

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism\*

### Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism: The International Orientation of Arts and Culture Coverage in U.S., Dutch, French, and German Newspapers, 1955 to 2005

Susanne Janssen

*Erasmus University Rotterdam*

Giselinde Kuipers

*University of Amsterdam*

Marc Verboord

*Erasmus University Rotterdam*

#### ABSTRACT

This article charts key developments and cross-national variations in the coverage of foreign culture (i.e., classical and popular music, dance, film, literature, theater, television, and visual arts) in U.S., Dutch, French, and German elite newspapers between 1955 and 2005. Such coverage signals the awareness of foreign culture among national elites and the degree and direction of “globalization from within.” Using content analysis, we examine the degree, direction, and diversity of the international orientation of arts journalism for each country and cultural genre. Results denote how international arts and culture coverage has increased in Europe but not in the United States. Moreover, the centrality of a country in the cultural “world-system” offers a better explanation for cross-national differences in international orientation than do other country-level characteristics, such as size and cultural policy framework. Recorded and performance-based genres differ markedly in their levels of internationalization, but the effect of other genre-level characteristics, such as language dependency and capital intensiveness, is not clear. In each country, international coverage remains concentrated on a few countries, of which the United States has become the most prominent. Although the global diversity of coverage has increased, non-Western countries are still underrepresented.

Globalization has become a key concept in the social sciences, even though its meaning is contested and its systematic study has proven difficult (Guillén 2001). Globalization refers to the increasing transnational exchange of goods, persons, and ideas. It is a prolonged process that has increased greatly in speed, scope, and impact in the latter half of the twentieth century. On a transnational level, this development has led to growing international interdependencies, an increase in transnational and supranational institutions and organizations, and some homogenization (Lechner and Boli 2005). On the national and local levels, growing transnational exchange has resulted in a number of transformations that Beck (2002) describes as “globalization from within.” This implies an intensified reflexivity or awareness of the world at large (Giddens 2000; Guillén 2001), as well as the emergence of a variety of “hybrid,” “creolized,” or “glocal” phenomena (Hannerz 1996; Pieterse 1995). Growing global interdependence and awareness has proven a challenge for national states and institutions. In the face of increasing international competition, nation states lose power to

---

\* Direct correspondence to Susanne Janssen, Erasmus University Rotterdam, FHK (Room L2-16), PO Box 1738, 3000 DR Rotterdam, The Netherlands (s.janssen@fhk.eur.nl). Support for this article’s research by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO, project 277-45-001) is gratefully acknowledged. We benefited from the opportunity to present portions of this work at the CAPCS-seminar of the Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies at Princeton University (March 2006), the panel on New Comparative Perspectives on Group Boundaries at the 2006 Conference of the Council for European Studies, the Sociology of Culture Sessions at the American Sociological Association Meetings in 2005 and 2006, and the annual meetings of the Sociology of the Arts Network of the European Sociological Association. We are grateful for the support and feedback we received at various stages of this research from, among others, Shyon Baumann, Denise Bielby, Diana Crane, Paul DiMaggio, Timothy Dowd, Wendy Griswold, Michèle Lamont, Elizabeth Long, Jan Marontate, John Mohr, Kees van Rees, Richard Peterson, Alain Quemin, Gisèle Sapiro, Ulrich Saxer, András Szántó, and Vera Zolberg. Last but not least, we are indebted to the *ASR* reviewers and *ASR* editors for their insightful comments and helpful suggestions.

transnational institutions and networks (Meyer et al. 1997; Sassen 2001). Consequently, national institutions find that nationality is no longer the prime focus for identification or organization (Castells 1997).

Cultural globalization—the growing international diffusion, exchange, and intermingling of cultural goods and media products—is the most visible manifestation of globalization in everyday life (Crane, Kawashima, and Kawasaki 2002). As a consequence of increasing cultural exports and the rise of cultural multinationals, the same music, movies, writers, pop stars, and art styles are now known around the world. Cultural globalization is thus central to the everyday experience of globalization from within. Moreover, the globalization of culture highlights the challenges globalization poses to national states and institutions. Although some cultural fields (e.g., visual arts) have always been internationally oriented, media and culture are traditionally strongly linked to national institutions. Indeed, arts and culture are generally considered central to national identity.

Following Bourdieu (1993), the field of arts and culture is often conceptualized as a power struggle in which actors compete for recognition from the institutions and persons endowed with the capacity to grant recognition (Baumann 2001; Dowd et al. 2002; Van Rees and Dorleijn 2001). From this perspective, cultural globalization means the opening of various national art fields to international competition and the emergence of transnational fields. Cultural valorization and artistic recognition are then seen as emanating from power struggles not only within national art fields, but also between art fields in different countries. In this global constellation, some countries and cities increasingly set the standards. De Swaan (1995) calls this the emergence of a “cultural world system,” analogous to Wallerstein’s (1974) world system, encompassing core countries and cities that dominate cultural production, along with peripheral and semi-peripheral areas.

Although the social scientific literature on globalization (Fiss and Hirsch 2005) pays ample attention to its cultural dimensions (Appadurai 1996; Hannerz 1996; Held et al. 1999; Tomlinson 1999), systematic, comparative studies into the globalization of arts and culture are still rare. Most research involves single country studies (Berger and Huntington 2002) or cross-national comparisons at a single point in time. These studies usually concentrate on a single genre, in particular news (Clausen 2003), film (Miller et al. 2005), or television programs (de Bens and de Smaele 2001).

Our research covers a 50-year period, four countries, and a wide range of cultural forms. We examine how the press coverage of international arts and culture has evolved since 1955 in France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States. We also look at how the degree, direction, and diversity of international coverage are affected by features of both the countries and the genres. Such comparative research is a prerequisite for understanding the transnational exchange of culture across time and place. Some things “travel” more easily than others (Gerhards and Rössel 2000; Moretti 2001), and some places, countries, and cultures seem more open to cultural import than others (Heilbron 1995). The direction of international orientation is not identical for all countries and genres, and it changes over time.

Our analyses of cultural exchange look at the international orientation of a central, intermediary agency within national art fields: the journalism of art and culture in elite newspapers. Art journalists and reviewers working for such papers are core agents in the classification of art (DiMaggio 1987). Through their selective and evaluative activities they publicly confirm, modify, or reject the ways in which cultural producers position their products on the market. This channels and shapes subsequent perception and valuation by other actors in the cultural field (Van Rees and Dorleijn 2001). The arts and culture coverage in elite newspapers indicates which cultural artifacts count as “legitimate” culture (Bourdieu 1993) in different countries and periods. Developments in the editorial prominence or critical approach toward a genre can, for example, identify changes in its prestige (Baumann 2001;

Janssen 1999). Likewise, coverage of international arts and culture is not merely indicative of the nature and volume of cultural imports, but it also signals national elites' awareness of foreign culture. Consequently, it signals the degree and direction of globalization from within.

## **THE DYNAMICS OF TRANSNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE**

Cultural exchange transcending regions and nation states is not a new phenomenon, but the volume, tempo, and extent of such exchange have increased enormously since World War II. This is largely due to improved dissemination possibilities, as well as an increase in shared languages, multilingualism, and the rise of multinationals that facilitate the production and distribution of cultural goods (Held et al. 1999).

The result has been a cultural world system: national cultural fields have become embedded in transnational systems of exchange, influence, and competition. Cultural supply has, correspondingly, been fundamentally altered as well. In many places, people have much more to read, see, and hear than ever before. At the same time, cultural offerings have become more similar from place to place. All over the world, national cultural production competes with foreign imports. This applies to the commercial domain of popular culture, as well as the performing arts, literature (Casanova 2004), and the visual arts (Moulin 2000). Consumer demand in most European countries (Sassoon 2006) shows a growth in the interest in foreign culture, particularly Anglo-American cultural fare among younger generations. Despite debate about the local implications of the increase in foreign cultural goods (Crane et al. 2002; Griswold and Wright 2004), national cultural content and domestic cultural products are, in the contemporary era, just one possible option among many.

*Hypothesis 1:* In line with the growth of international cultural exchange, journalistic attention to arts and culture has become more internationally oriented. Between 1955 and 2005, French, German, Dutch, and U.S. newspapers will devote an increasing portion of their cultural coverage to foreign arts and culture.

Although we anticipate an increase in international coverage for each of the four countries included in the study, we expect the degree of internationalization to vary across countries and genres.

## **COUNTRY CHARACTERISTICS: SIZE, CENTRALITY, AND POLICY**

Whether we consider trade, telecommunication traffic, scientific cooperation, or cultural exchange, actors in countries with smaller populations are, *ceteris paribus*, more internationally oriented than their counterparts in larger countries (Heilbron 1995; Katzenstein 2003). While a country's political system (the Soviet Union) or level of prosperity (India) may mediate the effect of size, a country's demographic base generally constitutes an independent factor, promoting or hampering international cultural exchange (Heilbron 1995). Drawing from Blau's (1977) theorem of group size and interaction, a larger proportion of the population in small countries is involved in transnational transactions. Second, countries with large home markets profit from economic advantages of scale, particularly in capital-intensive sectors (Marvasti and Canterbury 2005). In the Netherlands, for example, imported films accounted for over 90 percent of all films distributed in the 1990s, as opposed to 42 percent in the United States, 56 percent in France, and 62 percent in Germany (UNESCO 2000: 306-307). The multicultural character of large countries reduces the incentive to seek cultural

diversity outside their borders. Small countries thus rely more extensively on international exchange and are more internationally oriented.

*Hypothesis 2:* The degree of international cultural coverage will vary across countries according to population size (see Appendix, Table A1). Therefore, from 1955 to 2005, U.S. newspapers should be the least internationally oriented, followed by German, French, and Dutch papers, respectively.

Another factor determining the level of a country's international orientation is *centrality*: the extent to which a country's cultural production interests foreign producers, experts, and audiences (Heilbron 1995; Held et al. 1999). Certain countries and cities have emerged as the core of the cultural world system, while others occupy marginal positions in the (semi)periphery (De Swaan 1995). The cultural world system involves an implicit classification of places according to the perceived importance of their cultural production. An area with a central position usually has a strong concentration of cultural producers and mediators (e.g., theaters, schools, studios, and publishing houses). Moreover, these centers are home to the institutions and actors endowed with the power to "consecrate" culture (Bourdieu 1993). As a result, centers of cultural production become places where key actors set standards for evaluating and ranking cultural artifacts and their makers. High production also enables (and often needs) expanding markets, which are often found in the (semi)periphery. This results in unequal cultural flows, with more work heading from the center to the periphery than vice versa. A country or city that is central in a particular cultural field thus functions as an exemplar for aspiring places in the periphery. The more central a country's cultural position, the less it will be concerned with foreign works and artists. This is illustrated by the share of translations published in a country: translations are rare in English-speaking countries, but much more common in non-English-speaking Western countries (De Swaan 2001; Heilbron 1999).

