Approach and Methodology

Content
1. Conceptual Frame ................................................................. 2
2. Presentation and Dissemination ............................................... 3
3. Country Coverage ................................................................. 4
4. Definitions and Data ............................................................. 4
5. Criteria .............................................................................. 5
6. Proposed ECP Ranking System .............................................. 6
7. Currency conversion ............................................................. 7
The External Cultural Policy (ECP)-Monitor is an online system initiated in 2021 that presents key data and information about the external cultural policy of countries in a structured and systematic way. Organized in the form of country profiles and comparative reports, its emphasis is on quantitative data and contextual information, with links and references to relevant official documents, academic literature and other source material.

For the purpose of ECP-Monitor, we define external cultural policy as the ways and means by which states use culture and the arts, language, education, research, and media to exercise influence abroad for enhancing their geopolitical positioning. Understood in this sense, ECP can complement and substitute other economic, diplomatic, and military means of leverage.

The ECP-Monitor presents data and information in succinct ways that range from summaries to detailed reports and data presentations. The ECP-Monitor complements the Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends in Europe¹ and its extension, WorldCP². While the Compendium and WorldCP are designed for domestic cultural policy only, the ECP-Monitor exclusively reports on external cultural policy. Moreover, while the other two have a primary focus on arts and culture, the ECP-Monitor covers a broader range of policy fields. In addition to arts and culture, it covers education and research, language, and foreign media.

In approaching the development of the ECP-Monitor, we first focused on a framework for data collection, analysis and presentation.

1. Conceptual Frame

The ECP-Monitor has two main parts. The first one focuses on general contours of a country’s ECP, where the second one probes into various subfields. Note that the content structure is a provisional one and will be reviewed and revised as the project develops.

Part I. General ECP Contours

- **Terminology**: how does each country refer to, and regard, what the ECP-Monitor defines as external cultural policy?
- **Goals and Priorities**: what are the stated ECP goals and purposes?
- **Thematic Focus**: does the country’s current ECP have any thematic priorities, linking it more closely to other major policy areas such as security, trade, R & D or economic development?
- **Regional Focus**: does the current ECP have any explicit regional foci or priorities?
- **Decision-making**: which departments/ministries or agencies are involved in policy development and decision-making? How is ECP decided? Which actors are on the institutional “map” of ECP, and how do they relate to each other?
- **Implementation**: which departments/ministries or agencies are involved in policy implementation and program administration?

¹www.culturalpolicies.net [02.07.2021].
• **Resources**: how much does the country spend on ECP in total; what share of ECP budgets does government funding comprise; what is the total number of staff and volunteers & interns involved in ECP; what is the expenditure:
  – inside the country (domestic expenditures, domestic staff, volunteers and interns)
  – outside the country in bilateral relations
  – for international organizations and as part of multilateral policies?

### Part II. Major ECP Fields

While the specific program names vary from country to country, five main ECP subfields constitute the bulk of activities. These are:

• Arts and culture
• Language
• Education
• Science and research
• Media and communication

Depending on the circumstances of a particular country, and if relevant, other fields, such as religion, sports or the cultural industries may be added in the profile.

The focus of the ECP-Monitor is on government policy and activities, including public agencies and arms-length institutions. It does not cover private actors, their objectives and activities. Thus, philanthropic foundations, nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations do not fall within the compass of the Monitor, and neither do businesses and private individuals active in the field of cultural policy. However, we acknowledge the role of such private actors in the country reports in cases where they are relevant.

### 2. Presentation and Dissemination

The ECP-Monitor has a dedicated website hosted by the ifa (Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen/Institute for International Cultural Relations). The website allows for easy navigation to the main content components, all downloadable and open access: concise summaries of ECP for each country covered, country reports, statistical data, references and sources as well as other informational items. Specifically:

*ECP At a Glance* is for easy access and quick usage, and is supported by a Data Fact Sheet, which offers more detailed information.

The full report presents and assesses the breadth of findings and expands on select issues. The report covers:

• An overview of the country’s ECP and its geopolitical context
• An examination of specific ECP subfields:
  – Arts and culture
  – Language
  – Education
  – Science and research
  – Media and communication
• Issues and developments
• Appendix
  – References

The reports may benefit policy analysts, professional specialists, researchers and students. *ECP At a Glance* and the reports will be made available in German, English and French, and other languages depending on user interest and funding.

3. **Country Coverage**

The value of the ECP-Monitor for users increases with the number of countries covered and the quality of the comparative data and information presented. As an initial goal, we cover a select set of twenty-five countries that vary by size, regime type, policy model and, most importantly, the importance they attach to external cultural policy: Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Estonia, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Spain, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States.

In the future, all EU member, OECD and G20 countries will be included. In a further tranche, the ECP-Monitor plans to expand its reach by including additional countries.

4. **Definitions and Data**

The availability of data in the field of external cultural policy is critical. It is a largely underdeveloped field with fewer agreed-upon definitions and reporting standards. There are major gaps in coverage across fields and countries, and serious issues of comparability remain. Time-series data are all too rare. As a result, analysts and practitioners alike face an incomplete evidence base, which limits the understanding we have of the ECP of relevant countries. It also constrains the assessment of which policy options would be more effective than others.

Over time, the ECP-Monitor seeks to fill these glaring data gaps. This requires a better understanding and documentation of definitions, a systematic search and assessment of data sources, and ways of analyzing and presenting data.

