

Who gains advantages from the financial support provided by the public for the promotion of performing arts? An analysis of the differences between art provision and hegemony-distinction approaches

Afaq Khattak

Lecturer of finance at University of Kushal Khan Khattak University of Karak [at-
afaqtk@gmail.com](mailto:afaqtk@gmail.com)

Ali Iqbal Khattak

Ms Scholar University of Kushal Khan Khattak University of Karak

Abstract

The effectiveness of cultural policy is called into doubt in this article. Within the scope of this paper, we examine the appropriateness of two theoretical frameworks that provide justification for the utilisation of public sector monies to support the performing arts. One methodology, in contrast to the conventional approach, centre its attention on the ways in which cultural policies can improve the capacity of the general population to interact with the arts. The second method examines the ways in which cultural policy provides support for movements that not only exhibit authority but also divergence. Over the course of forty-eight years, the purpose of this study is to investigate the long-term shifts that have occurred in the distribution of public monies to cultural organisations. These institutions include orchestras, theatres, opera houses, and theatrical companies for example. Israel served as the location for the execution of the investigation's data collection. A time series analysis will be used to assess whether or not there is a correlation between disparities in educational performance, income levels, and ethnic makeup of the population and the financial patterns that have been seen. The purpose of this research is to determine an answer to this question. In light of the findings of our research, it is of the utmost importance to provide financial assistance to Israel's performing arts industry in order to assist the general population in adjusting to developments in educational attainment and affluence. The performing arts industry in Israel mostly caters to the wealthy and the impoverished, with little consideration given to the economic disparity that exists between the various ethnic groups that make up the countries population. In order to investigate this complex web of interrelationships, it is essential to take into consideration two distinct theoretical perspectives.

Keywords- Promotion art provision and hegemony-distinction approaches

Introduction

In their respective works, Schuster (2003) and Miller and Yudice (2002) state that the field of cultural policy research is concerned with all of the activities that the government does in relation to the arts, heritage, and education. The topic at hand is one that is of general interest to the field under consideration. Taking into consideration the current condition of the literature, there is frequently a lack of interest on the part of the general public and academics in the matter of government funding for the arts and culture. Additionally, the function that public support of the arts contributes to the establishment and maintenance of social divisions and hierarchies is commonly neglected. This is a problem because it is a widely held belief. It is possible to interpret the allocation of public funding towards cultural expenditures as a reflection of politically motivated ideas, as stated by Mulcahy (2006). This interpretation has the potential to have substantial repercussions for society. According to Dye (2005) and McGuigan (2004), the decision of the government regarding its involvement in cultural matters is a critical factor in determining the allocation of resources by the government towards cultural policy. Through the usage of public financing for artistic undertakings, this leads to the manifestation of ideas that are derived from political discourse.

The purpose of this research is to conduct an analysis of the existing body of literature that focuses on social inequality, cultural policy, and cultural consumption. The purpose of this project is to develop two distinct conceptual frameworks that can be applied to the task of defining the limits of public funding for the arts. The investigation is focused on determining whether or not there is a connection between the consumption of cultural commodities and the existence of social inequality. An examination is conducted on a certain point of view concerning the responsibilities of the state in providing culture and the arts. According to Netzer (1978), these things are usually accepted as merit goods or products to which individuals are fundamentally entitled. Also, they are considered to be of high quality.

The strategy that is being investigated, which is supported by Dubois (2011) and Laaksonen (2010), takes into consideration public money as a factor in determining whether or not cultural resources are accessible in a fair and reasonable manner. This method, which is usually referred to as the "art provision approach," places a great amount of emphasis on the role of the government to ensure that creative products

are accessible to the people who live within its borders. 2011, Zuidervaart's authorization was granted. The second method investigates the ways in which the acceptance of culture by the general public might serve to strengthen social hierarchy and, as a result, exacerbate or maintain the inequalities that exist between various social groups. The hegemony-difference theories proposed by Bourdieu (1984) are consistent with this approach, which is founded on the correlation between cultural policy and social divisions and conflicts.

