

Title: **Pandemic cultural policy. A comparative perspective on Covid-19 measures and their effect on cultural policies in Europe**

Word count: 7978

Authors:

Ole Marius Hylland (corresponding author). Telemark Research Institute, hylland@tmforsk.no.

ORCID: 0000-0001-7345-4626

Mira Burri, University of Lucerne, mira.burri@unilu.ch. ORCID: 0000-0001-9224-3568

Katarina Gidlund, Mid Sweden University, katarina.l.gidlund@miun.se. ORCID: 0000-0003-3315-5925

Christian Handke, Erasmus University Amsterdam, handke@eshcc.eur.nl. ORCID: 0000-0002-3976-0272

Jaka Primorac, IRMO, Zabreb, jaka@irmo.hr. ORCID: 0000-0001-6969-4598

Arturo R. Morato, University of Barcelona, rodriguez.morato@ub.edu. ORCID: 0000-0001-5299-4877

Kate Oakley, University of Glasgow, kate.oakley@glasgow.ac.uk. ORCID: 0000-0002-5225-0410

Aleksandra Uzelac, IRMO, Zagreb, auzelac@irmo.hr. ORCID: 0000-0003-2089-231X

Author bios:

Ole Marius Hylland works as a research professor at Telemark Research Institute, with research on cultural policy and cultural history. Hylland has concentrated on the field of performing arts and museums, and he has also written about cultural policy for children and young people, and the history of cultural policy. He is a cultural historian with a Ph.D. from the University of Oslo, with a master's degree in folkloristics and a doctorate in cultural history. He currently works with various projects related to the digitalisation of the cultural sector and cultural policy, and he leads

the project «Rapids and backwaters. Adapting fast and slow to a digital cultural turn», financed by Research Council Norway. Hylland has written a number of articles, reports and books on cultural policy and cultural history topics. In 2017, he published the introductory book *Kulturpolitikk. Organisering, legitimering og praksis* [Cultural Policy. Organization, Legitimation and Practice] together with Per Mangset, and in 2018 he published the anthology *Aesthetics and Politics* (Palgrave) together with Erling Bjurström.

Mira Burri is Professor of International Economic and Internet Law at the Faculty of Law of the University of Lucerne. Her research interests are in the areas of global trade, culture and copyright law and policy, in particular when confronted with digital technologies. Mira is presently the principal investigator of the research project “Trade Law 4.0: Trade Law for the Data-Driven Economy” sponsored by the European Research Council. Her recent publications include *Public Service Broadcasting 3.0* (Routledge 2015) and *Big Data and Global Trade Law* (Cambridge University Press 2021).

Katarina L Gidlund is a Professor of informatics and research leader for the Forum for Digitization (FODI) at Mid Sweden University, working with critical studies of digitization and societal change. Katarina holds various positions nationally and internationally, e.g. as member of scientific councils of The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the Swedish Agency for Accessible Media (MTM), and in the World Bank's newly launched expert group, The Global Influencer Panel.

Christian Handke is Associate Professor of Cultural Economics at Erasmus University Rotterdam. From 2012 to 2018, he was programme director of the Master in Cultural Economics and Entrepreneurship, and since 2017, he serves in the Faculty Council of the Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication. Dr. Handke's research focuses on cultural economics and the economics of copyright, innovation and technological change, cultural/creative and media industries, as well as on text and data mining and systematic literature reviews. His work has been

published in leading specialized journals, such as the Journal of Cultural Economics and Information Economics & Policy. Among other things, Dr. Handke is currently associate editor of the Journal of Cultural Economics and President of the Society for Economic Research on Copyright Issues. He has also consulted for a variety of public and private organizations, including the European Commission, the National Academies of the Sciences (USA), Industry Canada, the UK Intellectual Property Office, the federal German Expert Commission on Research and Innovation (EFI), the federal German Ministry of Justice and Consumer Protection, and the Spanish Fundacion Autor.

Jaka Primorac works as a Senior Research Associate at the Department for Culture and Communication, Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO), Zagreb, Croatia. She holds a PhD (2010) in Sociology from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia. Her research interests intersect the fields of sociology of culture, sociology of media and communications and sociology of work. Primorac collaborated on a number of research projects in Croatia and abroad (e.g. Jean Monnet project CULPOL, ‘Access to culture. Policy analysis’ EU Program Culture, COST Network ‘Dynamics of Virtual Work’, etc). Currently she leads Jean Monnet Erasmus+ project ‘European Union Policies and the Platformisation of Cultural and Audiovisual Sectors’ (2020-2022). Her work has been published in international and domestic scientific journals such as Cultural Trends, International Journal for Cultural Policy, Forum: Qualitative Social Research (FQS), etc. Her latest book entitled ‘From Project to Project: Work and Employment in the Cultural Sector’ was published in 2021 by BLOK, Zagreb.

Arturo Rodríguez Morató is Professor of Sociology and director of CECUPS at the University of Barcelona. Currently he is Visiting Scholar at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University. His specialty is the sociology of culture and the arts. Prof. Rodríguez Morató has carried out numerous researches and published extensively on artistic professions and markets,

culture and territory, cultural policy, heritage and cultural identities. At present, he is coordinating the European project UNCHARTED: Understanding, Capturing and Fostering the Societal Value of Culture (2020 - 24). He is also co-editing an special issue of the journal Cultural Trends on Shaping the value of culture in Europe and a book on Sociology of the Arts in Action – New Perspectives on Creation, Production, and Reception (Palgrave, forthcoming).

Kate Oakley is professor of Cultural Policy at University of Glasgow. Oakley's research, which is the broad area of cultural industries and the cultural economy, falls into three categories: policy, place and labour. Oakley has published widely in cultural policy including three books: Cultural Policy, with David Bell in the Routledge Key Ideas in Media and Cultural Studies Series and Culture, Economy & Politics: the case of New Labour, co-authored with David Hesmondhalgh, David Lee and Melissa Nisbett. In 2020, she co-edited Cultural Industries and the Environmental Crisis: New Approaches for Policy together with Mark Banks.

Aleksandra Uzelac is Research Advisor at the Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO), Zagreb, Croatia, and Head of the Department for Culture and Communication (<http://www.irmo.hr>). She holds a PhD (2003) in information science from the University of Zagreb and has over 25 years of professional experience in the area of cultural research related to issues of digital culture and cultural policies. Dr. Uzelac has participated, and coordinated IRMO team, in a number of EU funded research projects and has also provided her research expertise in the form of research studies and issue papers for the Council of Europe, the European Commission and European Parliament. Her work has been published in international and Croatian scientific journals and books. In 2018, she was co-editor (with Jaka Primorac and Paško Bilić) of the special issue of Croatian International Relations Review on 'European Union and Challenges of Cultural Policies: Critical Perspectives'. Most recently she coordinated IRMO team on the H2020 project SoPHIA - Social Platform for Holistic Heritage Impact Assessment (2020-2021).

Pandemic cultural policy. A comparative perspective on Covid-19 measures and their effect on cultural policies in Europe

Abstract: To what extent did the Covid-19 pandemic affect the tools, priorities, and organization of cultural policies? And did the pandemic enhance the digital aspect of these policies? This paper compare pandemic cultural policy measures in seven European countries to answer these questions. The countries all installed a plurality of mitigating measures, combining grants and subsidies, compensation of lost income, income support and financial flexibility, creating a tendency towards cultural policy turning into economic policy, fiscal policy, and labour market policy. Cultural policies have not been fundamentally challenged by the pandemic, in the sense that it has affected the essential political tools, divisions of labour, or core goals. The responses have confirmed an existing policy structure or enhanced existing developments. The importance of a state-centred or a federalist cultural policy system have not been challenged in a substantial way. Secondly there is little evidence to show a general acceleration of national digital cultural policies.

Keywords: Covid-19, cultural policy, digitalization, comparative analysis

Introduction

Ever since early March 2020, the Covid-19 pandemic has spurred a very basic question in most corners of society: what will change now? The question of change and, equally, the nature, scope and duration of change, has been and still is a topic for lengthy discussions. The cultural sector and cultural policy are no exception. It has become a prevalent hypothesis among academics, analysts, and commenters alike, that the current pandemic is causing structural changes in the cultural sector, or that it is accelerating developments within the sector. Examples include analyses of increased online presence of cultural institutions and an increase in digital performances (Agostino et al. 2020, Hylland 2022), increased platformisation (Vlassis 2021), a revision of cultural value (Meyrick and Barnett 2021) exposed precarity for cultural workers (OECD 2020a,

Comunian and England 2020; Banks 2020, Primorac 2021a, Pacella et al. 2021), as well as more general challenges for the cultural industries (Salvador et al. 2021, de Peuter et al. 2022).