By 1955, the United States had a highly central cultural position, due to its leading role in many cultural industries (e.g., film, music records, and books). It shared the lead with France, which played a prominent role in practically all cultural fields (Casanova 2004; Moulin 2000; Sassoon 2006; Scott 2000). Since then, the United States has acquired an even more central cultural position. French culture, on the other hand, has become less prominent, although Paris is still a leading center for some cultural forms (Scott 1997). The Netherlands occupies a semi-peripheral position in the international cultural arena (Heilbron 1995), while Germany has not been in a central position since before World War II (Sassoon 2006), except perhaps in classical music (Applegate and Potter 2002) and the visual arts (Quemin 2006). These observations are consistent with our data on the centrality of these countries' cultural production (see Appendix, Table A2).

Our choice of countries provides the necessary variability to sort out the independent effects of size and centrality on the degree of international orientation. The United States has always been big and has become more central, while France used to be central but has become less so over time. Germany and the Netherlands are both peripheral, but Germany is much larger.

*Hypothesis 3:* The degree of coverage given to foreign arts and culture will be inversely related to the centrality of a country's cultural production.

*Hypothesis 3a:* Contrary to what we anticipate in Hypothesis 2, we expect that U.S. and French newspapers in 1955 will have similar, relatively low levels of internationalization.

German and Dutch newspapers should have similar, comparatively high degrees of internationalization.

*Hypothesis 3b:* After 1955, we expect U.S. newspapers to remain focused on domestic arts and culture, whereas French newspapers should increase their coverage of foreign arts and culture. French newspapers should remain less internationally oriented than their German and Dutch counterparts, but the difference will become less salient.

Several authors argue that *policy* may affect a country's degree of internationalization (Crane et al. 2002). Most European countries have developed extensive regulations to support and protect their national cultures (Art Council of England [ACE] 1998). These policies range from direct funding of artists and art institutions to import quotas and domestic content requirements for radio and television programming. The United States, with its extensive reliance on indirect mechanisms of tax exemptions for cultural organizations and their contributors, is an exception in the funding of public culture (Mulcahy 2000). It is also unique in its call for free cultural trade. Taking into account the role of cultural policy does not lead us to expect that the United States will have a different position vis-à-vis the three European countries than that anticipated in Hypotheses 2 and 3. The absence of (overt) protectionist policies is unlikely to strengthen the position of foreign imports in the United States, as the U.S. market strongly favors domestic products over foreign fare in virtually all cultural fields (Miller and Yúdice 2002).

Assuming that a prevalence of protectionist policies strengthens the focus on national culture and the visibility of domestic producers, an alternative to Hypotheses 2 and 3b emerges for France, Germany, and the Netherlands (see Appendix, Table A3). French cultural policy has a long tradition of centralized intervention in (and production of) national culture. This tradition is diametrically opposed to Germany's administration of cultural affairs, which federal states and municipalities have largely controlled since World War II (ACE 1998). Within the European Union, (West) Germany has been a strong promoter of an external trade policy (OECD 2004). Germany has developed few protectionist regulations (Machet, Pertzidou, and Ward 2002), unlike the Netherlands (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science 2006) and, especially, France, which has been the main champion of a "cultural exception" to free trade (OECD 2005). As in France, cultural policy in the Netherlands is highly centralized (ACE 1998), although it does not emphasize culture as an element of national identity or prestige as strongly as the French model.

*Hypothesis 4:* The degree of international cultural coverage will vary across the three European countries in accordance with the degree of centralization (high or low) and openness (prevalence of protectionist policies) of their cultural policy frameworks.

*Hypothesis 4a:* Contrary to Hypothesis 2, from 1955 to 2005, Dutch newspapers will become more strongly focused on national culture than will their German counterparts.

*Hypothesis 4b:* Contrary to Hypothesis 3b, French newspapers will remain focused on national culture over time, with continued pronounced differences with Dutch and German newspapers.

## **GENRE CHARACTERISTICS: MODE OF DISTRIBUTION, LANGUAGE, AND CAPITAL INTENSIVENESS**

Not all cultural forms and genres disseminate equally across national boundaries. Cultural genres differ both in their material form and modes of production and distribution (Crane 1992). For example, recorded culture (e.g., films, CDs, books, and DVDs) is more easily distributed than performance-based culture (e.g., musical concerts, theater, and dance performances). As a result, recorded culture is more likely to spread to other countries. Newspaper coverage of these genres is thus probably more international. Within recorded culture, we can make a further distinction according to the form of distribution. Cultural genres that spread predominantly through mass media (e.g., film, television, and popular music) are likely to have more international coverage than those that do not (e.g., literature and classical music). Furthermore, they probably will have more coverage than genres that depend on other forms of distribution, such as specialized fairs or dealers for the visual arts.

Another factor affecting the international spread of cultural forms is language. We expect language-dependent genres (literature and theater) to be less successful outside of their language area (Moretti 2001) than would abstract art forms (music and dance) and cultural forms that predominantly depend on visual effects (visual arts and fashion). Film and television probably have an intermediate position, because they depend on language but are primarily visual.

Differences in international orientation between genres may also be related to capital investment. Film production is notoriously capital intensive; many smaller countries simply do not have the means to sustain a domestic film industry (Miller et al. 2005). Some performing arts (e.g., opera and musicals) also require large investments because of developing costs or dependence on highly specialized and skilled performers. Production of such capital-intensive cultural forms is likely to be more centralized, implying that smaller countries are more dependent on imports.

*Hypothesis 5:* The degree of international newspaper coverage will vary across cultural forms.

*Hypothesis 5a:* Coverage of recorded culture will be more internationally oriented than coverage of performance-based culture. Within recorded culture, coverage of mass-mediated culture will be more internationally oriented than will coverage of cultural forms distributed through other channels.

*Hypothesis 5b:* Coverage of language-dependent cultural forms will be less internationally oriented than the coverage of abstract and visual cultural forms.

*Hypothesis 5c:* Coverage of capital-intensive cultural forms will be more international than coverage of cultural forms that require lower investments.

## **CROSS-NATIONAL VARIATIONS BY CULTURAL GENRE**

Some countries are known for their cultural production of a particular genre. Consequently, the coverage of international culture likely varies across countries in accordance with their prominence in producing these genres.

*Hypothesis 6:* Newspapers from countries with a central position in a particular cultural field (see Appendix, Table A2) will tend to be less internationally oriented in those fields.

More specifically, we expect U.S. newspapers to be strongly nationally oriented in the cultural fields in which the United States has played a central role: cinema, popular music, television, and visual arts. We expect French papers to have a particularly strong national orientation in the earlier years of this study in the visual arts, literature, theater, and cinema. Because neither Germany nor the Netherlands had a central position in most fields from 1955 to 2005, we do not anticipate that their newspapers will have a particularly strong national focus in their coverage of any genre, with the possible exception of classical music in Germany.

#### **DIRECTION AND DIVERSITY OF INTERNATIONAL ORIENTATION**

Studies of cultural globalization generally find geographic and cultural proximity, as well as language kinship, to be important predictors of cultural exchange (La Palestina and Straubhaar 2005). Research on news production also shows proximity to be a core news value (Clausen 2003; Gans 1979). We expect arts and culture coverage to show a certain bias toward neighboring or culturally related countries. The few studies of cultural coverage of foreign countries suggest that such bias is even stronger in the realm of arts and culture than in other domains (Wilke 1998).

Again, government policies may strengthen or erode forms of international orientation rooted in geographic or cultural proximity. Since the 1950s, various European programs, such as Eurovision, have tried to promote cultural exchange and cooperation between EC/EU members (Yair and Maman 1996). The increasing political and economic integration of Europe has facilitated cultural exchange among member states. Similarly, the NAFTA agreements have intensified cultural exchange between Canada, Mexico, and the United States (Galperin 1999).

*Hypothesis 7:* Newspapers in all four countries will focus on culture from neighboring countries or countries that share the same language.

The importance of geographical proximity in the coverage of international culture has likely diminished since the 1970s. The past three decades have witnessed the rise of non-Western cultural centers, notably in Asia and Latin America. This has led to a diversification of the international cultural marketplace (Thussu 2000). Digital technology and satellite networks, deregulation of broadcasting, and the growth of sizeable non-Western minorities in many Western countries has enabled a growing contra-flow of cultural content from the Global South to the North (Biltreyst and Meers 2000).

*Hypothesis 8:* International cultural coverage in all four countries will become more diverse over time, covering a wider range of countries and regions.

Furthermore, the cultural power balance between the United States and Europe has shifted significantly since World War II. The United States now plays a prominent role in art disciplines formerly centered in Europe, such as the visual arts and literature. Within the cultural field, mass-produced cultural forms (e.g., television, cinema, and popular music) have gained in prominence. The centers of these industries are located predominantly in the United States, which further strengthens the position of U.S. cultural goods.

*Hypothesis 9:* The share of U.S. art and culture in the international cultural coverage of Dutch, French, and German newspapers will increase from 1955 to 2005.

*Hypothesis 10:* As a result of the above developments, regional proximity will become a less salient factor in the international cultural coverage of Dutch, French, and German newspapers.

## DATA AND METHOD

To assess how journalistic attention to foreign arts and culture developed during the past 50 years, we performed a comprehensive content analysis (Neuendorf 2002) of newspapers' arts and cultural coverage for four sample years: 1955, 1975, 1995, and 2005. Our analysis covers nine main forms of culture: applied arts,<sup>1</sup> classical music, dance, film, literature, popular music, television, theater, and visual arts.

We study newspapers that target the governing, intellectual, and cultural elite because these papers largely determine whether and how other media and the wider community discuss subjects. They thus fulfill a key role in the process of cultural valorization. We selected daily newspapers with a national or supra-regional distribution, rather than regional or local newspapers that by definition pay more attention to local news and information. The newspapers included were published during the entire research period. For each European country, we chose the two with the largest paid circulation, on average, during the research period (see Table A in the Online Supplement on the ASR Web site (<http://www2.asanet.org/journals/asr/2008/toc065.html>): *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* for France, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* and the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* for Germany, and *NRC Handelsblad* and *de Volkskrant* for the Netherlands. For the United States, we use only the *New York Times* because it carries far more articles than the European newspapers. Located in the United States' main arts center, it is also the only newspaper that reaches culture lovers throughout the country. Coverage of arts and culture is generally concentrated around the weekends, and it is also subject to seasonal influences. We therefore apply a multistage stratified sampling procedure in combination with the method of the constructed week: for each day of the week we select a random edition from each quarter, resulting in four constructed weeks (Riffe, Aust, and Lacy 1993). We thus have 24 editions (28 including Sunday editions) per sample year for each newspaper title.<sup>2</sup> The total sample for the content analysis contains 692 editions.

The newspapers were coded in original format by 14 coders in 2004 to 2006. We did not restrict data collection to arts and culture sections or lifestyle supplements but covered the whole newspaper.<sup>3</sup> Coders analyzed all types of articles, including news stories, reviews, background articles, interviews, and columns on the specified cultural genres. Intercoder reliability for coding the same genre proved to be good (Cohen's Kappa of .92). In the case of articles containing more than one item (e.g., an article reviewing literary novels by various authors), coders filled out a separate registration form for each item. These items are the research units of our current analysis (N = 15,276). Missing values on the main variables, described below, reduce this number to 14,624 cases.

For each item, we noted the principal actor reviewed, that is, the actor receiving the most attention. Intercoder reliability for coding the principal actor proved to be good (Cohen's Kappa of .81). These actors include not just artists, but also people involved in the production,

---

<sup>1</sup> Applied arts includes architecture, arts and crafts, fashion, and design.

