UNCHARTED

Understanding, Capturing and Fostering the Societal Value of Culture

Deliverable number	D1.3
Title	Analysis of the influence of globalization and digitization in the configuration of the values of culture

Due date	October 2020
Actual date of delivery to EC	30/10/2020

Included (indicate as appropriate)	Executive Summary	☒	Abstract	☐	Table of Contents	☒

Project Coordinator:

Prof. Arturo Rodriguez Morató

Universitat de Barcelona

Email: rodriguez.morato@ub.edu

Technical Coordinator:

Antonella Fresa

Promoter S.r.l.

Email: fresa@promoter.it

Project WEB site address:

http://www.Uncharted-culture.eu

Context:

Partner responsible for deliverable	Université Paris 8 and TRI
Deliverable author(s)	Ole Marius Hylland, Åsne Dahl Haugsevje and Ola K. Berge, Clara Lévy and Alain Quemin
Deliverable version number	1
Dissemination Level	Public

Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For at least the past twenty years, globalization has been one of the key questions for the social sciences in general and for sociology in particular. This theme underwent strong international development during the 1990s and, from the beginning of the 2000s, globalization was considered by experts as one of the major trends that was already identified in different societies. Today, there exists multiple and sometimes contradictory conceptions of cultural globalization in relation to the emergence and consolidation of values which unveil debates on two main questions: is internationalization and the values that it carries truly global? Does it imply homogenization of culture and values, hybridization, or even rejection through effects of cultural resistance? Those questions have been partly reshaped with the spectacular development of the internet during the 1990's, as a global access to information has been made possible. Digitization has affected the configuration of the values of culture in different ways. It has brought an increased complexity to the valuation of culture, and the views and attributed values of digitized culture have also developed during two decades of cultural digitization. In our review, we find values relating to cultural administration, production and participation. The main strands of identified values are within the categories of access, engagement and identification, and production/performance. Access values are concerned with mere access as an end value, but also with access being seen as a tool for i.a. inclusion, cultural democracy and democratization. In the categories of engagement and identification, we find that participation and diversity are core values that might lead to e.g. empowerment or identification. These perspectives view digitization of culture as giving opportunities to take part in, to identify with, and to find individual relevance in digital cultural expressions. In the category of Performance/Production, we find that the attributed value to digital or digitized culture can be placed on a continuum from the positive and hopeful perspectives, via the opportunistic or pragmatic to the outright critical, where the overall stance is more negative than positive, seen from the angle of the cultural producers. In general, we also find increasingly more critical views on the potential values of digitization in more contemporary research, especially in the categories of Access and Production/Performance.

1. INTRODUCTION

For at least the past twenty years, globalization has been one of the key questions for the social sciences in general and for sociology in particular. This theme underwent strong international development during the 1990s and, from the beginning of the 2000s, globalization was considered by experts as one of the major trends that was already identified in different societies. It was also expected to further accentuate in the world future (National Intelligence Council 2005: 9). Still, globalization effects, notably in the cultural domain and in connection to the emergence, spreading and consolidation of values have been strongly affected by the steep development of the internet from the 1990's.

By using the term globalization, researchers intend to point out a radical difference with internationalization, which had already been clearly identified and studied for a long time. Globalization generally designates a truly universal and polymorphous experience of extension and intensification, on a planetary scale, of social relations and exchanges. The current health crisis linked to Covid-19 which has hit the entire planet since 2020 can also be considered as one of the manifestations of this globalization at the health level.

The global extension of links and connections in the world and their intensification are reflected, in the cultural space, in exchanges and interactions that are again uninterrupted, truly worldwide, and a priori destined to always intensify.

Human mobility and cultural plurality have, of course, always existed and lead to the criticism of a naive conception of culture: "pure" cultures, preserved from any cultural transfer only constitute a theoretical abstraction, out of step with socio-historical reality (Lévi-Strauss, 1952). But so-called cultural globalization began to take a remarkable rise from the beginning of the 19th century and the Industrial Revolution. This period intensified the circulation of cultural values and their diffusion in territories that were increasingly distant geographically. The second phase dates from the beginning of the 1980s: the very beginnings of the Internet marked a double increase, qualitative and quantitative.

There is a unanimous agreement, beyond the multiple conceptions of cultural globalization to which we will return later in the first part of this text, to consider that cultural globalization affects culture (and the values that are associated with it) in its double definition: both learned and legitimate culture (the arts) as well as culture in the sense of the way of life.

In the second part of this report, we will describe the influence of one of the most fundamental drivers of societal change for the last couple of decades: digitization. The aim of the text is to look at how digitization affects the configuration of the values of culture. In what way does digitization influence how culture is valuated? To address this topic, we have conducted a systematic literature review to investigate results from different strands of research on the relations between digitization and the configuration of values of culture.

