

Terhi Rantanen
LSE

Media Globalization

So much has happened since the word globalization was first introduced in the early 1990s. Originally introduced as a concept of something positive that would transform many worlds into one – something, as Albrow put it, ‘by which the peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world society, global society’ (Albrow, 1990: 45), and even into a ‘global village’ (McLuhan (1964/1994), it is increasingly seen in negative terms. Soon after its introduction the very word it became a target of anti-globalization movements protesting against unforeseen consequences of injustices accompanying globalization around the world. Rarely has an academic concept so quickly reached the streets and so rapidly become a symbol of inequality. What anti-globalization demonstrators, who often identified themselves also as anti-capitalist and anti-neoliberalist, could not foresee was that right-wing populist parties would also start blaming globalization for the erosion of national economies, politics and culture. As the *Financial Times* wrote,

Mr Trump’s sweeping rhetoric and compulsive tweeting resonated among millions of Americans who have felt marginalized by globalization. In the US, as told by Mr Trump, globalization and free trade have rewarded only a privileged few. There is a kernel of truth in Mr Trump’s generalizations, to which more centrist leaders have given too little notice. Inequality has risen and median incomes have stagnated or fallen in recent years, especially among those without a college degree (Donald Trump’s victory challenges the global liberal order, 2016).

Today, at least in Europe and the United States, it often looks as if globalization has become Public Enemy Number One for both right- and left-wing movements and parties. In this situation, where it seems to have so few supporters, an academic question must be asked: is there any reason why we should try to rescue the concept of globalization? As Beck (Rantanen, 2005: 248) was setting out, discussion of the usefulness of globalization as a concept would pass through three different stages: (1) whether globalization exists, (2) the operationalization of globalization and empirical research (how much globalization?), and (3) the epistemological and methodological shift. Almost fifteen years later, we need to ask: even if we did find enough evidence that globalization existed, and of its consequences, has there now already been a shift that means we must leave the concept of globalization behind?

We need to ask to what extent, if any, the concept of globalization has brought anything new that was not there before into academic discussions that try to understand the world in all its complexities. Could we have lived happily ever after just with the concept of nationalism or internationalism or replacing the concept of globalization with that of cosmopolitanism, for example, or of transnationalism. In order to answer these questions, we need to make a historical detour and critically review the relevant academic literature to see what changes, if any, the concept of globalization has brought to the ways we conceptualize the world, especially when taking into account the role of the media and communications.

The concept of international communication: Homogenization

From the 1940s, when international communication was established as a sub-field of the new field of communication studies in the United States (Rantanen, 2005), it was often defined as communication between nations. Previously, communication had often been defined primarily as national, i.e. taking place within a nation-state. It was seen as culturally homogenous and belonging to the nation, and the state as having the right to protect its own territory against communication from other nations. The national sovereignty of communication (see, for example, Nordenstreng & Schiller, 1979) was often also understood in terms of a national communication (later media) system (see, for example, Siebert et al. 1956; Hallin & Mancini, 2004) and seen as part of a national culture that had to be protected against foreign influence. The question became whether 'one wants one's culture to be overwhelmed or homogenized' (Katz, 1979: 70), with 'decisions affecting unindustrialized states' being 'made by forces largely outside national boundaries' (Schiller, 1979: 21). When the national was the norm, media that worked across borders, such as international news agencies whose operations did not follow the boundaries of nation-states, were seen as threats to national agencies, with the 'home territories' of the latter often being supported and protected by the state in their respective countries against international agencies (see, for example, News agencies, 1953).

International communication was seen as potentially positive when, after World War 2, international organizations such as the UN and UNESCO were actively promoting peace and understanding among nations in order to prevent another world war, and saw the role of communication as paramount in their operations (Rantanen, 2010). However, international communication was also seen as something potentially dangerous that had to be kept under surveillance or even prevented, as happened during World Wars 1 and 2 and during the Cold War, when it was conceptualized as propaganda. In the 1970s the new concept of cultural imperialism (Schiller, 1976; Schiller, 1992) again emphasized the potential of international communication, with the power of domination exercised by some countries over others seen as threatening their own cultural values. Several scholars from Latin America (see, for example, Salinas & Paldan, 1979) actively engaged in and contributed to debates about media and cultural imperialism, claiming that US media tried to spread capitalist ideologies within the nations of that region. Works such as 'How to read Donald Duck' were produced in that spirit, arguing that even entertainment media aimed at children, such as Disney comics, were purveyors of capitalism (Dorfman & Mattelart, 1975). Likewise, the conceptualization of media imperialism highlighted the uneven character of international communication. Boyd-Barrett defined media imperialism as

...the process whereby ownership, structure, distribution, or content of the media in any one country are singly or together subject to substantial external pressure from the media interests of any other country or countries without proportionate reciprocation of influence by the country so affected. (Boyd-Barrett, 1977: 119)

Boyd-Barrett (1977: 119) writes that 'the country which is affected by media influence either adopts this influence as a deliberate commercial or political strategy, or simply absorbs this influence unreflectively as the result of the contract'. If national communication had formerly been seen as homogenous, international communication was now defined

even more strongly as homogenous, originating mainly from the United States (entertainment) and the UK (news) (Tunstall, 1992), and as threatening to national cultures, including their media. International organizations such as UNESCO were seen as able to correct this imbalance and injustice through their advocacy, for example, of the The New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO). International communication scholars were invited, or took it upon themselves, to produce research that could provide evidence in support of NWICO (Carlsson, 2003).

Debate around the concepts of cultural and media imperialism was useful because it introduced the issue of power (or lack of it) to research on international communication. Many (autocratic) governments also became explicitly aware of the power they had and could use in the name of protecting their markets or national culture, particularly in what is called the Global South. Measures included subsidies, quotas, censorship and blocking of access (Chadha and Kavoori, 2000). The concept of media and cultural imperialism emphasized the structures and systems of production and distribution of international communication (see, for example, Fuchs, 2010; Cunningham & Craig, 2016), but paid much less attention to people and the possibility of popular resistance to imperialism.

Critique of media and cultural imperialism: Early heterogenization theorists

Among the early studies that were critical of the concept of media and cultural imperialism were those of audience studies scholars (see, for example, Ang, 1985; Katz & Liebes, 1990; Lull, 1991; Straubhaar, 1991), who argued that the reception of international TV programmes (such as Dallas) was not homogenous, but that their reception – not only in different nation-states, but also in different ethnic and linguistic groups within one nation-state – was revealed, when these were compared, as heterogenous. Criticism of the concept of cultural imperialism led partly to the concept of active audiences, and the concept of cultural homogenization was challenged by that of cultural heterogenization. As Lull writes:

Globalization is best considered a complex set of interacting and often countervailing human, material, and symbolic flows that lead to diverse, heterogeneous cultural positionings and practices which persistently and variously modify established sectors of social, political and cultural power (Lull 1995: 150).