<sup>2</sup> This sample procedure minimizes the risk that the sampled years are outliers. If specific (cultural) events occurred in our sampled years, they are unlikely to affect the arts and culture coverage of the entire year.

<sup>3</sup> With the exception of magazine inserts, as they were not always available.



distribution, and consumption of culture, such as film companies, cultural policy organizations, critics, curators, and fans.<sup>4</sup> For all principal actors, the coders registered several variables, including whether they are contemporary actors,<sup>5</sup> their national origins (national identity), and their country of location (i.e., the country where the actors had their professional base at the time of the newspaper publication).

The primary measure of the degree of international orientation is the share of international or foreign actor items within the total number of items.<sup>6</sup> We classify all items as either a foreign or a domestic actor-item based on the country of location of the principal actor reviewed in the item. In addition, we code each item as foreign or domestic according to the principal actor's national origin. For items containing no principal actor, we use the dominant country location and nationality among the total group of actors discussed. Intercoder reliability of the main actor's country location and national origin is .93.

The data on the location of principal actors allow us to specify the direction of international orientation by considering the representation of specific countries and regions in arts and cultural coverage. We also look at the share of each country in the coverage given to contemporary actors only, to establish the degree to which countries are valued for their contribution to contemporary art and culture—as opposed to their traditional place in symbolic production.

Finally, foreign coverage may concentrate on a few specific countries and regions or involve a wider range. Besides counting the number of countries represented in international cultural coverage for each sample year and country, we compute a Gibbs-Martin index (Gibbs and Martin 1962) to measure the global diversity of international cultural coverage. We calculate this index by squaring the share of various world regions in the total number of international items and subtracting the sum of those squares from 1. The index ranges from zero to 1, with zero indicating a concentration of international coverage on a single region, and 1 indicating that the coverage is distributed evenly across all regions.<sup>7</sup>

## RESULTS

### THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF CULTURAL COVERAGE

We expect newspapers in all four countries to devote a growing part of their cultural coverage to foreign actors (H1). Table 1 shows, however, that while international cultural coverage increased in each of the European countries, the share of foreign culture in the *New York Times* remained constant (with a small increase in 1995, but a return to the levels of 1955 and 1975 in 2005).

<sup>4</sup> The three largest groups of principal actors are creative artists such as writers, composers, playwrights, scenarists, and visual artists (37 percent); performing artists (28 percent); and artistic directors such as directors, conductors, and choreographers (16 percent). About 11 percent of all items feature producers or mediators, such as film or music companies, publishers, museums, or gallery owners. In contrast, art experts, cultural policy actors, and laymen (e.g., fans and audiences) are the main actors in 4, 3, and 1 percent of all items, respectively.

<sup>5</sup> Actors are classified as contemporary if they were alive or—in the case of organizational actors—active at the time of publication. Actors who died in the year the item appeared are also coded as contemporary (in most cases, the death was the impetus for the article). Most of the newspaper items (89.8 percent) feature contemporary actors. The share of non-contemporary actors varies across cultural forms; it is highest in the coverage of visual arts (21 percent), literature (19.7 percent), and classical music (11.4 percent).

<sup>6</sup> In addition to the percent of foreign actor items, we calculate the percent of editorial space devoted to these items (i.e., the share of international cultural coverage within the total editorial space [in cm<sup>2</sup>] for arts and culture). Both measures yield similar results.

<sup>7</sup> The formula for the Gibbs-Martin index is as follows: Diversity =  $1 - \sum n_i (\text{region share}_i)^2$ .

For example, if all foreign actor items pertain to 2 regions having an equal share, the value of the diversity index would be  $1 - (.5^2 + .5^2) = 1 - (.25 + .25) = .5$ .

We classify items as domestic or foreign according to the country in which the principal actors are based at the time of publication. Part of the internationalization of the arts, though, lies in actors moving around the globe to find optimal conditions for producing and promoting their work (Florida 2002). Actors working in global centers such as New York are increasingly likely to be immigrants, implying a stronger internationalization of U.S. cultural coverage than is shown in Table 1. We therefore replicate our analyses using the national origin of actors instead of their country location.<sup>8</sup> For each country, particularly the United States, this results in a higher proportion of international arts coverage in all sample years, but the differences are modest. More importantly, the general picture does not differ from that in Table 1: international cultural coverage increases in the European countries, but not in the United States.

**Table 1.** Percentage of Newspaper Items Devoted to Foreign Actors by Country and Year

A.	1955	1975	1995	2005	N
All countries	32.5	37.5	45.7	46.9	14,624
France	29.1	31.8	44.1	49.5	3,784
Germany	44.5	50.0	55.2	57.6	3,281
Netherlands	46.4	45.2	51.5	52.2	3,394
United States	26.0	25.7	30.0	26.2	4,164
N	3,035	2,892	4,183	4,514	
<b>B. Differences Across Time</b>					
	FR	GE	NL	US	
All years	***	***	**	ns	
1975 to 1955	ns	ns	ns	ns	
1995 to 1975	***	*	*	ns	
2005 to 1995	**	ns	ns	ns	
<b>C. Cross-National Differences</b>					
	1955	1975	1995	2005	
All countries	***	***	***	***	
FR – GE	***	***	***	***	
FR – NL	***	***	**	ns	
FR – US	ns	**	***	***	
GE – NL	ns	ns	ns	**	
GE – US	***	***	***	***	
NL – US	***	***	***	***	

Note: FR = France; GE = Germany; NL = Netherlands; US = United States.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ ; ns = not significant (two-tailed chi-square tests).

## DEGREE OF INTERNATIONAL ORIENTATION BY COUNTRY

The four countries differ markedly in the degree of internationalization of arts and culture coverage (Table 1). In 1955, the French newspapers and the *New York Times* had similar degrees of internationalization. While the share of foreign actors remained modest in the *New York Times*, it rose to almost 50 percent in 2005 in the French papers. This is on par with the Dutch papers but lower than the German papers' 58 percent.

In 1955, Dutch and German newspapers were more internationally oriented than their U.S. and French counterparts, both devoting around 45 percent of items to international cultural actors. Like the French papers, the degree of internationalization in Dutch and German papers increased steadily, resulting in a majority share of foreign actors in 2005.

Considering its size (H2) as well as its location in the cultural world system (H3), we anticipated that the United States would be the least internationally oriented. Our results support these hypotheses. The French newspapers and the *New York Times* show a similar degree of international orientation in 1955 (see Table 1, panel C). This suggests that centrality (H3a) is more important than size (H2) in determining coverage. Although France is much

<sup>8</sup> See Table B1 in the Online Supplement on the ASR Web site (<http://www2.asanet.org/journals/asr/2008/toc065.html>)

smaller than the United States, it had a highly central position in the international art world in the early years of our study. The strong internationalization of French arts journalism accords with the decline of France’s central position, thus supporting the centrality hypothesis (H3b).

We expected the Dutch papers, being situated in the smallest country, to have the largest proportion of international arts coverage. Dutch and German newspapers, however, show no significant differences in international coverage in 1955, 1975, and 1995. In 2005, international coverage is higher for the German papers (Table 1, panel C). This, again, is consistent with the centrality hypothesis. Neither Germany nor the Netherlands has had a central position in any cultural genre after the 1950s. Although Germany is much larger, cultural coverage in German and Dutch newspapers is equally internationally oriented in most years.

Finally, we find little evidence that cultural policy affects international cultural coverage in European countries (H4). The strong internationalization of French arts coverage runs counter to Hypothesis 4a, which anticipates an enduring preoccupation with national culture in French newspapers. The similar degree of international cultural coverage in German and Dutch papers in 1955, 1975, and 1995 does not accord with Hypothesis 4b. We expected German papers to be less preoccupied with domestic culture in view of Germany’s decentralized and relatively open cultural policy system. Only in 2005, though, are the German papers significantly more internationally oriented than the Dutch and French papers, thus providing some support for Hypothesis 4b.

#### DEGREE OF INTERNATIONAL ORIENTATION BY GENRE<sup>9</sup>

As Hypothesis 5 predicts, newspaper coverage of some cultural forms is more internationalized than the coverage of others. Theater coverage is one of the least international forms of arts journalism (see Table 2). Although international theater coverage increased in 1975, it declined again afterward, yielding low levels of internationalization for 1995 and 2005. Theater is local and strongly dependent on language, which makes it difficult to commodify. Dance, which is not commodifiable but also not dependent on language, has more international coverage than theater, but coverage did not increase over time. These findings are consistent with our hypothesis that performance-based genres are not very susceptible to the internationalizing forces in arts journalism (H5a).

**Table 2.** Percentage of Newspaper Items Devoted to Foreign Actors by Genre, 1955 to 2005

	1955	1975	1995	2005	Total	N	X <sup>2</sup>
Classical music	<b>44.7</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>51.4</b>	<b>46.2</b>	1,831	**
Dance	<b>45.7</b>	39.7	38.3	38.3	40.0	450	ns
Film	34.9	<b>53.7</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>60.6</b>	<b>52.5</b>	2,350	***
Literature	<b>35.3</b>	<b>40.3</b>	45.8	47.6	43.5	2,660	***
Popular music	24.2	37.6	<b>58.9</b>	<b>53.2</b>	<b>51.6</b>	1,387	***
Television fiction	—	17.8	22.7	20.2	19.0	567	ns
Theater	22.3	32.6	28.4	24.2	26.3	1,911	**
Visual arts	28.5	36.1	47.5	48.2	41.8	1,822	***

Notes: The three most international genres are in bold. For a pair wise comparison of genres, see Table B2 in the Online Supplement. \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ ; ns = not significant (two-tailed chi-square tests).

<sup>9</sup> We do not include the following in this section: 549 items covering more than one genre (3.6 percent of all items), 183 items in which the genre was unclear (1.5 percent of all items), and 966 items dealing with applied arts (6.3 percent of all items). For 1955, we exclude television items (N = 82) because they appear almost exclusively in the *New York Times*. The virtual absence of television stories in the European newspapers is probably due to the late introduction of television in Europe relative to the United States.

For all forms of recorded culture, the attention devoted to foreign actors increased between 1955 and 2005, with the exception of television. In 1955, film and popular music coverage was less international than the coverage of dance and classical music. In all other sample years, film was the most international genre, and popular music ranked second in 1995 and 2005. The largest growth in international orientation occurred in visual arts, film, and, particularly, popular music.

We do not, however, find the anticipated differences between mass-mediated and other forms of recorded culture (H5a). In 2005, popular music (mass mediated) and classical music were equally internationalized. Coverage of television was highly national in orientation, possibly because national governments controlled much of television during our research period (Sassoon 2006). Generally, variations in internationalization between recorded genres are hard to interpret, which may indicate that their mode of distribution is not relevant to internationalization.

We anticipated a stronger national orientation for more language-dependent cultural forms (H5b), but our results support this hypothesis only for theater coverage. When comparing recorded genres, the most language-dependent cultural form, literature, is as internationally oriented as the visual arts. Further, coverage is more international for film, which is partly language-dependent, than for classical music. The strong international coverage of film is consistent with Hypothesis 5c, that capital-intensive cultural forms will be most international.

In sum, although the nine genres show marked differences in internationalization, we find clear support only for the hypothesized distinction between recorded and performance-based culture. Linguistic specificity and capital intensiveness may play some part, but our results are inconclusive.