PART 1. CULTURAL GLOBALIZATION AND VALUES

2. MULTIPLE AND SOMETIMES CONTRADICTORY CONCEPTIONS OF CULTURAL GLOBALIZATION

As other authors (Crane 2002; Dorin 2006; Chaubet 2018) have already done before us, we chose to present several models of cultural globalization. Some of these models are completely irreconcilable with each other, while others can, on the opposite, be combined and articulated.

2a- The model of convergence and homogenization

This first model emphasizes the dissemination, increasingly intense over time, of cultural products but also of the cultural values that accompany them. Uniform cultural products circulating in the world, homogeneous cultural values would spread in parallel (Strange 1988).

The circulation of products would thus be facilitated by the easing of protectionist economic measures on the one hand, and by technological progress on the other hand (in particular for dematerialized cultural products that are immediately available everywhere in the world thanks to the Internet). The circulation of cultural values is linked to the planetary success of some products (for example, cinematographic blockbusters; literary bestsellers or even international variety hits). They now often tend to be the supports of an identification that, sometimes, paradoxically, traditional and local cultural products no longer allow. All societies would therefore converge towards the consumption of identical cultural products, vectors of identical cultural values.

2b- The clash of civilizations model

This model totally contradicts the interpretation in terms of convergence of the former one. On the contrary, there are cultural repertoires which, despite the encounter, are and remain irreconcilable between different parts of the world. This perspective is less interested in cultural objects as such and in the different values and traditions to which they are articulated. The analyzes of S. Huntington (1996) are mobilized within this framework, in particular to point out the intrinsically incompatible character of certain Western cultural productions with certain religious dogmas. Islamist terrorism can thus be thought of as a reaction to cultural globalization, which at the same time allows it to emerge (Barber, 1995). This antagonist model can be illustrated, in a violent and tragic way, by the affair of the cartoons published by the French satirical newspaper Charlie Hebdo and the murderous Islamist attacks against it in 2015.

2c- The model of imperialism

This model emphasizes the imposition of contemporary Western - and especially American - values on the rest of the world. A line of analysis of particular relevance here is that represented by the works of I. Wallerstein (1991, 2000) and P. Bourdieu and L. Wacquant (1999), which point to an imbalance in international cultural exchanges and to the existence of domination effects. Wallerstein makes this point arguing that transnational cultural exchanges merely reflect the contradictions and imbalances in the world economy with a few Western economies dominating the rest of the world. Bourdieu and his disciples underline a certain degree of autonomy of the cultural sphere towards the economy. This school of thought highlights both the fact that 'Imbalances (…) characterize the very structure of international exchange' (Heilbron 2001: 146), and that 'instead of an equilibrium between import and export, the reality of transnational exchange is a process of uneven exchange '(Heilbron 1999: 439).

D.1.3. Analysis of the influence of globalization and digitization in the configuration of the valu
culture

The conclusion here is that cultural exchanges operate in relation to a clearly discernable geographical center, which is distinct from its periphery. In the field of the visual arts, a similar conclusion is at work. The most recognized artists on the international contemporary art scene, and whose work sells for the highest amounts at auctions, are from a very small number of Western countries, a clear illustration of cultural hegemony within this field (Quemin 2002, 2006).

2d- The hybridization and interbreeding model

This model, most often defended by advocates of multiculturalism, is based on a positive vision of cultural globalization, with an idea of the free movement of individuals and cultures without any relationship of domination with one another.

Based on the idea of the original syncretism of all cultures (none is ever pure), globalization is therefore not perceived as a radically new process, but as part of a long-term history, made up of permanent contacts and cultural transfers. The most recent history would see the progression of cultural interbreeding, with always more recurring borrowing from cultural repertoires others than the only Western one - for example, manga, African music, sushi, etc. (Pieterse*, 2003)*.

2e- The global flow model

Based on analysis by A. Appadurai (1996), this model considers that flows transcend national borders, in particular due to mass migrations and new technologies. Alongside the national communities, there are imagined communities organized in diasporic spheres that cannot be reduced to a single state. And the cultural imagery of these communities now concerns not only the social and intellectual elites, but also ordinary people.

The analyzes of S. Sassen (1996) and Z. Bauman (1998) suggest that under conditions of globalization, national borders are being increasingly erased and substituted with growing fluxes or international exchanges. In a rather close perspective, Manuel Castells (1996-8) considers that today, flows are decisive and take precedence over territories, particularly national ones.

2f- The "glocalization" model

The local and the global are no longer seen as poles, located at two ends far apart from each other, but are articulated to each other (Robertson 1992). The local constitutes one of the dimensions of the global. The nation-state and the local scale remain endowed with meaning for citizens and also for institutions, even if these are simultaneously affected by the global culture (Tardif and Farchy 2006: 243-292).