The idea that there was only one language and one culture within any nation-state came to be questioned. As a result, the concept of a single national identity was replaced by that of dual or multiple, and non-fixed, identities that were often in conflict with each other wherever there were different nationalities within one state (see, for example, Morley & Robins, 1995; Castells, 2006). Tomlinson (1991) was among the first to ask: at what level are we to locate the national culture that is allegedly under threat from cultural imperialism?

Chadha and Kavoori summarize the debate:

Despite pervasive and wide-ranging claims regarding global cultural homogenization and the destruction of indigenous cultural subjectivities, cross-cultural studies almost uniformly indicate that, given the option, viewers tend to actively privilege national or regional programming over its imported counterpart and in fact rarely turn to imported programs when local alternatives are available (Chadha & Kavoori 2000: 423).

Many (but not all) of the scholars who were critical of the notion of cultural homogenization later also started using the concept of globalization. Lull (2000: 233), one of the early media globalization theorists, wrote

Globalization does not mean that some universal, technology-based super-society covers the globe and destroys local social systems and cultures. Despite technology's awesome reach, we have not, and will not, become one people.

However, it was not media and globalization theorists who invented the concept of globalization. They adopted it from scholars working in other disciplines such as geography, sociology and anthropology, who were interested in the role of media and communications in globalization although they had not studied it themselves.

Introducing Media Globalization

While international communication scholars were busy debating whether the concepts of media and cultural imperialism were analytically apt for understanding world communication, academics in other fields, such as sociology, geography and anthropology (see, for example, Hannerz, 1987; Giddens, 1990; Albrow, 1990; Appadurai, 1990; Smith, 1990; Arnason, 1990; Harvey, 1991; Hall, 1991; 1997; Robertson, 1992; 1995; Tomlinson, 1994) started almost simultaneously to use the concept of globalization in their attempts to understand what had changed in the world. Their primary interest was not in communication, but they pointed out the importance of the role of communication in globalization. Many of the concepts they used (for example time-space compression, time-space distancing) referred indirectly to the role of media and communication in changing people's ways of relating to each other over distance and thus contributing to globalization. Early globalization theorists saw media and communications primarily as positive and as promoting heterogenization rather than homogenization. They introduced concepts, such as de- and re-territorialization and imagination (See, for example, Appadurai, 1990; Giddens, 1990; Tomlinson, 1990). Even if early theorists of globalisation saw the media as important, they did not do empirical research on their role.

Many of the early scholars were anthropologists, such as Hannerz (1987) or Appadurai (1990), who had recognized early in their own careers that cultures were rarely homogenous and had always been in interaction with each other (Rantanen, 2007). Many of these argued explicitly against the concept of media imperialism (Rantanen, 2005a, Rantanen, 2005b, Rantanen 2006a). They argued that the concepts of the global and the local were as important as those of the national and international, that they were interwoven in multiple ways and to such an extent that it was no longer always possible to separate them from each other. The co-existing concepts of the local and the global led, for example to the new concept of glocalization as introduced by Robertson (1995) to show how the local and the global intervene each other and have thus become more heterogenized (see, also Sreberny-Mohammadi, 1996; Lull, 2007).

At an early stage in this debate the concept of globalization was conveniently divided into three strands: (1) economic, (2) political, and (3) cultural (Held et al. 1999). Appadurai (1990: 33-36) also famously proposed five 'scapes' of globalization, of which one was the mediascape, thus emphasizing its growing importance (Appadurai's critique, see Bude & Durrschmidt, 2010). However, it is too simplistic to concentrate, as has often been the case, only on cultural globalization or on mediascapes. For example, if we follow Thompson's early definition of globalization, understood as 'growing interconnectedness of different

parts of the world, a process which gives rise to complex forms of interaction and interdependency' (Thompson, 1995: 149), it is clear that the category of cultural globalization or of a mediascape is too narrow, especially when the concept of the media has changed so much since the early days of the globalization debate in the early 1990s. When general globalization theorists referred to the media they were writing almost exclusively about the old media of the pre-Internet age, especially television. When early media scholars made an argument that there was no globalization without the media (for example Rantanen, 2002; Silverstone, 2007), they too had in mind primarily the old media.

This is why, when we talk about media globalization, it is important to remember that we are not only talking about the media per se, as technology or as institutions, but about the fundamental changes in the ways people interact with each other irrespective of geographical distance. Harvey (1989) and Giddens (1990) introduced new concepts of time-space compression and time-space distancing, addressing the changing relationship between space and time as a result of technology. Giddens (1984: 377) defines time-space distancing as 'the stretching of social systems across time-space, on the basis of mechanisms of social and system integration'. Harvey (1989) argues that the annihilation of space through time makes spatial distance less important and thus makes globalization possible. Both of them, and also Castells (1996) who argues that globalization is a consequence of network society, emphasize large-scale societal changes as a result of (communications) technology. Castells' point of departure is not globalization, but the network society and its globalizing effect. The network society has profoundly changed the ways in which organizations and individuals interact with each other. For Castells, globalization is not an analytical concept as such, but one of the consequences of a global network society (Rantanen, 2005: 145). What is remarkable here is that all of them point out the fundamental global changes that were taking place, while none of them refers to the media, but primarily to communication technology.

More recently, media scholars inspired mainly by McLuhan (1964/1994) and Williams (1977) and others have put forward the concept of mediation, which tries to capture more than purely technological aspects of the media by arguing that what is needed is something that is bigger than the media but addresses the change. Rantanen defines mediated globalization 'as a process in which worldwide economic, political, cultural and social relations have become increasingly mediated across time and space' (Rantanen 2005d: 8). The problem with this definition is that it still refers only to the media and not to networks, although using the concept of mediation rather than of media. But what these definitions try to grasp is that there has been a fundamental change in the ways most people and institutions interact with each other at all levels of societies. Political, economic and social relationships have become increasingly mediated, and individuals in different locations *within* and *between* nations *and* states (not only nation-states) are connected to each other through media and communications. This change has broken traditional boundaries of national societies and given birth to new and potentially global connections, again characterized by their mediation. As Castells (Rantanen, 2005b) put it, networks are non-isomorphic with nation states and increasingly enable individuals to communicate across borders from their homes.

