

ifa ECP Monitor

Ranking System

ifa ECP Monitor Approach and Methodology



Hertie School



Institut für
Auslandsbeziehungen

In order to delineate between levels of external cultural policy (ECP) activity, we propose a country-based ranking system as an ordinal scale with 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 ECP activities 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 given country has ECP activities and the overall scale of resources made available. Therefore, considering the overall data situation, a simple geographical count may well be the most valid measure for comparative purposes.

Based on this assumption, we propose a measure of ECP-scale as geographical range with four distinct levels: minor, medium, major, and global. For medium and major actors, we add the subcategory “regional focus” to indicate if ECP activities abroad have specific geographic foci or are internationally more dispersed.

Of course, the cut-off points involve some judgement, and have been suggested against the frequency distribution of countries covered by the ECP monitor. Specifically:

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

The measure is only a starting point, and in some cases, we made qualitative judgments to reclassify a particular country, for example Israel and South Korea. 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

	Number of countries with ECP activities	Ranking
Serbia	..	Minor ECP actor
South Africa	5	Minor ECP actor
Cuba	7	Minor ECP actor
Tunisia	11	Minor ECP actor
Israel	15	Medium ECP actor, international
Nigeria	15	Minor ECP actor
Egypt	20	Minor ECP actor
Kenya	20	Minor ECP actor
Thailand	20	Medium ECP actor, regional
Indonesia	21	Medium ECP actor, regional
Argentina	23	Medium ECP actor, regional
Netherlands	23	Medium ECP actor, international
Belgium	24	Medium ECP actor, international
Canada	29	Medium ECP actor, international
Saudi Arabia	34	Medium ECP actor, international
Poland	42	Medium ECP actor, international
Turkey	48	Medium ECP actor, regional
Japan	50	Major ECP actor, international
Taiwan	58	Major ECP actor, regional
Singapore	60	Major ECP actor, regional
India	65	Major ECP actor, international
Colombia	70	Medium ECP actor, regional
Norway	79	Major ECP actor, international
Estonia	96	Major ECP actor, regional
Austria	98	Major ECP actor, regional
Brazil	98	Major ECP actor, regional
Spain	110	Global ECP actor
Switzerland	120	Global ECP actor
Italy	123	Global ECP actor
Sweden	128	Global ECP actor
France	140	Global ECP actor
Russia	144	Global ECP actor
Germany	150	Global ECP actor
United States	160	Global ECP actor
United Kingdom	169	Global ECP actor
China	171	Global ECP actor

* international programming, contained domestically

.. unknown

Imprint

The External Cultural Policy Monitor

Developed by Helmut K. Anheier, Hertie School & UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs, and ifa Competence Centre. Supervised by Helmut K Anheier. Coordinated by Sarah Widmaier for ifa.

Preferred citation

Anheier, Helmut K. (11/2022). "Ranking System," in: Helmut K. Anheier and ifa (eds.). The External Cultural Policy Monitor. Stuttgart: ifa.

The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the ifa.

Publisher:

ifa (Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen)

Charlottenplatz 17

70173 Stuttgart

Postfach 10 24 63

D-70020 Stuttgart

www.ifa.de

© ifa 2022

Author: Helmut K Anheier

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0)



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17901/ecp.2022.075>