It is a pertinent question whether or to what extent the pandemic also has affected the tools, priorities and organization of cultural policy. That is the topic of this paper. At the time of writing, there is a handful of available studies of the relations between Covid-19 and cultural policy (OECD 2020b, KEA 2020, Betzler et al. 2020, Berge et al. 2021, Nordic Council of Ministers 2021, IDEA Consult et al. 2021, Banks and O'Connor 2021, Vlassis 2021, Walmsley et al. 2022). The majority of these studies are commissioned reports on the scope and success of different cultural policy measures to minimize the negative impact of Covid-19 on the cultural sector. The studies discuss the short- and long-term effect on cultural policy to a far lesser extent. A notable exception is the comparative analysis of Betzler et al. (2020), who underline the importance of *contextual* factors to understand the cultural policy measures of different countries and their potential consequences.¹

The pandemic situation represented a sudden challenge for cultural policy in general, in terms of priorities and practical implementation. Furthermore, as we will argue, the issue of a *digital* cultural policy become highly relevant, more or less overnight. In this paper, we look at adaptations and policy measures implemented in seven different European countries, all included in a comparative research project² on the digital turn of cultural production and cultural policies: Croatia, England, Germany, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland. These countries represent to some extent a cross-section of European nation states, as they differ, e.g., in population and size, in their constitutional and political organization, and in their relation to the EU.³ They also

¹ E.g.: “it can be expected that in terms of cultural policy countries will react in ways that align with their priorities, differing between cultural and instrumental motives. As such, differences in cultural policy aims and justifications can be expected at country level (and overtime), whereby the national preferences in cultural policy (and funding) aims can be considered to reflect the broader preferences of nation-states” (Betzler et al 2020, p. 2-3).

² *Rapids and backwaters. Adapting fast and slow to a digital cultural turn*. Financed by Research Council Norway.

³ With Norway and Switzerland being non-members, Croatia being a rather recent member (since 2013), Germany an original member state, Spain being a member since 1986 and Sweden being a member since 1995, while the UK now has become a *former* member.

represent both Northern, Western, Eastern and Southern Europe, according to established divisions of European regions.

The Covid-19 pandemic provides an opportunity to both revisit some fundamental questions for comparative cultural policy analysis as well as to ask new ones. This study takes the interaction between long-term processes and the sudden shock of the pandemic into focus.

We ask: Do the different adaptations to Covid-19 confirm, reinforce, or challenge existing cultural policy priorities and divisions of labour in different European countries? To what extent do the implemented measures represent an acceleration of a *digital* cultural policy in the respective countries?

An expectation for this analysis is that a process of convergence of cultural policy models or systems accelerates in reaction to external drivers. In this case, Covid-19 and digital transformation represents two different and possibly combined external drivers of change for the cultural policy system. From the financial crisis of 2008-2009, we know, however, that it is notoriously difficult to evaluate the lasting effects of an ongoing crisis. When e.g., the consequences for the cultural sector of the financial crisis were analysed by Bonet and Donato in 2011, they envisaged a much more fundamental change to take place than what arguably has happened. With the benefit of hindsight, it is possible to see a hypothesis like the following as overestimating the level of change: “[I]t is predictable that the degree of public contributions might significantly decrease in the next years, due to the deepening of the crisis and its impact on public budgets.” And, furthermore, that “in most European countries, culture is struggling to keep its position in the welfare state” (Bonet and Donato 2011, 7, cf. Badia et al. 2015 and Turbide et al. 2008). Numbers from Eurostat show, however, that governmental expenditure on “recreation, culture and religion” in the EU-27 countries has returned to a similar level as before the financial

crisis. Both in 2006 and in 2019 this category represented 2.5% of the total expenditure.⁴ With the caveat that pessimistic predictions may have triggered stakeholders and policy makers to adopt timely and effective countermeasures, the apparent problem invoked by Bonet and Donato did not come true.

In the following, we discuss the analytical vantage point for the paper. This is followed by a short presentation of the cultural policy division of labour in our seven case countries, both in general cultural policy and in more particular digital cultural policies. After a systematic review of the Covid-19-related measures in the different countries, we discuss the main questions of the article. In the final section, we present some implications and possible perspectives for upcoming research on the relation between Covid-19 and cultural policy.

Methodology and data

There are several potential parameters and categories for comparing Covid-19 measures. One possibility is to look at the basic policy nature of the implemented measures. Are the measures in question legislative and regulatory, administrative, informative, or fiscal (cf. Lowi 1972)? On a more practical level, a relevant parameter for comparison would be the way the different measures are operationalized: are they production subsidies and grants, loans, tax reliefs or reductions, or mere administrative leniency. In other words: Are the measures best understood as labour market policy or as cultural policy? This paper is based on official policy documents from the first 18 months of the pandemic. For each country, a policy mapping in three stages was done. The first stage, in May and June 2020, consisted of a country-specific mapping and categorizing of 1) policy measures and initiatives specifically targeting the cultural sector, 2) general measures and initiatives that included and affected the cultural sector, and 3) publicly sanctioned new platforms

⁴ See https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Government_expenditure_on_recreation,_culture_and_religion [Read 20.05.2021]

for digital production and/or distribution of culture. The sources for this mapping exercise were the webpages, news releases and strategies published by different national entities and ministries in charge of cultural policies in the respective countries (see the Annex for an overview of consulted webpages and selected documents). Although there were differences in the availability and the transparency of information from different governments, we are confident that we have covered the essential mitigating policies in all seven countries. This first-stage mapping also included a general mapping of cultural policy principles in these countries, including the division of labour and funding between levels of government, the relation to the EU, digital cultural policy initiatives and the relation between public and private funding of culture. Table 1 (below) contains a summary of this mapping.

The second stage of mapping took place in November 2020, when the abovementioned categories of policy measures were updated and revised. In addition to specific and general measures, a category of *regional* cultural policy COVID-19 measures was also added to the overview.

The third stage of policy mapping was in November 2021. This was an analytical mapping, where individual, country-wise analyses were written by the individual authors of this paper. These contained tentative answers to whether and to what extent the pandemic had affected 1) the general cultural policy model/structure of the individual countries, 2) the relative importance of different sources of funding, 3) the division of labour between different levels of government, and 4) the importance of digital cultural policies as part of general cultural policy. These analyses form an important part of the basis for the discussion of the paper.

Furthermore, we also selected four early studies of cultural policy related to Covid-19, some of which cover various countries (OECD 2020a; KEA 2020; Nordic Council of Ministers 2021; IDEA Consult et al. 2021). We use this qualitative data to work out categories and a systematic overview of types of Covid-19 measures directed to the cultural sector. To answer the questions asked in this paper, we draw on established categories of national cultural policy models, and we

have sought to develop related categories of various measures aimed at mitigating adverse consequences of the Covid-19 crisis in the seven countries concerned.

On comparative analysis of cultural policy and cultural policy changes

Previous comparative cultural policy analyses have concluded that statistics and quantitative indicators by themselves yield partial and patchy results. As underlined by both Belfiore (2004) and Betzler et al. (2020), a certain focus on context and qualitative approaches is necessary: “a quantitative approach cannot alone suffice to understand the workings of the cultural sector and of policies for it across nations” (Belfiore 2004, 15; see also Wiesand 2002).

There are some common aspects featured in most categorizations of national cultural policy. A central dimension is the role and importance of the state relative to the commercial and private sphere, and, often accordingly, to what degree the cultural policy is characterized by a free market logic. There are several attempts within cultural policy research to establish taxonomies of cultural policy models in this respect, enabling researchers to compare different national and regional versions of supporting arts and culture (e.g., Cummings & Katz 1987; Chartrand & McCaughey 1989; Zimmer & Toepler 1996; Madden 2009; Rius-Ulldemolins et al. 2019).