Many original media imperialism theorists have continued to argue for the importance of the nation-state (See for example, Ferguson, 1992; Morris & Waisbord, 2000; Sklair, 2002; Hafez, 2007). and the concept of national media systems, which still dominates in

comparative communication studies. Others have argued that globalization has had only homogenous consequences (Herman & McChesney, 1997), or that globalization is not a useful concept (Sparks, 2007; Ampuja, 2015). As Sparks writes

Theories of globalization, as currently advanced by such writers as Giddens, Beck and Appadurai, are so far from providing an accurate picture of the contemporary world that they are virtually useless. More generally, many of the phenomena reviewed here are better understood as aspects of capitalist development, and in particular the imperialist phase of capitalist development, than as the products of some new and distinct social phenomenon called 'globalization'. (Sparks, 2007: 152)

Even if not agreeing that the concept of globalization is useless, one has to acknowledge that the concept makes it difficult to analyse power. When the concept of globalization became popularized by anti-globalization movements, many academics started to distance themselves from it. This could be seen as either a political or an academic response to the debate. For example, Beck, whose first global book, was entitled *What is globalization?* (2000), began increasingly to use the concept of cosmopolitanization or cosmopolitanism in his later work, and Sassen (1991; 2005) started using the concept of 'the global' without using the term globalization (Rantanen, 2006b). Even Giddens acknowledged that the concept had been overused (Rantanen, 2005a) and was losing its analytical power.

In my view, the concept of globalization was most needed at the time when the media were primarily being theorized and researched by using a national or an international 'container model' (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002). Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002: 34) wrote that the 'social sciences have been captured by the apparent naturalness and given-ness of a world divided into societies along the lines of nation-states,' and that accordingly communication could be divided into either national or international without problematizing that division. Their argument was taken up by Beck (2007) and others (Robins, 2006: 22), who argued that researchers had been without noticing wearing national spectacles and as a result conveniently divided the world along the boundaries of nation-states. For the first time, academics started to question the fact that they had equated comparative research with comparing national media systems.

Although the concept of globalization has lost some of its popularity in academic research, the concept of 'the global' has not disappeared, but become very popular in many sub-fields of media and communication studies. Such concepts as the global public sphere (see, for example, Hjarvard, 2001; Khatib, 2003; Yang, 2003; Castells, 2008; Frazer, 2007; Brüggemann & Schulz-Forberg, 2009; Splichal, 2010; Chouliaraki, 2013; Volkmer, 2014) have been used to challenge the concept that was earlier defined purely in national terms. Equally, the concepts of global generations (Gillespie, 2002; Edmunds & Turner, 2005; Maass & González, 2005; Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2008) and global memories (Misztal, 2010) global events (Cui, 2013; Lundgren & Evans, 2017; Song & Lee, 2017; Katz & Dayan, 2017 to mention a few), and global newsrooms (Gurevitch and Levy, 1990) are now more widely used.

Increasingly, academics (see, for example, Chan, 2002; Rantanen, 2002; Mihelj, 2011; Orgad, 2012; Štětka, 2012; Skey, 2014) have noted that studying the global does not mean abandoning the national, but rather acknowledging a higher level of complexity. Indeed, as Mihelj (2011) observes, the global and the national should not be understood as opposite. These scholars have taken seriously the challenges that media globalisation poses for the mediation of nations and nation-states and examined them. In a similar way, as it was

previously argued that the local cannot be studied without the global it is now argued that the global cannot be studied without the national and vice versa.

Transnationalism: Hybridization

It is not entirely clear why some academics have started to use the term transnational rather than global even if both are being used (Chalaby, 2005; 2009). The noun 'transnationalism' is not used as often as globalization. A transnational analytical lens offers us the study of 'cultural practices that take place across national boundaries' (Athique, 2014: 2).

According to Brüggemann and Wessler (2014: 394),

the term transnational communication directs our attention toward the tension between the enduring powers of the national framework and the existence of communication phenomena that transcend it. The concept draws from globalization theory and theories about the transcultural character of today's media world in stressing that communication today does not only occur inter nationally as between national entities. It transforms national entities and contextualizes them within the framework of wider transnational media cultures.

Both institutions and audiences can be seen as transnational. Global media companies adopt strategies of localization in order to attract consumers and as a result global flows are increasingly diverse and complex, sometimes reversing patterns of cultural imperialism (Rogers & Antola, 1985: 33). As a result, cultures often generate new forms and make new connections with one another (Wang and Yeh, 2005: 177); we see fusing, mixing, blending, synthesizing, intermingling, combining, and a *mélange* of cultural forms (Pieterse, 1994; García Canclini, 1995; Kraidy 2002; Martín-Barbero, 2003). Some academics call this a 'third space within which elements encounter and transform each other' (Bhabha, 1994: 53; Larkin, 2003: 172). As Larkin (2003: 335) writes,

The popularity of Indian films with Arabic, Indonesian, Senegalese, or Nigerian youth reveals the mobilization of desire and fantasy that animates global cultural flows... Indian film offers a "third space" for Hausa audiences that mediates between the reified poles of Hausa Islamic tradition and western modernity (a false dichotomy to be sure, but one that remains deeply meaningful to people's political consciousness).

Although the evidence for the concept of hybridization, which replaced the concept of heterogenization, has mainly come from audience researchers, this approach also understands what we have previously understood as homogenous global media as actually being a much more diverse phenomenon than previously thought. Chalaby argues that the majority of cross-national television has a regional orientation (Chalaby, 2005: 30) and that the concept of cultural proximity is often used to understand why, for example, Hollywood films and TV programmes are not always the most popular among audiences. As La Pastina and Straubhaar write,

That most television programs in most genres will be locally produced and adapted rather than imported is predicted by the theory of cultural proximity (Straubhaar, 1991). This argues that audiences will tend to choose to watch television programs

that are closest, most proximate or most directly relevant to them in cultural and linguistic terms. Their first preference would tend to be for material produced within their own language and local or national culture. Audience research tends to show a strong preference for national productions, but those are only created and broadcast when economically possible and when the expertise to produce them has been acquired. (LaPastina & Straubhaar, 2005: 273)

Many scholars have shifted their attention from Western media companies and started conducting research on telenovelas (see, for example, Mayer, 2003), Bollywood (see, for example, Larkin, 2003) and Nollywood (see, for example, Miller, 2012). What people actually do with these products has been analysed by using such concepts as indigenization and hybridization. Likewise, instead of taking the nation as a starting point, pioneering academics started carrying out research on diasporic communities (Georgiou, 2012) where, as Georgiou (2012: 871) puts it, 'the interplay between proximity and distance becomes an everyday reality for diaspora; it is about being with distant others without being in distant places'.

The concept of the transnational has in many instances replaced that of the global, but they are also used interchangeably. Perhaps transnational is a less politically loaded term than global, denoting something less from above and more from below and not making academics seem to be defending globalization. Likewise, the concepts of cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanization were also introduced in order to emphasize that globalization was something more than big global companies taking over the world.

