

# THE IDEA OF CULTURE OBSERVATORIES – OVERVIEW

*Katarzyna Plebańczyk*

INSTITUTE OF CULTURE

Jagiellonian University, Poland

katarzyna.plebanczyk@uj.edu.pl

---

This article is an attempt to organize knowledge on cultural observatories. In the studies dedicated to the theme of management of culture this subject is relatively new and less analyzed. The text is based on the classification adopted by J. M. Schuster in 1999, the results of the work of the *ENCATC Working Group: Cultural Observatories and Cultural Information and Knowledge* and the author's own research. The article presents and compares various models (especially based on networks and institutional forms), scope and objectives of the observatories. However, it also raises questions about the essence of the observatories and the governance of accumulated knowledge.

KEYWORDS: culture observatories, management, culture research.

Today, countries are attempting to form their research potential in association with the functioning of culture anew. International organizations which bring together governments, such as UNESCO, the Council of Europe or the European Union, are expanding their research activities and creating a demand for comparative research and the exchange of information, and thus laying the foundations for future international cooperation. In the 1990s, building such cooperation resulted in a greater focus on creating consistent research methodologies and in pressurizing governments to base their cultural policy on reliable premises arising from scientific research. It is thanks to this research that we now know more about the cultural market. Cultural organizations and institutions in-

creasingly conduct a dialogue with their audience and make an effort to meet their needs. On a macro scale, the research aims to build knowledge, create development strategies and paint the vision of cultural policy. On a micro scale, the research directly serves the institutions and is helpful for cultural actions.

ASSUMPTIONS:

The article was based on several assumptions:

- a noticeable increase in the amount of an applied research – to support management in culture
- dispersed research information

- an increase in the number of research institutions, particularly those that function as cultural observatories.

The assumptions indicate very extensive starting materials. Over the world today a lot of organizations are engaged in this research. But often these are actions that are taken as additional, often disposable and incidental.

#### SCOPE

For the purposes of the article the observatories have been limited to networks and institutionalized forms, excluding statistical offices (due to the fact that their activities are of a slightly different nature). The adopted classification is based on the analysis of the American researcher J. M. Schuster. In 1999, Schuster conducted an analysis of existing information systems and models of culture, which became the starting point and reference for further research. This classification is quite broad and in addition to institutional forms includes activities such as networks.

The second starting point was the study conducted by C. Ortega and adopted by the *ENCATC Working Group: Cultural Observatories and Cultural Information and Knowledge*. The results have not been published thus far. Therefore the text is based only on the initial assumptions. It seems that C. Ortega's study, which includes 38 observatories (institutional), needs to be expanded – especially to Eastern Europe.

In Poland you can also see a growing interest in cultural observatory and the first attempts to create so-called regional cultural observatories. Their functioning, activities and financing are material for a separate article (requiring an additional highlight of the specific context). Therefore they have not been included in this study.

#### OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of the article are the following:

- to try to organize knowledge about cultural observatories, their objectives, scope of activities
- to look at observatories, especially in the context of their research activities.

Different countries have different approaches to researching cultural policy and cultural phenomena; the aforementioned UNESCO, Council of Europe and the EU have their organizations to this end. In the debate on cultural research, there are often complaints that various organizations are just gathering information for the sake of statistics but they do not analyze it. According to Frédérique Patureau of the Département des Études et de la Prospective (of the French Ministry of Culture and Communication), research in the field of cultural policy should include an actual study, statistics and documentation<sup>1</sup>. One could add to this a demand for conducting research in a continuous and comprehensive way, involving the constant monitoring of cultural activities, as well as a demand for both basic research, which would organize phenomena, and functional research (applied research), with a direct impact on the management of culture.

Modern culture is very diverse, not only in terms of its forms, but also in terms of its financing, policies, and economics. It creates significant research problems because our understanding of culture is very broad and is not only limited to the public and institutionalized sphere. And, although in *culture matters*<sup>2</sup>, an attempt to define culture has been made, this

1 Schuster J. Mark, *Informing Cultural Policy. Research and Information Infrastructure*, Kraków, 2007, p. 16.

2 Samuel Huntington P., Lawrence E. Harrison (eds.), *Culture matters. How Values Shape Human Progress*, Poznań, 2000, p. 6.

proves to be an unrewarding occupation because there is nothing vaguer than the word *culture*<sup>3</sup>.