An alternative for comparing the general cultural policy models of different countries is put forward by Stefan Toepler and Anette Zimmer (Zimmer and Toepler 1996; 1999, Toepler and Zimmer 2002). They investigate relations between different types of welfare states (e.g., liberal, conservative, social-democratic) and the public arts or culture policies. For instance, Zimmer and Toepler (1996) compare the cultural policy models of Germany, the United States, and Sweden. They observe that on one level, the cultural policies of the three countries share more similarities than differences, even though they represent three different welfare state systems. In all three countries, public cultural policy emerged within a social-democratic paradigm, through “building

cultural capital by increasing access to the arts” (Zimmer and Toepler 1996, 188). However, by looking at the more specific tools of cultural policy, more regime-specific differences emerge. Furthermore, the general expansion of cultural policy in the 1970s, taking place in a number of countries, is legitimated differently in the three case countries: “correction of market failure in the United States, income and employment guarantees in Sweden, and reduction of status differentiation between high and community culture in Germany” (ibid.).

Zimmer and Toepler conclude that different legitimations of cultural policy models might face substantial challenges and/or changes. They predict that the three welfare state models are *converging*; that the liberal model is gaining ground at the expense of the social-democratic doctrine. Furthermore, this process might even culminate in the end of unique and extensive statutory cultural policy proper, as we enter “the post-cultural policy age” (Zimmer and Toepler 1996, 199; see also Mangset 2020).

A more recent converging hypothesis has been put forward by Rius-Ulldemolins et al. (2019). They hypothesise that (European) cultural policy models converge, and even raise the question whether it still makes sense to speak of different cultural policies within the Europe. The authors document convergence in the aims underpinning cultural policy around explicit and similar social, regional, and economic goals being added to cultural policy throughout Europe (Rius-Ulldemolins et al. 2019, 16). However, they find no compelling evidence that the more fundamental models of cultural policy would be converging.

The concept of convergence is closely related to the concept of *isomorphism*. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) have argued that with social and economic development, comes a trend towards ever more similar organizations and organizing principles. According to the authors, this development is not just the result of a rational movement towards ever more efficient ways of organizing different kinds of practice (mimetic isomorphism), but also comes about through two other mechanisms: coercive isomorphism due to external pressures (including laws and

government regulation), and normative isomorphism, due to shared norms and values in societies, for instance of professionalism. According to Alasuutari and Kangas (2020), this isomorphism is apparent in the development of governmental conduct, including cultural policy. They point to UNESCO as a central agent in promoting a specific, shared conceptualization of cultural policy. Another possible force of convergence and/or isomorphism in European cultural policy is the EU, as a powerful legal entrepreneur and policy coordinator (Sassatelli 2002, 2007, 2009; see also Bradford 2020 and IDEA Consult et al. 2021). In general, there seem to be three major potential agents for transformations (including isomorphism) of national cultural policy: a) international and regional organizations and inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), such as UNESCO or the EU; b) external shocks that destabilize entrenched institutions, traditions, and routines, such as the Covid-19 pandemic; and c) technological change, including digitization.

The Corona pandemic provides thus a test to whether alleged, long-standing trends in cultural policy still hold. Corona brings an apparent urgent need for new policy initiatives, at least to tie things over a temporary pandemic situation. Cultural policy makers are virtually required to improvise, innovate, and go beyond traded routines. In ‘normal times’, extant (cultural) policy will often be preserved by appreciation of stability and reliability, the costs of change, as well as entrenched interests of influential stakeholders. During the pandemic, some of this scaffolding is falling away. Policy makers’ recent actions are thus likely to reveal with greater clarity what underlying assumptions and values guide current cultural policy.

Cultural policy and division of responsibility in seven case countries

Comparative cultural policy analyses have tended to use different ideal-types to describe the basic features of cultural policy in different countries. Norway and Sweden have been labelled as belonging to a Nordic or a Social-Democratic model, Germany as representing a Central-Western

European or Conservative model, Croatia as a South-Eastern, Switzerland as a Central-Western and Spain as a South-Western European model (cf. Duelund 2003, Zimmer and Toepler 1996, Rius-Ulldemolins et al. 2019). Partly using geographical, partly ideological or political descriptions, none of the existing attempts captures the relevant differences and characteristics in a satisfactory manner. This includes e.g., the divisions of labour between different levels of government.

What are the comparative characteristics of the cultural policy of our seven case countries? Based on our mapping of the cultural policies in our case countries, a set of basic traits of the cultural policy profile of the seven countries are summarized in Table 1: relations to the EU, the level of regional authority (as measured by the Regional Authority Index)⁵, the division of cultural spending between levels of government, the division of labour and responsibility, the importance of private funding, basic cultural policy values and traits from *digital* cultural policies.

Table 1. Comparison across selected country-specific and cultural policy-specific features

Country	Relation to the EU	Regional Authority Index	Division of cultural spending, central government /region /municipality. ⁶ Percentages	Division of labour/ responsibility	Private funding	Cultural policy values	Digital cultural policy
Croatia	Recent member	9,55	40,9 (state)/ 20,4(regional)/ 38,6 (local) (2020)	State, county, city	Limited importance.	Cultural pluralism, creative autonomy, polycentric cultural development, cultural participation and public/private cooperation	Limited funding; Fragmented, bottom-up approach; Low visibility of digital content. Plan for Digitization of Cultural Heritage (2020-2025) shifts emphasis on more centralistic approach.
Germany	Original member	25,67	17/39/45 (2017)	State, region , municipality	Limited importance. Public-private partnership increasing.	Decentralisation, subsidiarity, and plurality, freedom of the arts, some emphasis on 'high arts' and scepticism of commercial culture	Emphasis on private initiatives. Arts and culture play a minor role in government strategies on digitization.
Norway	Non-member	11,99	46/6/48	State, region, municipality	Of relatively little importance, albeit increasing.	Welfare, democratization of arts and culture, quality and diversity.	Digitization of cultural heritage central.
Spain	Member	35,67	17/27/58	State, region , provincial, local	Of relatively little importance	Heritage preservation, plurality of cultural identities, democratization	Digitization of cultural heritage, digitization of the cultural sector management.

⁵ Regional Authority Index is a comprehensive dataset and a methodology that measures the authority and autonomy of government levels (cf. Schakel 2018, Hooghe et al. 2010).

⁶ Source: Compendium of cultural policies. The percentages are not from one and the same year. All of them are from between 2013 and 2017. (cf. <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/statistics-comparisons/statistics/funding/#1563453131381-77d52055-b082>)

						of the arts, cultural participation, economic promotion	
Sweden	Member	12,00	43/15/42	State, region, municipality	Of relatively little importance, albeit increasing.	Three objectives: the independence objective, the participation objective and the societal objective.	Emphasis on accessibility, preservation, distribution and digitization (making the analogue digitally accessible).
Switzerland	Non-member	26,50	11/38/51	State, region , municipality	Private funding important and critical. Public-private partnerships.	Representation of the different languages and regions; cultural diversity.	Digitization of culture recently formulated as a key objective.
UK	Previous member	9,59 (18,5-20,5)	32/-/68 ⁷	State, country , region, municipality	Important in some sectors, amount of public funding diminishing	Economic growth of the cultural sectors, excellence, diversity and soft power	Increasing stress on digitization of heritage. Digital policy also focusses on regulation/harm reduction.

Sources: Our own mapping and policy analyses, Eurostat, Compendium.

What our case countries generally have in common, is that there is a general division of labour between two, three or four levels of government. The individual responsibility of these levels varies greatly, however, as does the division of cultural spending (cf. Table 1). Germany and Switzerland are federal states, where a large part of the responsibility for culture is placed at the regional level – in the *Länder* (Germany) or in the cantons (Switzerland) (cf. Wesner 2010; Marx 2020). At the same time, there are also state or confederate cultural policy actors in these two countries, like the Federal Office of Culture and Swiss Arts Council *Pro Helvetia* or the German quasi-ministerial post *Staatsminister(in)/Beauftragte für Kultur und Medien*.

