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 programme, 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.
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Introduction

In a recent survey of the international cultural policy research infrastructure, Schuster (2002b, p. 35), records a rise in international networks. These networks, he suggests, are developed as a way to share information and engage in comparative documentation and research. The International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA) is one such network, established in part with the aim 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 or commissioning their own research, and indirectly by highlighting the perceived information needs of their constituents and stimulating dialogue between network participants. This article 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 programme.2

This article 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. The article also adopts a broad notion of “research” as “the systematic study of materials and sources in order to establish facts and reach new conclusions” (www.askoxford.com), or “close, careful study” (www.answers.com). Breadth is necessary to ensure relevance to all the activities that might be considered research in cultural policy, especially by arts councils and
cultural support agencies, IFACCA’s main constituency. Indeed, for this very reason, the bulk of the research referred to here could be described as “applied” research – or research aimed at practical ends such as policy development – rather than “pure” research, which may be aimed at developing knowledge simply “for the sake of it”.

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

Arts and cultural policy analysis has a strong tradition of international, cross-country or intercountry comparisons. Australia Council (forthcoming) identifies a number of factors that are thought to promote such “internationalism”, including:

- A suspicion of “nationalism” in domestic cultural policies (Schuster & Amad 2002).
- An increasing global integration of cultural practices (Schuster & Amad 2002; Foote 2002).
- An increased global integration of nation-states and a rise of cross-national governance (Schuster 2002b, p. 35; corroborated by Jowell 1998).
- A dearth of quality domestic research (Weisand 2002).

These factors might also be behind an apparent internationalism in research into cultural policy issues, as indicated by the survey of comparative research in Kelland and Selwood (2002), and, perhaps more dramatically, by the recent spate of international “meta-analyses” (reviews, assessments, mappings and discussions) of cultural policy research (Fronville & Isar 2003; Kleberg 2003; Schuster 2002b; Wiesand 2002; Stewart & Galley 2003; Williams 2001). Mark Schuster’s international survey (Schuster 2002b) in particular marks a key milestone in cultural policy research, representing, in the opinion of Tepper (2004, p. 84), a “superb effort at mapping the [cultural policy research] landscape”.

These meta-analyses 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.

1. **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, p. 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;
- a mismatch between compartmentally focused academic research and the multidisciplinary needs of cultural policy making;
- the lack of a common language or “common intelligence”; and
- a difference between “political-administrative logic” and “research logic” (see also Nielsen 1999).
Schuster (2002a, p. 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.

2. 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 & Galley 2003, p. 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” (adapted from Mason 2004; Weintraub 2004; Greynet 2004).

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, assortment of formats and 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 (e.g., “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 led to calls for greater international coordination in cultural research and cultural statistics (e.g., Fronville & Isar 2003; Stewart & Galley 2003). Networks are seen by some as a way to achieve this.

International Networks

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

Networks for cultural policy have been on the rise for some time. Cvjetičanin (2003, p. 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, p. 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, p. 25; Wiesand 2002, p. 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, p. 35). Networks created for these reasons will have two main types of
impact on the cultural policy research agenda. The first is direct impact, where networks are
directly involved through commissioning research, collaborating in research projects or
producing research “in-house”. The second is indirect impact, where networks influence the
research agenda in other ways – for example, by “displaying” topics of interest to network
members; managing, editing and “curating” (e.g., on websites) information flows; and
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 (e.g., 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 into a network’s “character”. Analysing networks is a
complex business, as evident in the evaluations in Fondazione Fitzcorraldo (2001), Peterson
(2003) and various papers at www.mande.co.uk/networks.htm.

Networks are 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, p. 2) find that networks are
considered 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 policy ideas. Networks are also thought to have certain characteristics that
respond to the needs of the public policy – especially within the contemporary policy envi-
ronment, with its widespread “attempts to define the role of the state in neo-liberal theory,
and ... emphasis on good governance and sector-wide programmes” (De Vibe et al. 2002,
p. 2). Peterson (2003, p. 1) suggests that “growing interest in network forms of governance
reflects how modern society, culture and economy are all increasingly products of relations
involving mutuality and interdependence, as opposed to hierarchy and independence”. Will-
iams (2001, p. 43), who suggests that in cultural policy “we are shifting from [operating in] hierarchies to networks”, elaborates by contrasting some of the key characteristics of tradi-
tional, “hierarchical” forms of organisation and networks (see Table 1). Diamond (2003, p. 5)
claims similar benefits for research networks in the arts themselves.

