

# International Networks and Arts Policy Research

## Christopher Madden

Research Analyst, International Federation of Arts Councils  
and Culture Agencies

*Christopher Madden has been the Research Analyst at the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA) since 2001, over which time he has helped establish the organisation's research and information sharing program. Before joining IFACCA, Christopher worked for a variety of arts and culture agencies in Australasia, including the New Zealand Ministry of Cultural Affairs, Creative New Zealand, the Australia Council for the Arts and the National Centre for Culture and Recreation Statistics of the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Christopher has experience in developing frameworks and models for cultural statistics, and in analysing cultural data for policy analysis. His ideas on creativity and arts policy have been published in the International Journal of Cultural Policy and the Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, and he has had papers on aspects of cultural economics published in Media International Australia and the Australian Bulletin of Labour.*

### Abstract

There is a growth of networks in the cultural policy arena. Many of these networks have been formed to share information and to engage in comparative documentation and research. The International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA) is one such network, established with aims of consolidating the collective knowledge of arts councils and culture agencies, adding value to that knowledge, and improving the management and sharing of information on arts and cultural policy. Networks such as IFACCA impact on the research agenda in two main ways: directly, by undertaking, commissioning or collaborating on research projects, and indirectly, by highlighting the perceived information needs of their constituents or members. IFACCA's main research program, D'Art, is used as a case study to evaluate the direct impacts of the network, and this forms the basis for a discussion of the influence of such networks on the global arts policy research agenda.

### Keywords

Arts policy research, cultural policy research, international networks

## Introduction

In a recent survey of the international cultural policy research infrastructure, Schuster (2002; 35), records a rise in international networks. These networks, he suggests, are developed as a way to share information and to engage in comparative documentation and research.

By their very nature, these international networks impact on the arts policy research agenda. The International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA) is one such network, established with aims of consolidating the collective knowledge of arts councils and culture agencies, adding value to that knowledge, and improving the management and sharing of information on arts and cultural policy.

Networks such as IFACCA impact on the research agenda in two main ways: (i) *directly* by undertaking or commissioning their own research, and (ii) *indirectly* by highlighting the perceived information needs of their constituents and stimulating dialogue between network participants. The paper discusses possible costs and benefits of the impact that networks

might have on the arts policy research agenda. Examples of direct impacts are provided from IFACCA's D'Art research program.<sup>1</sup>

## **Arts and Cultural Policy Research from a Global Perspective**

Cultural policy has a strong international tradition, reflected in a healthy appetite for comparative cultural policy analysis (otherwise known as 'inter-country' or 'cross-country' analyses of cultural policy).<sup>2</sup> As **Australia Council (forthcoming)** shows, a number of reasons have been put forward for this:

- Suspicion of potentially 'nationalistic' cultural policies, meaning that policy development can be only fully trusted in context of independent verification (Schuster and Amad, 2002).
- Increasing global integration of cultural practices, which makes internationally-focussed analysis superior to nationally-focussed analysis (Schuster and Amad, 2002; Foote, 2002).
- Increased global integration of nation states and the rise of cross-national governance (Schuster, 2002, p 35; corroborated by Jowell, 1998).
- Culture is esoteric, and cultural policy therefore necessarily abstract (Hugoson, 1997). Comparison is a way of uncovering, understanding and prioritising potential domestic cultural policy issues (Weisand, 2002).
- A dearth of quality domestic research, which causes policy analysts to seek overseas information for adapting to local conditions, or for double-checking untrusted local research and data (Weisand, 2002).

The research that informs comparative cultural policy analysis – 'cultural policy research' – has thus also had a strong international tradition (a brief survey is in Kelland and Selwood, 2002). Nowhere is this more obvious than in the recent spate of international 'meta-analyses' – reviews, assessments, mappings and discussions of cultural policy research from an international perspective (Fronville and Isar, 2003; Kleberg, 2003; Schuster, 2002b; Wiesand, 2002; Stewart and Galley, 2003; and Williams, 2001). Mark Schuster's recent international survey (Schuster, 2002b) marks a key milestone in cultural policy research, representing, in the opinion of Tepper (2004; 84), a 'superb effort at mapping the [cultural policy research] landscape.'

These assessments and meetings have raised many issues in global cultural policy research. They itemise a long list of analytical problems about definitions, methodologies and frameworks, and about research quality and coordination. It is not possible to survey all the issues, but two recurrent themes are particularly worth noting.