Spain is a quasi-federal country. The structure of competences and responsibilities of cultural administrations (national, regional, and local, with two levels: provincial administrations and city councils) gives a predominant role to the regional level, which has an exceptionally high degree of autonomy, as shown by the country's Regional Authority Index (RAI) (cf. Table 1). But this role varies greatly depending on the size of the cultural sector located in the region, the historical link of this sector with the central administration and the level of political legitimacy of the regional culture. The central cultural administration deals mostly with regulatory and infrastructural aspects of cultural activity, but not only: the combination of the above factors also determines its very

⁷ The percentages for division of cultural spending for UK is calculated from the information in the national report from the UK in the *Compendium of cultural policies*. There are no numbers on regional expenditure in this overview. (cf. <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/database/search-by-country/country-profile/category/?id=42&g1=7>)

disparate presence and direct action in different regions – from a leading role in Madrid, where it is responsible for the most important cultural institutions, to an almost residual presence in the Basque Country or in Catalonia (cf. Rius-Ulldemolins and Zamorano 2015).

In the Scandinavian countries of Sweden and Norway, the cultural policy is characterized by a strong state and by policy development on a national level, but in both countries, there is also a sizeable financial responsibility on the regional and especially the municipal level (cf. Frenander 2014, Mangset and Hylland 2018). Furthermore, both countries have also recently implemented reforms giving the regional and municipal levels of government a larger cultural policy responsibility. These reforms are the source of numerous debates on what is gained and what is lost by shifting cultural policy responsibility from one level to another.

In the case of UK, there is also a division of labour and responsibility between different levels of government, complicated by the fact that UK is comprised of four separate countries – so-called *devolved nations* – granted a certain level of autonomy (cf. Bell and Oakley 2014). In general, there is some funding available at UK level, administered by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport. Otherwise, cultural policy is a “devolved matter”⁸, in the sense that the individual countries England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland develop individual cultural policies and associated funding schemes.

Regarding Croatia, their cultural policy can to some extent be described as *implicit* policy, as the official strategies for most areas are lacking and no systemic reform of the cultural system has been undertaken in the last 30 years. According to some analysts, Croatian cultural policy is (still) characterized by a combination of continuity and discontinuity with the former socialist system of the country. This is, e.g., visible in the fact that large parts of the existing cultural infrastructure

⁸ “Devolved matters are those areas of government where decision-making has been delegated by Parliament to the devolved institutions such as the Scottish Parliament, the Assemblies of Wales, Northern Ireland and London or to Local Authorities”. <https://www.parliament.uk/site-information/glossary/devolved-and-reserved-matters/> [Read 18.01.21]

are part of the legacy of this system (Primorac et al. 2017). The responsibility for funding arts and culture is primarily placed at the national level and at the level of towns and cities (with the city of Zagreb alone representing 22% of the total expenditure), while municipalities and countries combined represent 8% of the funding (ibid.).

Looking more specifically at *digital cultural policy*, the question of comparison becomes more challenging, partly because of the blurred boundaries between the explicit and implicit parts of this policy. Due to the fundamental and pervasive technological nature of digital production, distribution and consumption, choices and decisions made in policy areas like broadband infrastructure, tax regulations, broadcasting licences and competition law have direct consequences for the production and distribution of digital cultural content. We can think of this as the *implicit* side of digital cultural policy. In addition to this, the *explicit* side of digital cultural policy consists of the strategies and schemes for supporting the production and/or distribution of digital content, e.g., through the digitization of heritage, production of computer games or financing of distribution platforms. In other words, the policy area of digital culture, consists, broadly speaking, of a combination of infrastructure development and regulation and support mechanisms (cf. Hylland 2022).

The responsibility for digitization in general and digital culture more specifically is placed in different public organs, ministries, and directorates in the seven countries in question. The organization of responsibility partly follows the distinction between regulation and support. The case of UK is an example of the distinction between regulation of online content on the one hand and support for digitization on the other hand. In the UK, regulation is largely a matter for *Ofcom*, the communications regulator, which has had a lot of responsibility added to its portfolio in recent years – including online harms. The responsibility for digital infrastructure is placed at Building Digital UK (BDUK), part of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). This inclination towards seeing communication policy as mainly focused on infrastructure and

economic development and cultural and media policies as more on content regulation, is relatively common (Valtysson 2020, 57).

Summing up, the main differences between the seven countries are primarily concerning the level of regional authority and/or federalism and thereby the relative importance of the state level of government. Furthermore, the countries differ on the importance of private funding of arts and culture, and to some degree also on the legitimating values the cultural policies are based on, explicitly or implicitly. Regarding digital policies, it is a mixed picture. In general, all or most countries recognize that digitization in some way is an integrated part of their cultural policies, but actual governmental involvement in digital projects is rather scattered, with an emphasis on digitization of cultural heritage.

Covid-19 measures in the seven case countries

In mid-March 2020, the Covid-19 pandemic became the dominating context for most aspects of both cultural production and cultural policy in all seven countries. It became evident that there was a need to launch *ad hoc* policy measures to better the situation for the cultural and creative industries (CCI) sector. The situation for the part of CCI that was based, in some way or another, on a physical audience, was most immediately affected. This included concert arenas, clubs and stages, theatres, museums, galleries, festivals etc. Furthermore, parts of the cultural sector also suffered a loss in revenue because of the challenging economy of their patrons and clients, who became less interested in spending money on culture or on advertising (OECD 2020b). *Categories and implementation of measures*

During the pandemic, international organizations have attempted to summarize the state of the art in the CCI/CCS⁹ and the different measures to tackle the crisis. The OECD report *Cultural Shock*

⁹ Both acronyms (Cultural and Creative Industries/Cultural and Creative Sectors) are used in relevant reports.

systemizes various public tools to manage the crisis (OECD 2020a), distinguishing between four main categories of support: 1) public funding; 2) employment support; 3) deferral of payments and easing administrative procedures; and 4) structural policies. Under these main categories, a number of sub-categories of support are described, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Categories of Covid-19 support for CCI/CCS.

Public funding	Grants and subsidies for cultural sectors
	Grants and subsidies for individual artists
	Compensation of losses
	Loan provision and guarantee
	Investment incentives
Employment support	Job retention / income support
	Unemployment benefits
Deferral of payments and easing administrative procedures	Advanced aid
	Postponement of dues
	Relief of dues
	Procedural flexibility
Structural policies	Training and employment of creative workers
	Knowledge mobilisation and impact analysis
	Digitalisation
	Innovation
	Copyright licensing

Source: OECD 2020a.

In general, our mapping shows that all countries in our study installed mitigating measures in most of the OECD categories of public funding, employment support and deferral of payments/easing administrative procedures in the first months after the pandemic hit Europe.¹⁰ All countries used a plurality of measures, combining grants and subsidies, compensation of lost income, income support and financial flexibility or leniency. By necessity, these were mostly results of political *ad hoc* decisions. Several large-scale *funds* were established, e.g., the *Culture Recovery Fund* in the UK, and the *Neustart Kultur* and the *Sonderfonds für Kulturveranstaltungen* in Germany. Measures belonging to *structural policies* (the fourth main category of the OECD report) have, relatively speaking, been less important, in terms of both the amount of dedicated funding and the political attention for this kind of mitigating efforts. The importance of structural policies has

¹⁰ For a detailed overview of different measures, see webpages included in the Annex.

slightly increased in the latter part of the pandemic, including efforts to get knowledge on impact for the cultural sector and on the effects of Covid-19 policies, as well as funding dedicated to developing innovation and digitization-linked projects.

Overall, our mapping shows that there was a combination of general (e.g., for all small and medium-sized businesses (SMBs)), sector-specific (for cultural producers/CCI) and sub-sector specific (for e.g., film production, music industry, or museums) measures being implemented. In the practical administration of the many different funds, programmes, grants and subsidies, a range of public sector entities have been involved. Seemingly, no *new* entities, departments or offices dedicated to Covid-19 policies have been established, although some existing entities have been assigned new tasks. In Germany, e.g., there has been an expansion of federal cultural funding. A more specific case in point is that The Norwegian Gambling and Foundation Authority was administering the most important compensation scheme for the cultural sector. Certain administrative changes have been implemented, including updated legislation and/or regulations in most countries, to back up and secure a proper legislative foundation both for the implemented measures and for the shutdown of cultural activities. However, it is challenging to identify specific political or ideological principles across the wide range of measures for each country. Partly, this is rooted in the *ad hoc* and extraordinary nature of the first phase of Covid-19 cultural policies and the need for rapid implementation of support systems.

