

Multidimensional Evaluation and Comparative Study on International Competitiveness of Chinese and American Cultural Industries

Sixuan Ren

Dodge College of Film and Media Arts, Chapman University, CA 92866, United States

ABSTRACT

This paper systematically compares the international competitiveness of cultural industries between China and the United States. Construct a three-dimensional framework of industrial scale, innovation ecology and value chain positioning to reveal the structural differences between the two countries. Relying on market-oriented capital circulation and technology-driven, the United States dominates high value-added links such as creative research and development, forming a closed-loop system from innovation to global income. China has scale advantages in the field of processing and manufacturing, but it faces the imbalance of innovation factor allocation and the limitation of cultural symbol dissemination efficiency, and the industrial chain stays in the middle and low-end position. The study points out that the institutional differences between market-driven and policy-oriented constitute the essence of competition division. China needs to optimize the institutional environment to activate the innovation ecology, promote the industry from scale expansion to a compound mode of original capability and global resource allocation coordination, and realize the high-end breakthrough of cultural value chain and systematic strengthening of national soft power.

KEYWORDS

International Competitiveness; Chinese and American Cultural Industries; Multidimensional Evaluation.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the context of the deep integration of global value chains, the cultural industry has become a core carrier for measuring a country's soft power and economic competitiveness. As bipolar subjects of global cultural product supply and consumption, the differences in international competitiveness of industries between China and the United States not only reflect the deep characteristics of economic structure, but also reveal the structural division of technological innovation, policy coordination and industrial chain integration ability [1]. A systematic comparison of the performance of the two countries on multidimensional indicators has significant theoretical value in analyzing the evolution mechanism of the global cultural and economic pattern and exploring the industrial upgrading path of late-developing countries. This paper focuses on the multi-dimensional dynamic comparison of international competitiveness of Sino-US cultural industries, and constructs an analytical framework covering industrial scale, innovation ecology and value chain positioning. By integrating the core dimensions of market share, trade competitiveness index and participation in high value-added links, breaking through the limitations of single economic indicators, the formation mechanism of competitiveness is analyzed from the perspective of institutional coordination and factor allocation. Through multi-dimensional comparison, this paper aims to provide theoretical basis for the structural reform of China's cultural industry, promote its transformation from scale-oriented to compound

development mode of "original ability and global resource allocation," and finally serve the systematic promotion of national cultural soft power and the construction of global cultural governance discourse power.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS OF SINO-US CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

2.1. Theoretical Definition of Cultural Industry and International Competitiveness

The theoretical category of cultural industry points to the collection of economic activities centered on the production of cultural symbols, the development of creative content and the operation of intellectual property rights. The key difference between cultural industry and traditional industry lies in the uniqueness of value creation highly dependent on cultural resources, the professional quality of creative talents and the innovation depth of technology application. UNESCO brings film and television, publishing, digital media and other categories into the framework of cultural industry, emphasizing its cross-domain characteristics of forming the core driving force of knowledge economy through industrial chain integration. International competitiveness theory focuses on the ability of industry to obtain sustainable advantages in the global market, and its connotation covers static scale strength and dynamic development potential [2]. Michael Porter's "Diamond Model" reveals its generation mechanism, emphasizing that the quality of production factors, the maturity of demand market, the support of related industries and the governance structure of enterprises constitute the basic system, and government policies and historical opportunities are external regulatory variables.

The correlation between cultural industry and international competitiveness is embodied in two-way strengthening logic. On the one hand, industrial competitiveness is directly expressed as the position of cultural products in the global value chain, including market share, brand premium ability and standard-setting discourse power; on the other hand, deep competitiveness stems from the global recognition of cultural values through market carriers, that is, the efficiency of transformation from soft power to economic hard power. This transformation relies on a triple mechanism, an innovation-driven mechanism to promote technology integration and content originality upgrading, an institutional guarantee mechanism to build a development environment relying on intellectual property protection and policy adaptability, and a resource integration mechanism to optimize the allocation of global cultural elements [3]. Therefore, the competitiveness of cultural industry is essentially the composite embodiment of national hard power support and soft power output, and its theoretical definition needs to be analyzed in the dynamic balance between global competition and localization development.

2.2. The Development Process and Orientation of Sino-US Cultural Industries

The development of American cultural industry is rooted in mature market economy system. Private capital and marketization mechanism promote it to construct global industrial chain in film, television, music and other fields. Through transnational commercial operations, the United States has established a dominant position in global cultural production and dissemination, with its industrial orientation centered on global market expansion, emphasizing the commercial value transformation of creative content and the integration of digital technology, forming a value hegemony system of "creative R & D-global distribution-derivative value-added". The role of the U.S. government is limited to intellectual property protection and tax support, and market autonomy drives its long-term control of content creation, high value-added links and cultural symbol definition rights [4].