### ***Mismatch between Research and Decision-Making.***

Concern has been expressed that research is not meeting the needs of cultural policymakers. Kleberg (2003; p.131) notes that 'we have long witnessed a gap between researchers and decision-makers'. Schuster (2002b; 42) describes this as a 'lingering issue' in the cultural policy infrastructure. Examples of the mismatch from the 'meta analyses' cited above are:

- an overproduction of cultural data and an underproduction of meaningful or policy-relevant statistics and indicators
- low academic interest in cultural policy issues due to low rewards for academic work, particularly prestige

- mismatch between compartmentally-focussed academic research and the multidisciplinary needs cultural policymaking
- lack of a common language or 'common intelligence'
- difference between the 'political-administrative logic' and the 'research logic'.

Schuster (2002a; 17) suggests that 'much of the cultural policy research that is being undertaken around the world today might be better thought of as the development of a statistical base of data rather than the conduct of policy-relevant research.'

There is of course no rule that determines the level of influence policymakers should enjoy over what research is undertaken in their policy arena. It is certain that some balance needs to be found, by whatever means, between policy influence and research independence. Too much policy influence, and research risks losing objectivity, independent rigour, and the innovation that comes with the freedom of intellectual exploration. Too little policy influence, and research risks losing relevance.

### ***Poor Access to and Navigation of Cultural Policy Information Resources***

Cultural policy information is difficult to access and navigate. Cultural statistics are 'disorganised and scattered', and cultural policy reports and documents are 'ephemeral and out of circulation – the so-called gray literature – and therefore difficult to capture' (Stewart and Galley, 2001; 5).

The term 'grey literature' has been coined to describe the self-published materials (reports, newsletters, etc.) of organisations such as government agencies, professional organizations, research centers, universities, public institutions, special interest groups, and associations and societies. Grey literature poses problems for information management; it is often difficult to find through conventional channels, and it tends to have 'poor bibliographic information and control, non-professional layout and format, and low print runs.'<sup>3</sup>

So much of the cultural policy literature can obviously be described as grey. So many reports are produced by agencies 'in-house' or commissioned, with the uncertainty of release, the assortment of formats and the variability in distribution that this entails. Publishing reports exclusively on the web is common, but this does not necessarily make a report available to the world. Web searching can be hit-and-miss, and is particularly sensitive to terms used (eg social impacts, or social inclusion). Search varies according to an individual's skills, knowledge and access to technology. Google is not perfect.

The many problems identified in the 'meta-analyses', such as those detailed above, have lead to calls for greater international coordination in cultural research and cultural statistics (eg. Fronville and Isar, 2003; and Stewart and Galley, 2001). Networks are seen by some as a way to achieve this.

### **International Networks**

A network is 'a "community of practice", whose practitioners may be recognized by a coherence among three dimensions: a joint enterprise, the mutual engagement of its members, and a shared repertoire of resources' (Wiesand, 2002; 376, quoting Wenger, 1998).

Networks for cultural policy have been on the rise for some time. Cvjetičanin (2003; 3) notes: 'When the term 'age of networks' was coined in the nineties, it was due to the fact that a large

number of networks suddenly appeared, especially in the field of culture. In the meantime, as a flexible communication tool, many of those networks have ceased to exist, only to be replaced by an ever growing number of new networks, which aim to introduce new contents and new ways of interconnecting.'

Schuster (2002b; 38) shows that the network movement in cultural policy has been so strong 'that the field has recently witnessed a new phenomenon: the creation of networks of networks.'

Networks are seen by some as the answer to many of the problems in cultural policy research identified earlier (Williams, 2001;25, Wiesand, 2002; 376). The literature review in De Vibe et al (2002) indicates that cultural policy is not the only arena of public policy in which this opinion holds.

Among other things, cultural policy-related networks have been formed 'to share with and learn from one another' and 'to engage in comparative documentation and research' (Schuster, 2002b; 35). Networks created for these reasons will have two main types of impact on the cultural policy research agenda:

1) Direct impact, where networks are directly involved through commissioning research, collaborating in research projects or producing research 'in-house'.

2) Indirect impact, where networks influence the research agenda in other ways, for example: by 'displaying' topics of interest to network members; by managing, editing and 'curating' (eg on websites) information flows; and by convening meetings between researchers or people with command over research resources.

## **Networks and Policy Research: Pros and Cons**

The 'pros' and cons' of networks depend on a number of factors, including the network's architecture (eg. the existence or non-existence of a full-time secretariat), the formal and informal rules about how the network should run, and the codes of behaviour and habits that emerge over time and produce the a network's 'character'. For an introduction to the complexities of networks and their evaluation, see Fondazione Fitzcorraldo (2001).

