheless, there are instances of communities successfully employing community-based tourism (CBT) strategies to control cultural commodification and preserve their identity. This suggests that "losing" is not an unavoidable fate but rather hinges on the design of appropriate policy frameworks (Maharani et al., 2025).

Case Study of a Loser: Laos - The Price of World Heritage in the Globalized Economy

Laos presents a particularly concerning case. The UNESCO World Heritage status granted to Luang Prabang in 1995, initially intended for conservation, paradoxically accelerated intense commercial pressures. A comparative study of the physical environment between 1999 and 2009 revealed a clear transformation from residential areas to tourist-oriented uses. Traditional Lao architecture was supplanted by designs catering to tourist preferences, prompting UNESCO's World Heritage Committee to issue warnings about development pressures that threaten the integrity of the heritage site (Leong et al., 2016, 2017).

Laos's challenges reflect several structural limitations: low institutional capacity in managing tourism and the cultural industry, inadequate budget for heritage conservation, and reliance on international aid without the ability to implement proactive policies. In essence, Laos confronts a "World Heritage trap," where culture is valued and traded in the global tourism market, with the culture-owning communities receiving minimal benefit or agency in shaping its direction (Widodo, 2023).

Table 2 Comparative Analysis of Cultural Winners and Losers in Asia (2001-2025)

Criteria	South Korea (Winner)	Japan (Winner)	China (Partial Winner)	Indonesia (Partial Loser)	Laos (Loser)
Income from Culture	Very High; Hallyu exports worldwide (Komilovich, 2025)	Very High; anime 3.346 trillion yen (2023) (Zhang, 2025)	Moderate-High; BRI, Confucius Inst. (Chiebuka et al., 2025)	Moderate; tourism but concentrated (Mahendra, 2024)	Low; benefits do not reach communities (Leong et al., 2017)
Identity Preservation	High; Korean culture as a brand (Dannita &	High; integration of traditional and modern	Moderate; risk of rural cultural loss (Jiayuan, 2023)	Low-Moderate; widespread commodification (Parmadi	Low; architecture/traditions replaced (Leong et al., 2016)

Criteria	South Korea (Winner)	Japan (Winner)	China (Partial Winner)	Indonesia (Partial Loser)	Laos (Loser)
	Deniar, 2021)	(Yang, 2025)		& Benardin, 2021)	
Soft Power	Very High; image transformed globally (Kim, 2024)	Very High; 93% acceptance of diversity (Yang, 2025)	Moderate; faces political resistance (Khisamutdinova & Yang, 2024)	Low; lack of a clear national strategy	Very Low; still reliant on aid
State Policy	Proactive; investment in cultural industries (Affandi & Putri, 2023)	Proactive; Cool Japan + CPTPP (Yang, 2025)	Proactive; domestic and international control (Zhu, 2022)	Reactive; CBT is still unsystematic (Maharani et al., 2025)	Very Reactive; low capacity

From Lessons to Future: A Cultural Adaptation Framework for the Second Quarter of the 21st Century (2026-2050)

Synthesized Lessons: Structural Determinants of Success and Failure

A comparative synthesis of the five Asian case studies reveals that success in the global cultural arena is not accidental; rather, it is driven by deliberate structural alignments across three core strategic pillars.

The first pillar is State-Driven Industrial and Diplomatic Integration. Nations that successfully project cultural power, such as South Korea and Japan, actively transcend mere "museum-style preservation" by deploying proactive state policies that catalyze comprehensive cultural and creative industry value chains (Jang & Paik, 2013; Parc & Kim, 2020; Affandi & Putri, 2023; Yang, 2025). Crucially, this industrialization is not treated in isolation; it is systematically integrated into broader national foreign affairs and trade policies, effectively transforming cultural output into formidable diplomatic soft power (Becard & Filho, 2019; Komilovich, 2025).

The second pillar involves the Dynamic Hybridization of Tradition and Technology. Cultural resilience relies on the capacity to bridge traditional roots with contemporary innovation, utilizing indigenous heritage as the raw material for modern, globally resonant content (Yang, 2025; Yuniningsih et al., 2025). Furthermore, successful nations strategically harness digital ecosystems—such as streaming platforms and international fan networks—as powerful allies for cultural dissemination, rather than perceiving them solely as vectors of foreign domination (Parc & Kim, 2020; Affandi & Putri, 2023).