Networks are also seen as a way of coping with the overwhelming scope and scale
requirements of research on globally-relevant policy issues: “The 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 a network’s actions;
- a low level of ability to commit resources;
- concern that networks can be captured by the “agenda” of a major member or 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; and
- a tendency for many networks to become second rate as “star” members consolidate their memberships as networks proliferate.

Table 2 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. 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). The Federation’s secretariat, based in Sydney, Australia, is a non-profit company that employs just three staff.

Out of ten stated organisational objectives, the following 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._
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network function</th>
<th>Outcome/aim</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage dialogue between network participants</td>
<td>Network members can agree research priorities.</td>
<td>Better coordination of research agenda for the “public good” (an active role).</td>
<td>Members’ power hierarchy reflected in setting the research agenda (e.g., developed nations set the agenda).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network members can agree approaches (e.g., frameworks, definitions, methodologies and presentation of results).</td>
<td>Improved impact of research by allowing international comparisons.</td>
<td>Global standardisation decreases local relevance. Results may be applied inappropriately for local conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of resources</td>
<td>Network members can reduce doubling up or “reinventing the wheel”.</td>
<td>Reduced cost of research, and consequent liberation of resources for more research or alternative uses.</td>
<td>Replication of errors, opinions and misconceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network members can pool resources to gain ● economies of scale in undertaking their own research, and ● economies of scope by pooling thinly-spread research.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Research undertaken by policy agencies is seen as less objective. Creates unfair competition or “crowds out” private sector, independent or academic research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach – engaging a wide range of people</td>
<td>Improved discovery: help uncover work that is difficult to find. Greater variety of input/ideas. Existence of network improves commitment to sharing and engagement.</td>
<td>Innovative solutions via combining of alternatives. Cost reduction due to improved discovery.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub – centralising information flows</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Better coordination of research agenda for the “public good” (a passive role).</td>
<td>Emergence is not always right: crowds can be wrong (fads, fashions, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge between policy makers and researchers</td>
<td>Focal point or clearinghouse: improved dialogue between policy makers and researchers to bring policy issues and research topics closer.</td>
<td>Improve policy relevance of research.</td>
<td>Loss of objectivity. Undue influence of policy makers and politicisation of research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 programmes to work toward these goals. The rest of this article will focus on one of these programmes – D’Art – as a case study to explore the IFACCA network’s direct impact on cultural policy research.4

D’Art: Direct Impact

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

D’Art relies substantially on the participation of network members. Comments and assistance are sought at any stage of the process of report writing, including post-production (via online forums for each topic). In its design, the programme is a mild form of “open source” research, a methodology that appears to be expanding from its traditional realm in software development to other research arenas.5

D’Art has been designed with a number of the benefits from Table 2 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 programme 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, and nine research reports have been released.

According to IFACCA’s own promotional materials, the D’Art programme has been a success. Some commentators have even independently made positive comments on the programme. Stewart and Galley (2003, p. 8), for example, name the D’Art programme as one of 14 “encouraging developments” in United States cultural policy research ecology. How can the direct impact of the D’Art programme 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: twenty cursory responses or five in-depth ones? 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 Table 2, 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,
- the ability to uncover information,
- the objectivity of the research,
- the encouragement of engagement,
- the programme’s reach,
- the 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 programme’s effectiveness; it is an investigation of its direct impact on arts and cultural policy research with respect to the issues identified in this article.

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, p. 20). The majority (88%) 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”.

It could also be argued that D’Art reports are meeting a research need for policymakers that might not otherwise be fulfilled. There is a number of D’Art topics for which it is difficult to conceive an independent arts policy researcher undertaking (e.g., 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 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 could 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 (e.g., materials supplied by Arts Council England for the D’Art report on dance policies and programmes).

“Black” literature has also been uncovered via the D’Art programme. In the interim report on encouraging arts philanthropy, for example, a 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. Information on dance programmes in the United States was also released prior to publication, and included personalised additional comments from the respondent. A number of reports similarly incorporate unpublished comments made in e-mail responses (a clear example is Estonian information included in the D’Art report on conflict of interest policies).