The KEA study, taking into account the new “areas” of culture, introduced a division into:

1. The cultural sector – traditional areas of art and cultural industries, whose results are purely artistic, such as visual arts, performing arts, heritage, film and video, television, video games, music, books and the press.
2. The creative sector – encompassing ideas and actions which use culture as an added value in the production of non-cultural products; these are: architecture, design, advertisement and related industries (computers, mobile phones, MP3 players, etc.)<sup>4</sup>.

Following this way of thinking, culture is characterized by:

- creativity
- references to the use of symbols
- property understood in many ways<sup>5</sup>.

UNESCO (2009) identifies nine categories of cultural activity, which together equal culture in economic life. These are: heritage, printed materials and the press, music, performing arts, audiovisual media, social-cultural activity, sport, games and the natural environment<sup>6</sup>.

Due to technological advancement (particularly digital), anyone today can have access to culture in a form which suits their individual taste. Contrary to

the popular concerns, it does not drive people away from the “real” cultural institutions – quite the opposite, in recent years museums and theaters have been attracting an increasingly numerous audience. The recipient can and wants to be a “creator” at the same time – tangible products of culture, such as works of art or music, are commonly recycled. This does not necessarily aim to create a new work of art (though artists have very often “recycled” the works of others), but frequently to check one’s abilities, or to share the effect or the method used with others. Due to its universal availability, the Internet is now the most popular source of information and knowledge. In keeping with the popular belief stating that if something is not on the Internet, it does not exist, we are constantly being inundated with more and more information. The Internet has replaced printed publications on many topics for one very mundane reason – the very short time in which information can be disseminated. The problem is not so much a collection of data and information, but the responsible management, selection and classification thereof according to their usefulness for particular purposes.

## II. CULTURE OBSERVATORIES

### II.1. REVIEW

In response to these recently indicated problems, many countries have introduced the so-called *cultural observatories* or *culture laboratories*. These organizations, whose target is to *observe culture*, are primarily engaged in the collection and processing of data, but they also conduct targeted research, stimulate the exchange of knowledge and experiences, and sometimes publicize different information or at least their fragments categorized according to the needs of different user groups. The term *observatory* is the one most commonly used, although it is itself quite vague. The first organizations of this type (formed as early as the 1970s) mainly gathered and processed data and, since

3 Johann Gottfried von Herder, *Philosophy of history*, PWN, Warszawa, 1962.

4 *The Economy of Culture in Europe, Study prepared for the European Commission*, 2006. [www.keanet.eu/ecoculture/studynew.pdf](http://www.keanet.eu/ecoculture/studynew.pdf).

5 Victor A. Ginsburgh, David Throsby (eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*, Vol. 1. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2006.

6 UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics. UNESCO 2009, <http://www.unesco.pl/>.

the 1990s, they have been conducting commissioned research. However, their status is somewhat different today owing to such phenomena as advances in technology (particularly digital) and attempts to stimulate the development of culture. The activity areas of modern observatories are much broader: they organize meetings, conferences and workshops, they are a source of contact in culture, and they inform about events. They make the collected information available for the purposes of culture management and cultural policy-making as well as facilitating cultural cooperation at all levels. The observatories seek to be an active player on the cultural market – hence the increasingly emerging term *culture laboratory*. This name, however, is less common and is used to make an institution stand out from the crowd rather than show a unique type of activity.

Currently, there are many institutions known as *culture observatories* or *laboratories*. Their objectives, scope and forms of activity differ, ranging from regional to international level and entailing the observation of phenomena or active involvement in conscious cultural policy-making. This topic has been researched by J. Mark Schuster, who was commissioned by *The Pew Charitable Trust* in 1999 to conduct an analysis of current systems and models of cultural information. The aim was to identify whether any of them could be adapted (in part or as a whole) on the U.S. market. Some of his research questions included the following: “What is the structure of the information infrastructure in the field of cultural policy? How are various research activities, such as data collection and analysis, (...), developing information, preparing documentation, cataloging and archiving, or dissemination and communication, conducted?”<sup>7</sup>

Research concerning the information in cultural policy is carried out by various organizations and institutions, publicly or privately funded. Starting his

analysis of research infrastructure, Schuster identified several models which he divided into those based on institutions and those working outside institutions. He noted, however, that it is impossible to speak of any kind of system or logical organization, because most of the examples combine the elements of several models.