Networks are generally seen to have a variety of benefits for policy-related research. In a review of literature on the research-policy nexus, De Vibe et al (2002; 2) find that networks are seen as effective playmakers in issues of public concern: both as efficient institutions for negotiating public issues, and as a means of generating and advocating multiple viewpoints or alternative public policy ideas. Networks are also thought to have certain characteristics that respond to the needs of the current public policy environment; especially within the contemporary public policy environment, with its 'attempts to define the role of the state in neo-liberal theory, and the emphasis on good governance and sector-wide programmes' (De Vibe et al, 2002; 2). Williams (2001; 44) suggests that, in cultural policy at least, 'we are shifting from [operating in] hierarchies to networks', and that key characteristics of each are:

Hierarchies	Networks
Static	Dynamic
Products	Process
Events	Flows
Solid	Fluid
Being	Becoming
Explicit	Implicit
Predictable	Unfolding

Similar benefits of arts research networks are suggested by Diamond (2003;5).

Networks are also seen as a way of coping with the overwhelming scope and scale requirements of research on globally-relevant policy issues: '[t]he scope of the research agenda is vast and potentially overwhelming. The most effective way to ensure rapid progress in key areas is to encourage coordination of effort through national and international research networks, fuelled by effective exchange of information' (Gender Working Group of the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development, 1995).

However, networks are also seen to have costs. Schuster (2002b) itemises a number of concerns expressed by cultural policy experts about networks, including:

- Elusive or obscure accountability for network's actions
- Low level of ability to commit resources
- Concern that networks can be captured by the 'agenda' of a major member or a cluster of members
- An incentive structure that encourages membership through fear of exclusion rather than through the gaining of benefits from a network's activity
- A tendency for many networks to become second rate as 'star' members consolidate their memberships as networks proliferate.

Figure 1 expands on these ideas. It contains a selection of characteristics or functions of international policy networks, and suggests some possible costs and benefits of these functions.

Figure 1: Policy networks and research: Selected functions and possible costs and benefits

<b>Network function</b>	<b>Outcome/aim</b>	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Costs</b>
Encourage dialogue between network participants	Network members can agree research priorities.	Better coordination of research agenda for the 'public good' (an active role).	Members' power hierarchy reflected in setting the research agenda (eg, developed nations set the agenda).
	Network members can agree approaches (eg. frameworks, definitions, methodologies and presentation of results).	Improved impact of research by allowing international comparisons.	Global standardisation decreases local relevance. Results may be applied inappropriately for local conditions.
Consolidation of resources	Network members can reduce doubling up or 'reinventing the wheel'.	Reduced cost of research, and consequent liberation of resources for more research or alternative uses.	Replication of errors, opinions and misconceptions.
	Network members can pool resources to gain economies of scale in undertaking their own research, and economies of scope by pooling thinly-spread research.	Research is undertaken that might not otherwise be done. Research is policy-focused. Researchers can benefit from research in other countries when their own country's research is limited.	Research undertaken by policy agencies is seen as less objective. Creates unfair competition or 'crowds out' private sector, independent or academic research.
Reach - engaging a wide range of people	Improved discovery: help uncover work that is difficult to find. Greater variety of input/ideas. Existence of network improves commitment to sharing and engagement.	Innovative solutions via combining of alternatives. Cost reduction due to improved discovery.	Diseconomies of network scale: the wider the net, the less easy it is to sift information exchanged via the network. Free-rider: a sense that someone else will do the work.
Hub - centralising information flows	Emergence: By sharing information in a central place, patterns may be discerned in work that display – what is important, what is not, hierarchies of value for policy issues, and research gaps and priorities.	Better coordination of research agenda for the 'public good' (a passive role).	Emergence is not always right: crowds can be wrong (fads, fashions, etc...).
Bridge between policymakers and researchers	Focal point or clearinghouse: improved dialogue between policymakers and researchers to bring policy issues and research topics closer.	Improve policy relevance of research.	Loss of objectivity. Undue influence of policymakers and politicisation of research.

With this as background, IFACCA will be used as a case study to appraise the direct impact of an international network.

## **International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies**

IFACCA is ‘the first global network of national arts funding bodies. Established in principle at the First World Summit on the Arts and Culture in Ottawa in December 2000, the network’s mission is ‘to create an international resource and meeting ground for all those whose public responsibility it is to support excellence and diversity in artistic endeavour.’ ([www.ifacca.org](http://www.ifacca.org)). The Federation’s secretariat, based in Sydney, Australia, is a non-profit company that employs just three staff.