In the cultural space, several possibilities can be met: 1) the global comes to the aid of the local (for example, globalized tourism, which leads to the success of certain places, such as the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao); 2) the global fits into the local (for example, large American foundations); 3) the local is becoming global (global success of certain musical genres, such as South Korean K-pop); 4) the local clashes with the global, but is nevertheless affected by the latter (generalized use of the English language in scientific circles, but with certain policies of resistance).

Whatever the model considered to apprehend the phenomenon of cultural globalization is, one of the main challenges consists in defining the effects of this globalization on cultural production.

3. THE EFFECTS OF GLOBALIZATION ON CULTURAL PRODUCTION

The most massive and most frequently observed effect of cultural globalization concerns the fostering of increasingly strong cultural uniformity. Simultaneously, it should be noted that there are modalities of resistance to these cultural uniformity and homogeneity.

3a- Cultural standardization

Globalization has, quite logically, given birth to a globalized culture, that is to say to a set of cultural practices and manifestations common to all the peoples of the planet. This phenomenon has, of course, been further accentuated on the one hand by the digital revolution and on the other hand by the concentration of major cultural industries. The multiplication and intensification of real and virtual exchanges (international social networks) have resulted in the circulation of standardized products (works, knowledge, values).

Faced with the profusion of cultural products available, traditional prescribers such as family, school or peers have gradually been challenged by new digital prescribers: search engines, websites, social networks which no longer necessarily have local roots and spread according to a deterritorialized, international and globalized logic.

We can note several examples of this standardization, concerning different cultural fields: fashion; cinema and television series; but also contemporary art and literature.

3b- The persistence of forms of resistance to cultural uniformity

Even if the trend towards cultural globalization is a massive and indisputable phenomenon, there are still forms of effective resistance to cultural standardization:

> 1) The persistence of traditional cultural identities: resistance to cultural globalization can be exercised in several areas. We can even note an accentuation of this resistance and local demands concerning certain cultural facts - for example, religious, ethnic, linguistic, etc.

> 2) There are phenomena of limited internationalization as is the case for the telenovelas which irrigate Latin America and the Latina diaspora, or for Indian cinema, with Bollywood. Although they spread, they hardly extend beyond distinct communities.

> 3) Researchers highlight the fact that, for the same cultural product, there may be differentiated reception effects depending on the nation: the study was carried out in the sociology of reading for two novels, one French, the other Hungarian (Józsa and Leenhardt, 1982) and also in media studies for the American series Dallas (Movius 2010: 11, Liebes and Katz, 1990).

> 4) In addition, specific surveys document the fact that, when we study, in detail and within a specific national framework, the phenomenon of cultural globalization at the level of social groups, it can be shown that the appropriation of globalized cultural products is very different depending on the social position of the individuals who are surveyed (Cichelli and October, 2017).

> 5) Finally, we can note that cultural globalization is not always synonymous with Western-centered domination effects. Some states, which cannot claim to train global elites, find themselves extremely well placed on the international scene thanks to their competitive cultural industries - this is for example the case of Japan (Buissou, 2008: 15).

Those questions have been partly reshaped with the spectacular development of the internet during the 1990's, as a global access to information has been made possible.

PART 2 - DIGITIZATION AND ITS EFFECT ON CULTURAL VALUES

4. DIGITAL ACCESS TO CULTURE

Access has been launched as a central value to cultural digitization in a number of countries (see e.g. de Luca Pretto and Bailey 2010 and Pertierra 2012). In the context of digital culture, the value and concept of access is, however, not uncomplicated and one-dimensional. As Uzelac, Koržinek & Primorac (2016) states, access is «a dynamic and social process and not a simple one-off act of provision» (p. 89). Hence, the value of access has to be created in a «balance between commercial and public interest of culture» (ibid.).
Both the general ideas about and the empirical studies of the value of digital access to culture has gradually become more complex. As King, Stark and Cooke (2016) notes, in digital strategies from a key player like Arts Council England, «the digital is considered in terms related almost exclusively to breadth of audience and reach, rather than quality of experience» (p. 79). In a similar manner, studies of digital inequality and the digital divide, has been moving from the question of access to the question of use (Sanz & Turlea 2012; Calderón Gómez 2020).

A number of studies have been conducted to investigate the role and value of digital access to cultural heritage (e.g. Pieroni 2008; King, Stark & Cooke 2016; Nyhlen & Gidlund 2019; Evrard & Krebs 2017; Psomadaki, Dimoulas, Kalliris & Paschalidis 2019; Corallo, Trono, Fortunato, Pettinato & Schina 2018). Digital access to cultural heritage has been seen as a way to democratise, to ensure diversity and equality and to ensure citizen engagement (see e.g. Psomadiki et al. 2019, King et al. 2016 and Corallo et al. 2018). However, as Nyhlen and Gidlund (2019) write, digital access and digitization of cultural heritage, might just as well perpetuate and/or replicate already existing inequalities and differences. In some studies on digital cultural heritage, we also find attempts to answer a fundamental question: Is digital culture inferior to its analogue counterpart and ideally something that can direct consumers in an analogue direction, or, is digital culture valuable in and of itself (see Evrard & Krebs 2017; King et al. 2016)?