China's cultural industry is deeply bound to the process of reform and opening-up, showing policy-driven characteristics. The government promotes its transformation from career attribute to

industrialization through strategic planning, and its positioning has dual missions: meeting spiritual needs for domestic demand and upgrading industries, and undertaking the task of exporting cultural soft power to the outside world. China adopts the path of "government guidance-resource integration-technology catching-up" to show late-comer advantages in digital media and other fields, but the industry as a whole still faces the challenges of weak original ability and low global value chain potential.

The difference in positioning between the two countries stems from the distinction between economic system and innovation ecology. The United States relies on capital operation to form global hegemony dominated by private enterprises; China relies on policy dividends to activate market potential. In the global competition, the United States defines cultural consumption standards by virtue of mature industrial chains. Although China has advantages in manufacturing efficiency and market scale, it has not yet realized the equivalent transformation of cultural discourse power.

2.3. Construction of Multi-Dimensional Evaluation Index System

The scientific evaluation of international competitiveness of cultural industry needs to break through the limitation of single economic index and construct a three-dimensional framework covering value transformation efficiency, system guarantee ability and market response intensity. The value transformation dimension focuses on the dynamic evolution process from resource elements to industrial competitiveness. The core lies in measuring the creative transformation efficiency of cultural resources, including the modern interpretation ability of local cultural symbols, the integration depth of technology-enabled content production (such as the combination of AI and traditional cultural resources), and the market conversion rate of innovative achievements (such as the global authorization scale of original IP). This dimension should avoid simple quantification of output, but should pay attention to the synergistic gain mechanism of cultural value and economic value.

The institutional guarantee dimension emphasizes the compatibility between policy and market environment. On the one hand, it is necessary to evaluate the perfection degree and enforcement effectiveness of intellectual property protection system, which directly affects the long-term investment willingness of innovation subjects; on the other hand, it is necessary to investigate the effectiveness of cross-department coordination mechanism (such as policy linkage of culture and tourism, radio and television, Ministry of Industry and Information Technology), as well as the implementation effect of cultural trade facilitation measures (such as optimization of export approval process and support for cross-border payment settlement). The core of institutional design lies in balancing cultural security and open efficiency, providing stable expectations for industry to participate in global competition.

The market response dimension reflects the essence of competitiveness through the international market penetration and audience stickiness of cultural products. Specifically, it includes three levels: one is the accurate reach ability of the market segment; the second is the global adaptation degree of cultural consumption scenes; and the third is the emotional resonance intensity of the audience. This dimension needs to combine digital footprint analysis with traditional trade data to form a dynamic feedback mechanism.

3. MULTIDIMENSIONAL EVALUATION AND COMPARISON OF INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS OF CHINESE AND AMERICAN CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

3.1. Comparison of Industry Size and Global Market Share

Relying on the highly market-oriented private capital operation system, American cultural industry has occupied a leading position in the global cultural economy for a long time. It has built a global industrial chain and distribution network in core fields such as film and television and music, and realized large-scale expansion of market revenue through copyright operation and brand authorization. This advantage is not only reflected in the export volume of products, but also in the deep shaping of international cultural consumption habits and industrial standards, forming global cultural hegemony.

Driven by the expansion of domestic market demand and policy support, the scale of China's cultural industry has increased significantly in recent years. However, there is still a magnitude gap between global market share and that of the United States, especially in the high value-added links of cultural trade. Although emerging fields such as digital media and online games show market vitality, the whole still relies on the advantages of local market scale, and has not yet formed a cultural symbol definition ability and distribution system with global influence.

The essence of the difference in industrial scale between the two countries lies in the distinction between economic system and innovation ecology: the United States realizes the global value transformation of cultural resources through capital drive; China explores the transformation path from scale advantage to international influence by policy guidance. Under the current trend of diversification of global cultural consumption, the United States still controls the core channels of industrial chain. China needs to break through the structural bottleneck of original ability and global resource allocation in order to realize the substantial leap of industrial potential.

3.2. Comparative Analysis of Innovation Ecology and Value Chain Positioning

The innovation ecology of American cultural industry is driven by market-oriented capital circulation. Private capital deeply intervenes in innovation incubation and technology research and development through venture capital mechanism, forming a dynamic value-added model of "creative-technology-capital" trinity. Its innovation network is highly dependent on the integration of free-flowing creative talents and cross-border technologies (such as the combination of artificial intelligence and film and television production), promoting the long-term US dominance of high-value-added links such as R & D design, IP incubation and standard setting in the global value chain, and realizing vertical integration of the global value chain through copyright operation.