Out of ten stated objectives, the following objectives of IFACCA have specific implications for their direct and indirect impacts on arts policy research:

### Direct impact

- To consolidate the collective knowledge of arts councils and culture agencies by *brokering joint-commissioning of resources, research and analysis.*

### Indirect impact

- To strengthen the capacity of arts councils and national culture agencies...by *convening international forums to address key concerns.*
- To consolidate the collective knowledge of arts councils and culture agencies by *improving the management and sharing of information and ideas.*
- To encourage support for arts practice and cultural diversity by *stimulating dialogue and debate on emerging multilateral issues.*

The secretariat has designed a number of programs to work toward these goals. The rest of this paper will focus on one of these programs – D’Art – as a case study to explore the IFACCA network’s *direct* impact on cultural policy research.<sup>4</sup>

## **D’Art: Direct Impact**

The Federation’s premier research activity, *D’Art*, is an attempt to mobilise network members to help uncover information resources, to consolidate these resources and add value to them for the benefit of all arts policymakers. Under the program, an arts policy question sent to the IFACCA secretariat is forwarded on to the Federation’s network electronically. Responses are solicited, collated, analysed and a report written and published on the topic.

D’Art relies substantially on the participation of network members. In its design, the program is a form of ‘open source’ research, a methodology that appears to be expanding from its traditional realm in software development to other research arenas.<sup>5</sup>

D’Art has been designed with a number of the benefits from figure 1 in mind. Through its network reach, it aims to facilitate searching of the ‘grey’ cultural policy literature, or to uncover work that has not been published at all (what will be called here ‘black’ literature, for want of a better term). Relevance is virtually assured, since topics are those on which someone in the cultural policy community is working. The program aims to be ‘win-win’. The requestor gets easier access to current knowledge and/or best practices from around the world. Network members, through a minor effort of participation (such as making available work already undertaken and knowledge already

in existence), get a report on the international status on a particular subject. The multiplicity of views achieved through broad participation aims to reveal otherwise indiscernible patterns, uncover alternative approaches and encourage innovative thinking.

Appendix 1 summarises research topics to November 2003. In all, 14 questions have been disseminated by the IFACCA secretariat. Nine research reports have been released.

According to IFACCA's own promotional materials, the D'Art program has been a success. Some commentators have even independently made positive comments on the program. Stewart and Galley (2003; 8), for example, name the D'Art program as one of 14 'encouraging developments' in the USA's cultural policy research ecology. But how can the direct impact of D'Art program on the cultural policy research agenda be measured in more specific ways? This is not a simple task. For example, it is not clear what level of responses is appropriate for any particular research topic, or whether a low response rate for a topic reflects indifference among network members or simply a dearth of information. Nor is it easy to measure the 'depth' of responses - which is preferable; 20 cursory responses or 5 in-depth responses? Tracking all uses of a research report once it has been released, and moreover attributing positive outcomes to those uses, is nearly impossible.

The preceding discussion, and particularly the costs and benefits in figure 1, have, however, highlighted some general issues that might form the basis of such a complicated evaluation. Despite obvious difficulties, the following categories will be used as a basis for evaluating D'Art:

- the relevance of topics
- its ability to uncover information
- the objectivity of the research
- the encouragement of engagement
- the program's reach
- its ability to bridge the policy-research gap; and
- examples of direct impacts on the work of policymakers and researchers.

What follows is not, therefore, an overall evaluation of the D'Art program's effectiveness; it is an investigation of the program's direct impacts on arts and cultural policy research with respect to the issues identified in this paper.

## **Relevance**

Two evaluations of IFACCA activities indicate that D'Art reports appear to be relevant to network members. A survey carried out in 2003 found that most respondents (12 out of 15) who had used a D'Art report found it 'very useful' to their own work (IFACCA 2003b; 20).<sup>6</sup> The majority (88 percent) of respondents to a survey distributed at the Second World Summit in Singapore in November 2003 rated a collected volume of D'Art research reports (IFACCA, 2003a) 'good' or 'excellent'.<sup>7</sup>

It could also be argued that D'Art reports are meeting a research need for policymakers that might not otherwise be fulfilled. There are a number of D'Art topics for which it is difficult to conceive an independent arts policy researcher undertaking (for example, musical instrument banks, and conflict of interest policies in arts funding). A number of D'Art topics seem too specific to be of interest to academics, or even to serve as a basis

for a postgraduate thesis. The dearth of research on these topics uncovered during the D'Art process seems to substantiate this, so it is also unlikely that these D'Art topics are 'crowding out' other research projects.

Relevance should also be considered across time. If at the time of release a D'Art report is not relevant, because, perhaps, a policy is not under review, it may nevertheless be relevant in future if or when a review does take place. Web publishing makes the reports available when users are 'information ready', and the supplementary comments added via a topic's forum ensures that up-to-date information is supplied.

### ***Discovery of 'Grey' and 'Black' Resources***

A number of D'Art reports have gathered resources that would otherwise be time-consuming or difficult to find. Bibliographies in the reports are peppered with references to grey literature. The policy of including url addresses for online materials reveals that much of this literature would be able to be located online, although usually not without substantial search costs. Some D'Art reports are also useful repositories for materials that are no longer available online (for example, materials from Arts Council England in the dance report).