A growing number of studies have pointed to what they see as potential flipsides of digital cultural access: be it reproduction of inequality, unregulated power of global companies, or the development of more complex varieties of the digital divide. In an analysis of the social industry, digital media scholar Christian Sandvig (2015) presents a rather pessimistic view on the values of social media. A comparable critical perspective is found in van Dijck (2018, 2020). Van Dijck describes a rather pessimistic stance following in the wake of an initial digitization optimism. He asserts that the development of a platform society is challenging fundamental public values like tolerance, democracy and transparency.

Overall, there seem to be a tendency in scholarly work on access, values and digitization to move in a slightly more pessimistic direction, with regards to the outcomes of digital cultural access (see Sanz and Turlea 2012). While an analysis like Manuel Castells' (Castells 2009) and the Digital Agenda for Europe from 2010[1] could emphasize digital change as fuelling individual autonomy and empowerment, more recent contributions seem to focus more on disempowerment and an unhealthy systemic dependency of digital media.

---

[1] https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/27a0545e-03bf-425f-8b09-7cef6f0870af

5. PARTICIPATION AND IDENTIFICATION AS VALUE

Some of the literature on digitization is characterized by a positive discourse. This literature accentuates the possibilities, opportunities, and advantages brought fore by 'the digital turn', like the attraction of new audiences and opportunities for a diversity of users (cf. Turrini, Soscia and Maulini 2012; Boellstorff 2019). Several contributions within the field of cultural heritage research also demonstrate that models and tools based on digital storytelling and online co-creation increase the cultural participation of local communities. Giaccardi (2012) explores how 'participatory culture' and social media reframe our understanding and experience of heritage. Bonacini (2018) examines digital storytelling and co-creation as strategies in order to strengthen cultural democracy and give people the right to be part of their cultural heritage (see also Webb-Gannon and Webb 2019). Van der Hoeven (2019) discusses heritage professionals and lay people operating together in digital bottom-up heritage practices (see also Ginzarly, Pereira Roders, and Teller 2019).

The positive effects of digitalization with regard to diversity have been discussed by several scholars. Gran, Lager Vestberg, Booth & Ogundipe (2019) demonstrate that digital museum portals reduce barriers for access to museum collections, and contribute to expanded diversity (see also Gran, Røssaak & Kristensen 2019). Mihelj, Leguina, and Downey (2019) find the opposite in their study of cultural participation in museums and galleries in UK: «Rather than helping increase the diversity of audiences, online access seems to reproduce, if not enlarge, existing inequalities» (2019, p. 1465).

Some of the literature points out that the digital tools do not necessarily in itself lead to enhanced cultural participation. Based on survey data, Berte, Hauttekeete, Mechant & Nulens (2010) argues that the Flemish art scene, artists and cultural organisations need to develop a culture or a mind-set to truly exploit the technologies. Waller, Dreher, and McCallum (2015) have studied indigenous participatory media in Australia. They make a distinction between «participation as involvement in the production and dissemination of media, and participation as political influence» (2015, p. 57). In order to obtain the latter, democratic institutions and decision-makers must, according to the authors, develop political listening practices. A thorough discussion of the relations between the emergence of digital audio-visual media, diversity and media policy is offered in Albornoz and García Leiva (2019).

Some analysts accentuate the down-sides of the digital turn. Aigner (2016) finds that even though digital technologies and 'participatory culture` have created new opportunities for lay people to take part in architectural heritage discourses and practices, it «is not changing the rules of the game as is often assumed» (2016, p. 195). Instead of questioning the dominant expert values and knowledge, lay people's participation primarily reaffirm the dominant discourse.

A part of literature is addressing the negative consequences of digital algorithmic practices. Bishop (2018) demonstrates how the YouTube algorithms promote «hegemonic, feminized cultural outputs, created by beauty vloggers with significant embodied social and cultural capital» (2018, p. 70). Gran, Booth, and Bucher (2020) ask whether one can see a new digital divide emerging between people with high and low algorithm awareness. They find that 61% of the Norwegian population report having no or low such awareness, and that the levels follows demographic differences. The authors argue that this new digital divide is a democratic challenge.