Cosmopolitanization: Not 'either or' but 'both and'

There is some confusion between the concepts of a cosmopolitan, cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanization. The concept of a cosmopolitan was used by Hannerz (1990) in an article 'Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture' in which he emphasized the difference between the local and the cosmopolitan (see, Rantanen, 2007). He defined being a cosmopolitan as 'a personal ability to make one's way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting' (Hannerz, 1990: 238). Defined in this way, being a cosmopolitan is an individual skill, something that has to be acquired.

The concept of a cosmopolitan came to be heavily criticized. Massey (1994), for example, criticizes it for its elitism and sexism, as a figure of the West, and presenting a predominantly white/First World take on things. According to her, it also by implication denigrated local cultural experiences and practices or at least subordinated these to cosmopolitan experiences (p. 165). Tomlinson (1999: 187) summarized this critique as a conflict between the 'homme du monde' and the 'mujer en la casa', where privileged Western white men enjoyed the global lifestyle of a cosmopolitan while most women were still living locally, staying at home. In this scenario women with young children, for example, had no opportunities to reach beyond their own locality. The lack of research on gender issues in any of the global theories is striking even if most of the research so far has shown how different women's experience it (see, for example, Kim, 2005; Desai 2007; Harp, Harlow & Loke 2013; Parikka, 2015/2016)

It was Beck who salvaged the concept of a cosmopolitan by introducing the concepts of cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanization. This was not only a cosmetic shift, but, as he

emphasized, he found cosmopolitanization a particularly useful alternative concept to that of globalization, a praxis that takes place 'when the distinction between internal and external, national and international, local and global, lose their sharp contours' (Rantanen, 2005a: 248). As he wrote in 2002, 'this transforms everyday consciousness and identities significantly. Issues of global concerns are becoming part of the everyday local experiences and the "moral life-worlds" of the people' (Beck, 2002: 17). Beck repeatedly emphasizes that, rather than viewing cosmopolitanism 'as a normative desideratum, or as anti-thesis to an essentialized version of the national, cosmopolitanization was a matter of everyday life' (Beck & Levy, 2013: 5).

According to Beck, the concepts of globalization and of cosmopolitanization were interconnected and could not be understood without each other. While globalization could be seen as happening from above, cosmopolitanization happened from below as 'internal globalization from within national societies' (Beck, 2002: 23). For Beck, cosmopolitanization was a process that happened independently of whether people wanted it or not, but because their lives were transformed by the processes of globalization. Beck himself used three different terms (Rantanen, 2005: 252) which help us to understand his thinking. For him, there was firstly the concept of a cosmopolitan; secondly, that of cosmopolitanism as a philosophy, as in Kant (Beck, 2004: 135), and thirdly cosmopolitanization as the praxis of really existing, latent cosmopolitanism (Rantanen, 2005: 249). By this division, Beck again emphasized that cosmopolitanism as a philosophy of what should be done was very different from cosmopolitanization as a praxis with no unforeseen outcomes. His own work mainly focussed on cosmopolitanization, but the concepts both of cosmopolitanism and of cosmopolitanization are now widely used, without defining them and without pointing out the differences between the two.

Beck's influence in global media studies can nonetheless be defined in several ways. Firstly, Beck offered an alternative concept to that of globalization at a time when even Giddens, one of the most influential proponents of the concept, thought it had become overused and lost some of its explanatory power (Rantanen, 2015c). The new concept was quickly borrowed by several scholars, especially in the UK, including Tomlinson, 1999, Rantanen, 2005d; Silverstone 2007; Ong, 2009; Orgad, 2012; Sobre-Denton, 2016). Secondly, his critique of methodological nationalism, taking the nation-state as an automatic starting point for any research, has resonated with new research that takes, for example, cities as its starting point for comparative research instead of nation-states (see, for example, Aksoy & Robins, 2003; Georgiou, 2013). Thirdly, it has helped researchers to understand the complexities of identities in our era. Identities are not fixed, and they do not have to be only national or local, but can also be cosmopolitan (Rantanen, 2005d). Fourthly, the concept has been helpful in studying moments and memories of such global threats as climate change, terrorism or financial crises. As Beck wrote, 'my life, my body, my 'individual existence' become part of another world, of foreign cultures, religions, histories and global interdependencies, without my realizing or expressly wishing it' (Beck, 2006: 11). The work of many media scholars, such as Cottle (1998; 2011) or Chouliraki (2013), has emphasized the importance of Beck's work when carrying out research on global risks (see, also Jensen, 2017). Finally, Beck has had an influence of how ethics, politics and citizenship are expanded from a national to a global level. For example, Chouliraki (2013) and Voltmer (2014) and have expanded the concept of the public sphere to a global level. It is Beck's political philosophy that has become the most contested in contemporary times of increasing nationalism and xenophobia in different parts of the world.

Calhoun (2003) was one of the early critics of the notion of cosmopolitanism, arguing that it had been a project of empires, of long-distance trade, and of cities. According to him, it is born out of privilege: economic, political, cultural, and even linguistic. Academics have found it difficult to find supporting evidence when trying to operationalize the concept they (Schlesinger, 2007; Lindell, 2013). But Beck himself was acutely aware of this when he wrote that 'global risk is an unpredictable and impersonal force in the contemporary world, triggering events to which the human response is to organize on a global scale' (Beck, 2006: 338). More recently, in the present geopolitical situation, it appears that the response is more on a national than a global scale (see, for example,). Perhaps both Beck and others have emphasized too much the content of the media, especially of new media. As Hier writes,

...in a world of mobilities and flows, of non -- or quasi -- objects, where "subjects" are already in the world with "objects" of knowledge, individuals experience the world foremost beyond their immediate locality. Beck is acutely aware of this, recognizing the significance of what he designates as the *nowhere* (my emphasis) place: the digital cosmopolitan architecture of television, mobile phones and the internet. (Hier, 2008: 40).