'Black' literature has also been uncovered via the D'Art program. In the interim report on encouraging arts philanthropy, for example, previously unpublished summary of Singaporean tax incentives was provided by the National Arts Council of Singapore. Unpublished information from Canada was used to draft the conflict of interest D'Art report (as highlighted in the report's bibliography). Information on dance programs in the USA was also released prior to publication, and included personalised additional comments from the respondent. A number of reports similarly incorporate unpublished comments made in email responses (a clear example is in the D'Art on conflict of interest policies).

### ***Objectivity***

Objectivity is difficult to evaluate, especially so by someone intimately involved in the D'Art program. That said, many of the topics are relatively uncontroversial, and therefore less likely to be unduly influenced by any particular agenda.

The drafting of reports by the IFACCA secretariat has also elevated analyses from national concerns, which has allowed the reports to be written without apprehension over domestic conflicts that might have otherwise impacted on content. But the ideal of objectivity would be significantly advanced by widening the network's information 'net'. As will be noted later, D'Art reports have attracted participation from a specific sub-sector of the global IFACCA network. By expanding the linguistic, socioeconomic and geographic diversity of participation, a wider range of views could be captured through D'Art, and the claim to objectivity in D'Art reports enhanced.

### ***Engagement***

#### **Participants – participant (dis)interest**

The success of 'open source' research depends largely on the commitment and involvement of community members. Responses to D'Art questions range from 1 to 23 responses (23 responses represents a 2 percent response rate). As noted earlier, there

is no measure of how many responses to expect for any particular topic. It was also noted that a low response might simply reflect a dearth of information on the topic. But some topics have received few responses despite the certainty of that extensive information resources exist world wide (eg, disability policies in the arts received just four responses).

There is no discernible pattern to suggest that responses to D'Arts are increasing or decreasing over time, but it should be noted that both the D'Art program and the IFACCA network are in formative stages, and so too, therefore, are the reputation of both. Reputation effects would increase the response *rate* to D'Art questions (as reliability and quality are secured). And, as the network grows, blunt extrapolation would suggest that the *level* of responses to each query might increase.

### **Requestors – requestor vagrancy**

Under the D'Art guidelines, requestors are expected to draft the analysis that goes into the D'Art report. To date only two reports have contained analyses drafted by the requestor (copyright management systems, and dance policies and programs). In some cases, requesting organisations have undergone restructuring and personnel changes during the D'Art's duration. In other cases, requestors have simply been elusive. Unless a requestor intends to publishing a report themselves, there is little incentive for them to draft a report of publishable quality once information has been received from respondents. The IFACCA secretariat has no power to enforce the rule, and so most D'Art reports have been drafted by the secretariat itself.

Although this might seem to indicate that the D'Art program suffers from a version of 'free-riding', there are benefits to locating the report writing within the network's secretariat. The Secretariat's special interest in cross-country information exchange will ensure that D'Art reports will be written with cross-country knowledge transfer in mind. This may not be a factored into the drafting of a report in any particular country. Elevating the drafting of a report from any particular agency or country may also have benefits in terms of objectivity. These benefits need to be weighed up with the risk that globally-focussed reports may compromise local relevance, or that such reports may lack immediacy by being drafted more remotely from the policy or program workplace.

### ***Reach***

Despite D'Art queries being sent to network members in 140 countries, responses are still skewed toward English language resources and participants. Just one D'Art question has been translated (the dance policies and programs question was sent out in French and English). The bulk of responses have been in English, even when this is not the respondent's first language. To date, therefore, research outputs from the D'Art program have largely reflected the issues and served the needs of a sub-sector of the network.

### ***Bridging the Policy-Research Gap***

It is hard to determine the impact the D'Art program has had on improving the match between policymakers and researchers. Professor Wyszomirski's report on copyright management systems is the most obvious example of the program being at the intersection of policy and research, but whether this can be seen to be strengthening ties between the two spheres is difficult to determine. People who have responded to D'Art queries are mainly from the policy sphere (policymakers, administrators, managers and practitioners). A mere handful (around three) respondents have been from academia,

two of whom have been students. This is despite queries being sent to 184 academics and independent researchers globally (or 12 percent of the Federation's network).

### ***Direct Measures of Impact***

#### **Creation of new knowledge resources**

Most D'Art reports represent to some degree 'added value' to existing knowledge on a subject. The creation of new resources has been more explicit in some reports than in others, as in the D'Art report on dance policies and programs, for which information was drafted specially for the D'Art by two agencies with responsibility for dance policy in New Zealand (Creative New Zealand, and the Ministry for Culture and Heritage).

#### **Citations**

D'Art reports have been variously cited and quoted in policy and research reports.<sup>8</sup> The report on ways to define artists for tax and benefit systems is the D'Art with the most citations. It was cited in: Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts (2002), a major independent review of the visual arts sector in Australia; McAndrew (2002), a research report for Arts Council England; Staines (2004); dole4arts.com; and world-education-resources.com.