Specifically, the purpose of this research is to investigate the hypotheses that are derived from two opposing viewpoints regarding the function of public funding for culture, specifically focusing on whether or not it serves as a social differentiator or a social mediator. With this goal in mind, the purpose of our research is to investigate the relationships that exist between the oscillations in public money granted to the performing arts in Israel over the course of forty-eight years and the political, economic, and demographic characteristics of the country. Specifically, the outcomes of the research that was carried out indicate that cultural policy serves as an embodiment of broader concepts and aims concerning the function of culture within society.

The art provision method

Scholars dedicate a significant amount of time to examining the diverse perspectives on the involvement of the state in cultural and creative domains. Heilbrun and Gray (2001), Mulcahy and Swaim (1982), Snowball (2008), Throsby (2010), Toepler and Zimmer (2002), and Zuidervaart (2011) represent a subset of scholars who have conducted research on this particular discourse.

The objective of government action is to provide equitable access to the arts for individuals, irrespective of their financial circumstances or the state of the economy.

The incorporation of the right to freedom of opinion and expression inside the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights serves as evidence of the widespread acknowledgement and endorsement of this fundamental right on a global scale. Baumol and Bowen (1966) argue that it is the responsibility of the government to ensure equitable access for all individuals to artistic goods and services. Furthermore, it is imperative for the government to ensure that no particular group is granted exclusive privileges to these facilities. This method has emerged as a result of a more comprehensive program in which the government maintains control over the

distribution and financial support of a diverse range of consumer goods. An alternate approach to the existing model of arts supply involves conceptualizing cultural activities as "merit goods." The distribution of art to the citizens by the state can be justified based on both personal taste and the increasing agreement that art possesses inherent value and beauty that is connected to morality (Musgrave, 1959; Netzer, 1978). Despite the presence of low demand for a certain commodity, the government maintains the belief that it is in the best interest of the populace to engage in its purchase. Given the possibility of reduced or nonexistent demand for these projected expenditures under a purely free market system, the government may assume either full or partial responsibility for providing support for these expenditures. Moreover, it is not unexpected that throughout the annals of Western civilisation, the realm of art, namely the performing arts, has consistently relied on benefactors for financial support. The rationale behind the high costs and resource requirements associated with the creation and exhibition of artistic works stems from various factors. As a result of the possibility of artistic organizations facing closure and the consequent decline in the accessibility of artistic works (Netzer, 1978; Pick et al., 1988), the contemporary nation-state has taken on the role of providing financial support to the creative industries.

Exploring innovative approaches to financing cultural endeavors.

The area of public policy analysis encompasses several subfields, one of which focuses on the allocation of government expenditures among diverse social services, educational institutions, and cultural establishments. Scholars in this field investigate the factors that determine or influence the financial allocations of various institutions. Within the realm of scholarly literature, several notable works have emerged in this particular topic. Notably, the contributions of Di Matteo & Di Matteo (1998), Ha (2008), and Potrafke (2010, 2011b) have garnered significant attention. The primary focus of these analyses pertains to the factors that are connected with specific events. The aspects that have been examined and taken into account include age structure (Manwaring and Shefrin, 1997; Noonan, 2007), cultural variety (Kuijs, 2000; McDonald, 2008), and economic characteristics (McCarty and Schmidt, 1997; Potrafke, 2011b). Several researchers, including McCarty and Schmidt (1997), McDonald (2008), and Kuijs (2000), have extensively explored this subject

Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review
VOLUME. 1, ISSUE. 1 2023

matter. Besley and Case (2003) conduct a comprehensive literature review that examines the various factors that influence policy results.

This overview was presented in the context of a research paper. Multiple scholarly investigations have come to the conclusion that the political, organizational, and demographic characteristics of a nation have an effect on the policies and allocations of that nation, including those policies and allocations that pertain to finance agencies and cultural administrations. This conclusion has led to a consensus among the academic community. The research that is being done in the field of cultural policy with an emphasis on the financial component will cover a wide range of subjects. The examination of legislative appropriations for the arts in a variety of countries (Getzner, 2002; Lewis and Rushton, 2007; Netzer, 1992; Noonan, 2007; Schuster, 1990), the documentation of the characteristics of public arts agencies (Schuster, 2003), and the analysis of the political and economic factors that influence support for the arts (DiMaggio, 1991; Dworkin, 1991; Madden, 2005; Netzer 1978) are some examples of these types of studies.