A balanced, but critical, approach can be identified in the literature analysing the ambiguities of the participatory culture. Ritzer and Jurgenson (2010) analyse the rise of the prosumer capitalism as an ambiguous economy where power relations are less clear-cut. This capitalism is characterised by unpaid rather than paid labour, abundancy rather than scarcity with regards to products, and effectiveness rather than efficiency (see also Valtysson 2010). The anthology Digital labor edited by Scholz (2013) introduces the term 'playbor', a combination of 'play' and 'labor'. They observe that the distinction between leisure

time and work has collapsed, and discuss the ambiguity of exploitation and empowerment. A corresponding perspective is presented by Dulong de Rosnay and Musiani (2016). The authors point out that peer-production offers many opportunities, but there are also limitations. On the one hand, these platforms can be empowering participatory tools, but they may also be "alienating instruments of digital labour" (2016, p. 189).

6. PERFORMANCE AS VALUE

A third category of values relates to production. However, relatively few of the contributions cover how digitization has affected core cultural producers, such as artists, musicians etc. Rather, the focus is mainly on cultural intermediaries (Childress 2012; Hutchinson 2019; Salvador, Simon & Benghozi 2019), i.e. those who negotiate and create values for and around cultural products. An exception is Phillips and Street (2015) who looks at artists' attitudes towards copyright in digital era – their attitudes and values, and what seems to lie behind these.

Also in this category, we find a growing awareness of potential negative sides to digitization. This development follows an initial, mainly positive, attitude towards the early phases of digitization, often referred to as Web 1.0 and (the subsequent) Web 2.0. (O'Reilly 2005), with the introduction of positive terms like democratization of culture, prosumers and participatory culture (Kawashima 2010; Jakobsson 2010; Zhao 2016). The development represents a more critical stance towards some of the effects that follows what some now refer to as Web 3.0. The fact that the technological development is moving fast towards robotization and AI, seemingly has also come with an additional portion of critical voices within the field of culture.

Accordingly, we find more or less three positions towards digitization: positive or hopeful, opportunistic and critical. Arguably, the frequency of critical voices increases as we approach today. In the positive category, we e.g. find Kawashima (2010), focusing on copyright law in an increasingly digital cultural production framework. She argues that cultural policy and copyright law have paid insufficient attention to the rise of mini-creators (non-professionals making remixes or manipulating photos). In the article, Kawashima argues that the challenges of digital culture to copyright too frequently are discussed in relation to how we might protect copyright owners' economic interests and expand (or limit) authors' moral rights, and to rarely in terms of user creativity. It thus draw attention to how prosumer participation represent a positive, democratic motion, which should be encouraged. In a similar way, Gauntlett (2011) claims that digitization has resulted in an increase in creativity, and consequently in favourable social networks. Also Zhao (2016) investigates the integration of amateurism and professionalism in on-line content creation, drawing focus towards user-generated content and digital participatory culture (see also Iversen 2016).

A number of the academic contributions take a more pragmatic or even opportunistic position towards digitization. E.g., Borissova (2018) aims to develop the intellectual property management aspects related to the digitization of cultural heritage, in particular securing the economic characteristics of cultural values, in a useful manner for cultural organizations, a perspective also examined by Gantzias (2014). Studying the US trade publishing industry, Childress (2012) finds that editors, which traditionally have relied on own dispositions, intuitions and aesthetic sensibilities, are able to keep cultural capital as 'arbiters of taste' and the ability to promote works they find valuable, despite the adoption of market-driven data.

As asserted, a growing number of studies take on a more critical view of digitization (and its consequences). Already in 2010, Jakobsson criticized the predominant idea that value creation in social

media, social production, participatory culture, etc. is founded on cooperation, as it downplays the role played by competition and rivalry (2010). In the article, a theory seeing Web 2.0 as constituting a mimetic machine is developed, challenging existing theories like that of prosumer-culture and participatory culture. More recently, Hutchinson (2019) discusses the roles of an emerging type of media intermediaries, digital first personalities, demonstrating the importance of critical social influencers who operate among the leading social media platforms. In a cultural economics oriented article Peukert (2019) discusses the supply-side economics of the next wave of digital technological change, e.g. online advertising, automated licensing and blockchain technology. In the article it is called for more research addressing these technologies, which potentially can totally alter how cultural value is viewed and appreciated in cultural production.

Several studies advertise for new policies that incorporate the challenges of new technology. Salvador et al. (2019), investigates how disruptive technologies are challenging the actual organization and value chain of the cinema industry. They argue that although cultural and creative industries are based on a capacity for innovation, recent technological dynamics support disruptive ways to devise, deploy and create value from innovation. Examining how the digital revolution has created opportunities for both cultural industries and heritage organizations such as public libraries, Huang (2018) points to the need for cultural policy for the development of new forms of digital library services.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Cultural globalization arouses resistance on the part of public authorities because of the risks of standardization, or even of cultural imperialism, that it generates. This fear justifies the establishment of mechanisms to protect and promote cultural diversity, both national - at the level of States which feel threatened in their traditional identity (support of mechanisms for national creation or in the language of the country) - and international at the level of supranational bodies (cf. the European Community or UNESCO).