The 'nowhereness' of the digital cosmopolitan architecture may provide one of the explanations for why the media cannot be seen as promoting cosmopolitanism. Nancy and Barrau's book (2015) *Dans quel(s) monde(s) vivons-nous?* (What are these worlds coming to?) highlights the importance of asking the question. They write that, at a time when we say that everything is more globalized, 'the question of the world must be reconsidered' (Nancy & Barrau, 2015: ??). Do we now live in one world, as suggested by Albrow? Or has globalization resulted in so many different worlds that is impossible to live in all of them and no matter what the consequences of media globalization are, it is simply impossible to live in one world only. For example, as Maass and González (2005) show, the experience of a 'global' Mexico was far from being democratic, limited to people from middle and upper classes in big urban centres. The many worlds of social media, we virtually 'live' are not the same ones, even if the architecture of social media (for example, Facebook) may make us think we are all in the the same Facebook world? After all, this is an empirical question. As Beck put it,

World society [...] The question of how far it exists may therefore [...] be empirically turned into the question of how, and to what extent, people and cultures around the world relate to another in their differences, and to what extent this self-perception of world society is relevant to how they behave. (Beck 2000: 20)

De-westernization: The post-colonial critique of globalization

Most of the early globalization theorists did their work in the West, and most of them were themselves Western. Although they did not define the concept of globalization in a uniform way, it soon came to stand for neo-liberalism and Westernization. In the same way as the concept of media imperialism was introduced to criticize Western media influence, the concept of de-Westernization was introduced to critique the Westernization of the concept of globalization (Curran & Park, 2000). As Gunaratne (2009: 60) points out,

The concept of globalization debated since the 1960s lacks universal universalism because the oligopoly of the social sciences, which includes communication science,

has marginalized the discussion of globalization from the perspective of non-Western cosmologies.

Shome (2009: 701) also asked an important question when critically reviewing the globalization of cultural studies: 'And for whom is cultural studies "going global" or "international"? What we need, instead, is an imagination of "international" cultural studies that recognizes the diverse modalities and temporalities of the "international" in the project(s) of cultural studies'. Both Gunaratne and Shome argue that taking the West as a starting point and a norm when researching globalization inevitably leads to a situation where the rest of the world and its experience is either ignored or misunderstood (see, also Wang & Kuo, 2010; Iwabuchi, 2010). Their critique is important because it points out that not only have Western media companies dominated the market, but also Westernized academics in Western universities have dominated the production of knowledge.

As a response to this Western dominance, Gunaratne (2010: 486) suggests several counter-measures to de-Westernize media and communication research. These include:

(1) Digging into the axial philosophies and philosophers, and exploring the indigenous literature for nuggets of ideas that could bloom into communication models and paradigms;

(2) Creating new comprehensive theories aligned with the third wave of systems theories or complexity science in any one of three forms: empirical; analytical; cultural-critical or historical-hermeneutical;

(3) Initiating peer-reviewed journals, preferably with free online access, and university-supported book publishing outside the oligopolistic social science centres of the West;

(4) Writing textbooks (in English and major regional languages like Chinese, Malay/Indonesian, Hindi/Urdu) highlighting the social thought of non-Western scholars aimed at regional groups or the whole of the non-West.

These proposed changes are important, but, as always with any new concept, also problematic. As Shome (2009: 704) has argued, 'The west and non-west are of course not, [...] 'cartographic localit[ies]' [...] ; they constitute networks, desires, and imaginations'. Even on a map, it is difficult to point to where the boundaries are between East and West, and they are ever-changing, as happened with the collapse of 'Eastern' Europe after the fall of Communism. What is 'Eastern' and 'Western' scholarship is also hard to define, since academics have traditionally been on the move and often divide their time between the universities where they work and their original home countries. Waisbord and Mellado (2014) also criticise de-westernisation, and have called for a more complex debate, examining and questioning 'what' exactly needs to be de-westernised, and in which contexts.

One of the outcomes of the critique of the Westernization of globalization has been that media globalization has now to be researched outside the traditional West, for example in India (Thussu, 1998); China (Kang, 2004; Curtin, 2007) and in Russia (Rantanen, 2002), but also in Bollywood (Larkin, 2003) and Nollywood (Miller, 2012). From an African point of view (see, for example, Willems, 2014), de-Westernization is itself a problematic concept and from this perspective the term probably should be changed to de-Northization. But overall the concept of de-Westernization has emphasized the importance of diversifying the field (see, for example, Rao & Wasserman, 2007), the theories used and the empirical materials

collected. It has also called for comparative research not only within the West or between the West and the East, but also within the East (see, for example Meng & Rantanen, 2015), making us re-think our unit of analysis.

Conclusion

This chapter started by asking whether globalization is still a useful concept. After a historical detour that started with the period after World War 2 and ended with the concept of de-Westernization it is time to try to answer the question. We can approach it in four different ways: (1) theoretically, (2) methodologically, (3) empirically, and (4) in terms of the impact of the field itself.

Theoretically, the concept of globalization clearly challenged research in international communication and especially the concept of media imperialism. It challenged research that had predominantly conceptualized the world through the lens of nation-states with more or less powerful communication systems. The concept of globalization brought new levels of the local and the global into research, and thus challenged the very systemic view of the world with media systems that could dominate all channels of communication. However, at the same time, when media globalization was seen as hybridized and present everywhere and anywhere without a clearly defined system or a source of influence such as the United States, it also lost much of the political edge that the concept of media imperialism had had. Politically, it makes more sense to resist media imperialism than media globalization, since the former is a much better understood target.

Since globalization became so contested as a word outside academia, many academics have distanced themselves from it and started using different concepts. The concept of cosmopolitanization turned that of globalization upside down and looked at it from below. It also brought with it a new optimism about people and their understanding of belonging to the same world. Unfortunately, at a moment when nationalism is on the rise around the world it is difficult to find empirical evidence for this optimism. The current world calls for new research on media nationalism, but we can never go back to researching only media nationalism without media globalization. The concept of de-Westernization has brought back the issue of power, this time not outside academia but within it. In sum, each of these concepts adds another layer to our attempt to analyze the complexities of global media and communications and their consequences.

The concept of globalization has also been increasingly replaced by use of the word global, serving as an umbrella term for all studies of the many worlds of media and communications. It has become more and more accepted that different concepts related to media globalization have found their intellectual home in global media studies or global communication (in the USA the term global communication is now more widely used). Each of these has contributed to *global media studies* – used here as a generic term, although many theorists have used different concepts, such as network society, transnationalism or cosmopolitanization.

Methodologically and empirically, the biggest change has been in the unit of analysis and in 'sampling'. If earlier, in international communication research, comparisons were made primarily between nations, which were seen as closed containers of media and communication, global media studies problematized this taken-for-granted starting point of comparative research and suggested new units of analysis such as cities, networks or digital

media across and beyond the national. Taking global media studies seriously has also meant that research on media globalization cannot only take place in the advanced West, but must take place beyond it. This is increasingly acknowledged, although progress is slow. However, when it comes to developing new methods for global comparative research, I am afraid we have only taken baby steps where giant leaps are needed.