### DEGREE OF INTERNATIONAL ORIENTATION BY COUNTRY AND GENRE

Table 3 shows finer distinctions in the internationalization of arts coverage, presenting the share of foreign actor items by country and genre. The U.S. pattern differs markedly from that of the European countries. Coverage in the *New York Times* has a much stronger national orientation for television, theater, popular music, literature, film, and visual arts. The level of internationalization shows no significant change in any direction, except for film and dance. After 1955, the *New York Times* coverage of dance became more focused on domestic actors. At the same time, its international coverage of film, a genre in which the United States is a market leader, actually increased, although it remains far below the level of the European countries.

The strong national orientation of the *New York Times* for most genres supports our hypothesis (H6) that newspapers from countries with a central position in a particular cultural field will be less internationally oriented in those fields. Moreover, the *New York Times*' national focus is particularly strong in U.S. dominated fields such as film, popular music, television, dance, and, in the later years, visual arts (see the Appendix, Table A2).

Even in fields where U.S. hegemony is less salient (e.g., literature, theater, and classical music), coverage is more national in focus than coverage in the European papers. This overall national orientation may be connected with a more general centralized position: if one is in the cultural center, there is no need to look far. One could also argue, though, that the United States, and especially New York, has a central position in the literary field and the performing arts. We expected French newspapers to have a strong national orientation during the early years of this study in fields in which France had a central position (see the Appendix, Table A2). In 1955, coverage of literature, theater, and the visual arts was indeed

very national in orientation. Film coverage was especially nationally oriented in 1975, which according to our data is closer than 1955 to the heyday of French film. After 1975, the level of international orientation increases for all genres. By 2005, French newspapers were similar to their Dutch and German counterparts in the fields of classical music, theater, and visual arts. They remained more nationally oriented in their coverage of literature and dance than the German newspapers, but they no longer differed from Dutch papers (see Tables B3 to B10 in the Online Supplement). For film and popular music, the difference between France and the other European countries was still significant in 2005. This may be the result of French policies designed to protect domestic cultural industries, which would be consistent with Hypothesis 4b, the policy hypothesis.

**Table 3.** Percentage of Newspaper Items Devoted to Foreign Actors by Country and Genre, 1955 to 2005

	1955	1975	1995	2005	Total	N	X <sup>2</sup>
France							
Classical music	<b>45.1</b>	33.7	<b>57.6</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>48.2</b>	342	**
Dance	<b>34.8</b>	<b>36.0</b>	35.3	36.8	<i>35.6</i>	101	ns
Film	<b>50.6</b>	<b>41.8</b>	<b>55.8</b>	<b>61.8</b>	<b>53.7</b>	773	**
Literature	19.4	<b>36.2</b>	38.3	48.1	38.9	699	***
Popular music	29.6	31.8	<b>64.0</b>	<b>54.6</b>	<b>56.5</b>	371	***
Television	—	6.3	19.1	30.8	23.3	116	*
Theater	15.0	20.2	22.7	27.0	<i>20.5</i>	513	ns
Visual arts	14.5	33.6	43.6	53.6	<i>37.4</i>	423	***
Germany							
Classical music	40.0	53.1	52.5	48.2	<i>49.2</i>	421	ns
Dance	<b>50.0</b>	<b>81.0</b>	<b>74.2</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>75.7</b>	74	ns
Film	<b>47.9</b>	<b>77.0</b>	<b>80.9</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>73.2</b>	440	***
Literature	<b>52.2</b>	47.3	49.1	57.8	<i>54.5</i>	695	ns
Popular music	37.5	<b>66.7</b>	<b>74.4</b>	<b>75.5</b>	<b>72.8</b>	202	ns
Television	—	20.4	22.2	20.0	<i>20.7</i>	217	ns
Theater	48.0	48.5	41.5	39.3	<i>44.4</i>	396	ns
Visual arts	37.3	48.0	53.8	59.3	<i>52.4</i>	532	**
Netherlands							
Classical Music	<b>39.8</b>	45.4	51.5	<b>61.2</b>	<i>49.5</i>	465	**
Dance	27.3	26.1	35.0	33.3	<i>31.0</i>	87	ns
Film	<b>84.1</b>	<b>71.8</b>	<b>73.8</b>	<b>72.5</b>	<b>74.5</b>	435	ns
Literature	<b>50.6</b>	<b>53.0</b>	53.1	48.6	<i>51.0</i>	645	ns
Popular music	23.1	<b>62.0</b>	<b>70.9</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>67.4</b>	429	**
Television	—	26.5	<b>58.3</b>	26.7	<i>33.3</i>	63	ns
Theater	35.6	40.0	29.4	23.0	<i>30.9</i>	414	*
Visual arts	37.0	26.8	47.3	48.1	<i>42.9</i>	473	**
United States							
Classical music	<b>47.8</b>	30.3	32.7	<b>42.7</b>	<b>40.5</b>	603	**
Dance	<b>56.4</b>	<b>30.8</b>	18.8	<b>28.6</b>	<b>32.4</b>	188	**
Film	14.4	<b>33.8</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>34.5</b>	<i>25.4</i>	702	***
Literature	29.2	25.0	<b>33.8</b>	24.3	<i>28.3</i>	621	ns
Popular music	19.0	17.5	19.4	15.2	<i>17.3</i>	376	ns
Television	6.4	9.7	19.0	12.3	<i>11.9</i>	253	ns
Theater	13.5	25.8	15.7	12.2	<i>16.0</i>	588	*
Visual arts	<b>29.8</b>	<b>33.8</b>	<b>35.4</b>	27.4	<b>31.0</b>	394	ns

Note: The three most international genres are in bold.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ ; ns = not significant (two-tailed chi-square tests).

In practically all fields, Dutch and German newspapers were more internationally oriented than French (until 2005) or U.S. papers (in all four years). The Dutch newspapers were generally less internationally oriented than the German papers, especially in 2005, in the fields of literature, visual arts, theater, and dance (see Tables B3 to B10 in the Online Supplement). This may be connected to the distinct cultural policy frameworks of both countries. Contrary to the German papers, the Dutch papers show a clear trend toward increased internationalization in their classical music coverage, resulting in a significantly higher coverage of foreign actors in 2005. The relatively strong national focus of classical

music coverage in the German papers accords with Germany's prominent position in the field of classical music (see the Appendix, Table A2).

In other cultural fields and in most years, Dutch and German newspapers had strikingly similar degrees of international orientation. This confirms the role of centrality and also suggests that genre characteristics are more important than country characteristics. For both countries, the strongest increase and the highest international orientation occurred in the same mass-mediated forms of recorded culture (popular music and film). The initially high degree of foreign literature coverage remained at the same level and thus lagged behind the increasing international orientation for other genres. This stability may be attributed to the genre's strong language dependency, as neither Germany nor the Netherlands had a strong position in the field of literature during this period.

### **DIRECTION AND DIVERSITY OF INTERNATIONAL ORIENTATION**

Our last four hypotheses concern the origin of the actors featured in newspaper coverage. We anticipated a high level of attention to actors from neighboring countries or the same language area (H7); increasing global diversification (H8); and, for the European papers, increasing coverage of U.S. art and culture (H9) at the expense of regional and linguistic preferences (H10).

Our results do not support the specific regional or linguistic orientations that we expected (see Tables C1 to C4 in the Online Supplement). We do find some evidence of this relationship, however, in the prominent place of Austrian actors in the German newspapers; these papers also discuss East German and Swiss actors with some frequency. The role of shared language is also apparent from the prominence of British actors in the otherwise nationally oriented *New York Times*, but the effect is not very strong. Moreover, the U.S. data offer no support for the alleged orientation toward neighboring countries. The *New York Times* rarely features Canadian arts actors, but it does focus on actors from Europe. For France and the Netherlands, the rankings provide little evidence for the geographical or linguistic proximity hypothesis. For example, only about 1.6 percent of French newspaper items mention Belgium, which shares a language and a boundary with France. Belgium receives more attention in Dutch newspapers, but it never reaches above 3.3 percent. In both cases, Belgium ranks highest in 2005, suggesting an increase rather than decrease of regional orientation.

In sum, the data do not substantiate the geographic or linguistic proximity hypothesis (H7). The German newspapers' orientation to a cross-national German-speaking region is an exception, and this may partly explain the high degree of international orientation we find in these papers. Insofar as there is an effect, language kinship seems more important than geographical proximity.

Hypothesis 8 predicts increasing global diversification in arts journalism, which our findings support. In 2005, the newspaper sample features actors from 72 different countries, as opposed to 47 countries in 1955 (see Table 4). Moreover, the share of European actors declines sharply (especially those from Western Europe), while the share of actors from other parts of the world increases. This includes actors from not just North America, but also Africa, Oceania, Latin America, and, most notably, Asia, which accounts for 7.3 percent of international arts coverage in 2005 (see Table 5).

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

**Table 4.** Number of Countries Represented in Newspaper Arts and Culture Coverage per Country and Entire Sample, 1955 to 2005

	1955	1975	1995	2005	N
France	28	38	59	60	3,784
Germany	23	33	47	48	3,281
Netherlands	21	34	44	57	3,394
United States	38	36	45	53	4,164
Entire sample	47	56	69	72	14,624

**Table 5.** Representation of Regions in Foreign Arts and Culture Coverage (Percentage of Items per Region)

	1955	1975	1995	2005
Mean Share per Region (FR, GE, NL, and US)				
Europe (Western)	68.7	57.8	53.0	52.8
Europe (other)	9.6	13.5	8.1	7.2
North America	17.3	19.5	26.7	23.8
Latin America	1.7	3.3	3.3	3.8
Asia	2.2	4.3	4.6	8.0
Africa	.1	1.2	3.0	3.1
Oceania	.4	.7	1.4	1.4
Global diversity (Gibbs-Martin)	.49	.61	.64	.65
France				
Europe (Western)	48.9	51.1	42.6	42.7
Europe (other)	11.0	14.9	5.4	8.7
North America	34.1	23.4	35.8	28.6
Latin America	2.7	5.5	5.4	4.5
Asia	3.3	3.8	5.4	10.2
Africa	0	.9	4.4	5.1
Oceania	0	.4	1.0	.2
Global diversity (Gibbs-Martin)	.63	.66	.68	.71
Germany				
Europe (Western)	71.5	59.0	51.0	52.8
Europe (other)	13.3	17.6	9.6	6.7
North America	12.7	19.6	31.1	31.9
Latin America	1.9	1.0	1.3	1.6
Asia	0	1.3	3.8	5.4
Africa	0	1.0	1.2	.7
Oceania	.6	.6	2.0	1.0
Global diversity (Gibbs-Martin)	.45	.58	.63	.61
Netherlands				
Europe (Western)	76.1	58.3	54.6	49.5
Europe (other)	4.3	7.3	8.3	8.6
North America	18.3	26.2	32.0	30.4
Latin America	.4	1.3	2.4	2.2
Asia	.9	4.6	1.5	5.3
Africa	0	2.3	1.1	3.4
Oceania	0	0	.2	.6
Global diversity (Gibbs-Martin)	.39	.58	.59	.65
United States				
Europe (Western)	78.4	62.7	63.9	66.0
Europe (other)	9.7	14.0	9.0	4.7
North America	4.0	8.8	7.8	4.3
Latin America	1.9	5.2	3.9	7.0
Asia	4.6	7.3	7.8	10.9
Africa	.3	.5	5.1	3.1
Oceania	1.1	1.6	2.4	3.9
Global diversity (Gibbs-Martin)	.37	.57	.57	.54

*Note:* This table does not include domestic coverage.