The institution-based models include:

- The research department of a government agency which finances culture – these are separate units at the highest administrative level of a given country, operating within the structures of various ministries. They manage the national research and information potential, conduct and commission research, and provide documentation services.
- National Statistics Office – in most countries, statistical offices collect and process data on the cultural sector.
- Independent nonprofit research institute – Schuster emphasizes that this particular model makes it possible to liberate the area of research and information from political pressure, giving the example of the Dutch Boekman foundation.
- Government-funded university research center – the strongest of such centers is the French National Centre for Scientific Research (*Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*). This model is not only free from political influence, but it allows for activities of a more scientific nature, and cooperation with university teaching and training programs.
- Private consultancy company – originally it is to have a commercial character, and the research on cultural policy conducted by many of these companies is rather ad hoc and short-term. One larger-scale exception

<sup>7</sup> Schuster J. Mark, *Informing Cultural Policy. Research and Information Infrastructure*, p. 4.

quoted by Schuster is *the International Intelligence on Culture* in London – the company which has inherited the privatized research and information legacy of *the Arts Council of Great Britain*.

- Culture observatory – is a form merging different models. The institutions which call themselves ‘culture observatories’ deal with various elements of research on information in culture. Since they usually do not operate within governmental structures, there are often several of them in one country (e.g. in France). The increasing number of such institutions drew the attention of UNESCO, which had the idea to combine them into an international network.

Nevertheless, the examples cited by Schuster are to be considered as starting points. A characteristic distribution of research tasks can be observed in the Netherlands, for example. The Dutch Central Statistical Bureau is the main source of information for state institutions – the data is analyzed in reports which are later published. The Ministry of Education, Culture and Science commissions such reports to the Boekman foundation, which garners and disseminates knowledge and information about culture and arts both in terms of policy and practice. It also stimulates research and development, and creates opinions on policy-making and policy distribution concerning the arts and culture [www.boekman.org].

The Foundation is also a library and a documentation archive, and helps to organize conferences aimed at the dissemination of research results. However, it is not an entirely independent organization itself.

Nor is the French *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*, which operates in the local system of financing the education sector. This extensive network of academic and research centers works thanks to financial aid and research commissioned by the *Dépar-*

*tement des Études et de la Prospective* (of the French Ministry of Culture and Communication).

More than 50% of the thirty-eight existing observatories (the figures do not include networks of cooperation, but only structured organizations with research functions) was established before 1970<sup>8</sup>. In 1989, the *Observatoire des Politiques culturelles* (Grenoble, France) and the already mentioned *Culturelink* based in Paris (France) were instituted.

The years between 1992 and 1994 brought *the European Audiovisual Observatory* based in Strasbourg, *the ERICarts* based in Bonn (Germany) and *the EUCLID* (Manchester and Liverpool, United Kingdom).

After 1995, cultural observatories began to mushroom in various parts of the world (of which as much as 14% appeared after 2000). The most famous ones include (the most active ones?):

- *Interarts*, Barcelona, Spain
- *Center for Cultural Policy Research*, Gothenburg, Sweden
- *Observatory of Cultural Activities*, Lisbon, Portugal
- *ICAn*, Nottingham, United Kingdom
- *Observatorio de Cultura Urbana*, Bogota, Columbia
- *Observatorio del Caribe Colombiano*, Cartagena de Indias, Columbia
- *Asia-Europe Foundation*, Singapore
- *Observatorio Cultural*, Buenos Aires, Argentina- *Creative Exchange*, London, United Kingdom.
- *Culturale Observatorio del Piemonte*, Turin, Italy

8 Results of the research conducted for the PhD dissertation of Cristina Ortega Nuere from the University of Deusto (Bilbao, Spain) were presented at the conference of the *Cultural Observatories and Cultural Information and Knowledge* working group attached to ENCATC, which was held in December 2008 in Bilbao. The materials were made available courtesy of the research's author.

- *The Budapest Observatory*, Budapest, Hungary
- *Iniciativa Latinoamericana*, Montevideo, Uruguay
- *Observatorio de Políticas Culturales Municipales*, Montevideo, Uruguay
- *Observatory of Cultural Policies in Africa*, Maputo, Mozambique
- *Observatorio OIC, Buenos Aires, Argentina-Consejo Nacional de la Cultura y Las Artes CNCA*, Chile.