#### **Stimulating new research**

The D'Art on conflict of interest policies prompted the following response from Lluís Bonet of ENCATC ([www.encatc.org](http://www.encatc.org)): 'the outcome of IFACCA's fourth D'Art query on conflict of interest policies used in arts and culture funding agencies around the world [has] convinced [us] to begin a new research project comparing the situation in France and Spain.'<sup>9</sup>

### **Summary and Conclusion**

This paper has built on the observation that cultural policymaking and cultural policy-relevant research are becoming increasingly international. The rise in internationalism has seen a rise in international networks. Networks are believed to have a number of beneficial qualities in meeting the needs of policymakers and in improving the link between policy and research. Cultural policy networks manage information flows and undertake their own research, so they inevitably impact on the cultural policy research agenda.

The paper evaluated some of the direct impacts of the Federation's D'Art program on arts and cultural policy research. Overall, the program has produced relevant, original and useful research reports. A number of reports have had measurable impacts on cultural policy research.

D'Art has, however, had variable impacts on the two major concerns that are evident from assessments of the current state of cultural policy research and documentation: it has been successful in uncovering and consolidating grey information resources; but it does not appear to have significantly closed the gap between researchers and policymakers.

The evaluation here must be read with two important caveats. First, the paper has not attempted to evaluate the network's indirect impacts on research. The overall impact of the IFACCA network is, therefore, not being assessed. Second, the IFACCA network and the D'Art program are still young. Both are still developing a presence and a

reputation in the world of cultural policy research. A future evaluation might measure very different impacts.

So long as there is a dearth of independent cultural policy-relevant research, policy agencies (and networks of policy agencies), are obliged to be directly involved in research. How such agencies can do this while maintaining the integrity – perceived or real - of their research output is a real issue in cultural policy. This paper is itself a case in point. It carries the usual disclaimers and apologies of a paper delivered by someone employed by the agency that is intimately a part of the analysis. Despite these disclaimers, and despite all efforts to court objectivity, openness and self-reflexivity, the paper could be summarily dismissed as biased. This is, after all, a conference on cultural *policy* research, not cultural research, so I expect a number of papers presented at the conference will be prone to similar accusations. The IFACCA secretariat welcomes comments or criticisms on this paper, and invites your input in any form on any of the issues raised here, including your advice or thoughts on specific D'Art topics.

## **Acknowledgements**

The author is grateful for the help of Sarah Gardner and Louise Godley in the drafting this paper. The usual caveats apply.

## **Notes**

---

<sup>1</sup> Though the author is employed by IFACCA, the views expressed here cannot be taken to represent those of the IFACCA secretariat, the board of IFACCA, nor the members of IFACCA.

<sup>2</sup> This paper uses the terms 'arts policy' and 'cultural policy' without distinguishing between the two. It is assumed that the arts are a subset of culture, and that, accordingly, arts policy is narrower in focus than cultural policy. This is by no means an international policy standard.

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from Mason (2004), Weintraub (2004) and Greynet (2004).

<sup>4</sup> Reference will be made to IFACCA's 'network members'. These are not just fully paid IFACCA members, but the more than 1,500 people who receive the Federation's newsletter. A recent internal analysis of this network indicates that the network includes people in national arts councils and culture agencies (44 members of IFACCA and more than 110 non-member agencies), arts funding agencies at the state and local level, arts organisations (including performing arts, visual arts, literature, music etc), artists, librarians, policy makers, researchers, private foundations, business sponsors, academic institutions, consultants, students, international bodies, arts advocacy organisations, journalists, aid agencies, diplomatic personnel and individuals interested in arts support.

<sup>5</sup> The term 'open source' has been used primarily to describe an on-line collaborative method for computer software development (used, for example, in developing the 'Linux' operating system). Open source techniques, complemented by the 'copyleft' movement, are being increasingly applied outside of information technology, such as in the social sciences and policy research (see Goetz, 2003; Lawton, 2002; and Schweik and Grove, 2000).

<sup>6</sup> The survey was sent out via email to 599 people. Ninety responses were received (a 15 percent response rate). Respondents came from 36 countries across all continents except the Middle East. Responses were evenly spread between members and non-members of IFACCA.

<sup>7</sup> Unpublished data from World Summit evaluation. In all, 45 delegates from 23 countries completed the questionnaire (a 36 percent response rate). Respondents were from Asia, Europe, Africa, the Pacific, South America and North America.

<sup>8</sup> Most citations are recorded in the 'forum' for each topic on the IFACCA website (login required).

<sup>9</sup> From email sent to IFACCA Secretariat, 20 June 2003.