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

**Table 6.** Representation of Countries in Arts and Culture Coverage, 1955 to 2005: Mean Percentage of Items per Country in Dutch, French, German, and U.S. Newspapers

1955	Percent	1975	Percent	1995	Percent	2005	Percent				
<i>Home Country</i>	63.5	(62.9)	<i>Home Country</i>	61.8	(60.5)	<i>Home Country</i>	54.8	(56.1)	<i>Home Country</i>	53.6	(53.8)
France	8.9	(8.1)	US	8.7	(9.2)	US	14.7	(15.3)	US	14.8	(15.2)
US	7.3	(8.1)	UK	5.3	(5.0)	UK	7.4	(7.4)	UK	6.4	(6.4)
UK	4.7	(4.7)	France	4.6	(4.5)	France	4.8	(4.5)	France	4.1	(3.7)
Italy	3.5	(3.5)	Italy	3.7	(3.6)	Italy	2.9	(2.1)	Italy	2.9	(2.3)
West Germany	2.6	(2.4)	USSR/Russia	2.6	(2.4)	Germany	2.6	(2.1)	Germany	2.6	(1.9)
Austria	2.0	(1.9)	West Germany	2.5	(1.8)	Austria	1.6	(1.4)	Belgium	1.6	(1.4)
USSR/Russia	1.5	(.9)	Austria	2.0	(1.7)	Russia/USSR	1.2	(1.0)	Austria	1.4	(1.3)
Spain	1.3	(1.5)	Belgium	.9	(.7)	Spain	1.1	(1.0)	Switzerland	1.4	(1.2)
Denmark	.8	(.4)	Spain	.9	(.8)	Canada	1.0	(1.1)	Russia/USSR	1.3	(1.1)
Switzerland	.8	(.9)	East Germany	.8	(.7)	Belgium	.9	(.9)	Japan	1.1	(1.1)
East Germany	.7	(.8)	Switzerland	.7	(.7)	Switzerland	.9	(.9)	Spain	1.1	(.6)
Belgium	.5	(.4)	Netherlands	.7	(.4)	Australia	.5	(.4)	Netherlands	.9	(.7)
Canada	.5	(.4)	Sweden	.5	(.5)	Netherlands	.4	(.4)	Canada	.8	(.9)
Hungary	.4	(.3)	Canada	.4	(.5)	Japan	.4	(.4)	Poland	.6	(.5)
Australia	.3	(.1)	Czechoslovakia	.4	(.4)	Ireland	.4	(.5)	China	.6	(.6)
Japan	.3	(.3)	Hungary	.4	(.3)	Poland	.4	(.4)	Norway	.4	(.3)
Netherlands	.3	(.3)	Japan	.4	(.5)	Denmark	.3	(.3)	South Korea	.4	(.5)
			Denmark	.3	(.1)	South Africa	.3	(.3)	Mexico	.4	(.4)
			Israel	.3	(.3)				Ireland	.4	(.4)
			Poland	.3	(.4)				Denmark	.4	(.3)
									South Africa	.4	(.5)
									Sweden	.4	(.4)
									Australia	.3	(.4)
									Portugal	.3	(.3)
29 other countries < .3			35 other countries < .3			50 other countries < .3			47 other countries < .3		
N = 3,035 (2,614)			N = 2,892 (2,485)			N = 4,183 (3,563)			N = 4,514 (3,890)		

*Note:* Each country's share in contemporary arts and culture coverage is in parentheses.



The Gibbs-Martin index of global diversity in coverage (see Data and Method section) has increased since 1955 in all four countries at a remarkably similar pace. With the exception of France, which had a much higher diversity level at the start of our research period, coverage diversity increased the fastest between 1955 and 1975, with little growth thereafter. This suggests the need for further analysis on the role of globalization, as globalization is generally considered to have accelerated after the 1970s.

Table 6 shows the ranking of the country locations of the main actors for the entire data set, enabling us to identify the “winners” and “losers” in the cultural world system. Italy and the USSR/Russia lost ground in international arts journalism, but France suffered the largest decline. In 2005, French actors were featured in only 4.1 percent of Dutch, German, and U.S. articles devoted to arts and culture, compared with 8.9 percent in 1955.

As Hypothesis 9 predicts, U.S. actors witness the biggest increase in newspaper coverage abroad. The United States’ share doubles between 1955 and 2005, with the steepest increase occurring between 1975 and 1995. This development, though, is not accompanied by a decline in attention to arts and culture from neighboring or linguistically related countries (H10). Increasing coverage of U.S. arts and culture is primarily due to diminished attention to domestic arts and culture and to the “losers” of the cultural world system. Moreover, there is an interesting side effect: the other “winner” is the United Kingdom, probably due to the cultural and linguistic affinity it has with the United States. In the slipstream of the U.S. success, coverage of British arts and culture also increased.

Despite these winners and losers, all the rankings of international cultural coverage from the four countries’ newspapers remain remarkably stable over time. Spearman’s correlation coefficient between each pair of reference years ranges from .81 (1955 versus 2005) to .96 (1975 versus 1995).<sup>10</sup> The United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Italy are in the top five of each country’s newspapers in all sample years. The fifth country varies, most often it is Germany, sometimes Russia, and in Germany it is usually Austria.

Although the lion’s share of all newspaper items feature contemporary actors, in some fields, such as classical music, the visual arts, and literature, a comparatively high proportion of items focus on historical actors (see note 5). This might explain certain countries’ high ranking in international cultural coverage. In addition to the overall ranking of countries, Table 6 shows each country’s share in the coverage given to contemporary actors (in parentheses). This indicates the degree to which countries are valued for their contribution to contemporary art and culture. In all years, the ranking of countries according to their share in contemporary cultural coverage is highly similar to the overall ranking. Spearman’s correlation coefficient between the two rankings is higher than .95 ( $p < .001$ ) in all four sample years. Some countries, notably Italy and Germany, owe their prominent position in later years to their past cultural performance. This suggests that the effects of a central position in specific cultural fields can linger for a long time. By contrast, the United States’ high ranking primarily results from its performance in contemporary art and culture. Although many items about Austrian actors concern Mozart, Austria’s solid position in the overall ranking (sixth or seventh) appears to result from contemporary Austrian art actors’ presence in the German papers, rather than from Austria’s former strength in classical music.

---

<sup>10</sup> In the other cases, Spearman’s correlation coefficient amounts to .86 (1955 versus 1975), .90 (1955 versus 1995), .90 (1975 versus 2005), and .88 (1995 versus 2005). In each case,  $p \leq .001$ .

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The research reported in this article examines trends in the degree, direction, and diversity of the international orientation of newspaper coverage of cultural genres in France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States during 1955 to 2005. We found a clear internationalization of arts and culture coverage in the European newspapers, but not in the *New York Times*, which devoted roughly one-quarter of its coverage to foreign actors throughout the research period. German and Dutch papers' cultural coverage already showed a high international orientation in 1955, and this grew steadily to just over half of the total attention devoted to arts and culture. French newspapers used to be strongly focused on national arts and culture but have become much more internationally oriented over time.

Our findings indicate that the centrality of a country's cultural production offers a better explanation for cross-national differences in journalistic attention to foreign culture than does population size or cultural policy. Germany, the largest EU member, but a country with a peripheral position in the cultural world system, shows more resemblances to the Netherlands, equally peripheral but much smaller, than it does to France, which is almost the same size but far more central to the international art world. The comparative shifts in the coverage of individual cultural genres further underscores the importance of centrality. The increasing international orientation of French newspapers coincides with France's declining dominance in the production of literature, film, and the visual arts. Moreover, the decrease in national focus is largest for those genres in which France held a particularly strong position in the early years of our study (see Appendix, Table A2).

Cultural globalization is not a unidirectional process. It has provoked a number of counter-tendencies, such as the rise of anti-globalization and anti-American movements and sentiments, a growing awareness of national identities and heritage, and the implementation of policies to protect or endorse national culture (Crane et al. 2002). We find little evidence, however, of policy effects on the international orientation of arts journalism. The countries in our study differ significantly in their levels of cultural protectionism but the effects are not very visible. Exceptions are the French papers' film and popular music coverage which, compared to the Dutch and German papers, continues to be more national in focus, and the comparatively strong international orientation of German arts journalism in 2005. Even more striking, journalistic attention to arts and culture from other EU countries has decreased. The period of our study corresponds almost exactly with the institution of the European Economic Community (EEC), which later became the European open market, and all three European countries in our study were founding EEC members.

Our examination of the direction and diversity of international orientation (i.e., the origins of the cultural actors discussed in newspapers) shows the other side of centrality's importance in the cultural world system. Irrespective of geographical or linguistic proximity, a select group of countries—namely the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, and Germany—receive the most attention in all four sample countries. Again, we see France's waning influence in these rankings balanced by such a dramatic rise of the United States that one could perhaps speak of “Americanization” (Beck, Sznaider, and Winter 2003).

The growing share of U.S. arts and culture in European newspapers is partly due to the increased prominence of U.S. actors in traditional “high” arts, such as the visual arts and literature. The United States has also benefited from the increasing importance of mass-produced and mediated cultural products in Western societies. In the past 50 years, “popular” cultural forms have gained in legitimacy, as indicated, in part, by increased coverage in elite newspapers (Baumann 2001; Heilbrun 1997; Janssen 1999). Therefore, the relatively limited coverage of foreign actors in the *New York Times* probably does not mean that the United States has been immune to cultural globalization. Rather, it provides additional support for the

centrality hypothesis. The U.S. cultural field's growing international embeddedness may have promoted openness to foreign culture, but this effect may have been neutralized by the United States' increasingly central position in the dominant cultural genres of the late twentieth century.

In contrast to the contra-flow argument, newspaper attention to arts and culture has not become much more global. The global diversity of cultural coverage has increased, but attention to peripheral or non-Western countries is only a small part of the internationalization of cultural coverage. This finding, which is consistent with other empirical research (Biltreyst and Meers 2000; Johnston and Baumann 2007; Quemin 2006), underscores the enduring imbalance in international cultural exchanges. International coverage of the arts is largely confined to a select group of countries—what we may call the core and the semi-periphery of the cultural world system—while domestic culture remains important in all four countries.

This enduring journalistic focus on domestic culture is inherent to processes of news selection in which domestic locale is a key value. Reviewers and other cultural experts tend to be preoccupied with the valuation and ranking of the work of indigenous artists because it is primarily at the national level that their judgments “count” in processes of artistic valorization and canon formation. Newspaper coverage of arts and culture is therefore likely to have a local bias.