Covid-19 cultural policies

After almost two years of pandemic, we can nevertheless identify some characteristic traits of European cultural policies responding to the pandemic situation, both in general and regarding each country. Firstly, we see a tendency across all countries that cultural policy is turning into economic policy, fiscal policy, and labour market policy. Even if the field of arts and culture, or at

least parts of it, is characterized by a *refusal* of economy and economic interest (e.g., Bourdieu 1980), money tends to be very close to the top of the hierarchy of needs for this sector. This has meant that ministries of finance or business in effect have come to represent important parts of national cultural policy during the pandemic. Although cultural policy in general concerns the allocation of funds for culture, it generally also bases such allocation on prioritization, ideas of quality, policy goals and ambitions etc. That has not been the case for Covid-19 cultural policies, as the focus has been directed towards mere business or industry survival, income loss compensation, salaries, and liquidity. The UK government framing of the 1,57-billion-pound *Cultural Recovery Fund* is illustrative: “to help save these sectors, maintaining jobs and keeping businesses afloat”.¹¹ This has also highlighted the entrepreneurial and business-side to cultural policies. This has been especially visible in countries like Norway and Sweden, where the perspective of culture as a profitable industry has been a less prevalent part of cultural policies. In the UK, however, where the value of the creative economy has been a core argument in the cultural policy discourse, this seems to have been downplayed in the administration of pandemic crisis funds. That said, it should be noted that the UK Cultural Recovery Fund tended to have greater uptake in places and with organisations that had a history of obtaining public cultural investment – and through this the funds did little to reverse existing inequalities in funding.

Another aspect being highlighted in all countries, are the differences in distribution of risk between subsidized institutions and freelance artists (see e.g., Primorac 2021b). While there are examples of subsidized cultural institutions making a profit of the combination of no production costs, layoffs and emergency support, thousands of self-employed artists lost all or most of their income (cf. Salvador et al. 2021, Comunian and England 2020). This division could materialize through organizations restricting their activities to the *skeleton crew* (or the people with permanent contracts, who were too costly to let go), while still receiving extensive subsidies. This has

¹¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/culture-recovery-board>

brought attention to the general precarity of cultural labour and to the general gap between the subsidized cultural sector and freelance cultural production (OECD 2020a, Berge et al. 2021, Walmsley et al. 2022). In several countries, specific measures were put in place to specifically counter the negative effects on revenue for freelance creative workers.

Through the EU implementation in March 2020 of the *State Aid Temporary Framework*¹², based upon specific exceptions under EU law, the possibility to support economies and enterprises in exceptional circumstances was expanded. This framework was pertaining to all seven countries, with the exception of Switzerland.¹³ Any kind of support needed to comply with some general rules, as described in the different versions of the framework. The measures needed to be “necessary, appropriate and proportionate”, in the words of the European Commission. All mitigating measures implemented by a non-member like Norway, needs e.g., to be approved by ESA (EFTA Surveillance Authority), in order to check whether the support is in violation with the EEA Agreement and the European Internal Market. A question of whether the EU has contributed to a cultural policy *convergence* during the pandemic is thus challenging. On the one hand, the temporary framework gave individual member states more flexibility in designing support measures according to national needs, with less emphasis on EU regulation and coordination. This would potentially represent cultural policy divergence more than convergence. On the other hand, the continued emphasis on keeping “the level playing field” and the “cohesion within the Union” is keeping potential divergence in check, with the ESA approval routines as a case in point.

A pandemic challenge to cultural policies?

¹² See https://ec.europa.eu/competition-policy/state-aid/coronavirus/temporary-framework_en [Read 11.02.22]. The importance of state aid control is at the same time emphasized in the temporary framework: “Likewise, EU State aid control ensures that the EU Internal Market is not fragmented and that the level playing field stays intact. The integrity of the Internal Market will also lead to a faster recovery. It also avoids harmful subsidy races, where Member States with deeper pockets can outspend neighbours to the detriment of cohesion within the Union.”

¹³ The UK needed to comply with the framework during the transition period until December 31st 2020.

A central question is whether the cultural policies of individual countries has been fundamentally changed or challenged in any way by the pandemic, in the sense that it has affected the essential political tools, divisions of labour, or core legitimation and goals of these policies. We think that the general answer to that question is *no*. Likewise, there is very little evidence to support a convergence hypothesis – that European cultural policies are becoming more similar. Rius-Ulldemolins et al. asked in their 2019 article: “Can we then still talk of different European cultural policy models?” (Rius-Ulldemolins et al. 2019, 1045). To this question, they answer affirmative, as we also do in this article. Furthermore, Rius-Ulldemolins et al. also, by and large, refute their own convergence hypothesis of increasingly similar cultural policies, also in line with our results. A third comparative point is that they also document that the economic crisis in 2008-2009 did not lead to national cultural policies behaving *out of character*. On the contrary, the different national responses to the crisis, in terms of budget cuts, varied according to their respective cultural policy models (Rius-Ulldemolins et al. 2019, 1056, see also Rubio Arostegui and Rius-Ulldemolins 2020).

What the pandemic and the mitigating efforts have done, however, is to highlight and partially fortify existing cultural policy structures (cf. Berge et al. 2021). All the seven countries in question show this kind of tendency. In Croatia, the policy measures reflect a previously set policy course, although the situation at times was overshadowed by two major earthquakes. Due to the fact that Croatia has a rather unequal regional and local development and hence big differences exist in local and regional budgets, cultural measures were mostly implemented at the national level. The crisis has thus not been used as an opportunity for policy change. The reaction on the local and regional level has been rather minimal even in areas that usually show high support for cultural field. In Germany, as well as in Switzerland, the pandemic cultural policies have been, as in most other countries, focusing upon temporary financial needs and a reduction of red-tape procedures to

facilitate access to funds. There are very few measures that signal policy changes, e.g., in fostering a more risk-resilient sector or in strengthening a digital cultural infrastructure.

In the Scandinavian countries of Norway and Sweden, the situation and the public discussion of measures highlighted the uneven distribution of risk between cultural producers. Some institutions profited from the situation, while many individual cultural producers and freelance artists suffered a great deal economically. The Nordic model of cultural policy represents a high level of public funding, an emphasis on the autonomy of the arts and a prominent role of artist organizations and unions (cf. Mangset et al. 2008). These traits were by and large affirmed and consolidated: both the importance of state funding, artistic autonomy, and a thoroughly organized cultural sector.

In Spain, the measures implemented varied, reflecting the heterogeneity of the different cultural policy contexts of the country. This includes the differences between different levels of government, and the different political legitimacy of different public administrations (cf. Rius-Ulldemolins and Zamorano 2015). As e.g., the Catalan cultural administration is imposed as a privileged reference to the Catalan cultural sector, while the Madrid cultural sector tends to be directly linked to the central administration, the mitigating actions of the different territorial administrations have varied, both in nature and volume. There are nevertheless tendencies towards some policy change, both regarding a slight shifting of powers between the tiers of government, and regarding the focus on the digital side of cultural policies.

The pandemic cultural policies of Switzerland also seemed to confirm the basic principles of Swiss cultural policy. While some have maintained that the Swiss Covid-19 response has been characterized by a *consociational*¹⁴ crisis and by neo-corporatism (Sager and Mavrot 2020), this is not necessarily true for the cultural sector, where there was a great deal of solidarity shown and

¹⁴ Consociationalism is a political system whereby major internal divisions of a state are kept in check through stabilizing efforts by different elites. Cf. Sager and Mavrot 2020.

several new initiatives, both by public actors, such as the ProHelvetia Foundation and public service radio and broadcasting channels, as well as by bottom-up initiatives.

In the UK, the pandemic period could be seen as having deepened or intensified some trends that were already apparent. Among these are the increasing distinctions between policy in the four nations of the UK, the turn towards digital and the fading or mutating of the ‘creative economy’ discourse as a major driver of cultural policy. The sense of a fragmenting United Kingdom has been intensified during the period. Furthermore, the use of the recovery funding suggests that traditional arguments for support were just as important as creative economy arguments.