The final, indispensable pillar is Grassroots Community Empowerment. As evidenced by the nuanced outcomes in Indonesia, sustainable cultural preservation necessitates robust, community-based management mechanisms (CBT) (Sokka et al., 2021; Maharani et al., 2025). Top-down commercialization without protection inevitably leads to the loss of authenticity, whereas empowering local communities ensures they remain the primary decision-makers, stewards, and beneficiaries of their own cultural capital.

A Five-Dimensional Cultural Adaptation Framework (FDCAF) for 2026-2050

Drawing upon the empirical lessons and comparative analyses from the first quarter of the 21st century, this paper proposes the "Five-Dimensional Cultural Adaptation Framework

(FDCAF)" for policymakers, communities, and cultural stakeholders in Asia. As illustrated in Figure 2, the framework adopts a holistic, deeply interconnected approach, functioning as a strategic ecosystem rather than as a set of isolated policies. At its core lies the objective of sustainable cultural adaptation, supported by five mutually reinforcing dimensions designed to navigate the complexities of the digital platform economy and the Slowbalization era.



Figure 2 The Five-Dimensional Cultural Adaptation Framework (FDCAF) Model

The specific mechanics and strategic actions within each dimension are detailed as follows:
Dimension 1: Assertive Identity Affirmation. Rather than merely "protecting" culture from global flows, this framework proposes that nations and communities undertake an "inventory of cultural assets" to identify and value cultural heritage with the potential to transform into creative capital, both economically and symbolically (Maharani et al., 2025; Pasina & Corti, 2026).
Dimension 2: Strategic Cultural Industrialization. Countries lacking robust cultural industries must invest in complete value chains, from production and distribution to intellectual property protection and the creation of international markets (Yoo & El Ayboud, 2025; Zhang, 2025).
Dimension 3: Digital Cultural Governance. In the 2026-2050 era, where AI platforms and the metaverse will significantly shape cultural consumption, governments must develop regulatory systems that balance openness to innovation with the protection of local cultures. South Korea and Japan lead in this area through cross-border agreements on Data Free Flow with Trust (DFFT) (Sajida et al., 2025; Yang, 2025).
Dimension 4: Community Cultural Ecosystem Development. Sustainable policies must foster systems where communities are both owners, producers, and beneficiaries of cultural capital, moving beyond merely serving as attractions for external tourism industries (Sokka et al., 2021; Pasina & Corti, 2026).
Dimension 5: Regional Cultural Cooperation. In the era of Slowbalization, where global multilateralism is weakening, regional cooperation within ASEAN and East Asia plays a crucial role in balancing the influence of cultural superpowers (Rohman & Bandau, 2025).
Specific Recommendations for a Synergistic Cultural Ecosystem
To effectively operationalize this framework, a synergistic approach across multiple sectors is essential. At the macro-institutional level, policymakers must establish dedicated national funds for cultural and creative industries, enact robust intellectual property laws to safeguard local heritage, and strategically integrate cultural objectives with foreign policy, education, and digital technology (Rohman & Bandau, 2025; Xudayberganovich et al., 2025). Concurrently, the private sector—particularly tourism and cultural businesses—must transition toward ethical, community-based tourism (CBT) models that mandate equitable revenue sharing with culture-owning communities (Mudana et al., 2025; Pasina & Corti, 2026). This economic restructuring naturally empowers grassroots communities and small-to-medium enterprises

(SMEs) to develop distinctive, highly competitive local cultural brands for the digital market, using online platforms to assert indigenous narratives rather than yielding to external interpretations (Hafidhoh, 2025; Maharani et al., 2025). Finally, to sustain and evaluate this cultural ecosystem, academic institutions and researchers are tasked with developing comprehensive indicators to assess the ongoing impacts of globalization and pioneering culturally specific negotiation models tailored to the unique dynamics of the Southeast Asian context (Kester, 2023).

Projected Challenges in the Second Quarter of the 21st Century (2026-2050)

As the global landscape transitions into the second quarter of the 21st century (2026-2050), Asian nations will confront an intersecting triad of cultural challenges. Foremost among these is the proliferation of artificial intelligence and machine-generated culture. AI generative systems are fundamentally transforming the established paradigms of cultural production, distribution, and consumption. Without robust regulatory frameworks governing AI in the cultural sphere, developing nations face the acute risk of "cultural mimicry," wherein authentic local identities are overshadowed or inaccurately replicated by algorithms trained predominantly on foreign datasets (Sajida et al., 2025).