---

## References

- Anheier, H., 2003, *The World Cultures Report* (draft proposal), School of Public Policy and Social Research, University of California (LA),  
[http://www.utexas.edu/cofa/unesco/documents/World\\_Culture\\_Project\\_June\\_.doc](http://www.utexas.edu/cofa/unesco/documents/World_Culture_Project_June_.doc).
- Australia Council, forthcoming, *Pitfalls in International Data Comparisons and Some Tips for Their Mitigation*, Australia Council, Sydney.
- Cvjetičanin, B., 2003, 'Editorial: The Unique Role of Networks in International Cooperation,' *Culturelink*, Vol. 13, no. 40, August 2003; 99-132,  
<http://www.culturelink.org/review/40/cl40ed.html>
- Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, 2002 *Report of the Contemporary Visual Arts and Craft Inquiry*, DCITA, [http://www.dcita.gov.au/Article/0,,0\\_1-2\\_2-3\\_163-4\\_111225,00.html](http://www.dcita.gov.au/Article/0,,0_1-2_2-3_163-4_111225,00.html).
- De Vibe, M., Hovland, I., and Young, J., 2002, 'Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography', *Overseas Development Institute Working Paper* 174,  
[http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Projects/R0040a/Biblio\\_Intro.html](http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Projects/R0040a/Biblio_Intro.html).
- Diamond, S., 2003, Arts R&D, e-culture conference: investing in innovation, *Melkweg*, 24 October 2003, <http://www.virtueelplatform.nl/docs/artisticR&D.pdf>.
- Fondazione Fitzcorraldo, 2001, *How Networking Works*, Arts Council of Finland,  
<http://www.ietm.org/docs/ietmeng.pdf>.
- Foote, J., 2002, 'Cultural Consumption and Participation,' *Canadian Journal of Communication*, vol 27(2-3); [http://www.cjc-online.ca/title.php3?page=11&journal\\_id=43&document=1](http://www.cjc-online.ca/title.php3?page=11&journal_id=43&document=1).
- Fronville, C., and Y. Isar, 2003, *The International Creative Sector: Its Dimensions, Dynamics and Audience Development*, summary and proceedings from conference at the University of Texas, 5-7 June 2003, Center for Arts and Culture, Washington DC,  
<http://www.culturalpolicy.org/pdf/UNESCO2003.pdf>.
- Gender Working Group of the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development, 1995, 'Information as a transformative tool', Chapter 12 from *Missing Links: Gender Equity in Science and Technology for Development*, IDRC/IT Publications/UNIFEM 1995 Document 15 of 20 IDRC Gender and Information Working Group  
[http://web.idrc.ca/en/ev-29527-201-1-DO\\_TOPIC.html](http://web.idrc.ca/en/ev-29527-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html).
- Gray, C., 'Comparing Cultural Policy: A Reformulation,' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 2 (2); 213-222.
- Greynet, 2004, *Greynet*, <http://www.greynet.org/pages/1/index.htm>.
- Goetz, T., 2003, 'Open Source Everywhere', *Wired*, issue 11.11;  
<http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.11/opensource.html>.
- Hugoson, R., 1997, 'The Rhetoric of Abstract Goals in National Cultural Policies,' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 3(2); 323-340.
- International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies, 2003a, *IFACCA Research Reports 2002 to 2003*, Sydney.
- International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies, 2003b, *Three-Year Report to IFACCA Members*, IFACCA, Sydney. (url to be supplied)
- International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies, 2004, ACORNS, no. 58, Thursday, 15 April 2004, IFACCA.
- Kawashima, N., 'Comparing Cultural Policy: Towards the Development of Comparative Study,' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 1(2); 289-307.
- Kelland and Selwood, 2002, 'Literature Review', *Arts Research Digest*, 25 summer; 4-7.
- Kleberg, C-J., 2003, 'International Co-operation for Cultural Policy Motivated Research: Setbacks and Promises', *Culturelink*, Vol. 13, no. 40, August 2003; 99-132.
- Lawton, G., 2002, 'The Great Giveaway', *New Scientist*, online, January 2002,  
<http://www.newscientist.com/hottopics/copyleft/copyleftart.jsp>.
- McAndrew, C., 2002, *Artists, taxes and benefits - an international review*, ACE,  
<http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/documents/publications/316.doc>.
- Mason, M., 2004, *Grey Literature: Its History, Definition, Acquisition, and Cataloguing*  
<http://www.moyak.com/researcher/resume/papers/var7mkmkw.html>.
- Nielsen, Henrik Kaare (1999) Critical Public Agent or Hired Hand?: Perspectives for Research on Cultural Policy. *Cultural Policy*, 5(2): 183-198.