(Re)distribution of power between levels of government

Across the different countries, there are a couple of aspects that merits specific attention. As illustrated by the RAI index (cf. Table 1), a central distinguishing factor of different cultural policies, is the degree of regional (or local) autonomy. If we look specifically at this factor, we see that this parameter is helpful in understanding the cultural policy responses of the different countries. For most countries, the existing distribution of responsibility and power balance between governmental tiers has, been confirmed through the pandemic policies. The importance of, respectively, a state-centred or a federalist cultural policy system, or a system of devolved nations in the case of the UK, has not been challenged in a substantial way. At the same time, there are small and potentially important shifts to be noted for some of the seven countries. In Spain, without altering the general distribution of power and thus preserving the high degree of territorial autonomy that characterizes the Spanish system, cultural policies against Covid-19 have contributed, to some degree of cultural *recentralization* of the country (cf. Rius-Ulldemolins et al. 2021). This is partly due to the importance of pandemic employment support from the central administration and partly to the importance of money from the European Recovery Fund, also

administered by the central administration. Also, in the federalist states of Germany and Switzerland, the importance of the federal government in cultural policy have become more central during the pandemic, partly because the extraordinary nature of the crisis had shifted the regulatory authority to the federal level, e.g. through the implementation of the fund *Neustart Kultur*. And as mentioned, the importance of the state as a cultural policy actor has been thoroughly underlined and possibly strengthened in the Scandinavian countries. Being constituted by four individual nations, the UK is a case of its own, showing tendencies towards increasing distinctions between the four autonomous cultural policies of the country.

The potential power shifts are by no means unique to cultural policy. In a general report on managing the crisis across levels of government, the OECD observed differing governmental responses in terms of shifting responsibilities: “some governments are temporarily recentralising while others are temporarily decentralising in order to manage the crisis” (OECD 2020b, 6). Even if our policy documentation does not show any considerable *decentralizing* tendencies in the pandemic cultural policies, the OECD report directs attention to two relevant points for our topic: the potential temporality of the observed tendencies and the importance of *multi-level governance* during a crisis (cf. Hooghe and Marks 2001).

Digitization and Covid-19

A second general topic across the pandemic cultural policies of the seven countries is the topic of digitization and digital cultural policy. One of the working hypotheses for this analysis was that the Covid-19 situation was a potential accelerator for a digital turn in cultural policy – bringing digital culture, digital cultural consumption, and digital policies to the fore. The different lockdown phases of the pandemic, with digital distribution of culture as the only accessible option, should provide fertile ground for such acceleration. In the OECD report on Covid-19 and the

CCI/CCS, this kind of policy is labelled as structural change policies. While emphasizing the importance of digitization as a central part of such policies, the report documents surprisingly few initiatives in this regard (OECD 2020a). This is also confirmed by our analysis, thereby being an exception to the general analysis of another OECD report, pointing to accelerated digitalisation of services as an overall policy consequence of the pandemic (OECD 2020b). At the same time, there is little doubt that the first phase of the pandemic saw a very rapid increase in digital cultural offerings, e.g., through digital concerts (cf. Hylland 2021). Equally, the use of digital cultural media (streaming music, film, concerts, performances) and social media platforms rose substantially (cf. e.g., Kshetri 2020).

In total, we find relatively few examples in our data indicating that the pandemic spurred a fundamental acceleration of a digital cultural policy in any of the seven countries included in the study. This differs, however, somewhat between them. While there was some political attention directed towards the importance of digitization in countries like Norway, Sweden and Germany, there were hardly any new initiatives to foster digital infrastructure with direct government involvement. In Norway, e.g., where very generous support measures were implemented, no funding was directed towards digitization or digital culture. Likewise, there are few, if any, noticeable attempts in these countries to rethink the importance of digitization as a part of cultural policies. In the UK, parts of the *Cultural Recovery Fund* were used to finance digitization work and digital infrastructure. At the same time, the pandemic itself did not lead to the introduction of new digital policies for culture. These are underway as part of concerns about platform regulations and the growth of digital markets.¹⁵ The pandemic did seemingly not affect the ambitions or progress of this work. Furthermore, research carried out in the UK (Walmsley et al. 2022) suggested that despite the relative importance of digital content in this phase of the pandemic, it

¹⁵ See <https://www.create.ac.uk/blog/2021/11/26/the-birth-of-neo-regulation-where-next-for-the-uks-approach-to-platform-regulation/>.

was still only accessed by a minority of the population (43%) and largely by the same people who had accessed it before i.e., the number of those happy to consume their culture digitally did not increase markedly.

In Switzerland, there is a recent and more explicitly spelled out emphasis on the digitization of cultural policies. The current 4-year national cultural strategy, the *Kulturbotschaft (2021–2024)*, which sets out the priorities for cultural measures at the federal level, stresses the digital side of culture based on a twofold approach: on the one hand, digital channels and platforms should facilitate access to culture; on the other hand, the development, production, and communication of digital art are to be promoted. At the same time, there are few visible signs of political attempts to relate this digital emphasis to the pandemic situation and the increase in digital cultural consumption during the pandemic, and indeed there is an ongoing discussion on reduction of funds for media outlets and the public service broadcaster and their engagement with online media. In contrast and as a proof that the policy environment is fluid and contentious, the Swiss Parliament adopted the so-called “Netflix” law in September 2021, which will demand content platforms to devote a small part of their revenues for Swiss-made productions¹⁶

For the last two countries, Croatia and Spain, the case is slightly different. Both members of the EU, these countries exemplify the potential impact and importance of EU funding within the cultural sector, also pertaining to digitization. In Croatia, EU funding has previously been central to the development of digitization strategies, including a current Plan for Digitization of Cultural Heritage (2020–2025). During the pandemic, the Ministry of Culture and Media has launched public calls for developing digital cultural offerings, in part or in total financed by EU funds. In the recently published (post-pandemic) National Recovery and Resilience Plan 2021-2026, there is also an acknowledgement of the importance of digitalization for the CCI sector. In the case of

¹⁶ Cf. https://www.parlament.ch/de/services/news/Seiten/2021/20210916142551538194158159038_bsd136.aspx [Read 25.10.22]

Spain, the impact and influence of the EU membership became apparent in the later stages of the pandemic. Spain is one of the largest benefactors of the EU recovery package Next Generation EU (NGEU). With digital transitions being one of the four general guiding principles of NGEU, Spain has emphasized digitization heavily also in the cultural chapter of their recovery plan. Thus, both the pandemic and the EU funding has actually represented a certain acceleration of a digital cultural policy in Spain. The vigorous development of these digitization policies in the cultural sphere can be interpreted in this case as the result of the articulation between the window of opportunity offered by the European plan and the structural interests of the central administration in its implicit competition with the territorial administrations.

Concluding remarks

The analysis and concluding points of this article must necessarily be read with some precaution. At the time of writing, the pandemic is still not officially ended. Furthermore, the long-term effects of the pandemic, both in terms of the general conditions for cultural production and in terms of cultural policies, are not evident quite yet. In other words, our comparative analysis will potentially be affected by the fact that we still to some extent are mid-crisis or Nevertheless, our study is clearly pointing towards results that will be highly relevant to follow up by further research in the years to come. Firstly, we think it is fair to say that the Covid-19 pandemic and the cultural policy measures accompanying it has *not* challenged the existing cultural policy structures of the countries investigated. This was not anticipated, and points to a substantial stability and resilience in the existing cultural policy models. Furthermore, the crisis has not led to any observable convergence of cultural policies, making the different national cultural policy models more similar than they were pre-Covid. These two points should be revisited in future research, to consider whether this apparent cultural policy inertia is a lasting quality.

Even if the nature of the cultural policy responses has a lot in common between the seven countries, the responses have in general either confirmed an existing policy structure or enhanced a development already happening within the individual countries. The importance of, respectively, a state-centred or a federalist cultural policy system, or for that matter, a system of devolved nations in the case of the UK, have not been challenged in a substantial way. Secondly, although the results are not univocal, there is little evidence to support the hypothesis that the pandemic cultural policies have represented an acceleration of national digital cultural policies. With the exception of Spain and possibly Croatia, the countries studied have not brought questions of digital culture and digital cultural consumption to the fore of their cultural policies. This is contrary to what was generally expected, especially in the first phase of the pandemic, when digital distribution of culture for a period became dominant.