Compounding this technological disruption is the complex resurgence of identity politics and cultural nationalism. While the inward-looking nature of the Slowbalization era has stimulated nationalist sentiments that can revitalize local heritage, it simultaneously risks breeding isolationism. A critical challenge for contemporary policymakers will be delicately navigating this spectrum—fostering constructive "identity affirmation" while actively mitigating the descent into hostile "cultural exclusivism" (Helleiner, 2021; Smith, 2023).

Finally, the efficacy of any technological or policy-driven adaptation remains heavily constrained by systemic digital inequality. Persistent disparities in access to digital infrastructure—both between nations and within domestic populations—serve as a formidable barrier. Particularly for local communities across Southeast Asia, bridging this profound digital divide is an absolute prerequisite for democratizing cultural preservation and ensuring equitable participation in the future cultural economy (Rohman & Bandau, 2025).

Table 3 Five-Dimensional Cultural Adaptation Framework (FDCAF) for 2026-2050

Dimension	Core Approach	Example Actions	Target Stakeholders
Assertive Identity Affirmation	Inventory cultural assets and define value	Develop national and community-level cultural asset inventories	Government + Communities
Strategic Cultural Industrialization	Build complete value chains	VC funds for the creative economy; cultural accelerator programs	Government + Private Sector
Digital Cultural Governance	Balance innovation and protection	AI + cultural heritage laws; DFFT framework (Yang, 2025)	Government
Community Cultural Ecosystem Development	Communities as owners of cultural capital	CBT models; revenue transfer from tourism (Maharani et al., 2025)	Communities + Private Sector
Regional Cultural Cooperation	Create a counterweight to superpower influence	ASEAN Cultural Fund; joint content creation initiatives (Rohman & Bandau, 2025)	Government + ASEAN

Conclusion and Discussion: Culture as a Battlefield and a Resource

This study synthesizes the complex interplay between Asian cultures and the evolving currents of globalization and Slowbalization from 2001 to 2025, yielding critical insights into the contemporary cultural battlefield. The findings challenge the traditional paradigm of unidirectional cultural imperialism, revealing instead a dynamic landscape characterized by simultaneous counter-flows, extensive hybridization, and multi-scalar glocalization. Crucially, this theoretical shift recontextualizes Asian nations not as passive recipients or "victims" of global forces, but as highly strategic "negotiating actors" capable of shaping global cultural discourse. Second, the determinants of success in the global cultural arena are not solely a nation's size or natural resource wealth, but rather its capacity for proactive cultural policy formulation, the development of creative industries with complete value chains, and the affirmation of identity through the production of competitive contemporary culture.

Third, the Slowbalization era presents both opportunities and threats to local cultures. The opportunity lies in the expanded space for local and national identity. However, a new threat emerges: cultural domination through digital platforms that transcend national borders, making them significantly harder for states to regulate than traditional forms of globalization. Fourth, cultural commodification is a double-edged sword. With a robust regulatory framework and genuine community participation, it can generate income while preserving culture. However, if market forces are left unchecked and not properly overseen, this can lead to the loss of authenticity and identity. Fifth, the case study of Laos demonstrates that international recognition (e.g., UNESCO World Heritage status) does not guarantee success in cultural preservation. Instead, it can become an accelerator of commercial pressures if adequate regulatory policies are absent.

Theoretically, this research significantly contributes to refining Robertson's "glocalization" framework and Appadurai's "scapes" framework by adding new dimensions relevant to the Asian context during the Slowbalization era. Specifically, Slowbalization does not diminish global flows but rather transforms their modalities. This shifts the "points of negotiation" in the cultural arena from traditional mass media to digital platforms and creative industry value chains. Furthermore, this study affirms and expands Nye's soft power theory by demonstrating that, in the Asian context, cultural soft power is a product of deliberate policy investment rather than a mere natural manifestation of existing culture.

From a policy perspective, this research proposes the "Five-Dimensional Cultural Adaptation Framework" (FDCAF), synthesized from the lessons of both cultural winners and losers. This framework holds significant implications for policymakers in Southeast Asia, who often face resource and institutional constraints but possess immense cultural capital that remains underexploited. Crucially, this research warns that in the second quarter of the 21st century (2026-2050), cultural globalization will not diminish but will transform its modalities once again, with AI technology and the platform economy serving as primary vehicles. Nations that fail to develop comprehensive digital cultural policy frameworks will risk a profound and irreversible loss of cultural identity, more severe than anything experienced previously. Conversely, countries that can strategically harness "culture as capital" in the digital age will gain sustainable geopolitical and economic advantages throughout the latter half of the 21st century.