The biggest number of observatories – twenty – operate in Europe; there are 10 in South America, a few in North America and Africa, and one in Asia. They have a very different range of activities – from local to transcontinental. Most of them (38%) declare themselves to operate internationally, 23% declare their scope to be national, and 21% claim to act at the transcontinental level<sup>9</sup>.

The observatories' activities focus on miscellaneous areas – from cultural policy, through collaboration, management, to the labor market in culture, and all that in the contexts of technological advancement, economics, as well as social and civilization development. Some strive to stimulate development by influencing the decision-making processes; others seek to do the same through the producing of scientific papers, studies, plans and programs. Moreover, the existing observatories provide a different territorial range, which is expressed in their names, declarations and actual practical initiatives, e.g. *The Budapest Observatory - Regional Observatory on Financing Culture in East-Central Europe* (BO) is managed by *the Foundation for the East-Central European Cultural Observatory* and its scope of activities covers 18 countries sharing common history and post-communist legacy (including Poland). The BO's mission is "to help those

who want to learn more about the conditions (financing, law, management, policy) of cultural life (activities, products and organizations) in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe"<sup>10</sup>. Its work concentrates on the exchange of experiences and information by such activities as creating the directories of the so-called "good practices", effective and misguided sectorial policies, and ways of financing culture. Its other purpose is to support research and making contacts in the area of financing culture, cultural policy, law and statistics.

The organization which is the most significant for European cultural policy is ERICarts – *European Research Institute for Comparative Cultural Policy and the Arts*. It was created by *the European Association of Cultural Researchers and Centers* and the Centers of Excellence operating in the realm of culture in many European countries. It is an independent, supranational organization conducting comparative studies and monitoring all aspects of culture (e.g. cultural policy, cultural labor market, cultural industry and media, management of art and collections, art education). It seeks to promote cultural and scientific dialogue in Europe and worldwide by such actions as publications, conferences, and online platforms. Its chief areas of activity include: comparing cultural policies and management systems, researching trends and needs in the field of European cultural and scientific cooperation, exchange programs for arts and media employees, improving the professional qualifications of culture and media staff, and developing cultural industry. As indicated by its full name – this organization is not a network, it was established as a permanent center with its own research staff, with the aim of remaining an independent Europe-wide organization. The most important achievement of ERICarts, underlying its establishment, has been the compendium of cultural policies in European countries, commissioned by the

9 The author's own observation based on the above list.

10 [www.budops.org](http://www.budops.org)

Council of Europe and developed in cooperation with CIRCLE in 2000. The compendium is now available online and updated from time to time<sup>11</sup>.

The term *cultural observatory* has become very popular and has been used to denote a wide range of activities. Many research or information institutions operate within networks (as models not based on institutions). Their formation is typically associated with the cultural policy of UNESCO and the Council of Europe.

Therefore, *the International Network of Observatories in Cultural Policies*, operating under the auspices of UNESCO is also an observatory. It is an international network of cooperation made up of centers collecting information on cultural policy. The purpose of this cooperation is a constant international exchange of information on planning and evaluating cultural policies, promoting scientific research and analyzing cultural policies. Originally, the network should reflect the geo-cultural diversity, improve the coordination of activities and identify the centers responsible for the implementation of particular initiatives in a given region.

The *LabforCulture* Network is an Internet platform created with the support of e.g. the European Cultural Foundation. Its goal is to promote European cooperation in the cultural sector as well as international cultural exchange, to initiate cultural debate, disseminate information on cultural activities, and support European scientific research concerning culture. The platform is designed for all the professionals working in the field of European cultural cooperation and for others interested in it. *LabforCulture*, originally created as a pilot project for the period of 2004-2008, is still up and running in as many as six language versions – English, French, Italian, German, Spanish, and Polish.

Over the years, the Council of Europe, formed in 1949, has been involved in a myriad of pan-European

projects related to cultural policy. It does not create permanent research units, but rather addresses the emerging issues through projects and programs, and subjects them to international evaluation. As a center it monitors activities in culture and focuses strongly on the relationship between culture and society. In 1985, it supported the establishment of CIRCLE - *Cultural Information and Research Centers Liaison in Europe*, a network which originally brought together ten institutions from different countries. This allowed for regular activities, regular meetings to discuss the latest cultural issues, and for being up-to-date with changing trends in cultural policy. Above all, however, the network brought together a group of researchers who, apart from working in CIRCLE, also work in many other institutions. For instance, Péter Inkei, the network's long-standing secretary general is also a director of the *Budapest Observatory*. One of the board members is Kirill Razlogov, a director of the Russian Institute for Cultural Research. According to the information obtained from the long-standing president, Professor Dorota Ilczuk, since 2008 the network's operations have been slowly dying down and its members are increasingly continuing to work in other, more structured forms.