We have also seen big changes in academic education and employment. New books and academic journals with titles referencing either globalization or global started to appear in the field of media and communication studies. This was followed in the new millennium by the establishment of new global media programmes in many universities in the UK and in Europe, which attracted students from all over the world. This happened at a time when academics themselves were increasingly on the move. Universities that previously were seen as primarily national institutions offering jobs for academics from the countries where they were located were now hiring academics from other countries to teach their increasingly global and diverse student bodies. For example, with skills in comparative research and knowledge of languages now more in demand, the enlargement of the European Union and free movement of labour inside it made it possible for many academics to work outside their home countries. The globalization of higher education has provided new opportunities for both academics and students to study the media outside their home countries and in a global context.

But is one of the consequences of mediated globalization that we all now live in one world? And do we even want to? Perhaps one of the outcomes of globalization is that we now need to re-address Nancy's and Barrau's (2015) question: whose world are we living in? This, again, brings us back to the different concepts discussed in this chapter and how they become the tools with which we try to understand the world. We also need new concepts that will help us to understand the increasingly complex relationship between mediated globalization and the many worlds we are simultaneously living in.

Bibliography

Aksoy, Asu & Robins, Kevin (2003). The enlargement of meaning: Social demand in a transnational context. *International Communication Gazette* 65(4–5): 365–388.

Albrow, Martin (1997). *The global age: State and society beyond modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ampuja, Marko (2015). Globalisation and neoliberalism: A new theory for new times?. In: Joseph Zajda (Ed.), *Second international handbook on globalisation, education and policy research*, pp. 17-31. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Ang, Ien (1985). *Watching Dallas: Soap opera and the melodramatic imagination*. New York, NY: Methuen.

Appadurai, Arjun (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Public Culture* 2(3): 1-23.

Arnason, Johann (1990). Nationalism, globalization and modernity. *Theory, Culture & Society* 7(2): 207-236.

Athique, Adrian (2014). Transnational audiences: Geocultural approaches. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 28(1): 28-42.

Beck, Ulrich (2000). *What is globalization?*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Beck, Ulrich (2002). The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(2): 17–44.

Beck, Ulrich (2004). Cosmopolitical realism: On the distinction between cosmopolitanism in philosophy and the social sciences. *Global Networks* 4(2): 131-156.

Beck, Ulrich (2006). Living in the world risk society. *Economy and Society* 35(3): 329-345,

Beck, Ulrich (2007). The cosmopolitan condition. Why methodological nationalism fails. *Theory, Culture & Society* 24(7-8): 286-290.

Beck, Ulrich (2009). *World at risk*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Beck, Ulrich & Beck-Gernsheim, Elisabeth (2008). Global generations and the trap of methodological nationalism. For a cosmopolitan turn in the sociology of youth and generation. *European Sociological Review* 25(1): 25–36.

Beck, Ulrich & Levy, Daniel (2013). Cosmopolitanized nations: Re-imagining collectivity in world risk society. *Theory, Culture & Society* 30(2): 3–31.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London, UK: Routledge.

Boyd-Barrett, Oliver (1977). Media imperialism: Towards an international framework for an analysis of media systems. In: James Curran, Michael Gurevitch & Janet Woollacott (Eds.) *Mass communication and society*, pp. 116-35. London, UK: Edward Arnold.

Brüggemann, Michael & Schulz-Forberg, Hagen (2009). Becoming Pan-European? Transnational media and the European public sphere. *International Communication Gazette* 71(8): 693-712.

Brüggemann, Michael & Wessler, Hartmut (2014). Transnational communication as deliberation, ritual, and strategy. *Communication Theory* 24(4): 394–414.

Bude, Heinz & Dürschmidt, Jörg (2010). What's wrong with globalization?: Contra 'flow speak' - Towards an existential turn in the theory of globalization. *European Journal of Social Theory* 13(4): 481-500.

Calhoun, Craig (2003). 'Belonging' in the cosmopolitan imaginary. *Ethnicities* 3(4): 531-568.

Carlsson, Ulla (2003). The rise and fall of NWICO. From a vision of international regulation to a reality of multilevel governance. *Nordicom Review* (24)2: 31-67.

Castells, Manuel (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Castells, Manuel (2006). Globalisation and identity. A comparative perspective, *Transfer: Journal of Contemporary Culture* (1)1: 56-67.

Castells, Manuel (2008). The new public sphere: Global civil society, communication networks, and global governance. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616(1): 78-93.

Chadha, Kalyani & Kavoori, Anandam (2000). Media imperialism revisited: Some findings from the Asian case. *Media, Culture & Society* 22(4): 415-432.

Chalaby, Jean (2005). From internationalization to transnationalization. *Global Media and Communication* 1(1): 28-33.

Chalaby, Jean (2009). *Transnational television worldwide. Towards a new media order*. London, UK: I. B. Tauris.

Chan, Joseph (2002). Disneyfying and globalizing the Chinese legend Mulan: A study of transculturation. In: Joseph Chan & Bryce McIntyre (Eds.), *Search of*

boundaries: Communication, nation-states and cultural identities, pp. 225-248.
Westport, CT: Ablex.

Chouliaraki, Lilie (2013). Mediating vulnerability: Cosmopolitanism and the public sphere. *Media, Culture & Society* 35(1): 105-112.

Cottle, Simon (1998). Risk society and the media: A catastrophic view?. *European Journal of Communication* 13(1): 5–32.

Cottle, Simon (2011). Taking global crises in the news seriously: Notes from the dark side of globalization. *Global Media and Communication* 7(1): 77–95.

Cui, Xi (2013). Media events are still alive: The opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics as a media ritual. *International Journal of Communication* 7: 1120-1235.

Cunningham, Stuart & Craig, David (2016). Online entertainment: A new wave of media globalization? *International Journal of Communication* 10: 5409-5425.

Curran, James & Park, Myung-Jin (2000). (Eds), *De-westernizing media studies*. London, UK: Routledge.

Curtin, Michael (2007). *Playing to the world's biggest audience: The globalization of Chinese film and TV*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Desai, Manisha (2007). The messy relationship between feminisms and globalizations. *Gender & Society* 21(6): 797-803.

Donald Trump's victory challenges the global liberal order. Opinion FT View. *The Financial Times*, Nov 6, 2016.

<https://www.ft.com/content/a4669844-a643-11e6-8b69-02899e8bd9d1>. Accessed on Nov 15, 2017.

Dorfman, Ariel & Mattelart, Armand (1975). *How to read Donald Duck: Imperialist ideology in the Disney comics*. Translated by David Kunzle. New York, NY: International General.

Edmunds, June & Turner, Bryan (2005). Global generations: Social change in the twentieth century. *The British Journal of Sociology* 56(4): 559–577.

Ferguson, Marjorie (1992). The mythology about globalization. *European Journal of Communication* 7(1): 69-93.

Frazer, Nancy (2007). Transnationalizing the public sphere. On the legitimacy and efficacy of public opinion in a post-Westphalian world. *Theory, Culture & Society* 24(4): 7-3.