References

Affandi, R., & Putri, N. (2023). KOCCA strategy for expanding South Korean cultural content to global audiences amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *E3S Web of Conferences 426*, 02050.

Agarwal, R., Agrawal, S., & Reena. (2025). Global Flows and Cultural Identity: Analysing Shivya Nath’s The Shooting Star: A Girl, Her Backpack and the World Through Appadurai’s Lens. *Lex Localis - Journal of Local Self-Government, 23*(S4), 1333-1339.

Azizah, I. (2024). Islamic Local Culture Commodification in Disruption Era Tourism Industrial. *Jurnal Penelitian Agama, 25*(1), 139-160.

Becard, D., & Filho, P. (2019). Chinese Cultural Diplomacy: Instruments in China's strategy for international insertion in the 21st Century. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional, 62*(1), eoo5.

Botelho, J., Mietule, I., Puriy, H., Maksymova, I., & Kulishov, V. (2021). Economic Diplomacy Strategy for the Recovery of the Slowdown of Globalization (Slowbalization). *Journal of European Economy, 20*(2), 246-261.

Chang, P. (2019). *Cultural Preferences in International Trade: Evidence from the Globalization of Korean Pop Culture.* A paper presented at the 2019 IEFS-EAER Conference, June 5, 2019, Seoul, South Korea.

Chhakchhuak, L. (2024). Hallyu Beyond the Age of American Cultural Imperialism: Counter Cultural Flows and Cultural Diplomacy. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 6*(4), 1-10.

Chiebuka, A., Janet, O., & Oluchi, O. (2025). The Belt and Road Initiative: China's Vision for Global Connectivity and Soft Power Influence. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 51*(1), 262-272.

Coker, W. (2023). Beyond technophilia: A critique of media globalization. *Cogent Arts & Humanities, 10*(1), 2224602.

Dannita, S., & Deniar, S. (2021). The Chaebol's contribution on South Korea nation branding through Korean wave. *Satwika: Kajian Ilmu Budaya dan Perubahan Sosial, 5*(2), 317-336.

Ding, X., & Wu, Y. (2023). Determinants of international Korean language promotion: A cross-country analysis. *Heliyon, 9*(10), e21078.

Febriani, R., & Hamdi, I. (2024). Soft Power & Hegemony: Gramsci, Nye, and Cox's Perspectives. *Jurnal Filsafat, 34*(1), 86-110.

Hafidhoh, H. (2025). Cultural Identity and Traditional Commodification: A Case Study of Local Tourism Branding in the Digital Age. *INJURITY: Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 4*(2), 110-117.

Helleiner, E. (2021). The Return of National Self-Sufficiency? Excavating Autarkic Thought in a De-Globalizing Era. *International Studies Review, 23*, 933-957.

Jang, G., & Paik, W. (2013). Korean Wave as Tool for Korea's New Cultural Diplomacy. *Advances in Applied Sociology, 2*(3), 196-202.

Jiayuan, Y. (2023). China's Cultural Soft Power in International Communication: How to Make the World Listen to China's Voice. *Media and Communication Research, 4*(9), 65-72.

Katzenberg, J. (2020). Exoticization and internationalization in the cultural history of the fashion district Harajuku. In D. Chiavacci & I. Wieczorek (eds.). *Japan 2020: Politik, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (pp. 316-341). Munich: Iudicium.

Kester, K. (2023). Revisiting 'Asia as method' in education research: Problems and prospects. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 24*, 181-186.

Khisamutdinova, N., & Yang, Y. (2024). Confucius Institutes - Soft Power or Trojan Horse? View from the Russian Far East. *Vestnik RUDN. International Relations, 24*(3), 417-426.

Khramchenko, D. (2025). Englishization of Education: A Critical Look at Africa and Asia. *Integration of Education, 29*(1), 49-67.

Kim, Y. (2024). A Study on French Public Discourse on the Korean Wave. *Journal of European Integration Studies, 15*(1), 107-144.

Kipng'etich, L. (2024). Cultural Hybridity and Identity Formation in Globalized Societies. *International Journal of Humanity and Social Sciences, 2*(5), 14-25.

Komilovich, S. (2025). The Cultural Diplomacy of the Republic of Korea. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 11*(5), 339-342.