Studies that have been conducted to investigate the distribution of financial resources to support cultural institutions have utilized a variety of different methodologies. A cost-benefit analysis of cultural policy (Peacock and Godfrey, 1976), an analysis of government support in relation to population consumption patterns to identify beneficiaries of subsidized culture (Netzer, 1992), an examination of changes in appropriations for culture over time (Heilbrun and Gray, 2001), and an exploration of funding priorities (Schuster, 2003) are some of the strategies that can be utilized. These studies investigate the effects of policies on a variety of outcomes, including the distribution of state funds in the United States (Lewis and Rushton, 2007; Noonan, 2007), the financial support for public orchestras in Germany (Schulze and Rose, 1998), the overall expenditure on cultural activities in Austria (Getzner, 2002), the municipal expenditure on cultural initiatives in Italy (Dalle Nogare and Galizzi, 2011), and other topics associated with this area of research.

According to the aforementioned research, increased personal incomes (Frey, 2003; Lewis and Rushton, 2007), robust state or national fiscal conditions (Lewis and Rushton, 2007; Noonan, 2007; Schulze and Rose, 1998), population growth (Schulze

and Rose, 1998), and political progressivism (Getzner, 2002; Lewis and Rushton, 2007; Noonan, 2007) all contribute to an increase in the amount of money available for charitable organizations. In the following section, we are going to look at specific ideas that correspond to the key elements that affect public finance.

Ideas or hypotheses

In the course of this research, two separate groups of hypotheses were developed, each of which corresponded to one of the two theoretical approaches that were presented. This was done with the intention of determining which of the two theoretical approaches was more appropriate for describing the connection that exists between the various elements and the amount of money that the Israeli government spends on culture. A literature review that investigated the political, demographic, and economic aspects that are related with public expenditure on culture served as the basis for the selection of variables and the development of postulated links between features and funding patterns.

According to Schulze and Rose (1998) and Werck et al. (2008), there is a strong correlation between the level of education among a population and funding. The degree of education among a population is commonly seen as an indicator of demand. According to Katz-Gerro (2011), for a considerable amount of time, there has been widespread agreement regarding the significance of education with regard to cultural consumption. The majority of those who participate in activities associated with art and culture are those who have attained a higher degree of education. In addition, those with higher levels of education make up a sizeable interest group that is highly motivated to reduce the costs that are associated with the cultural goods and services they consume. According to Lewis and Rushing (2007), the average income of a population can be used as an indicator of both the level of demand for artistic expression as well as the capacity of individuals to financially support artistic endeavors. Werck and colleagues (2008) carried out the research for the study. People who have a high socioeconomic standing frequently voice their approval for the practice of devoting a percentage of public funds to cultural endeavors. As was discussed in Section 3, conducting an investigation into Israel's ethnic make-up is of

Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review
VOLUME. 1, ISSUE. 1 2023

utmost significance within the context of the country. This study's objective is to determine the extent to which Ashkenazi and Mizrachi populations have an impact on the distribution of financial resources within the Jewish population.

In addition to the basic correlations that have already been discussed, the percentage of younger and older people that make up the population is another factor that is taken into account. These criteria are indicative of both the desire and the capacity to provide financial support for the arts (Dalle Nogare and Galizzi, 2011; Lewis and Rushton, 2007; Noonan, 2007; Werck et al., 2008). Alle Nogare and Galizzi (2011). In addition, Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita (Frey, 2003; Getzner, 2002) is thought of as a measure of wealth and government resources, and it is predicted that it will reveal a positive relationship between the two. According to a number of studies (Florida, 2002; Frey, 2003; Potrafke, 2011a,b; Throsby, 2001), Democrats, who are typically identified with the political left in the United States, tend to place a greater emphasis on the positive externalities that are connected with the arts than do Republicans, who are typically associated with the political right. This is the case despite the fact that Republicans are more likely to support funding for the arts. These externalities include the encouragement of economic growth and the provision of more opportunities to participate in cultural activities for disadvantaged populations. According to the findings of a study that was carried out by Getzner (2002) between the years 1967 and 1988 in Austria, there was not a major impact caused by government partisanship on the distribution of public funds towards cultural expenditures. This was determined by looking at the data. Nevertheless, Potrafke (2011b) found that administrations in Germany with ideology leaning to the left tended to spend somewhat lesser amounts of financing towards cultural matters during the time period spanning from 1974 to 2006. This was the case during the entire period from 1974 to 2006.