Cultural globalization seems to be an inevitable phenomenon, and one that is still destined to increase - even if cultural antagonisms persist simultaneously. This, it can be expected that globalization will have difficulty in making them disappear, which will allow cultural diversity to subsist at some point.
The emergence and diffusion of values, among which cultural ones, is directly affected by the internet today and more generally by the phenomenon of digitization Although a growing number of studies take on a critical view of digitization (and its consequences), nowadays, the phenomenon seems quite inevitable and irreversible. Today, it is impossible to imagine cultural public policies without integrating the digital dimension.

8. REFERENCES

Aigner, A. (2016). Heritage-making from below: The politics of exhibiting architectural heritage on the Internet-a case study. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 22*(3), 181-199. doi:10.1080/13527258.2015.1107615

Albornoz, L., & García Leiva, M. T. (2019). *Audiovisual industries and diversity : economics and policies in the digital era*(Vol. 4).

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity At Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.

Barber, B. (1995). *Jihad vs McWorld*. NY Times Books.

Berte, K., Hauttekeete, L., Mechant, P., & Nulens, G. (2010). Broadband for culture, a culture for broadband? *Observatorio (OBS*), 4*(2), 119-135. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=57715247&site=ehost-live

Bishop, S. (2018). Anxiety, panic and self-optimization: Inequalities and the YouTube algorithm. *Convergence, 24*(1), 69-84. doi:10.1177/1354856517736978

Boellstorff, T. (2019). The opportunity to contribute: disability and the digital entrepreneur. *Information Communication and Society, 22*(4), 474-490. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2018.1472796

Bonacini, E. (2018). Heritage Communities, Participation and Co-creation of Cultural Values: The #iziTRAVELSicilia Project. *Museum International, 70*(1-2), 140-153. doi:10.1111/muse.12199

Borissova, V. (2018). Cultural heritage digitization and related intellectual property issues. *Journal of Cultural Heritage, 34*, 145-150. doi:10.1016/j.culher.2018.04.023

Bouissou, J.M. (2008). Quelques questions sur la globalisation culturelle. *Critique internationale*, 38, 9-18.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. (1999). On the cunning of imperialist reason. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 16(1), 41-58.

Calderón, Gómez, D. (2020). The third digital divide and Bourdieu: Bidirectional conversion of economic, cultural, and social capital to (and from) digital capital among young people in Madrid. *New Media & Society*, 146144482093325. doi:10.1177/1461444820933252

Castells, M. (1996-8) *The Information Age : Economy, Society, and Culture*, 3 vols. Blackwell.

Castells, M. (2009). *Communication Power*. Oxford University Press.

Chaubet, F. (2018). *La mondialisation culturelle*, Presses Universitaires de France.

Childress, C. C. (2012). Decision-making, market logic and the rating mindset: Negotiating BookScan in the field of US trade publishing. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 15*(5), 604-620. doi:10.1177/1367549412445757

Cicchelli, V. & Octobre, S. (2017). Les cultures juvéniles à l'ère de la globalisation : une approche par le cosmopolitisme esthético-culturel. *Culture études*, 1, 1-20.

Corallo, A., Trono, A., Fortunato, L., Pettinato, F., & Schina, L. (2018). Cultural event management and urban e-planning through bottom-up user participation. *International Journal of E-Planning Research, 7*(1), 15-33. doi:10.4018/IJEPR.2018010102

Crane, D. (2002). Culture and Globalization: Theoretical Models and Emerging Trends. in Crane D., Kawashima N., Kawasaki K. (eds), *Global Culture: Media, Arts, Policy and Globalization*. Routledge. pp 1-28

Crossick, G., & Kaszynska, P. (2016). *Understanding the value of arts & culture. The AHRC Cultural Value Project*: Arts & Humanities Research Council.

de Luca Pretto, N., & Guedes Bailey, O. (2010). Digital culture in Brazil: Building 'peeracy'? *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics, 6*(3), 265-282. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1386/mcp.6.3.265_1

Dorin, S. (2006). Culture, Globalisation and Communication: Contemporary Theoretical Perspectives. Conference Paper. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303899128_Culture_Globalisation_and_Communication_Contemporary_Theoretical_Perspectives

Dulong de Rosnay, M., & Musiani, F. (2016). Towards a (De)centralization-Based Typology of Peer Production. *TripleC, 14*(1), 189–207-189–207. doi:10.31269/triplec.v14i1.728

Evrard, Y., & Krebs, A. (2018). The authenticity of the museum experience in the digital age: the case of the Louvre. *Journal of Cultural Economics, 42*(3), 353-363. doi:10.1007/s10824-017-9309-x

Gantzias, G. K. (2014). Cultural policy, administration, and info-communication landscape: The cultural management model, Info-Communication Cultural Management (ICCM). *International Journal of Social Ecology and Sustainable Development, 5*(4), 30-42. doi:10.4018/ijsesd.2014100103

Gauntlett, D. (2011). *Making is connecting : the social meaning of creativity, from DIY and knitting to YouTube and Web 2.0*. Cambridge: Polity.