References

- Alasuutari, P. and A. Kangas. 2020. "The global spread of the concept of cultural policy." *Poetics* 82. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2020.101445.
- Agostino, D., M. Arnaboldi and A. Lampis. 2020. "Italian state museums during the COVID-19 crisis: from onsite closure to online openness." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 35 (4): 362–372. doi: 10.1080/09647775.2020.1790029.
- Arostegui, J.A.R. and J. Rius-Ulldemolins. 2018. "Cultural policies in the South of Europe after the global economic crisis: is there a Southern model within the framework of European convergence?" *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 26 (1): 16–30. doi:10.1080/10286632.2018.1429421
- Badia, F., E. Borin, E. and F. Donato. 2015. "How the financial crisis affected models of public-private partnership in the cultural sector: Empirical evidence from France, Germany and Italy." Paper at AIMAC conference 2015, Aix-en-Provence. doi:10.13140/RG.2.1.3041.9929.
- Banks, M. 2020. "The work of culture and C-19." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 23(4), 648–654. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549420924687>
- Banks, M., and O'Connor, J. (2021). "A plague upon your howling": art and culture in the viral emergency. *Cultural Trends* 30 (1), 3–18.
- Belfiore, E. 2004. *The methodological challenge of cross-national research: comparing cultural policy in Britain and Italy*. Working Paper. Coventry: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick. Centre for Cultural Policy Studies University of Warwick Research Papers (No.8).
- Bell, D. and K. Oakley. 2014. *Cultural policy*. London: Routledge.
- Berge, O., H.N. Storm and O.M. Hylland. 2021. *Covid-19-pandemiens effekter på kultursektoren i de nordiske landene* [The influence of the Covid-19 pandemic on the cultural sector in the Nordic countries]. Bø: Telemark Research Institute.
- Betzler, D., E. Loots, M. Prokůpek, L. Marques and P. Grafenauer. 2020. "COVID-19 and the arts and cultural sectors: investigating countries' contextual factors and early policy measures." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 27 (6): 796–814. doi:10.1080/10286632.2020.1842383.
- Bonet, L. and Donato, F. 2011. «The financial crisis and its impact on the current models of governance and management of the cultural sector in Europe». *ENCATC Journal of cultural management and policy* 1 (1), 4–11.
- Bourdieu, P. 1980. "The production of belief: contribution to an economy of symbolic goods." *Media, culture & society* 2 (3): 261–293. doi:10.1177/016344378000200305.
- Bradford, A. 2020. *The Brussels Effect: How the European Union Rules the World*. Oxford University Press.
- Chartrand, H. and C. McCaughey. 1989. "The Arm's Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perspective - Past, Present and Future." In *Who's to Pay for the Arts? The International Search for Models of Support*, edited by M. Cummings and J.M.D. Schuster. ACA Books: New York.

- Comunian, R. and L. England. 2020. "Creative and cultural work without filters: Covid-19 and exposed precarity in the creative economy." *Cultural Trends* 29 (2): 112–128. doi:10.1080/09548963.2020.1770577.
- Cummings, M. and R. Katz, eds. 1987. *The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America and Japan*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- DiMaggio, P. J. and W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48 (2): 147–160. doi:10.2307/2095101.
- Duelund, P., ed. 2003. *The Nordic Cultural Model*. Copenhagen: Nordic Cultural Institute.
- Frenander, A. 2014. *Kulturen som kulturpolitikens stora problem: Diskussionen om svensk kulturpolitik fram till 2010*. [Culture as the main problem for cultural policy. Discussions on Swedish cultural policy until 2010]. Hedemora: Gidlund.
- Hooghe, L., G. Marks and A.H. Schakel. 2010. *The rise of regional authority: A comparative study of 42 countries*. London: Routledge.
- Hooghe, L. and G. Marks. 2001. *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. New York: Rowan and Littlefield.
- Hylland, O.M. 2021. "Tales of temporary disruption: Digital adaptations in the first 100 days of the cultural Covid lockdown." *Poetics*, 101602. doi:[10.1016/j.poetic.2021.101602](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2021.101602).
- Hylland, O.M. 2022. "Digital Cultural Policy. The Story of a Slow and Reluctant Revolution." *International Journal of Cultural Policy Research* [Forthcoming.] doi:10.1080/10286632.2022.2137148.
- IDEA Consult, Goethe-Institut, S. Amann and J. Heinsius. 2021. *Research for CULT Committee – Cultural and creative sectors in post-Covid-19 Europe: crisis effects and policy recommendations*. Brussels: European Parliament, Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies
- Kshetri, N. 2020. "Covid-19 meets big tech." *Computer* 53 (8): 10–13.
- KEA European Affairs. 2020. *Worldwide Policy Response to COVID-19 in Support of the CCS*.
- Lowi, T. J. 1972. "Four systems of policy, politics, and choice." *Public Administration Review* 32 (4): 298–310. doi:10.2307/974990.
- Madden, C. 2009. *The independence of government arts funding: A review*. International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies.
- Mangset, P., Kangas, A., Skot-Hansen, D., Vestheim, G. 2008. "Editors' Introduction: Nordic Cultural Policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 14 (1): 1–7. doi:10.1080/10286630701856435.
- Mangset, P. and O.M. Hylland 2018. *Kulturpolitikk. Organisering, legitimering og praksis*. [Cultural policy. Organization, legitimation and practice]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Mangset, P. 2020. "The end of cultural policy?" *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 26 (3): 398–411. doi:10.1080/10286632.2018.1500560.

- Marx, L. 2020. "Who governs culture? Actors, federalism and expertise in Swiss regional cultural policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 26 (3), 365–382. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2018.1518977.
- Nordic Council of Ministers 2021. *Covid-19-pandemiens effekter på kultursektoren i de nordiske landene*. [The influence of the Covid-19 pandemic on the cultural sector in the Nordic countries]. Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers.
- Meyrick, J. and T. Barnett. 2021. "From public good to public value: arts and culture in a time of crisis." *Cultural Trends* 30 (1): 75–90. doi:10.1080/09548963.2020.1844542.
- OECD. 2020a. *Culture shock: COVID-19 and the cultural and creative sectors*. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/culture-shock-covid-19-and-the-cultural-and-creative-sectors-08da9e0e/> \l "section-d1e44
- OECD. 2020b. *The territorial impact of COVID-19: Managing the crisis across levels of government*. Retrieved from https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/view/?ref=128_128287-5agkkojaaa&title=The-territorial-impact-of-covid-19-managing-the-crisis-across-levels-of-government
- Pacella, J., S. Luckman and J. O'Connor. (2021). "Fire, pestilence and the extractive economy: Cultural policy after cultural policy." *Cultural Trends* 30 (1), 40–51. doi: 10.1080/09548963.2020.1833308.
- de Peuter, G., K. Oakley and M. Trusolino. (2022). "The pandemic politics of cultural work: collective responses to the COVID-19 crisis." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 1–16. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2022.2064459.
- Primorac, J., N. Obuljen Koržinek and A. Uzelac. 2017. "Access to culture in Croatian cultural policy: moving towards explicit policies." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 23 (5): 562–580. doi:10.1080/10286632.2015.1102906.
- Primorac, J. 2021a. "Lost Income and Found Solidarities: The Impact of the First Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the Cultural Sector in South-Eastern Europe." *Sociologija i prostor* 59 (219): 219–240. doi:10.5673/sip.59.0.8.
- Primorac, J. 2021b. *Od projekta do projekta. Rad i zaposlenost u kulturnom sektoru* [From Project to Project. Work and Employment in the Cultural Sector]. Zagreb: BLOK.
- Rius-Ulldemolins, J. and M.M. Zamorano. 2015. "Federalism, cultural policies, and identity pluralism: cooperation and conflict in the Spanish quasi-federal system." *Publius: The journal of federalism* 45(2), 167–188. doi: 10.1093/publius/pju037.
- Rius-Ulldemolins, J., A. Pizzi and J. A. Rubio Arostegui. 2019. "European models of cultural policy: towards European convergence in public spending and cultural participation?" *Journal of European Integration* 41 (8): 1045–1067. doi:10.1080/07036337.2019.1645844.
- Rius-Ulldemolins, J., J. A. Rubio Arostegui and V. Flor. 2021. "Ministry of Cultural Re-Centralization? Spanish Cultural Policy, from a Regionalized State System to Madrid's Promotion as Hegemonic Cultural Capital (1980-2019)." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 51 (1): 53–72. doi:10.1080/10632921.2020.1851838.