CONCLUSION

The engagement of the state in creative undertakings is seen as a technique of propaganda in the context of authoritarian regimes. This instrument is strategically deployed to generate art that is aligned with and promotes the ideas upheld by the

Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review
VOLUME. 1, ISSUE. 1 2023

regime. It is generally accepted that democratic regimes' cultural policies are geared toward the advancement of the general public interest. It is possible that the service does not discriminate against different social groups since it does not differentiate between those groups if it does not have any intrinsic equalizing features. According to the findings of this study, democratic governments such as Israel are able to maintain both of these political systems simultaneously. In point of fact, it is true to say that the objective of allocating funds towards the arts is to serve the purpose of providing financial aid to artistic organizations, while simultaneously attempting to augment such funding in response to the growing public interest in the sphere of art. This interest comes from a combination of factors, including the fact that more people are becoming interested in the arts. The distribution of funding, in much the same way as cultural policy in autocratic nations does, reflects the power dynamics of society and may have an effect on the ability to preserve cultural heritage.

Within modern democratic regimes, social conflicts and power struggles frequently take the form of symbolic expressions, with art being one such expression. This is the fundamental premise of this thesis. In the context of arts finance and cultural policy, the interaction of the realms of politics and business with the field of art is readily apparent.

Therefore, one can see signs of the fight between classes in the patterns of how money is distributed for the arts.

This raises the question of whether the outcomes that were observed are the unintended consequences of underlying prejudices and negotiations among various societal factions, or whether politicians must intentionally set clear aims of exclusion and hegemonic assertion in order to achieve their goals. There is not any empirical support referring to conscious decision-making processes or underlying reasons within the context of our research design. This is the case because of the absence of empirical support. Exploration of new data sources is one of the possible study directions that could be pursued in the future. These additional pieces of information could be gathered through keeping track of the development of legislation that affects arts groups, conducting interviews with public officials and politicians, and reviewing working papers and minutes from committee hearings. Because it is considered that this approach provides a more concrete comprehension of how

Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review
VOLUME. 1, ISSUE. 1 2023

culture influences the lives of individuals, the focus of this research is not on the goals and intentions of policymakers but rather on the results of policies.

Our claim is that there is a gap in our understanding of the connection between social conflict, art worlds, and cultural policy as a result of the little amount of empirical work that has been conducted on cultural budgets in comparison to the substantial body of research that has been conducted on welfare, health, and education budgets. This is because of the limited amount of research that has been conducted on cultural budgets. In order to gain a deeper understanding of the people who stand to benefit from cultural policy in a variety of settings, we believe that the empirical method that we have developed has the potential to be used in other nations. It is possible to reach a higher level of success by putting into practice a method that partitions financial resources for cultural endeavors into distinct and extra subcategories. This investigation will focus on four of the most prominent subfields within the realm of the performing arts: dance, orchestras, theater, and opera. The realms of visual arts, literature, and museums are all additional artistic domains that could be taken into account as potential candidates. Further distinctions can be made between the interior and outside regions of a certain geographical area, as well as between highbrow and popular art and the various aesthetic expressions of different ethnic groups. Indicators of economic inequality, such as the Gini coefficient, can be a helpful supplement to the income variable by providing insights into the allocation of society resources. This is because the Gini coefficient measures the degree to which individuals' incomes differ from one another. Additionally, other indicators referring to supplemental funding sources, such as private foundations and municipal money, may also function as significant independent variables. This is because private foundations and municipal funding are both examples of this. A future examination would benefit from using a triangulation of techniques, which would include investigations into other aspects of cultural policy, such as law and entrepreneurship, in addition to the analysis of alternate sources of funding. This approach would make future research more effective.

REFERENCES

Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review
VOLUME. 1, ISSUE. 1 2023

Alt, J., Lowry, R., 1994. Divided government, fiscal institutions, and budget deficits: evidence from the States. *American Political Science Review* 88, 811–828.