Another example is *Culturelink – the Network of Networks for Research and Cooperation in Cultural Development*, created by UNESCO and the Council of Europe in 1989 and located at *the Institute for International Relations* in Zagreb, Croatia. *Culturelink's* mission is to develop communication and cooperation between the network members. A long-term goal is to create a global information system for research and cooperation in the development of culture. Its activities are focused around the collection, processing and dissemination of information about cultural life as well as cultural development and the policies of individual countries. These tasks are implemented at various levels: through an Internet page, the preparing of own databases by institutions, research projects,

11 [www.culturalpolicies.net](http://www.culturalpolicies.net)

publications, artistic activities, and international cooperation. The main area of activity is promoting joint regional, interregional and international research projects on cultural policy, international communication, cultural identity, and the impact of reforms on the situation of culture.

It is also important to mention the *ENCATC Working Group of Cultural Observatories and Cultural Information and Knowledge*, the aim of which is to monitor cultural phenomena and bring together the representatives of both scientific communities and the existing observatories and networks.

Regardless of the adopted organizational and financial model or the scope of activities, observatories can be discussed together in the context of their business. According to the author's initial deliberations included in this paper, in the 1990s their activities expanded, and one of their most important forms was not so much conducting research as stimulating the development of culture (research became a tool for achieving this goal). Based on the analyses of the observatories' activities, a conclusion can be drawn as to what exactly a cultural observatory is, and what its features should be in order to be considered as one. The summary will attempt to answer several fundamental questions about the observatory's objectives, scope, form of activity, and dissemination of information.

## II. 2. CULTURE OBSERVATORIES – ANALYSIS OBJECTIVES

The analysis of the activities of the aforementioned institutions shows that irrespective of whether we are dealing with a local, national or global organization or network, the primary goal is concerned with the management of knowledge about culture as well as stimulating its development through activities such as collecting (including research), storing and sharing information about culture. Other objectives include facilitating the management of public and private cul-

tural institutions as well as active involvement in conscious policy-making. This should be done by:

- initiating and coordinating the scientific and research activities in the field of culture,
- monitoring the cultural processes,
- responding to the needs of cultural institutions by e.g. creating the conditions for and initiating local, national, and international cooperation, in addition to training for managers.

### SCOPE

The vast majority of research conducted globally involves expanding the statistical base.

Despite the changes observed in recent years, research institutions dealing with culture still focus primarily on the accumulation of numbers, rather than analyses – for which they are in fact constantly criticized. The problem is not so much the lack of data, but the fact that it is not adequately utilized. In most countries, statistical data are obtained regularly and amount to a set with great practical potential. Collection and availability, however, have replaced analysis and research. It has drawn relentless criticism, for example, T. Cheney points out that a large amount of data are widely available, but the institutional capacity to analyze them is limited. Alan Peacock noted:

The biggest museums and galleries as well as major companies supported financially by the Scottish Art Council manage to generate numbers required by law, but these numbers are not subjected to any analysis, at least not the one that brings any public benefit<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> Schuster J. Mark, *Informing Cultural Policy. Research and Information Infrastructure*, p. 19.



On the one hand, active efforts should be focused on the analysis of phenomena, development of a uniform approach to various issues, and development of research methodology (basic research); on the other hand, they should involve applied research too. In particular, these efforts should entail:

1. The monitoring of cultural processes at the national and international level, e.g. the development of cultural networks, international cooperation, following cultural trends, new technologies in culture, and cultural tourism.
2. Culture management, including:
  - a) cultural policy – projects and proposals of national, regional and local policies for a given period, views and attitudes
  - b) legislation
  - c) cultural economics: infrastructure, sources and methods of financing the cultural projects (both professional and amateur), financial management in cultural institutions
  - d) culture market – supply and demand, advertising, marketing, public relations, sponsorship
  - e) cultural programs and projects
  - f) issues concerning jobs in the cultural sector, staff and artist mobility, employment and salaries
  - g) management of cultural institutions (including museums and galleries, archives, national heritage, conservation and maintenance of historical monuments, literature, books, magazines, music, dance, theater, audiovisual arts, libraries).
3. Cultural research methodology.
4. Culture vs. other sciences, such as anthropology, philosophy, sociology, psychology (e.g. social cultural activity, preparing for the reception of art, economic opportunities, the level of awareness of one's cultural needs,

building a sense of cultural identity in a given geopolitical area, globalization, and the cultural behavior of societies and individuals).