- Rubio Arostegui, J. A. and Rius-Ulldemolins, J. (2020). "Cultural policies in the South of Europe after the global economic crisis: is there a Southern model within the framework of European convergence?" *International journal of cultural policy*, 26 (1): 16–30. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2018.1429421.
- Sager, F. and C. Mavrot. 2020. "Switzerland's COVID-19 policy response: Consociational crisis management and neo-corporatist reopening." *European policy analysis* 6 (2): 293–304. doi:10.1002/epa2.1094.
- Salvador, E., T. Navarrete and A. Srakar. 2021. *Cultural Industries and the COVID-19 Pandemic. A European Focus*. London: Routledge.
- Sassatelli, M. 2002. "Imagined Europe: The shaping of a European cultural identity through EU cultural policy." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (4): 435–451. doi:10.1177/136843102760513848.
- Sassatelli, M. 2007. "The arts, the state, and the EU: Cultural policy in the making of Europe." *Social Analysis* 51 (1): 28–41. doi:10.3167/sa.2007.510103.
- Sassatelli, M. 2009. *Becoming Europeans: cultural identity and cultural policies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schakel, A. H. 2018. *Final report on updating the regional authority index (RAI) for 45 countries (2010-2016)*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Toepler, S. and A. Zimmer. 2002. "Subsidizing the arts." In *Global culture: media, arts, policy, and globalization*, edited by D. Crane, N. Kawashima and K. Kawasaki, 29–48. London: Routledge.
- Turbide, J., C. Laurin, C., L. Lapierre and R. Morissette. 2008. "Financial crises in the arts sector: Is governance the illness or the cure?" *International Journal of Arts Management* 10 (2): 4–13. doi:10.2307/41064949.
- Valtysson, B. 2020. *Digital Cultural Politics. From Policy to Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Vlassis, A. 2021. "Global online platforms, COVID-19, and culture: The global pandemic, an accelerator towards which direction?" *Media, Culture & Society* 43 (5): 957–969. doi:10.1177/0163443721994537.
- Walmsley, B., A. Gilmore, D. O'Brien, D. and A. Torreggiani. 2022. *Culture in Crisis. Impacts of Covid-19 on the UK cultural sector and where we go from here*. Retrieved from <https://www.culturalvalue.org.uk/culture-in-crisis-new-report-from-our-major-research-project-into-the-impacts-of-covid-19/>
- Wesner, S. (2010). "Cultural fingerprints—the legacy of cultural values in the current cultural policy agenda in Germany." *International journal of cultural policy* 16 (4): 433–448.
- Wiesand, A. J. 2002. "Comparative Cultural Policy Research in Europe: A Change of Paradigm." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 27 (2–3): 369–378. doi:10.22230/cjc.2002v27n2a1308.
- Zimmer, A. and S. Toepler. 1996. "Cultural policies and the Welfare State: the cases of Sweden, Germany, and the United States." *The journal of arts management, law, and society* 26 (3): 167–193. doi:10.1080/10632921.1996.9942961.

Zimmer, A. and S. Toepler. 1999. "The subsidized muse: government and the arts in Western Europe and the United States." *Journal of Cultural Economics* 23 (1): 33–49.
doi:10.1023/A:1007565515785.

Annex: Document overview

Governmental overviews and (selected) documents/webpages consulted for the analysis of Covid-19 measures in the seven countries.

Croatia: <https://min-kulture.gov.hr/the-government-of-the-republic-of-croatia-adopted-a-series-of-measures-to-assist-the-cultural-sector-in-order-to-minimise-the-adverse-effects-of-the-covid-19-pandemic/19501> [Overview of Croatian governmental measures]

Germany: <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/themen/coronavirus/corona-kultur-1735378> [Overview of German governmental measures and measures from the individual *Bundesländer*]

https://kreativ-bund.de/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/200527_Verba%CC%88ndeumfrage_KKW.pdf [Report from the German Cultural Council (Deutscher Kulturrat) on pandemic effects on CCI and the effect of support measures]

<https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/themen/buerokratieabbau/milliardenhilfen-fuer-kultur-und-medien-1850938> [Press release on the support fund *Neustart Kultur*]

Norway: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/kultur-idrett-og-frivillighet/innsiktsartikler/tidslinje-koronatiltak-under-kulturdepartementet/id2828012/> [Timeline and overview of Norwegian governmental measures]

<https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumentarkiv/regjeringen-solberg/aktuelt-regjeringen-solberg/smk/pressemeldinger/2020/regjeringens-strakstiltak-for-a-dempe-de-okonomiske-virkningene-av-koronaviruset/id2693442/> [Press release on first round of Norwegian governmental measures]

<https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumentarkiv/regjeringen-solberg/aktuelt-regjeringen-solberg/kud/pressemeldinger/2020/stor-kompensasjonsordning-til-kultur-frivillighet-og-idrett/id2693889/> [Press release on first Norwegian government rescue package for the culture sector]

<https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumentarkiv/regjeringen-solberg/aktuelt-regjeringen-solberg/kud/pressemeldinger/2020/185-nye-milliarder-kroner-til-kultur-idrett-og-frivillighet-bidrar-til-mer-aktivitet/id2704396/> [Press release on expansion of rescue package for the culture sector]

Spain: <https://www.culturaydeporte.gob.es/cultura/industriasculturales/linea-liquidez-covid-19.html> [Overview of Spanish governmental measures]

<http://www.culturaydeporte.gob.es/actualidad/2020/05/200527-prestaciones-artistas-boe.html> [Press release on unemployment benefits for artists]

<https://cultura.gencat.cat/ca/departament/plans-i-programes/accions-covid/> [Overview of measures from the Government of Catalonia]

<https://www.comunidad.madrid/servicios/informacion-atencion-ciudadano/ayudas-comunidad-madrid-paliar-efectos-crisis-covid-19> [Overview of general measures from the region and city of Madrid, including cultural sector measures]

Sweden: <https://www.regeringen.se/regeringens-politik/regeringens-arbete-med-coronapandemin/om-kultur-med-anledning-av-covid-19/> [Overview of Swedish governmental measures]

<https://www.regeringen.se/pressmeddelanden/2020/04/kulturradet-filminstitutet-konstnarsnamnden-och-sveriges-forfattarfond-fordelar-krispengar-till-kulturen> [Press release on division of governmental support between different sub-sectors]

<https://www.regeringen.se/pressmeddelanden/2020/05/krisstod-till-flera-statligt-finansierade-kulturinstitutioner> [Press release on expansion of governmental support package]

<https://www.regeringen.se/pressmeddelanden/2020/09/kulturens-delar-av-budgeten/> [Press release on state budget on culture, including support measures]

Switzerland: <https://www.bak.admin.ch/bak/de/home/themen/covid19/massnahmen-covid19/chronologie-massnahmen-kultursektor.html> [Timeline and overview of Swiss governmental measures]

<https://www.bak.admin.ch/bak/de/home/themen/covid19/massnahmen-covid19.html> [Overview of Swiss governmental measures]

<https://prohelvetia.ch/en/press-release/call-for-covid-19-success/> [Information on Covid-19 projects scheme from Swiss Arts Council Pro Helvetia]

<https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/eli/cc/2020/162/de> [Decree on the mitigation of economic impact from the Corona virus on the culture sector]

United Kingdom: <https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/covid19> [Overview of Covid-19 support from Arts Council England]

<https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/culture-recovery-fund> [Information on the Culture Recovery Fund]

<https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/financial-support-organisations-outside-national-portfolio> [Information on support for organisations outside the National Portfolio]

<https://www.creativescotland.com/funding/funding-programmes/bridging-bursary> [Information on the Bridging Bursary Fund from Creative Scotland]

<https://committees.parliament.uk/work/250/impact-of-covid19-on-dcms-sectors/> [Governmental inquiry on impact of the pandemic for the CCI and on the effect of the support packages]

<https://committees.parliament.uk/work/250/impact-of-covid19-on-dcms-sectors/publications/written-evidence> [Collected evidence of Covid-19 impact and the effect of support measures]