Leong, C., Takada, J., & Yamaguchi, S. (2016). Analysis of the Changing Landscape of a World Heritage Site: Case of Luang Prabang, Lao PDR. *Sustainability, 8*, 747.

Leong, C., Takada, J., Hanaoka, S., & Yamaguchi, S. (2017). Impact of Tourism Growth on the Changing Landscape of a World Heritage Site: Case of Luang Prabang, Lao PDR. *Sustainability, 9*, 1996.

Liu, C. (2025). Exploration of China's Game Industry's Overseas Strategy Under The 'Belt and Road' Initiative. *Scientific Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 7*(10), 27-32.

Liu, J. (2022). The Possibility of Cultural Cooperation Between China, Japan and South Korea and the Construction of East Asian Cultural Community. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 638*, 513-516.

Magu, S. (2015). Reconceptualizing Cultural Globalization: Connecting the "Cultural Global" and the "Cultural Local". *Social Sciences, 4*, 630-645.

Maharani, N., Maharani, A., Novilianti, N., & Putri, K. (2025). Cultural Tourism Business Management: A Fair and Sustainable Strategy Based on Local Participation and Digital Innovation for Indonesia's Cultural Image. *Journal Management and Hospitality, 2*(2), 36-43.

Mahendra, D. (2024). The Impact of Tourism on the Preservation and Transformation of Cultural Identity in Bali, Indonesia. *Studies in Social Science & Humanities, 3*(6), 34-41.

Manzi, R. (2019). Economic globalization in the global post-crisis of 2008: Limits and deadlocks. *Brazilian Journal of Political Economy, 39*(3), 470-484.

Mudana, I., Sinaga, F., Suarja, I., & Surata, I. (2025). Preserving local culture as a strategy for sustainable tourism in Bali. *Journal of Commerce, Management, and Tourism Studies, 4*(3), 450-459.

Nurhadi, I., Sumarti, T., Dharmawan, A., & Damanhuri, D. (2022). The Commodification of Culture and Ethical Transition of Tourism Development: An Insight from Osing Community, Indonesia. *Sodality: Jurnal Sosiologi Pedesaan, 10*(1), 24-43.

Osman, A., Subhani, A., & Hasan, S. (2013). Asian ascendancy: media in the age of globalization. *SpringerPlus, 2*, 646.

Parc, J., & Kim, S. (2020). The Digital Transformation of the Korean Music Industry and the Global Emergence of K-Pop. Sustainability, 12, 7790.

Parmadi, B. & Benardin. (2021). Globalization of Tourism Industry Toward Culture of Local Wisdom in the Existance of Pseudo Traditional Art Case Study of the Commodification of Bengkulu Traditional Arts. *Lekesan: Interdisciplinary Journal of Asia Pacific Arts, 4*(2), 102-109.

Pasina, I., & Corti, E. (2026). Preserving culture, fostering community engagement and sustaining the heritage ecosystem: a case study of Al Jazeera Al Hamra heritage village. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development.* https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-08-2025-0292

Quiña, G. (2025). Hybrid cultures. On Néstor García Canclini's contribution to cultural research in Latin America. *Cultural Trends.* https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2025.2566793

Robertson, R. (2012). Globalisation or glocalisation?. *The Journal of International Communication, 18*(2), 191-208.

Rohman, D., & Bandau, P. (2025). Peran ASEAN Strategic Plan for Culture and Arts dalam Mendorong Identitas Regional Asia Tenggara. *Review of International Relations, 7*(2), 251-280.

Sajida, S., Nuswantari, S., & Suprapti, S. (2025). Artificial Intelligence-Driven Digital Communication: Evaluating the Mobile-Applications and Fostering Policies for Cultural Heritage Preservation. *Jurnal Publikasi Manajemen Informatika, 4*(1), 306-326.

Sanmee, W. (2024). Cultural Identity and Globalization: Navigating Tradition and Modernity in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Exploration in Interdisciplinary Methodologies, 1*(1), 11-20.

Schmalz, S. (2022). Soziologie der Deglobalisierung. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie, 32*, 349-361.

Shidqi, R., & KN, J. (2022). Hypercommodification in Indonesian Mass Media and Its Impact on Society: A Study and Suggestions. *COMMUSTY: Journal of Communication Studies and Society, 1*(2), 65-70.

Smith, T. (2023). Mapping complexity in deglobalisation: A typology of economic localisms from 'hyper-localism' to 'strategic autonomy'. *Local Economy, 38*(3), 242-263.