This study leaves a number of underexposed issues for future research to explore. First, we did not look at the role of newspaper journalism in the wider political and sociocultural context of our sample countries (Ferree et al. 2002), nor did we examine the ways in which variations in national media systems may affect the form and content of international coverage (Benson and Saguy 2005). Second, we ignored the content of cultural coverage and treated any coverage, positive or negative, as interchangeable. It is a distinct possibility, though, that while European newspapers frequently review U.S. art, the reviews might be very critical, drawing symbolic boundaries between domestic or European products and U.S. imports. Surely, this would qualify the “Americanization” of European arts journalism. Still, such a finding would underscore the increased centrality of the United States in the cultural world system: not only does it set the standards, but it is also a favorite whipping board and counter-example in discourse about national identities (Kroes 1996).

Our central focus has been on specific manifestations of cultural globalization. We conceptualized cultural globalization primarily as the exchange of cultural goods, as well as the growing awareness of the world outside one's own nation. As noted in the introduction, however, cultural globalization may manifest itself in other ways, such as the emergence of hybrid genres like French–Algerian or German–Turkish rap music. We do not consider cultural hybridization here, mainly because our methods cannot adequately trace this manifestation of globalization. Another unexamined effect of globalization is the possibly declining influence of nationally-based institutions and distribution networks (including, perhaps, national newspapers). Transnational media and distribution networks provide new opportunities for small groups, from transnational diasporas to global fan communities, to access cultural products outside their countries of residence. National newspapers, while probably quite representative of the cultural mainstream, clearly are not the right source to research such developments.

Finally, our finding that a sizeable group of arts actors, especially in the United States, have different countries of origin raises questions about the role of the locations in which these cultural emigrants anchor and engage in their cultural activities. Based on their reputations as creative centers, certain cities and regions attract artists and cultural entrepreneurs from around the world (Florida 2002; Scott 1997), which guarantees constant media attention due to their high cultural output. These culturally rich metropolitan areas also

target audiences from abroad. Blockbuster museum exhibitions in “global cities” such as New York, London, and Paris (Sassen 2001) are no longer produced exclusively for local audiences but are intended to attract tourists from across the globe. To what extent and in what ways these forms of artistic globalization affect newspaper coverage of the arts remains an interesting topic for further exploration.

#### AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

*Susanne Janssen is Professor of Sociology of Media and Culture in the Departments of Media and Arts and Culture Studies at Erasmus University Rotterdam. She has published widely on the agents and institutions involved in the production and mediation of culture, the social conditions of cultural production and consumption, media use, and the digitization of culture. She is the director and principal director of the VICI-project Cultural Classification Systems in Transition, a large-scale comparative research project on the internationalization and social valuation of culture since the 1950s.*

*Giselinde Kuipers is Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Amsterdam. She has published on media, cultural globalization, and the sociology of humor. In 2006, she published Good Humor, Bad Taste: A Sociology of the Joke. Her current research is concerned mostly with the internationalization of culture in a comparative perspective.*

*Marc Verboord is Assistant Professor in the Department of Media at Erasmus University Rotterdam. He has published on cultural consumption patterns, socialization, and media use. He is currently involved in a large-scale research project on the social valuation of cultural products in France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States since the 1950s.*

APPENDIX

**Table A1.** Country Size: Population Size (in millions) of France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States, 1950 to 2005

	1950	1960	1975	1995	2005
France <sup>a</sup>	41.6	45.5	52.6	57.8	60.7
(West) Germany <sup>b</sup>	50.9	55.9	61.6	81.8	82.4
Netherlands <sup>c</sup>	10.0	11.4	13.5	15.4	16.3
United States <sup>d</sup>	150.2	179.3	215.9	262.8	296.4

<sup>a</sup> Source: French National Institute of Economic and Statistical Information (INSEE). 2006. *The French Demographic Situation in 2004: Population Changes*. Population of metropolitan France on January 1 (overseas departments are not included).

<sup>b</sup> Source: Federal Statistical Office Germany (Statistisches Bundesamt Deutschland). Figures for 1950, 1960, and 1975 pertain to the Federal Republic of Germany only.

<sup>c</sup> Source: Statistics Netherlands (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek).

<sup>d</sup> Source: Population Estimates Program, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

**Table A2.** Centrality of Cultural Production: Average Proportion of Attention Devoted to the United States, France, Germany, and the Netherlands in the Foreign Arts Coverage of the Other Three Countries' Newspapers, Total and Per Genre, 1955 to 2005

	Year	Percent U.S.	Percent France	Percent Germany	Percent Netherlands	
Total	1955	18	21	7	1	
	1975	19	11	7	2	
	1995	28	10	5	1	
	2005	27	8	6	2	
Per Genre						
	Classical music	1955	13	15	14	< 1
		1975	12	9	14	2
		1995	14	7	15	< 1
2005		10	5	22	3	
Dance	1955	22	< 1	< 1	< 1	
	1975	18	6	< 1	6	
	1995	35	7	7	4	
	2005	22	2	3	< 1	
Film	1955	28	13	7	< 1	
	1975	28	21	7	< 1	
	1995	44	14	2	1	
	2005	45	13	4	< 1	
Literature	1955	17	21	10	< 1	
	1975	17	12	4	< 1	
	1995	15	7	5	< 1	
	2005	19	8	2	2	
Popular music	1955	38	32	< 1	< 1	
	1975	45	5	2	< 1	
	1995	50	4	< 1	< 1	
	2005	47	3	4	< 1	
Television	1955	–	–	–	–	
	1975	13	6	4	< 1	
	1995	32	11	8	< 1	
	2005	44	11	3	< 1	
Theater	1955	14	28	3	1	
	1975	15	5	5	< 1	
	1995	11	7	10	< 1	
	2005	9	8	3	< 1	
Visual arts	1955	3	21	6	8	
	1975	12	7	10	6	
	1995	21	10	10	4	
	2005	16	11	10	5	

Note: For more details on how we measured cultural coverage, see the Data and Method section.

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

**Table A3.** Cultural Policy: Source and Level of Government Support in France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States, 1993 to 1995

	FR	GE	NL	US
Main Year of Data	1993	1993	1994	1995
Source of Government Support <sup>a</sup>				
Central	43%	8%	48%	41%
Regional	4%	34%	5%	17%
Local	53%	54%	47%	42%
Level of Government Support <sup>b</sup>				
Government direct arts spending as percentage of gross domestic product	.26%	.36%	.21%	.02%
Direct spending per capita	\$57	\$85	\$46	\$6

Note: FR = France; GE = Germany; NL = Netherlands; US = United States.

<sup>a</sup> Source: ACE (1998: Tables 13.2 and 6.2). Figures for Germany are recalculated from Table 6.2, as the figures in Table 13.2 do not add to 100 in the source. These figures capture only part of a more nuanced overall picture. According to the National Endowment of the Arts (NEA 2007), the United States actually has a far more decentralized support system than do European countries.

<sup>b</sup> Source: The NEA (2000: Table 1) provides a conversion of the figures reported in the ACE (1998) report into U.S. dollars.

## REFERENCES

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Applegate, Celia and Pamela Potter, eds. 2002. *Music and German National Identity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Art Council of England (ACE). 1998. *International Data on Public Spending on the Arts in Eleven Countries*. London, UK: Art Council of England.
- Baumann, Shyon. 2001. "Intellectualization and Art World Development: Film in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 66:404–26.
- Beck, Ulrich. 2002. "The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies." *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(1–2):17–44.
- Beck, Ulrich, Nathan Sznaider, and Rainer Winter, eds. 2003. *Global America? The Cultural Consequences of Globalization*. Liverpool, UK: Liverpool University Press.
- Benson, Rodney and Abigail C. Saguy. 2005. "Constructing Social Problems in an Age of Globalization: A French-American Comparison." *American Sociological Review* 70:233–59.
- Berger, Peter L. and Samuel P. Huntington, eds. 2002. *Many Globalizations: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Biltreyst, Daniël and Philip Meers. 2000. "The International Telenovela Debate and the Contra-flow Argument: A Reappraisal." *Media, Culture and Society* 22(4):393–413.
- Blau, Peter M. 1977. *Inequality and Heterogeneity*. New York: Free Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Cambridge, UK: Polity press.
- Casanova, Pascale. 2004. *The World Republic of Letters*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Castells, Manuel. 1997. *The Power of Identity*. London, UK: Blackwell.
- Clausen, Lisbeth. 2003. *Global News Production*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Crane, Diana. 1992. *The Production of Culture: Media and the Urban Arts*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Crane, Diana, Nobuko Kawashima, and Ken'ichi Kawasaki, eds. 2002. *Global Culture: Media, Arts, Policy, and Globalization*. London and New York: Routledge.

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

- De Bens, Els and Hedwig de Smaele. 2001. "The Inflow of American Television Fiction on European Broadcasting Channels Revisited." *European Journal of Communication* 16:51–76.
- De Swaan, Abram. 1995. "De Sociologische Studie van de Transnationale samenleving." *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 22(1):16–35.
- . 2001. *Words of the World: The Global Language System*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- DiMaggio, Paul. 1987. "Classification in Art." *American Sociological Review* 52:440–55.
- Dowd, Timothy J., Kathleen Liddle, Kim Lupa, and Anne Borden. 2002. "Organizing the Musical Canon: The Repertoires of the Major U.S. Symphony Orchestras, 1842 to 1969." *Poetics* 30:35–61.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, William Anthony Gamson, Jürgen Gerhards, and Dieter Rucht. 2002. *Shaping Abortion Discourse: Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge, UK and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fiss, Peer C. and Paul M. Hirsch. 2005. "The Discourse of Globalization: Framing and Sensemaking of an Emerging Concept." *American Sociological Review* 70:29–52.
- Florida, Richard. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Galperin, Hernan. 1999. "Cultural Industries Policy in Regional Trade Agreements: The Cases of NAFTA, the European Union and MERCOSUR." *Media, Culture & Society* 21:627–48.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1979. *Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek and Time*. New York: Pantheon.
- Gerhards, Jürgen and Jörg Rössel. 2000. "Zur Transnationalisierung der Gesellschaft der Bundesrepublik: Entwicklungen, Ursachen und mögliche Folgen für die europäische Integration." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 28(5):325–44.
- Gibbs, Jack P. and Walter T. Martin. 1962. "Urbanization, Technology, and the Division of Labor." *American Sociological Review* 27:667–77.
- Giddens, Anthony. 2000. *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping our Lives*. New York: Routledge.
- Griswold, Wendy and Nathan Wright. 2004. "Cowbirds, Locals, and the Dynamic Endurance of Regionalism." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(6):1411–51.
- Guillén, Mauro F. 2001. "Is Globalization Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble? A Critique of Five Key Debates in the Social Science Literature." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:235–60.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1996. *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Heilbron, Johan. 1995. "Mondialisering en Transnationaal Verkeer." *Amsterdam Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 22(1):162–80.
- . 1999. "Towards A Sociology of Translation: Book Translations as a Cultural World-System." *European Journal of Social Theory* 2(4):429–44.
- Heilbrun, James. 1997. "The Competition between High Culture and Popular Culture as Seen in the *New York Times*." *Journal of Cultural Economics* 21:29–40.
- Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt, and Jonathan Perraton. 1999. *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Janssen, Susanne 1999. "Arts Journalism and Cultural Change: The Coverage of the Arts in Dutch Newspapers, 1965–1990." *Poetics* 26:329–48.