In terms of definitions, we have assembled a Glossary of terms and how they are defined, measured and treated in the ECP-Monitor. The Glossary can be found [here](#).

The ECP Monitor uses a wide range of data sources. For basic statistics (GDP, population, government expenditure etc.) we use Eurostat sources for the EU, OECD sources for member states outside the EU, and World Bank sources for all other countries. Nationally, we use statistics provided by the relevant statistical offices, ministries or agencies. Official data are complemented by extensive desk research of relevant government websites and documents, secondary sources like academic publications and media reports as well as consultations with relevant diplomatic representations and local experts.
The data presented in the first set of countries were collected between June 2020 and March 2021, and report 2019 data or the nearest year for which data are available. We also collected data from 2015 to establish an initial time series whenever possible.

To ensure data quality in terms of validity and reliability, we consulted multiple sources and cross-checked information if possible. In some instances, where no precise data were available, we used estimates based on face validity and plausibility assumptions.

5. Criteria

Given the variation of external cultural policies and the underdeveloped and patchy state of available data, we established a set of standardized criteria that are covered in more detail in the Glossary.

Among the main criteria, we examine:

- **ECP activities** cover the fields of culture & the arts; language promotion; primary & secondary education abroad; tertiary education including student mobility, transnational education, and scholarship schemes; science & research; international media; other relevant communication strategies abroad.
- **The estimated number of countries with ECP activities** is based on the number of countries with diplomatic representations and cultural promotion programs.
- **The number of ECP institutions abroad** refers to on-the-ground venues, liaison offices and branches.
- **ECP staff** is all staff (FTE equivalent or head count) working in ECP institutions abroad in the fields of culture and language promotion, education, science & research, media. Also included is the staff who coordinate external cultural action from within the country.
- **Government financial support** equals the total budget allocations to a directorate or program involved in external cultural policy. If no equivalent programs exist, an estimate is based on government spending in all ECP fields.
- **Financial scale of ECP activities** is an aggregate of expenditure on ECP activities in a fiscal year. The following ECP actors are considered: governments, public agencies and arms-length institutions, and contributions to international cultural organizations and multi-lateral programs.

Excluded are:

- **ECP activities** such as sports, youth and volunteering programs and exchanges, tourism, religion, think-tanks, and international cooperation and development assistance unless they have specific and explicit ECP objectives
- **Temporary and joint ECP institutions abroad** such as temporary representations, joint institutions (e.g., Franco-German cultural institutes), and tourism offices\(^3\)
- **ECP staff** working in cultural affairs unless explicitly involved in external cultural activities as well as part-time local staff and freelancers\(^4\)
- **Financial scale of ECP activities** excludes the budgets of research institutes, universities, schools etc. unless they are explicitly allocated to ECP activities or can be estimated otherwise.

---

\(^3\) With the exception of France where the state tourism agency is a part of the cultural diplomacy program.

\(^4\) When the number of such staff is considerable, e.g., in case of France, it is reported separately.
6. Proposed ECP Ranking System

In order to delineate between levels of external cultural policy (ECP) activity, we propose a country-based ranking system as an ordinal scale with the following four categories (see below).

We choose the metric of “countries with ECP activities” as it is the most widely available and comparable statistic contained within the ECP comparative dataset. Not all countries have a comparable institutional structure (some are contained within embassies while others have standalone institutes, and some may lack core ECP functions such as schools abroad or international broadcasters). What is more, budget and personnel figures are frequently incomplete, and they may not be comparable. However, we can assume that there is a positive correlation between the number of countries in which a country X has ECP activities and the overall scale of resources made available. Therefore, a simple geographical count may well be the most valid measure for comparative purposes.

Based on this assumption, we have an internal measure of ECP-scale as geographical range, i.e., the number countries with ECP activities, and the option of creation an ordinal measure of groups of actors, with four distinct levels: minor, medium, major, and global. The added category of “regional focus” is a concentration category. It indicates if ECP activities abroad have specific geographic foci or more dispersed globally.

Of course, the cut-off points involve some judgement, and have been suggested against the frequency distribution of countries (see figure 1). Specifically:

1. **Global ECP actor**: 100+ countries with activities
2. **Major ECP actor**: 50-100 countries with activities
   2.1. Major ECP Type I actor: 50-100 countries with activities dispersed globally
   2.2. Major ECP Type II actor: 50-100 countries with majority of activities concentrated in one region
3. **Medium ECP Type I actor**: 20-50 countries with activities
   3.1. Medium ECP Type I actor: 20-50 countries dispersed globally
   3.2. Medium ECP Type II actor: 20-50 countries with majority of activities concentrated in one region
4. **Minor ECP actor**: up to 20 countries with activities

This breakdown divides countries into roughly equal categories based on the first 25 countries studied (see table 1). The measure is only a starting point. Further inquiry into the reports and factsheets is essential to understand the ECP context and range of any specific country. However, the ranking system does provide a useful “first glance” tool for researchers and students to begin their use of the ifa ECP tool.
### Figure 1: ECP Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of countries with ECP activities</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Minor ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Minor ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Medium ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Medium ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Medium ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Medium ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Medium ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Medium ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Medium ECP actor, regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Major ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Major ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Major ECP actor, regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Major ECP actor, regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Global ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Global ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Global ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Global ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Global ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Global ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Global ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Global ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Global ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Global ECP actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Global ECP actor*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*global programming, contained domestically

#### 7. Currency conversion

Currency conversion to Euros uses the annual average exchange rates of the European Central Bank.
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