Fuchs, Christian (2010). New imperialism: Information and media imperialism?. *Global Media and Communication* 6(1): 33-60.

García Canclini, Nestor (1990). *Hybrid cultures: Strategies for entering and leaving modernity*. Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minneapolis Press.

Georgiou, Myria (2012). Watching soap opera in the diaspora: Cultural proximity or critical proximity?. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35(5): 868-887.

Georgiou, Myria (2013). *Media and the city: Cosmopolitanism and difference*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Giddens, Anthony (1984). *The constitution of society. Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Giddens, Anthony (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Gillespie, Marie (2002). *Television, ethnicity and cultural change*. Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis.

Gunaratne, Shelton A. (2009). Globalization: A non-Western perspective: The bias of social science/communication oligopoly. *Communication, Culture & Critique* 2(1): 60–82.

Gunaratne, Shelton A. (2010). De-Westernizing communication/social science research: Opportunities and limitations. *Media, Culture & Society* 32(3): 473-500.

Gurevitch, Michael & Levy, Mark (1990). The global newsroom. *British Journalism Review* 2(1): 27-37.

Hall, Stuart (1997). The local and the global: Globalization and ethnicity. In: Anthony King (Ed.), *Culture, globalization, and the world-system: Contemporary conditions for the representation of identity*, pp. 19-40. Minneapolis, MI: University of Minnesota Press.

Hallin, Daniel C. & Mancini, Paolo (2004). *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hannerz, Ulf (1987). The world in creolization. *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 54(4): 546–59.

Hannerz, Ulf (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory, Culture & Society* 7(2): 237–51.

Harp, Dustin, Harlow, Summer & Loke, Jaime (2013). The symbolic annihilation of women in globalization discourse: The same old story in U.S. news magazines. *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 21(5): 263–277.

Harvey, David (1991). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Hafez, Kai (2007). *The myth of media globalization*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Held, David et al. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics, culture*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Herman, Edward S. & McChesney, Robert W. (1997). *The global media: The new missionaries of corporate capitalism*. London, UK and Washington, DC: Cassell.

Hier, Sean P. (2008). Transformative democracy in the age of second modernity: Cosmopolitanization, communicative agency and the reflexive subject. *New Media & Society* 10(1): 27-44.

Hjarvard, Stig (2001). *News in a globalized Society*. Gothenburg, Sweden: Nordicom.

Iwabuchi, Koichi (2010). De-Westernization and the governance of global cultural connectivity: A dialogic approach to East Asian media cultures. *Postcolonial Studies* 13(4): 403-419.

Jensen, Klaus Bruhn (2017). Speaking of the weather. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 23(4): 439-454.

Katz, Elihu & Dayan, Daniel (2017). L'Esprit de l'Escalier: 25 Years of hindsight. *Media, Culture and Society*, published online first in August 2017: 1-10.

Kang, Liu (2004). *Globalization and cultural trends in China*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Katz, Elihu & Liebes, Tamar (1990). *The export of meaning. Cross-cultural meanings of Dallas*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Khatib, Lina (2003). Communicating Islamic fundamentalism as global citizenship. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 27(4): 389-409.

Kim, Youna (2005). Experiencing globalization. Global TV, reflexivity and the lives of young Korean women. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 8(4): 445–463.

Kraidy, Marwan (2002). Hybridity in cultural globalization. *Communication Theory* 12(3): 316–39.

Kraidy, Marwan M. (2005). *Hybridity, or the cultural logic of globalization*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

La Pastina, Antonio & Straubhaar, Joseph D. (2005). Multiple proximities between television genres and audiences: The schism between telenovelas' global distribution and local consumption. *International Communication Gazette* 67(3): 271-288.

Larkin, Brian (2003). Itineraries of Indian cinema: African videos, Bollywood & global media. In: Ella Shohat & Robert Stan (Eds.), *Multiculturalism, postcoloniality and transnational media*, pp. 170-192. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Lindell, Johan (2013). Mediapolis, where art thou? Mediated cosmopolitanism in three media systems between 2002 and 2010. *International Communication Gazette* 77(2): 189-207.

Lundgren, Lars & Evans, Christine (2017). Producing global media memories: Media events and the power dynamics of transnational television history. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 20(3): 252–270.

Maass, Margarita & González, Jorge A. (2005). Technology, global flows and local memories. Media generations in 'Global' Mexico. *Global Media and Communication* 1(2): 167-184.

Martín-Barbero, Jesús (2003). La Globalización en Clave Cultural. Una Mirada Latinoamericana. *Renglones, Revista del ITESO* 53: 18-32.

Massey, Doreen (1994). *Place, space and gender*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Mayer, Vicki (2003). Living telenovelas/telenovelizing life: Mexican American girls' identities and transnational telenovelas. *Journal of Communication* 53(3): 479–495.

McLuhan, Marshall (1964/1994). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Meng, Bingchun & Rantanen, Terhi (2015). A change of lens: A call to compare the media in China and Russia. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 32(1): 1–15.

Mihelj, Sabina (2011). *Media nations: Communicating belonging and exclusion in the modern world*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Miller, Jane (2012). Global Nollywood: The Nigerian movie industry and alternative global networks in production and distribution. *Global Media and Communication* 8(2): 117-133.

Misztal, Barbara (2010). Collective memory in a global age: Learning how and what to remember. *Current Sociology* 58(1): 24-44.

Morley, David & Robins, Kevin (1995). *Spaces of identity. Global media, electronic landscapes and cultural boundaries*. London, UK: Routledge.

Morris, Nancy & Waisbord, Silvio (2001). (Eds.), *Media and globalization: Why the state matters*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Nancy, Jean-Luc & Barrau, Aurlien (2015). *What's these worlds coming to?*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

News Agencies (1953.) Their structure and operation. Paris, France: UNESCO.

Nordenstreng, Kaarle & Schiller, Herbert I. (1979). (Eds.), *National sovereignty and international communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ong, Jonathan (2009). The cosmopolitan continuum: Locating cosmopolitanism in media and cultural studies. *Media, Culture & Society* 31(3): 449–466.

Orgad, Shani (2012). *Media representation and the global imagination*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Parikka, Tuija (2015/2016). *Globalization, gender, and media formations of the sexual and violence in understanding globalization*. Lanham, ML: Lexington Books.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen (1994). Globalisation as hybridization. *International Sociology* 9(4): 161–184.

Rantanen, Terhi (2002). *The global and the national: Media and communications in post-Communist Russia*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Rantanen, Terhi (2005a). Giddens and the 'G'-Word. An interview with Anthony Giddens. *Global Media and Communication* 1(1): 63-77.