**Objectivity**

Objectivity is difficult to evaluate, especially by someone intimately involved in the D’Art programme. That being 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. However, 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 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% response rate). As noted earlier, there is no measure of how many responses should be expected for any topic. A low level of response might reflect a lack of information as much as a lack of interest. Yet some topics have received few responses despite the certainty that extensive information exists worldwide (e.g., disability policies in the arts received just four responses initially).

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 programme 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, crude extrapolation might 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 report. To date only two reports have contained analyses drafted by the requestor (copyright management systems, and dance policies and programmes). 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 publish 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.

Requestor “vagrancy” might at first appear to be a weakness of the D’Art process, but there are benefits to locating the report writing within the network’s Secretariat. The Secretariat’s special interest in cross-country information exchange ensures that D’Art reports are
written with cross-country knowledge transfer in mind. This may not be a factored into the drafting of a report within a particular country. Elevating the drafting of a report from any particular agency or country also reduces the influence of local politics. These benefits need to be weighed with the risk that globally focused reports may compromise local relevance, or that such reports may lack immediacy by being drafted more remotely from the policy or programme workforce.

Reach

Despite D’Art queries being sent to network members in 140 countries, responses are still skewed toward English speakers and English language. Just one D’Art question has been translated (the dance policies and programmes 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 programme might be seen to reflect the issues and needs of a sub-sector of the network.

Bridging the Policy–Research Gap

It is hard to determine the impact the D’Art programme 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 programme 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 of respondents (around three) 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% of the Federation’s network).

Direct Measures of Impact

Creation of new knowledge resources. Most D’Art reports represent some degree of “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 report on dance policies and programmes, for which information was drafted specially 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.8 The report on ways to define artists for tax and benefit systems has the most citations, being cited in: DCITA (2002), a major independent review of the visual arts sector in Australia; McAndrew (2002), a research report for Arts Council England; Staines (2004); Shaw (2004); dole4arts.com; and world-education-resources.com.

Stimulating new research. The D’Art report on conflict of interest policies prompted the following response from Lluis Bonet of ENCATC (ww.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”.9
Summary and Conclusion

This article has built on the observation that cultural policy making 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.

This article evaluated some of the direct impacts of IFACCA’s D’Art programme on arts and cultural policy research. Overall, the programme 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, this article 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 programme 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 article 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, this article could be dismissed summarily as biased. However, the subject under discussion is, after all, cultural policy research, not cultural research; so much of the intellectual inquiry, commentary and debate on the subject occurs at the confluence between the murky waters of policy making and the pristine waters of academia.

It is hoped that this article has raised awareness of the impacts that networks may have on the cultural policy research agenda, and of how good impacts might be maximised. Although not directly addressed, it is also hoped that it will stimulate ideas about improving the link between cultural policy making and cultural policy research. There is no rule that determines the level of influence policymakers should enjoy over research in their policy area, but if our topic is to be cultural policy research, then some balance needs to be struck between policy influence and research independence. In their calls for more policy-relevant research, policymakers appear to be of the opinion that the balance is currently not in their favour. If they are right, how the imbalance can be redressed without losing the perceived objectivity of research and the innovation that comes from independent inquiry, is, I believe, an immediate issue in cultural policy research.
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NOTES
1. This article is based on a paper presented at the Third International Conference on Cultural Policy Research, 25–28 August 2004, Montréal, Canada.
2. Although the author is employed by IFACCA, the views expressed here cannot be taken to represent those of the IFACCA secretariat, the board of IFACCA or the members of IFACCA.
3. Many of the issues are mirrored for arts policy research in the United States in Morris and Pankratz (2003).
4. 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 and music), 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.
5. The term ‘open source’ has been used primarily to describe an online collaborative method for computer software development (used, e.g., 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; Schweik & Grove 2000).
6. The survey was sent via e-mail to 599 people. A total of 90 responses were received (a 15% response rate). Respondents came from 36 countries across all continents except the Middle East, and were evenly spread between members and non-members of IFACCA.
7. Unpublished data from World Summit evaluation. In all, 45 delegates from 23 countries completed the questionnaire (a 36% response rate). Respondents were from Asia, Europe, Africa, the Pacific, South America and North America.
8. Most citations are recorded in the ‘forum’ for each topic on the IFACCA website (login required).
9. From an e-mail sent to IFACCA Secretariat, 20 June 2003.
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D’Art schedule as at November 2003

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

All reports are downloadable at www.ifacca.org

APPENDIX 1 Source: IFACCA (2003a)