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

- Johnston, Josée and Shyon Baumann. 2007. "Democracy versus Distinction: A Study of Omnivorousness in Gourmet Food Writing." *American Journal of Sociology* 113:165–204.
- Katzenstein, Peter J. 2003. "Small States and Small States Revisited." *New Political Economy* 8(1):1–22.
- Kroes, Rob. 1996. *If You've Seen One, You've Seen the Mall: Europeans and American Mass Culture*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- La Palestina, Antonio C. and Joseph D. Straubhaar. 2005. "Multiple Proximities between Television Genres and Audiences." *Gazette* 67:271–88.
- Lechner, Frank J. and John Boli. 2005. *World Culture. Origins and Consequences*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Machet, Emanuelle, Eleftheria Pertziniidou, and David Ward. 2002. *A Comparative Analysis of Television Programming Regulation in Seven European Countries: A Benchmark Study*. Düsseldorf, Germany: European Institute for the Media.
- Marvasti, Akbar and E. Ray Canterbury. 2005. "Cultural and Other Barriers to Motion Pictures Trade." *Economic Inquiry* 43:39–54.
- Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. "World Society and the Nation-State." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(1):144–81.
- Miller, Toby, Nitin Govil, John McMurril, Richard Maxwell, and Ting Wang. 2005. *Global Hollywood 2*. Rev. ed. London, UK: British Film Institute.
- Miller, Toby and George Yúdice. 2002. *Cultural Policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moretti, Franco. 2001. "Planet Hollywood." *New Left Review* 9:90–101.
- Moulin, Raymonde. 2000. *Le Marché de L'Art: Mondialisation et Nouvelle Technologies*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 2000. "The Government and Cultural Patronage: A Comparative Analysis of Cultural Patronage in the United States, France, Norway, and Canada." Pp. 138–68 in *The Public life of the Arts in America*, edited by J. M. Cherbo and M. J. Wyszomirski. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers State University Press.
- National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). 2000. *International Data on Government Spending on the Arts*.
- National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). 2007. *How the United States Funds the Arts*. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: NEA.
- Neuendorf, Kimberly A. 2002. *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2004. *Enhancing Market Openness through Regulatory Reform: Regulatory Reform in Germany*. Paris: OECD.
- . 2005. *Enhancing Market Openness through Regulatory Reform: Regulatory Reform in France*. Paris: OECD.
- Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. 2006. *Cultural Policy in the Netherlands*. The Hague: Ministry of Education, Culture and Science.
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 1995. "Globalization as Hybridisation." Pp. 45–68 in *Global Modernities*, edited by M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson. London, UK: Sage.
- Quemin, Alain. 2006. "Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts." *International Sociology* 21(4):522–50.



## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

- Riffe, Daniel, Charles F. Aust, and Stephen R. Lacy. 1993. "The Effectiveness of Random, Consecutive Day and Constructed Week Samples in Newspaper Content Analysis." *Journalism Quarterly* 70:133–39.
- Sassen, Saskia. 2001. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sassoon, Donald. 2006. *The Culture of the Europeans: From 1800 to the Present*. London, UK: Harper Press.
- Scott, Allen J. 1997. "The Cultural Economy of Cities." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 21:323–39.
- . 2000. "French Cinema: Economy, Policy and Place in the Making of a Cultural-Products Industry." *Theory, Culture & Society* 17(1):1–38.
- Thusu, Daya Kishan. 2000. *International Communication: Continuity and Change*. London, UK: Arnold.
- Tomlinson, John. 1999. *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- UNESCO. 2000. *World Culture Report 2000. Cultural Diversity, Conflict and Pluralism*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Van Rees, Kees and Gillis Dorleijn. 2001. "The Eighteenth-Century Literary Field in Western Europe: The Interdependence of Material and Symbolic Production and Consumption." *Poetics* 28:331–48.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World-System*. Vol. 1, *Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York/London: Academic Press.
- Wilke, Jürgen. 1998. "Kultur als Thema der Auslandberichterstattung." Pp. 187–98 in *Medien-Kulturkommunikation*, edited by U. Saxer. Opladen, Germany: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Yair, Gad and Daniel Maman. 1996. "The Persistent Structure of Hegemony in the Eurovision Song Contest." *Acta Sociologica* 39(3):309–26.

**ONLINE SUPPLEMENT  
to article in**

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2008, VOL. 73 (OCTOBER: 719-740)

Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism: The International Orientation of Arts and Culture Coverage in U.S., Dutch, French, and German Newspapers, 1955 to 2005

Susanne Janssen  
*Erasmus University Rotterdam*

Giselinde Kuipers  
*University of Amsterdam*

Marc Verboord  
*Erasmus University Rotterdam*

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

**Table A.** Selected Newspapers per Country and their Circulation in 1955 and 1995<sup>a</sup>

	Founding Year	1955	1995
<i>Le Monde</i> <sup>a</sup>	1944	166,000	379,089
<i>Le Figaro</i> <sup>a</sup>	1854	384,000	391,533
<i>Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung</i> <sup>b</sup>	1949	145,475	391,220
<i>Süddeutsche Zeitung</i> <sup>c</sup>	1945	188,081	396,746
<i>N.R.C. / NRC Handelsblad</i> <sup>d</sup>	1844	109,471	267,000
<i>De Volkskrant</i> <sup>d</sup>	1919	149,501	359,000
<i>New York Times</i> <sup>e</sup>	1851	555,726	1,122,277

<sup>a</sup> Sources: J. M. Charon. 1996. *La Presse Quotidienne*. Paris, France; P. Murschetz. 1998. State Support for the Press in Europe: A Critical Appraisal. *European Journal of Communication* 13 (3): 291-313. Circulation figures pertain to 1960 instead of 1955.

<sup>b</sup> Source: FAZ Media Service.

<sup>c</sup> Source: IVW-Circulation Figures Süddeutsche Zeitung (first quarter).

<sup>d</sup> Sources: F. van Vree. 1996. *De metamorfose van een dagblad: Een journalistieke geschiedenis van de Volkskrant*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff; F. Huysmans, J. de Haan, A. van den Broek. 2004. *Achter de schermen: Een kwart eeuw lezen, luisteren, kijken en internetten*. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office (p. 41).

The NRC Handelsblad is the result of a merger of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant* (NRC) and the *Algemeen Handelsblad* in 1970. For the period prior to that, the NRC was coded.

<sup>e</sup> Sources: *The World Almanac and Book of Facts* (1956); *Audit Report New York Times* (1996).

**Table B1.** Percentage of Newspaper Items Devoted to Foreign Actors by Country and Year (Foreign Actors Measured in Terms of National Origin)

A.	1955	1975	1995	2005	N
All countries	34.5	39.8	47.5	49.3	14,624
France	30.8	35.9	47.4	53.5	3,784
Germany	44.3	50.2	55.3	58.6	3,281
Netherlands	46.7	46.5	53.2	53.4	3,394
United States	29.3	29.0	31.8	29.7	4,164
N	3,035	2,892	4,183	4,514	
B. Differences Across Time	FR	GE	NL	US	
All years	***	***	**	ns	
1975 to 1955	ns	ns	ns	ns	
1995 to 1975	***	*	*	ns	
2005 to 1995	**	ns	ns	ns	
C. Cross-National Differences	1955	1975	1995	2005	
All countries	***	***	***	***	
FR – GE	***	***	***	***	
FR – NL	***	***	**	ns	
FR – US	ns	**	***	***	
GE – NL	ns	ns	ns	**	
GE – US	***	***	***	***	
NL – US	***	***	***	***	

Note: FR = France; GE = Germany; NL = Netherlands; US = United States.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ ; ns = not significant (two-tailed chi-square tests).

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

**Table B2.** Genre Differences in the Percentage of Newspapers Items to Foreign Actors per Year

	CLA	DAN	FIL	LIT	POP	TEL	THE
1955							
DAN	ns						
FIL	**	ns					
LIT	**	ns	ns				
POP	***	*	*	*			
TEL	—	—	—	—	—		
THE	***	***	***	***	ns	—	
VIS	***	**	*	*	ns	—	*
1975							
DAN	ns						
FIL	***	**					
LIT	ns	ns	***				
POP	ns	ns	***	ns			
TEL	***	***	***	***	***		
THE	*	ns	***	*	ns	**	
VIS	ns	ns	***	ns	ns	***	ns
1995							
DAN	*						
FIL	***	***					
LIT	ns	ns	***				
POP	**	***	ns	***			
TEL	***	**	***	***	***		
THE	***	*	***	***	***	ns	
VIS	ns	†	***	ns	***	***	***
2005							
DAN	*						
FIL	**	***					
LIT	ns	ns	***				
POP	ns	**	**	*			
TEL	***	***	***	***	***		
THE	***	**	***	***	***	ns	
VIS	ns	*	***	ns	†	***	***

Note: CLA = classical music; DAN = dance; FIL = film; LIT = literature; POP = popular music; TEL = television; THE = theater; VIS = visual arts.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ ; †  $p < .10$ ; ns = not significant (two-tailed chi-square tests).

**Table B3.** Classical Music: Percentage of Items to Foreign Actors by Country and Year

	1955	1975	1995	2005
France	45.1	33.7	57.6	51.1
Germany	40.0	53.1	52.5	48.2
Netherlands	39.8	45.4	51.5	61.2
United States	47.8	30.2	32.7	42.7
N	512	448	441	430
Cross-National Differences				
All countries	ns	**	ns	ns
FR – GE	ns	**	ns	ns
FR – NL	ns	ns	ns	ns
FR – US	ns	ns	***	ns
GE – NL	ns	ns	ns	*
GE – US	ns	***	ns	ns
NL – US	ns	**	ns	**

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

**Table B4.** Dance: Percentage of Items to Foreign Actors by Country and Year

	1955	1975	1995	2005
France	34.8	36.0	35.5	36.8
Germany	50.0	81.0	74.2	85.7
Netherlands	27.3	26.1	35.0	33.3
United States	56.4	30.8	18.8	28.6
N	81	121	133	115
Cross-National Differences				
All countries	ns	***	***	**
FR – GE	ns	**	ns	ns
FR – NL	ns	ns	ns	ns
FR – US	ns	ns	***	ns
GE – NL	ns	ns	ns	*
GE – US	ns	***	**	ns
NL – US	ns	**	*	**

**Table B5.** Visual Arts: Percentage of Items to Foreign Actors by Country and Year

	1955	1975	1995	2005
France	14.5	33.6	43.6	53.6
Germany	37.3	48.0	53.8	59.3
Netherlands	37.0	26.8	47.3	48.1
United States	29.8	33.8	35.4	27.4
N	598	391	597	764
Cross-National Differences				
All countries	**	*	*	***
FR – GE	**	*	ns	ns
FR – NL	**	ns	ns	ns
FR – US	*	ns	ns	***
GE – NL	ns	**	ns	*
GE – US	ns	ns	**	***
NL – US	ns	ns	ns	***

**Table B6.** Film: Percentage of Items to Foreign Actors by Country and Year

	1955	1975	1995	2005
France	50.6	41.8	55.8	61.8
Germany	47.9	77.0	80.9	73.2
Netherlands	84.1	71.8	73.8	72.5
United States	14.4	33.8	34.8	34.5
N	598	391	597	764
Cross-National Differences				
All countries	***	***	***	***
FR – GE	ns	***	***	*
FR – NL	***	***	**	*
FR – US	***	ns	***	***
GE – NL	***	ns	ns	ns
GE – US	***	***	***	***
NL – US	***	***	***	***