5. Professional/amateur and public/private cultural activities in different fields of culture, including literature, fine arts, design, theater, music, film, architecture, radio, television, multimedia, audiovisual arts, cultural heritage, new media – events, projects, creation and circulation of works of art, products of tangible and intangible culture.

#### FORMS OF ACTIVITY

The tasks are implemented through specific actions connected to the three aforementioned objectives:

1. Initiating and coordinating the scientific and research activities in the field of culture:
  - determining research trends and topics
  - initiating and conducting scientific research
  - developing specialized terminology
  - organizing meetings and scientific conferences
  - providing analytical works, expert opinions, views and perspectives
  - managing research projects
  - consultancy and counseling
  - publishing services, including books, bibliographies, journals, conference materials.
2. Monitoring of cultural processes:
  - collecting up-to-date data on the national and global condition of culture, defining standards, creating and implementing a system of indicators
  - identifying new trends in culture
  - processing information, building a cultural database
  - creating an electronic system of cultural information.

3. Responding to the needs of cultural institutions:
  - initiating a dialogue about culture and cultural management, including the organization of meetings, conferences, workshops, and debates, which would bring together cultural professionals
  - coordinating the cooperation between various sectors of culture
  - creating a network of institutions and organizations cooperating together
  - educational activities, e.g. training
  - cultural project management
  - informational activities, e.g. making the collected information available to the interested audience in a prearranged form
  - the seeking of funds.

#### DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

Sharing information should be based on modern ICT solutions, primarily on online platforms. The majority of information is gathered, but rarely distributed. Dissemination today is usually done through publications of research results, which are either unavailable or incomprehensible to the average domestic or foreign reader. It is all the more curious because the vast majority of observatories operate internationally.

A web platform provides a potential reader with a quick and simultaneous access to a variety of information resources. Such resources should be stored in databases and online news bulletins, located on an observatory's server and the servers of cooperating institutions. Access to the resources should be differentiated according to a user type and there should be fees for certain options. Apart from an electronic version, the platform should have its traditional, printed version available in an observatory library.

Another issue is the language – many observatories publish their Internet page and its contents in

their mother tongue only, which is understandable if they operate only nationally or locally, but more difficult to justify when the organization operates on a larger scale, or represents its national government.

There are no places, such as Internet platforms, where the results of conducted studies could be made available. Individual reports are frequently scattered over the World Wide Web and are very difficult to find. Very often, one does not even know that a given study was conducted.

The words of G. Hagoort from Utrecht University which appeared in a book published in 1992 provide the best conclusion. They prove that the world is constantly changing and, as it was 20 years ago, so it is remains difficult to analyze and assess this phenomena:

So far the most important task for the one managing the culture was to create basic conditions for the process of creativity. These days this task is changing and requires a thorough observation of the process itself, the process of managing the culture as well as to develop further the cultural – political vision that would again define the place of the culture in the constantly changing (world) society<sup>13</sup>.

#### III. CONCLUSIONS

The above analysis leads to several conclusions.

1. Each attempt to discuss cultural observatories is fraught with considerable risk. This is due to the fact that:
  - It is extremely difficult to carry out a clear classification which would help determine what an observatory is and what is not. Most models are mixed, both in terms of organizational forms and actions. As indicated earlier, the proposed number of observatories in the recent

<sup>13</sup> Giep Hagoort, *Cultural entrepreneurship. An introduction to arts management*, Kraków, 1997, p.

study by C. Ortega should be extended, for example by *Informkultura* or *Cultural Policy Institute* in Russia, *The Pacific Asia Observatory of Cultural Diversity in Human Development* in Australia, *UNESCO Arts in Education Observatory for Research in Local Culture and Creativity in Education* from Hong Kong, or *Korean Culture and Tourism Institute* (but these are just some examples).