Sokka, S., Badia, F., Kangas, A., & Donato, F. (2021). Governance of cultural heritage: Towards participatory approaches. *European Journal of Cultural Management & Policy, 11*(1), 4-19.

Sumartana, I., Hudiananingsih, P., & Rouf, M. (2025). Balancing globalization and linguistic heritage involves preserving mother tongues through inclusive education that values cultural identity and language diversity. *Journal of Language, Literature, Social and Cultural Studies, 3*(2), 179-196.

Tao, X. (2018). The Emergence of the 'Chinese School'?: The 'Sinicization' of International Relations Theory in China. *ICCS Journal of Modern Chinese Studies, 11*(1), 23-45.

Taptiani, N., Mahadi, A., Romadhon, I., Pratama, A., Muhammad, R., Purwanto, E., … & Isbandi, F. (2024). The Impact of Globalization on Local Culture. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies, 45*(1), 92-102.

The Economist. (2019). *Slowbalisation: The future of global commerce.* Retrieved from https://www.economist.com/weeklyedition/2019-01-26.

Utomo, S., & Pandin, M. (2021). *Changes in Foreign and Modern Culture in the 21st Century Which Drivers Culture in East Java Seen from a Historical Perspective.* Preprints.org. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202106.0281.v1

Wang, X. (2022). Comparative Study of Cultural Industry Development between China and Japan. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research, 652*, 1308-1314.

Wheatley, M. (2024). Globalization and Local Cultures: A Complex Coexistence. *Premier Journal of Social Science, 1*, 100005.

Widodo, J. (2023). UNESCO world heritage branding: learning from some cases in Asia. *Journal of City: Branding and Authenticity, 1*(1), 12-23.

Witt, M., Li, P., Välikangas, L., & Lewin, A. (2021). De-globalization and Decoupling: Game Changing Consequences?. *Management and Organization Review, 17*(1), 6-15.

Wu, B., Yu, P., & Jiao, X. (2024). Disjunctures and flows in the global "scapes": The case of Indian medical students in China. *ACCESS: Contemporary Issues in Education, 44*(1), 1-16.

Xie, Z. (2024). The Development Experience of Japan and South Korea's Cultural Soft Power and Its Enlightenment to China. *Highlights in Business, Economics and Management, 35*, 1-7.

Xudayberganovich, M., Ahmadov, A., & Karomi, K. (2025). The Governments' Role in Preserving National Identity on Globalization. *Journal of Sustainable Development and Regulatory Issues, 3*(2), 191-220.

Yang, D. (2025). An Analysis of the Evolution and Influence of Japan's "Cool Japan" Strategy on National Image and Soft Power. *Communications in Humanities Research, 60*, 66-71.

Yaqoub, M., Gao, Z., Ye, X., Al-Kassimi, K., Chen, Z., & Haizhou, W. (2023). Three decades of glocalization research: A bibliometric analysis. *Cogent Social Sciences, 9*, 2245239.

Yoo, J., & El Ayboud, R. (2025). Intellectual property rights protection, trade, and GVC participation - an empirical analysis based on South Korean data. *Journal of International Logistics and Trade, 23*(1), 78-91.

Yuniningsih, T., Larasati, E., Suwitri, S., Hidayati, R., & Mangai, M. (2025). Five-dimensional Analysis of Gastrodiplomacy of the South Korean Government. *KnE Social Sciences, 10*(4), 296-307.

Yusuf, A., Julian, M., Hussain, S., Saputro, L., Wardani, D., Fahreza, G., & Mareta, M. (2025). The Impact of Tourism on Traditional Arts in Cireundeu Cultural Village: Between Cultural Preservation and Commodification. *SHS Web of Conferences, 226*, 01002.

Zhang, J. (2025). Japanese Animation as Cultural Trade: Soft Power, Economic Spillovers, and National Competitiveness. *Communications in Humanities Research, 89*, 166-172.

Zhu, B., & Li, X. (2024). Transformational governance framework for institutions of cultural diplomacy: The case of the Chinese Confucius Institute. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 30*(4), 491-510.

Zhu, Y. (2022). China's 'new cultural diplomacy' in international broadcasting: Branding the nation through CGTN Documentary. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 28*(6), 671-683.

Zrazhevska, N. (2015). Cultural Imperialism in the Discourse of Globalization (Subjective Factors). *Current Issues of Mass Communication, 18*, 22-32.

Data Availability Statement: The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted without any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. This is a fully open-access article distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).