**Table B7.** Literature: Percentage of Items to Foreign Actors by Country and Year

	1955	1975	1995	2005
France	19.4	36.2	38.3	48.1
Germany	52.2	47.3	49.1	57.8
Netherlands	50.6	53.0	53.1	48.6
United States	29.2	25.0	33.8	24.3
N	445	539	854	822
Cross-National Differences				
All countries	***	***	***	***
FR – GE	***	*	***	*
FR – NL	***	**	**	ns
FR – US	ns	*	ns	***
GE – NL	ns	ns	ns	*
GE – US	**	***	***	***
NL – US	***	***	***	***

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

**Table B8.** Popular Music: Percentage of Items to Foreign Actors by Country and Year

	1955	1975	1995	2005
France	29.6	31.8	64.0	54.6
Germany	37.5	66.7	74.4	75.5
Netherlands	23.1	62.0	70.9	68.8
United States	19.0	17.5	19.4	15.2
N	90	170	535	583
Cross-National Differences				
All countries	ns	***	***	***
FR – GE	ns	*	ns	**
FR – NL	ns	*	ns	**
FR – US	ns	ns	***	***
GE – NL	ns	ns	ns	ns
GE – US	ns	***	***	***
NL – US	ns	***	***	***

**Table B9.** Theater: Percentage of Items to Foreign Actors by Country and Year

	1955	1975	1995	2005
France	15.0	20.2	22.7	27.0
Germany	48.0	48.5	41.5	39.3
Netherlands	35.6	40.0	29.4	23.0
United States	13.5	25.8	15.7	12.2
N	633	432	388	458
Cross-National Differences				
All countries	***	***	**	***
FR – GE	***	***	**	ns
FR – NL	***	**	ns	ns
FR – US	ns	ns	ns	**
GE – NL	ns	ns	ns	**
GE – US	***	***	***	***
NL – US	***	*	*	*

**Table B10.** Television: Percentage of Items to Foreign Actors by Country and Year

	1955 <sup>a</sup>	1975	1995	2005
France	–	6.3	19.1	30.8
Germany	–	20.4	22.2	20.0
Netherlands	–	26.5	58.3	26.7
United States	6.4	9.7	19.0	12.3
N	82	135	194	238
Cross-National Differences				
All countries		ns	*	ns
FR – GE		ns	ns	ns
FR – NL		ns	ns	ns
FR – US		ns	ns	**
GE – NL		ns	*	ns
GE – US		ns	ns	ns
NL – US		ns	**	ns

Note: FR = France; GE = Germany; NL = Netherlands; US = United States.

<sup>a</sup> Not available because of small number of cases.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ ; ns = not significant (two-tailed chi-square tests).

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

**Table C1.** France: Representation of Countries in Arts and Culture Coverage 1955 to 2005: Percentage of Items per Country and Total Number of Countries Represented

1955	Percent	1975	Percent	1995	Percent	2005	Percent
<i>France</i>	70.9	<i>France</i>	68.2	<i>France</i>	55.9	<i>France</i>	50.5
US	8.7	US	6.6	US	14.1	US	12.5
Italy	4.0	UK	3.3	UK	7.0	UK	5.6
UK	3.2	Italy	3.3	Italy	3.0	Italy	4.1
USSR/Russia	2.0	West Germany	2.3	Germany	2.8	Germany	2.5
Spain	1.5	USSR/Russia	2.0	Spain	1.3	Russia	2.0
West Germany	1.1	Belgium	1.4	Canada	1.3	Switzerland	1.7
Austria	.6	Spain	1.3	Switzerland	1.1	Belgium	1.6
Canada	.5	Switzerland	.8	Russia/USSR	.9	Japan	1.6
Denmark	.5	Yugoslavia	.6	Belgium	.8	Spain	1.4
East Germany	.5	Austria	.5	Japan	.6	Austria	1.2
Greece	.5	Chile	.5	Colombia	.5	Canada	1.1
Japan	.5	Greece	.5	Egypt	.5	Poland	1.1
Netherlands	.5	Japan	.5	Ireland	.5	Algeria	.8
Belgium	.3	Sweden	.5	Algeria	.4	China	.7
Brazil	.3	Argentina	.4	Brazil	.4	South Korea	.7
Switzerland	.3	Canada	.4	Denmark	.3	Netherlands	.6
		Czechoslovakia	.4	India	.3	Brazil	.5
		Mexico	.4	Poland	.3	Mexico	.5
		Netherlands	.4			Portugal	.5
		Poland	.4			Fr. Caribbean	.4
		Portugal	.4			Hong Kong	.4
		Rumania	.4			Ireland	.4
		Brazil	.3			Argentina	.3
		Denmark	.3			Egypt	.3
		Hungary	.3			Iran	.3
		Israel	.3			Israel	.3
		Palestine	.3			Turkey	.3
11 other countries < .3		10 other countries < .3		40 other countries < .3		32 other countries < .3	
N = 657		N = 787		N = 1,235		N = 1,105	

**Table C2.** Germany: Representation of Countries in Arts and Culture Coverage 1955 to 2005: Percentage of Items per Country and Total Number of Countries Represented

1955	Percent	1975	Percent	1995	Percent	2005	Percent
<i>Germany</i>	55.5	<i>Germany</i>	50.0	<i>Germany</i>	46.7	<i>Germany</i>	43.2
France	11.1	US	8.6	US	14.8	US	17.0
Austria	5.3	France	7.1	France	7.3	UK	6.5
US	5.0	Austria	5.4	UK	5.6	France	5.7
UK	3.7	Italy	5.4	Austria	4.4	Italy	3.8
Italy	2.9	UK	4.1	Italy	3.3	Austria	3.6
East Germany	2.1	USSR/Russia	3.5	Switzerland	2.1	Switzerland	2.3
USSR/Russia	1.9	East Germany	2.6	Russia/USSR	1.5	Netherlands	1.5
Spain	1.6	Spain	1.4	Spain	1.1	Russia/USSR	1.4
Denmark	1.3	Switzerland	1.4	Australia	.9	Japan	1.3
Switzerland	1.1	Netherlands	1.1	Netherlands	.7	Spain	1.3
Brazil	.5	Czechoslovakia	.9	Belgium	.5	Belgium	1.2
Netherlands	.5	Belgium	.8	Canada	.5	China	.8
Australia	.3	Hungary	.6	China	.5	Norway	.6
Belgium	.3	Argentina	.3	Denmark	.5	Canada	.5
Bulgaria	.3	Greece	.3	Poland	.5	Greece	.5
Canada	.3	Ireland	.3	Czechoslovakia	.4	Australia	.4
Czechoslovakia	.3	Japan	.3	Hungary	.4	Denmark	.4
Hungary	.3	Poland	.3	Israel	.4	Ireland	.4
Ireland	.3	Sweden	.3	Japan	.4	Mexico	.4
Poland	.3	Yugoslavia	.3	South Africa	.4	Poland	.4
Sweden	.3			Greece	.3	Portugal	.4
Yugoslavia	.3			Sweden	.3	Sweden	.4
						Czech Republic	.3
						South Korea	.3
						Turkey	.3
No other countries		12 other countries < .3		24 other countries < .3		22 other countries < .3	
N = 380		N = 648		N = 1,134		N = 1,119	

## Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism

**Table C3.** Netherlands: Representation of Countries in Arts and Culture Coverage 1955 to 2005: Percentage of Items per Country and Total Number of Countries Represented

1955	Percent	1975	Percent	1995	Percent	2005	Percent
<i>Netherlands</i>	53.6	<i>Netherlands</i>	54.8	<i>Netherlands</i>	48.5	<i>Netherlands</i>	47.8
France	11.6	US	10.9	US	15.2	US	14.9
US	8.1	UK	7.1	UK	9.1	UK	6.3
Italy	5.2	Italy	4.3	Germany	4.1	France	4.5
West Germany	4.8	France	3.7	France	3.4	Germany	3.4
UK	4.8	West Germany	3.6	Italy	2.9	Belgium	3.3
Switzerland	1.4	Austria	1.6	Belgium	2.3	Italy	2.5
Austria	1.2	USSR/Russia	1.5	Austria	1.4	Russia/USSR	2.2
Spain	1.2	Belgium	1.1	Spain	1.4	South Africa	1.1
Belgium	1.0	Denmark	.7	Russia/USSR	1.3	Spain	1.0
Denmark	1.0	Sweden	.7	Former Yugoslavia	1.1	Japan	.8
Hungary	.8	Hungary	.6	Canada	.8	Norway	.6
USSR/Russia	.8	Poland	.6	Denmark	.5	Poland	.6
Israel	.4	South Africa	.6	Poland	.4	Austria	.5
		Spain	.6	Portugal	.4	Hungary	.5
		Canada	.4	Sweden	.4	Sweden	.5
		India	.4	Brazil	.4	Switzerland	.5
		Indonesia	.4			India	.5
		Japan	.4			Canada	.4
		China	.3			Denmark	.4
		Chile	.3			South Korea	.4
		East Germany	.3			Turkey	.3
		Egypt	.3			Jamaica	.3
		Israel	.3			Morocco	.3
		Switzerland	.3				
7 other countries	< .3	9 other countries	< .3	27 other countries	< .3	34 other countries	< .3
N = 517		N = 699		N = 920		N = 1,258	

**Table C4.** United States: Representation of Countries in Arts and Culture Coverage 1955 to 2005: Percentage of Items per Country and Total Number of Countries Represented

1955	Percent	1975	Percent	1995	Percent	2005	Percent
<i>US</i>	74.0	<i>US</i>	74.3	<i>US</i>	70.0	<i>US</i>	73.8
UK	7.1	UK	6.5	UK	7.7	UK	7.1
France	4.0	USSR/Russia	3.3	France	3.7	France	2.0
Italy	2.0	France	2.9	Italy	2.2	Germany	2.0
West Germany	1.9	Italy	1.8	Canada	1.5	Canada	1.1
USSR/Russia	1.2	West Germany	1.7	Russia/USSR	1.2	Italy	1.0
Canada	1.0	Austria	.5	Germany	1.0	Australia	.8
Spain	.9	Canada	.5	Japan	.7	Japan	.8
Austria	.9	Israel	.5	Australia	.6	China	.6
Japan	.7	Japan	.5	South Africa	.6	Spain	.6
Poland	.5	Netherlands	.5	Spain	.6	Ireland	.5
Belgium	.4	Brazil	.4	Austria	.4	Mexico	.5
Switzerland	.4	Philippines	.3	India	.4	Netherlands	.5
Australia	.3	Sweden	.4	Netherlands	.4	Austria	.4
Denmark	.3	Puerto Rico	.4	Norway	.4	Denmark	.4
Hungary	.3	Australia	.3	Poland	.4	Russia/USSR	.4
Ireland	.3	Ireland	.3	China	.3	Switzerland	.4
Netherlands	.3	Norway	.3	Czech Republic	.3	Finland	.3
		Switzerland	.3			India	.3
						Norway	.3
						South Africa	.3
						Sweden	.3
20 other countries	< .3	17 other countries	< .3	27 other countries	< .3	31 other countries	< .3
N = 1,481		N = 758		N = 894		N = 1,032	