Giaccardi, E. (2012). *Heritage and Social Media: Understanding heritage in a participatory culture*. Routledge.

Ginzarly, M., Pereira Roders, A., & Teller, J. (2019). Mapping historic urban landscape values through social media. *Journal of Cultural Heritage, 36*, 1-11. doi:10.1016/j.culher.2018.10.002

Gran, A. B., Lager Vestberg, N., Booth, P., & Ogundipe, A. (2019). A digital museum's contribution to diversity–a user study. *Museum Management and Curatorship, 34*(1), 58-78. doi:10.1080/09647775.2018.1497528

Gran, A. B., Røssaak, E., & Kristensen, L. B. K. (2019). Digital Infrastructure for Diversity-On Digital Bookshelf and Google Books. *Journal of Arts Management Law and Society, 49*(3), 171-187. doi:10.1080/10632921.2019.1581114

Gran, A.-B., Booth, P., & Bucher, T. (2020). To be or not to be algorithm aware: a question of a new digital divide? *Information, Communication & Society, ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print), 1-18. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2020.1736124

Heilbron, J. (1999). Towards a sociology of translation. Book translations as a cultural world system. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2(4), 429-444.

Heilbron, J. (2001). Echanges culturels transnationaux et mondialisation: Quelques réflexions. *Regards sociologiques*, 22, 141-154.

Huang, Y. (2018). Public Digital Libraries: Observations and Prospects from the Chinese Experience. *Journal of Arts Management, Law & Society, 48*(2), 122-132. doi:10.1080/10632921.2017.1377662

Huntington, S. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Simon and Schuster.

Hutchinson, J. (2019). Digital first personality: Automation and influence within evolving media ecologies. *Convergence*. doi:10.1177/1354856519858921

Iversen, G. (2016). An alternative digital film culture: The new independent Norwegian film production. *Journal of Scandinavian Cinema, 6*(1), 63-69. doi:10.1386/jsca.6.1.63_1

Jakobsson, P. (2010). Cooperation and competition in open production. *Platform, 2*(SpecialIssue), 106-119. Retrieved from https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84906419890&partnerID=40&md5=dd6dcaee4b8368e0ed2f42d6dda347c0

Józsa, P. & Leenhardt, J. (with Burgos M.). (1982). *Lire la lecture. Essai de sociologie de la lecture*. Le Sycomore.

Kawashima, N. (2010). The rise of 'user creativity' - Web 2.0 and a new challenge for copyright law and cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy: Creativity and Cultural Policy, 16*(3), 337-353. doi:10.1080/10286630903111613

Keeble, D., & Cavanagh, R. (Eds.). (2008). *Concepts in value chain analysis and their utility in understanding cultural industries*. Ottawa.

King, L., Stark, J. F., & Cooke, P. (2016). Experiencing the Digital World: The Cultural Value of Digital Engagement with Heritage. *Heritage & Society, 9*(1), 76-101. doi:10.1080/2159032X.2016.1246156

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1952). *Race et histoire*, Gallimard.

Liebes, T. & Katz, E. (1990). *The Export of Meaning : Cross-Cultural Readings of Dallas.* Oxford University Press.

Mihelj, S., Leguina, A., & Downey, J. (2019). Culture is digital: Cultural participation, diversity and the digital divide. *New Media & Society, 21*(7), 1465-1485. doi:10.1177/1461444818822816

Movius, L. (2010). Cultural Globalisation and Challenges to Traditional Communication Theories. *PLATFORM: Journal of Media and Communication, 2*(1), 6-18.

National Intelligence Council. (January 2005). *Mapping the Global Future*. https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Global%20Trends_Mapping%20the%20Global%20Future%2020 20%20Project.pdf

Nyhlen, S., & Gidlund, K. L. (2019). 'Everything' disappears... reflexive design and norm-critical intervention in the digitalization of cultural heritage. *Information Communication & Society, 22*(10), 1361-1375. doi:10.1080/1369118x.2018.1424922

O'Reilly, T. (2005). *What is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software*. Retrieved from https://www.oreilly.com/pub/a/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html

Pertierra, A. C. (2012). If They Show Prison Break in the United States on a Wednesday, by Thursday It Is Here: Mobile Media Networks in Twenty-First-Century Cuba. *Television & New Media, 13*(5), 399-414. doi:10.1177/1527476412443564

Peukert, C. (2019). The next wave of digital technological change and the cultural industries. *Journal of Cultural Economics, 43*(2), 189-210. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10824-018-9336-2