The innovation ecology of China's cultural industry presents the dual characteristics of policy-oriented and market exploration. The government cultivates technology application ability through industrial fund, tax preference and park construction, but there are structural bottlenecks in the allocation of innovation elements. Uneven acquisition of resources between state-owned and private enterprises, insufficient efficiency of technical coordination, weak reserve of creative talents restrict breakthrough of original content, resulting in long-term concentration of value chain in middle and low-end links such as processing and production, platform operation, etc [5]. Although digital products such as Short Video and online games have taken shape in the international market, a symbol output system with cultural definition has not yet been formed.

The essence of the difference between the two countries lies in the structural division of innovation power: the United States relies on the market mechanism to derive technology iteration and global IP operation capability; China needs to solve the mismatch of factors through institutional optimization, so as to promote the transformation of value chain from scale expansion to compound competitiveness of "original capability + global resource allocation." At present, the essence of global

cultural industry competition is the competition of innovation ecological maturity. China urgently needs to construct a more flexible institutional environment to open up the collaborative channel between innovation chain and value chain.

3.3. Policy Environment and Industrial Chain Efficiency Differences

The policy environment of cultural industries in China and the United States presents significant differences, which deeply affects the efficiency of industrial chain and international competitiveness. The United States has established a policy framework with market mechanism as the core, and guaranteed the innovation ecology led by private capital through laws. For example, the principle of freedom of speech established by the First Amendment of the Constitution lays the foundation for the cultural industry. The federal and state tax preferential systems (such as film and television production cost deduction and copyright income exemption) stimulate the independent innovation vitality of enterprises and promote the global leadership in high value-added links such as R & D design and IP incubation. This policy orientation promotes the industrial chain to form a closed-loop cycle of "creative-capital-technology", and the synergy between Hollywood and Silicon Valley reflects the efficiency advantage of technology-enabled content.

China adopts a government-led policy model, driving scale expansion through industrial planning, financial subsidies and park construction. Although policies such as the Cultural Industry Promotion Law have accelerated the development of emerging fields such as digital media, there are structural contradictions in policy implementation. The uneven distribution of resources between state-owned and private enterprises and regional barriers restricts the flow of factors lead to the locking of the middle and low end of the industrial chain of "processing and production-platform operation". At the same time, the lack of policy stability and multi-management problems weaken the long-term innovation power of market entities. For example, the imperfect copyright protection mechanism restricts the global competitiveness of original IP.

The difference of industrial chain efficiency is further mapped to the position of international division of labor. With mature distribution network and standard-setting right, the United States realizes global penetration and value export of cultural products; although China has made partial breakthroughs in Short Video and other fields relying on its local market advantages, its cultural symbol definition ability and international channel control power are still weak, and the participation of high value-added links is limited. In the future, China needs to open up the coordination channel between policy and market through system optimization, for example, drawing lessons from the regional tax incentive experience of the United States, and constructing the industrial chain upgrading path of "original incubation-global operation" to bridge the industrial chain efficiency gap.

4. CONCLUSION

The essential difference between the international competitiveness of Chinese and American cultural industries reflects the deep game between market-driven and policy-oriented development modes. With mature market mechanism and technological innovation ability, the United States continues to strengthen its control over the high end of global cultural value chain; China faces structural bottlenecks such as insufficient innovation ecological resilience and fragmented policy implementation, resulting in significant cultural trade deficit and limited international discourse power. In the future, China needs to break the barriers to factor flow with institutional innovation, and optimize the spatial allocation of cultural elements by integrating the dual-track path of "internal circulation quality improvement" and "external circulation climbing." At the same time, accelerate the construction of digital technology empowerment and cultural brand internationalization, transform the 5,000-year civilization into cultural symbols with global definition power, and realize the historical leap from "cultural power" to "cultural power" in the complex international pattern.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hussain, M., Yaqoub, M., Zhang, Y.: Post-COVID-19 comparison between Chinese and North American Film Industry: A systematic review of the year 2020 Cinema. *Global Strategic & Security Studies Review*, Vol. 6 (2021) No. 1: 11-19.
- [2] Song, G.: “Little fresh meat”: The politics of sissiness and sissyphobia in contemporary China. *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. 25 (2022) No. 1: 68-86.
- [3] Bai, Q., Nam, B. H.: Where “West meets East”: The cross-cultural discourses regarding the Chinese arts collections at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. *Identities*, Vol. 29 (2022) No. 6: 883-902.
- [4] Gibson, C., Connell, J.: Popular culture and tourism: Conceptual advances and future directions. *Tourism Geographies*, Vol. 27 (2025) No. 4: 767-778.
- [5] Kaye, D. B. V., Chen, X., Zeng, J.: The co-evolution of two Chinese mobile short video apps: Parallel platformization of Douyin and TikTok. *Mobile Media & Communication*, Vol. 9 (2021) No. 2: 229-253.