- 
- Schuster, J., 1987, 'Making Compromises to Make Comparisons in Cross National Arts Policy Research', *Journal of Cultural Economics*, vol. 11(2); 1-36.
- Schuster, J., 1996, 'Thoughts on the Art and Practice of Comparative Cultural Research', in van Hamersveld and van der Wielen, eds., *Cultural Research in Europe*, Boekmanstichting, Amsterdam.
- Schuster, J., 2002a, *Informing Cultural Policy: Data, Statistics, and Meaning*, paper presented at International Symposium on Culture Statistics, October 21-23, Montreal, [http://www.colloque2002symposium.gouv.qc.ca/PDF/Schuster\\_paper\\_Symposium.pdf](http://www.colloque2002symposium.gouv.qc.ca/PDF/Schuster_paper_Symposium.pdf)
- Schuster, M., 2002b, *Informing Cultural Policy: The Research and Information Infrastructure*, Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, New Brunswick.
- Schuster, J., and Amad, P., 2002, Seminar in Comparative Cultural Policy, course notes for Public Policy 402, Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, The University of Chicago, <http://harrisschool.uchicago.edu/academic/syllabi/pp402.html>
- Schweik, C. and Grove, J., 2000, "Fostering Open-Source Research Via a World Wide Web System," *Public Administration and Management: An Interactive Journal*, 5(3); [http://www.pamij.com/5\\_4/5\\_4\\_2\\_2\\_opensource.html](http://www.pamij.com/5_4/5_4_2_2_opensource.html).
- Staines, J., 2004, *Tax and Social Security: A Basic guide for Artists and Cultural Operators in Europe*, IETM, [http://www.ietm.org/members/downloads.asp?item\\_id=1446&t=Tax+and+Social+Security+](http://www.ietm.org/members/downloads.asp?item_id=1446&t=Tax+and+Social+Security+).
- Stewart, R., and C. Galley, 2003, *The Research and Information Infrastructure for Cultural Policy: A Consideration of Models for the United States*, Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, New Brunswick, [http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/culture\\_policy\\_book\\_appendix.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/culture_policy_book_appendix.pdf).
- Tepper, S., 2004, 'Review: Informing Cultural Policy: The Research and Information Infrastructure', *Journal of Cultural Economics*, vol. 28(1); 83-88.
- Weintraub, I., 2004, *The Role of Grey Literature in the Sciences*, <http://library.brooklyn.cuny.edu/access/greyliter.htm>.
- Wiesand, A., 2002, 'Comparative Cultural Policy Research in Europe: A Change of Paradigm', *Canadian Journal of Communication*, vol 27(2); 369-378, <http://www.cjc-online.ca/viewarticle.php?id=731&layout=html>.
- Williams, J., 2001, *Research in the Arts and Cultural Industries: Towards New Policy Alliances*, report on a Transatlantic Workshop, UNESCO headquarters, Paris, 24-26 June 2001, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001261/126114e.pdf>.

---

## ***Appendix 1: D'Art Schedule as at November 2003***

### D'Art schedule as at November 2003

No.	Title	Requestor	Question asked	Report released
1	Defining Artists for Tax and Benefit Purposes	National Association for the Visual Arts, Australia	Sep 01	Jan 02
2	International Comparisons of Arts Participation Data	Australian Bureau of Statistics	Nov 01	Feb 02
3	Copyright management systems	Professor Margaret Wyszomirski, Ohio State University, USA	Dec 01	Mar 02
4	Conflict of Interest Policies in Arts and Culture Funding Agencies	Creative New Zealand	Nov 01	Dec 02
5	Venues policies	Arts Council of Ireland	Jan 02	
6	Artists' remuneration	Performing Arts Network of South Africa	Mar 02	
7	Encouraging Arts Philanthropy: Selected Resources	Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, Australia	May 02	Mar 03
8	Musical Instrument Banks: Online Materials	Global Alliance, UNESCO, France	Aug 02	Jul 03
9	National Cultural Policy Models	Arts Council of Ireland	Oct 02	
10	Arts and disability policies	Arts Council of Northern Ireland	Nov 02	
11	Successful Dance Policies and Programs	Australia Council for the Arts	Jan 03	Oct 03
12	Status of the artist legislation	Saskatchewan Arts Alliance, Canada	Feb 03	
13	Inter-country Comparisons of Government Arts Expenditure	Canada Council for the Arts	Jun 03	Jun 03
14	Audience development initiatives	Australia Council for the Arts	Aug 03	
15	Legal Services for the Creative Sector	New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage	Aug 03	
16	Arts Advocacy Arguments	Australia Council for the Arts	Sep 03	Oct 03

---

**All reports are downloadable at [www.ifacca.org](http://www.ifacca.org)**

---

*Source: IFACCA (2003a)*