Rantanen, Terhi (2005b). The message is the medium: An interview with Manuel Castells. *Global Media and Communication* 1(2): 135–147

Rantanen, Terhi (2005c). Cosmopolitanization – Now! An interview with Ulrich Beck. *Global Media and Communication* 1(3): 247–263.

Rantanen, Terhi (2005d). *The media and globalization*. London, UK: Sage.

Rantanen, Terhi (2006a). A man behind scapes: An interview with Arjun Appadurai. *Global Media and Communication* 2(1): 7-19.

Rantanen, Terhi (2006b). Digging the global mine: An interview with Saskia Sassen. *Global Media and Communication* 2(2): 142-159.

Rantanen, Terhi (2007). A transnational cosmopolitan. An interview with Ulf Hannerz. *Global Media and Communication* 3(1):11-27.

Rantanen, Terhi (2010). Methodological inter-nationalism in comparative media research: Flow studies in international communication. In: Anna Roosvall & Inka Salovaara-Moring (Eds.), *Communicating the nation: National topographies of global media landscapes*, pp. 25-39. Gothenburg, Sweden: Nordicom.

Rao, Shakuntala & Wasserman, Herman (2017). Global media ethics revisited. A postcolonial critique. *Global Media and Communication* 3(1): 29-50.

Robertson, Roland (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. London, UK: Sage.

Robertson, Roland (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In: Michael Featherstone, Scott Lash & Roland Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities*, pp. 25-44. London, UK: Sage.

Robins, Kevin (2006). *The challenge of transcultural diversities – Final report of the transversal study on the theme of cultural policy and cultural diversity*. Strasbourg: Council for Europe Publishing.

Rogers, Everett M. and Antola, Livia (1985). Telenovelas: A Latin American success story, *Journal of Communication* 35(4): 24–35.

Salinas, Raquel & Paldán, Leena (1979). Culture in the process of dependent development. In: Kaarle Nordenstreng & Herbert I. Schiller (Eds.), *National sovereignty and international communication*, pp. 82-98. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Sassen, Saskia (1991). *The global city: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: New Jersey.

Sassen, Saskia (2005). The global city: Introducing a concept. *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 11(2): 27-43.

Schiller, Herbert (1976). *Communication and cultural domination*. White Plains, NY: International Arts and Sciences Press.

Schiller, Herbert I. (1979). Transnational media and national development. In: Kaarle Nordentreg & Herbert I. Schiller (Eds.), *National sovereignty and international communication*, pp. 65-81. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Schiller, Herbert (1992). *Mass communications and American empire*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Schlesinger, Philip (2007). Cosmopolitan temptation. *European Journal of Communication*, 22(4): 413-426.

Shome, Raka (2009). Post-colonial reflections on the 'Internationalization' of cultural studies. *Cultural Studies* 23(5-6): 694-719.

Siebert, Fred S., Peterson, Ted & Schramm, Wilbur (1956). *Four theories of the press. The authoritarian, libertarian, social responsibility, and Soviet Communist concepts of what the press should be and do*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Silverstone, Roger (2007). *Media and morality: On the rise of the Mediapolis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Skey, Michael (2014). The mediation of nationhood: Communicating the world as a world of nations. *Communication Theory* 24(1): 1-20.

Sklair, Leslie (2002). Democracy and the transnational capitalist class. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 581(1): 144-157.

Smith, Anthony (1990). Towards a global culture? *Theory, Culture & Society* 7(2): 171-191.

Sobré-Denton, Miriam (2016). Virtual intercultural bridgework: Social media, virtual cosmopolitanism, and activist community-building. *New Media & Society* 18(8): 1715-1731.

Song, Yunya & Lee, Chin-Chuan (2017). Collective memories of global media events: Anniversary journalism of the Berlin Wall and Tiananmen crackdown in the Anglo-American elite press, 1990–2014. *Journalism*, published online first in July 2017: 1-20.

Sparks, Colin (2007). What's wrong with globalization?. *Global Media & Communication* 3(2): 133-55.

Splichal, Slavko (2010). Eclipse of 'the Public'. From the public to (transnational) public sphere. Conceptual shifts in the twentieth century. In: Jostein Gripsrud & Hallvard Moe (Eds.), *The digital public sphere. Challenges for media policy*, pp 23-40. Gothenburg, Sweden: Nordicom.

Sreberny-Mohammadi, Annabelle (1996). The global and the local in international communication. In: James Curran & Michael Gurevitch (Eds.), *Mass media and society*, pp. 23-40. London, UK: Arnold, 1996, 2nd Edition.

Štětka, Václav (2012). From global to (g)local: Changing patterns of television program flows and audience preferences in Central and Eastern Europe. *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 40(3): 109-118.

Straubhaar, Joseph (1991). Beyond media imperialism: Asymmetrical interdependence and cultural proximity. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 8(1): 39–59.

Thompson, John B. (1995). *The media and modernity: A social theory of the media* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Thussu, Daya (1998). Localising the global, Zee TV in India. In Daya Thussu (Ed.), *Electronic empires – Global media and local resistance*, pp. 273-293. London, UK: Arnold.

Tomlinson, John (1991). *Cultural Imperialism: A critical introduction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tomlinson, John (1994). A phenomenology of globalization: Giddens on global modernity. *European Journal of Communication* 9(2): 149–172.

Tomlinson, John (1999). *Globalization and culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Tunstall, Jeremy (1992). Europe as world news leader. *Journal of Communication* 42(3), 84-99.

Volkmer, Ingrid (2014). *The global public sphere: Public communication in the age of reflective interdependence*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Waisbord, Silvio & Mellado, Claudia (2014). De-Westernizing communication studies: A reassessment. *Communication Theory* 24(4), 361-372.

Wang, Georgette (2011). (Ed.), *De-Westernizing communication research: Altering questions and changing frameworks*. London, UK: Routledge.

Wang, Georgette & Kuo, Eddie C. Y. (2010). The Asian communication debate: Culture-specificity, culture-generality, and beyond. *Asian Journal of Communication* 20(2): 152-165.

Wang, Georgette & Yueh-yu Yeh, Emilie (2005). Globalization and hybridization in cultural products. The cases of Mulan and Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 8(2): 175-193.

Willems, Wendy (2014). Provincializing hegemonic histories of media and communication studies: Towards a genealogy of epistemic resistance in Africa. *Communication Theory* 24(4): 415-434.

Williams, Raymond (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Wimmer, Andreas & Glick Schiller, Nina (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs* 2(4):301-33.

Yang, Guobin (2003). The Internet and the rise of a transnational Chinese cultural sphere. *Media, Culture & Society* 25(4): 469-490.