Phillips, T., & Street, J. (2015). Copyright and musicians at the digital margins. *Media, Culture and Society, 37*(3), 342-358. doi:10.1177/0163443714567018

Pieroni, A. (2008). Between exposure and exposition: On the manifold educational uses of photographic images. *International Journal of the Inclusive Museum, 1*(3), 97-106. doi:10.18848/1835-2014/CGP/v01i03/44519

Pieterse, J. N. (2003). *Globalization and Culture : Global Melange*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Psomadaki, O. I., Dimoulas, C. A., Kalliris, G. M., & Paschalidis, G. (2019). Digital storytelling and audience engagement in cultural heritage management: A collaborative model based on the Digital City of Thessaloniki. *Journal of Cultural Heritage, 36*, 12-22. doi:10.1016/j.culher.2018.07.016

Quemin, A. (2002). L'illusion de l'abolition des frontières dans le monde de l'art contemporain international. La place des pays ''périphériques'' à ''l'ère de la globalisation et du métissage''. *Sociologie et Sociétés*, XXXIV(2), 15-40.

Quemin, A. (2006). Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts. An Empirical Survey of "High Culture" and "Globalization". *International Sociology*, 21/4, 522-550.

Quemin, A. (2020). What Does Developing a Ranking of Leading Contemporary Art Galleries Unveil about the Importance of the National Factor? An Analysis of Art Basel Art Fair, *Arts*, 2020, 9, 105, 1-16.

Ritzer, G., & Jurgenson, N. (2010). Production, Consumption, Prosumption. The nature of capitalism in the age of the digital prosumer. *Journal of Consumer Culture, Vol. 10,*(1), 13-36.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization. Social Theory and Global Culture*. Sage.

Salvador, E., Simon, J. P., & Benghozi, P. J. (2019). Facing disruption: The cinema value chain in the digital age. *International Journal of Arts Management, 22*(1), 25-40. Retrieved from https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85074327211&partnerID=40&md5=949976ae1d2da1f61d25c78655f7eaea

Sandvig, C. (2015). The Social Industry. *Social Media and Society, 1*(1). doi:10.1177/2056305115582047

Sanz, E., & Turlea, G. (2012). Downloading inclusion: A statistical analysis of young people's digital communication inequalities. *Innovation, 25*(3), 337-353. doi:10.1080/13511610.2012.699652

Sassen, S. (1996). *Losing Control ? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization*. Columbia University Press.

Scholz, T. (2013). *Digital labor : the Internet as playground and factory*. Routledge.

Strange, S. (1988), *States and Markets : An Introduction to International Political Economy*. Pinter.

Tardif, J. & Farchy J. (2006). *Les enjeux de la mondialisation culturelle.* Éditions Hors Commerce. 2006.

Turrini, A., Soscia, I., & Maulini, A. (2012). Web communication can help theaters attract and keep younger audiences. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 18*(4), 474-485. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2011.625420

Uzelac, A., Koržinek, N. O., & Primorac, J. (2016). Access to culture in the digital environment: Active users, re-use and cultural policy issues. *Medijska Istrazivanja, 22*(1), 87-113. doi:10.22572/mi.22.1.4

Valtysson, B. (2010). Access culture: Web 2.0 and cultural participation. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 16*(2), 200-214. doi:10.1080/10286630902902954

van der Hoeven, A. (2019). Networked practices of intangible urban heritage: the changing public role of Dutch heritage professionals. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 25*(2), 232-245. doi:10.1080/10286632.2016.1253686

van Dijck, J. (2018). *The platform society : public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.

van Dijck, J. (2020). Governing digital societies: Private platforms, public values. *Computer Law and Security Review, 36*. doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2019.105377

Waller, L., Dreher, T., & McCallum, K. (2015). The Listening Key: Unlocking the Democratic Potential of Indigenous Participatory Media. *Media International Australia*(154), 57-66. doi:10.1177/1329878x1515400109

Wallerstein, I. (1991). *Geopolitics and Geoculture. Essays on the Changing World System*, Cambridge University Press/Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Wallerstein, I. (2000). The national and the universal : Can there be such a thing as world culture?, in King A. D. (ed.), *Culture, Globalization and the World System. Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, University of Minnesota Press, pp. 91-105.

Webb-Gannon, C., & Webb, M. (2019). "More than a Music, It's a Movement": West Papua Decolonization Songs, Social Media, and the Remixing of Resistance 1. *Contemporary Pacific, 31*(2), 309-343,611.

Zhao, E. J. (2016). Professionalization of amateur production in online screen entertainment in China: Hopes, frustrations, and uncertainties. *International Journal of Communication, 10*, 5444-5462. Retrieved from https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85047953600&partnerID=40&md5=6216b5c7fcd48caf8718c693d331d424