2. In many places in the article the observation was made that today's observatories take on a very broad activity – and not just related to analyzing culture, but also to stimulate its development.
  - There remain therefore the following questions: whether this is a new feature of observatories? Is it the result of necessity – the need to stay on the market, find sources of funding? It is worth noting that an increase in activities is not the only characteristic for observatories created in the last decade. A potential risk may be noted – a blurring of the activities that have so far characterized the activities of most observatories.
3. There are more and more questions. The most important seems to be: What does knowledge management currently entail? How is this knowledge used by observatories and how it is used to implement cultural policy?
  - In the last part of the article, dedicated to the dissemination of information, it was shown that this is the weakest point of the functioning of observatories. To verify this it is necessary to conduct additional, in-depth research.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Ginsburgh A. Victor, David Throsby (eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*, Vol. 1, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2006.
- Hagoort Giep, *Cultural entrepreneurship. An introduction to arts management*, Kraków, 1997.
- Huntington P. Samuel, Harrison E. Lawrence (eds.), *Culture matters. How Values Shape Human Progress*, Poznań, 2000.
- Kisilowska Małgorzata, "Obserwatorium kultury jako ośrodek zarządzania wiedzą", in: *RAPORTY.ANALIZY.OPINIE*, Warszawa: NCK, 2005.
- Plebańczyk Katarzyna, "Informing Cultural Policy – J. M. Schuster book review", in: *Culture management eds. Gawel Luksz, Orzechowski Emil, vol. 9*", Kraków: UJ, 2008.
- Schuster J. Mark, *Informing Cultural Policy. Research and Information Infrastructure*, Kraków, 2007.
- von Herder Johann Gottfried, *Philosophy of history*, PWN, Warszawa, 1962.
- The Economy of Culture in Europe*, Study prepared for the European Commission, KEA, 2006.
- UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics*, UNESCO, 2009.
- [www.circle-network.jaaz.pl](http://www.circle-network.jaaz.pl)  
[www.culturelink.org](http://www.culturelink.org)  
[www.budobs.org](http://www.budobs.org)  
[www.labforculture.org](http://www.labforculture.org)  
[www.culturalpolicies.net](http://www.culturalpolicies.net)  
[www.circle-network.jaaz.pl](http://www.circle-network.jaaz.pl)  
[www.incp-ripc.org/en.html](http://www.incp-ripc.org/en.html)  
[www.boekman.org](http://www.boekman.org)

## KULTŪROS OBSERVATORIJŲ IDĖJA – APŽVALGA

*Katarzyna Plebańczyk*

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: kultūros observatorijos – vadyba – kultūros tyrimai.

#### SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamas kultūros observatorijų funkcionavimas. Straipsnis sudarytas iš trijų dalių. Įžangoje apibūrinami pagrindiniai principai, susiję su kultūros vadybai sustiprinti siekiančiais gausesniais taikomaisiais tyrimais, pasklidusia tyrimų informacija, padidėjusiu tyrimo įstaigų, ypač funkcionuojančių kaip kultūros observatorijos, skaičiumi.

Toliau aptariamos tyrimų apribojimus nustatančios taisyklės. Gausi tyrimo medžiaga buvo šiek tiek apribota remiantis klasifikacijos principais, kuriuos 1999 m. priėmė J. M. Schusteris ENCATC darbo grupės dėl „Kultūros observatorijų ir kultūros informacijos ir žinių ir autoriaus savarankiškų tyrimų“ rezultatų pagrindu. Nurodyti šie pagrindiniai straipsnio uždaviniai: pabandyti susisteminti žinias apie kultūros observatorijas, tikslus ir veiklos mastą, panagrinėti observatorijas tyrimų veiklos kontekste. Pirmoje dėstymo dalyje pateikiama egzistuojančių observatorijų apžvalga, remiantis tinklalapiuose pateikiama medžiaga aprašomos įvairios organizacijos ir veiklos formos. Antroje dalyje analizuojami observatorijų skiriamieji bruožai pagal jų tikslus, mastą, veiklos formas. Šiek tiek nagrinėjama informacijos sklaida. Išvadose aptariami observatorijų aptartyje išskylantys sunkumai, iš kurių pagrindinis nurodomas kaip veiklos klasifikacija. Iškeltas klausimas ir apie surinktos medžiagos tvarkymą siekiant atsakingo atrinkimo ir klasifikavimo pagal jos naudą konkreitiems tikslams.