Baumol, W.J., Bowen, W.G., 1966. *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*. The Twentieth Century Fund, New York.

Ben-Ami, I., 1996. Government involvement in the arts in Israel: some structural and policy characteristics. *Journal of Art Management, Law and Society* 26, 195–219.

Bennett, T., 1992. Putting policy into cultural studies. In: Grossberg, L., Nelson, C., Treichler, P. (Eds.), *Cultural Studies*. Routledge, New York, pp. 23–37.

Bereson, R., 2002. *The Operatic State: Cultural Policy and the Opera House*. Routledge, London.

Besley, T., Case, A., 2003. Political institutions and policy choices: evidence from the United States. *Journal of Economic Literature* 41, 7–73.

Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Box, G.E.P., Jenkins, G.M., 1976. *Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control*. Holden-Day, Oakland, CA.

Brooks, A.C., 2001. Who opposes government arts funding? *Public Choice* 108, 355–367.

Brooks, A.C., 2004. In search of true public arts support. *Public Budgeting and Finance* 24 (2), 88–100.

Dalle Nogare, C., Galizzi, M.M., 2011. The political economy of cultural spending: evidence from Italian cities. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 35 (3), 203–231.

Di Matteo, L., Di Matteo, R., 1998. Evidence on the determinants of Canadian provincial government health expenditures: 1965–1991. *Journal of Health Economics* 17 (2), 211–228.

DiMaggio, P., 1991. Decentralization of arts funding from the federal government to the states. In: Benedict, S. (Ed.), *Public Money and the Muse: Essays on Government Funding for the Arts*. W.W. Norton, New York, pp. 216–252.

DiMaggio, P., Pettit, B., 1999. *Public Opinion and Political Vulnerability: Why has the National Endowment for the Arts Been Such an Attractive Target?* Working Paper No. 7. Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.

Dubois, V., 2011. Cultural capital theory vs. cultural policy beliefs: how Pierre Bourdieu could have become a cultural policy advisor and why he did not. *Poetics* 39 (6), 491–506.

Dworkin, D., 1991. State advocacy in the arts: a historical overview. *Journal of Arts Management and Law* 21 (3), 199–214.

Dye, R., 2005. *Understanding Public Policy*. Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Eagleton, T., 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction*. Verso, London.

Fiorina, M., 1991. Divided government in the states. *Political Science and Politics* 24, 646–650.

Florida, R., 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class*. Basic Books, New York.

Frey, B., 2003. *Arts*

Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review
VOLUME. 1, ISSUE. 1 2023

& Economics: Analysis & Cultural Policy. Springer, Berlin. Getzner, M., 2002. Determinants of public cultural expenditures: an exploratory time series analysis for Austria. *Journal of Cultural Economics* (26), 287–306. Gramsci, A., 1971. Selection from the Prison Notebook. Lawrence and Wishart, London. Ha, E., 2008. Globalization, veto players, and welfare spending. *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (6), 783–813. Haas, H., 1999. Leisure culture in Israel 1998. *Panim* 10, 107–139 (in Hebrew). Hebdige, D., 1979. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. Routledge, London. Heilbrun, J., Gray, C., 2001. *The Economics of Art and Culture*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. Horowitz, A., 2010. *Mediterranean Israeli Music and the Politics of the Aesthetic*. Wayne State University Press, Detroit. Johnson, V., Fulcher, J.F., Ertman, T. (Eds.), 2007. *Opera and Society in Italy and France from Monteverdi to Bourdieu*. Cambridge University Press, New York. Katz, E., Haas, H., Weitz, S., Adoni, H., Gurevitch, H., Schieff, M., 2000. *Leisure Culture in Israel*. Open University Press, Tel Aviv (in Hebrew). Katz, E., Sella, H., 1999. *The Beracha Report: Culture Policy in Israel*. Van Leer Jerusalem Institute and Beracha Foundation, Jerusalem (in Hebrew). Katz-Gerro, T., 2011. Cross-national cultural consumption research: inspirations and disillusion. *Kölnner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 51, 339–360. Katz-Gerro, T., Raz, S., Yaish, M., 2007. Class, status, and the intergenerational transmission of musical tastes in Israel. *Poetics* 35, 152–167. Kimmerling, B., 2004. *Immigrants, Settlers, Natives: The Israeli State and Society between Cultural Pluralism and Cultural Wars*. Am Oved, Tel Aviv (in Hebrew). Klamer, A., Petrova, L., Mignosa, A., 2006. *Financing the Arts and Culture in the EU*. Directorate General Internal Policies of the Union, European Parliament, Brussels. Krebs, S., Pommerehne, W.W., 1995. Politico-economic interactions of German public performing arts institutions. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 19, 17–32. Kuijs, L., 2000. *The Impact of Ethnic Heterogeneity on the Quantity and Quality of Public Spending*. Working Paper 00/ 49. International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC. Laaksonen, A., 2010. *Making Culture Accessible: Access, Participation and Cultural Provision in the Context of Cultural Rights in Europe*. Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg. Laclau, E., Mouffe, C., 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Verso, London. Levy, A., 1999. Towards identity politics: Mizrahi culture's struggle for recognition and support. *Panim* 10, 32–40 (in Hebrew). Lewis, G., Rushton, M., 2007. Understanding state government appropriations for

Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review
VOLUME. 1, ISSUE. 1 2023

the arts: 1976–1999. *State and Local Government Review* 39, 107–114. MacDonald, L., 2008. The impact of government structure on local public expenditures. *Public Choice* 136, 457–473. Madden, C., 2005. Indicators for arts and cultural policy: a global perspective. *Cultural Trends* 14 (3), 217–247. Manwaring, R., Sheffrin, S., 1997. Litigation, school finance reform, and aggregate educational spending. *International Tax and Public Finance* 4 (2), 107–127. McCarty, T., Schmidt, S., 1997. A vector-autoregression analysis of state-government expenditure. *The American Economic Review* 87 (2), 278–282. McGuigan, J., 2004. *Rethinking Cultural Policy*. Open University Press, Berkshire, UK. Michman, J., 1973. *Cultural Policy in Israel*. UNESCO, Paris. Miller, T., Yudice, G., 2002. *Cultural Policy*. Sage, London. Mizrahi, N., 2004. “From badness to sickness”: the role of ethnopsychology in shaping ethnic hierarchies in Israel. *Social Identities* 10 (2), 219–243. Mulcahy, K.V., 2006. Cultural policy: definitions and theoretical approaches. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 35, 319–330. Mulcahy, K.V., Swaim, C.R., 1982. *Public Policy and the Arts*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO. Musgrave, R.A., 1959. *The Theory of Public Finance: A Study in Public Economy*. McGraw-Hill, New York. Netzer, D., 1978. *The Subsidized Muse: Public Support for the Arts in the United States*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. Netzer, D., 1992. Arts and culture. In: Clotfelter, C. (Ed.), *Who Benefits from the Nonprofit Sector?* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 174–206. Noonan, D., 2007. Fiscal pressures, institutional context, and constituents: a dynamic model of states’ arts agency appropriations. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 31, 293–310. Ohaion, S., 2009. The Ministry of Culture’s Budget: Allocation of Cultural Budget and Resources in 2008. Coalition of Organizations and Artists for Equal Allocation of Cultural Budgets. (in Hebrew). Orian, D., 2004. *The Ethnic Problem in Israeli Theater*. Open University Press, Tel Aviv (in Hebrew). Peacock, A., Godfrey, C., 1976. Cultural accounting. In: Blaug, M. (Ed.), *The Economics of the Arts*. Westview Press, London, pp. 72–76. Perelson, I., 2006. *A Great Joy Tonight: Arab-Jewish Music and Mizrahi Identity*. Resling, Tel Aviv (in Hebrew). Pick, J., Ajala, R., Anderton, M.H., 1988. *The Arts in a State: A Study of Government Arts Policies from the Ancient Greece to the Present*. Bristol Classical Press, Bristol, UK. Potrafke, N., 2010. The growth of public health expenditures in OECD countries: do government ideology and electoral motives matter? *Journal of Health Economics* 29 (6), 797–810. Potrafke, N., 2011a. Does government ideology influence budget composition?

Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review
VOLUME. 1, ISSUE. 1 2023

Empirical evidence from OECD countries. *Economics of Governance* 12 (2), 101–134.

Potrafke, N., 2011b. Public expenditures on education and cultural affairs in the West German states: does government ideology influence the budget composition? *German Economic Review* 12 (1), 124–145.

Regev, M., Serrousi, E., 2004. *Popular Music and National Culture in Israel*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Roginsky, D., 2009. The national, the ethnic and in-between: sociological analysis of the interrelations between folk, ethnic and minority dances in Israel. In: Rottenberg, H., Roginsky, D. (Eds.), *Dance Discourse in Israel*. Resling, Tel Aviv, (in Hebrew), pp. 95–125.

Ruskin, A., 1998. *State Subsidy of Culture and the Performing Arts in Israel*. The Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies, Jerusalem.

Saada-Ophir, G., 2006. Borderland pop: Arab Jewish musicians and the politics of performance. *Cultural Anthropology* 21 (2), 205–233.

Santoro, M., 2010. Constructing an artistic field as a political project: lessons from La Scala. *Poetics* 38, 534–554.

Schulze, G.G., Rose, A., 1998. Public orchestra funding in Germany—an empirical investigation. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 22, 227–247.

Schuster, M., 1990. Correlates of state arts support: the geographic distribution of organizations, artists, and participation. In: Pankratz, D.B., Morris, V.B. (Eds.), *The Future of the Arts: Public Policy and Arts Research*. Praeger, New York, pp. 81–103.

Schuster, M., 2003. *Mapping State Cultural Policy: The State of Washington*. University of Chicago, Cultural Policy Center, Chicago.

Schwartz, E., 2008. *Proposals for the Culture and Arts Law*. Center of Research and Information, The Knesset, Jerusalem (in Hebrew).

Shavit, Z. (Ed.), 2000. *Culture Charter—Vision 2000: Cultural Policy for the State of Israel in the 21st Century*. Ministry of Science, Culture and Sports, Jerusalem (in Hebrew).

Shenhav, Y.A., 2006. *The Arab Jews: A Postcolonial Reading of Nationalism, Religion, and Ethnicity*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Shoshana, A., 2011. Governmentality, self, and acting at a distance. *Social Identities* 17 (6), 771–791.

Smooha, S., 1993. Jewish ethnicity in Israel. In: Kyle, K., Peters, J. (Eds.), *Whither Israel? The Domestic Challenges*. I.B. Tauris, London, pp. 161–176.

Snowball, J.D., 2008. *Measuring the Value of Culture*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Swirski, S., 1999. *Politics and Education in Israel: Comparisons with United States*. Falmer Press, New York.

Throsby, D., 2001. *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Throsby, D., 2010. *The Economics of Cultural Policy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Toepler, S., Zimmer, A.,

Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review
VOLUME. 1, ISSUE. 1 2023

2002. Subsidizing the arts: government and the arts in Western Europe and the United States. In: Crane, D., Kawashima, N., Kawasaki, K. (Eds.), *Global Culture: Media, Arts, Policy and Globalization*. Routledge, New York, pp. 29–48. Velicer, W.F., Colby, S.M., 2005. A comparison of missing-data procedures for ARIMA time-series analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 65, 596–615. Weber, M., 1978. *Economy and Society*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA. Werck, K., Heyndels, B., Geys, B., 2008. The impact of “central places” on spatial spending patterns: evidence from Flemish local government cultural expenditures. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 32 (1), 35–58. Withers, G.A., 1979. Private demand for public subsidies: an econometric study of cultural support in Australia. *Journal of Cultural Economics* (3) 1-53–64. Yaish, M., 2004. *Class Mobility Trends in Israeli Society, 1974–1991*. Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston, NY. Yonah, Y., 2005. In *Virtue of Difference: The Multicultural Project in Israel*. Hakibbutz Hameuchad and Van Leer Jerusalem Institute, Tel Aviv (in Hebrew). Yonah, Y., Shenhav, Y., 2000. The multicultural condition. *Theory and Criticism* 17, 163–188 (in Hebrew). Zuidervaart, L., 2011. *Art in Public: Politics, Economics and a Democratic Culture*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.