doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2008.01748.x

# MANAGING CULTURAL POLICY: PITFALLS AND PROSPECTS

CLIVE GRAY

Cultural policies have become increasingly used by governments to fulfil a large number of policy requirements. The extent to which such policies are capable of being effective in fulfilling governmental goals is open to doubt since there are considerable definitional, methodological, analytical and structural difficulties associated with such policies. This paper identifies and analyses these difficulties and indicates that considerable pitfalls lie in the way of attempts to develop, manage and implement effective cultural policies.

## INTRODUCTION

'Culture' is an essentially contested concept and has no commonly accepted core definition. The consequences of definitional complexity for cultural policy form an important element of the discussion in this paper. Culture nevertheless is increasingly seen by governments as a tool that can be utilized for a variety of developmental practices – from urban regeneration (Evans 2001, Ch. 8), to social inclusion (Long and Bramham 2006), to health care and treatment (Wolf 2002; Madden and Bloom 2004), or even for what seems like personal or state glorification (Looseley 1995; Collard 1998). In the managerial, evidence-based views of public policy that are supported not only by the current Labour government in Britain but also by many other governments, the utility of cultural interventions in policy terms is something that is increasingly examined (Evans and Shaw 2004; Ruiz 2004; Scottish Executive 2006). This examination has been not only in terms of the effectiveness of cultural contributions for specific policy interventions, but also in terms of the 'value' that resides in culture itself, rather than simply in terms of the instrumental contribution that it can make to other policy agendas (Cowling 2004; Holden 2004; Jowell 2004). The bases upon which these twin developments in the utilization of culture in policy terms rest are, however, as this paper will show, open to questioning. Much of the examination that has taken place to date has tended to be in terms of the social impact of the arts, as a particular example of cultural policies in action (Merli 2002; Belfiore 2002, 2006). It can be argued, however, that the problems that confront the utilization of cultural policy for instrumental means in this fashion extend far beyond the particular concerns of any given case (Gray 2007). They ultimately raise questions about whether 'culture' is capable of producing the major benefits that are being claimed for it, not only in Britain but in the other countries where a 'cultural turn' in policy has also been marked.

This paper investigates a number of key difficulties that confront the utilization of 'culture' in public policy. These difficulties differ from the dilemmas of cultural policy that have been identified by Matarasso and Landry (1999), in that while their dilemmas were derived primarily from practical matters of policy (for example, centralization as opposed to decentralization; heritage or contemporary; subsidy or investment), the difficulties identified here are concerned with deeper matters of methodology and analysis. The extent to which cultural policy can become meaningful or be effective in attaining

Clive Gray is Reader in Cultural Policy in the Faculty of Business and Law, Leicester Business School, De Montfort University.

Public Administration Vol. 87, No. 3, 2009 (574–585)

the multitude of policy goals to which it has become attached – without a satisfactory resolution of such methodological and analytical concerns – is an important matter for consideration. This is both because of the increasing usage of culture as a focus for state activity, and because it provides lessons for both new and already established policy areas in terms of managing complex policy structures.

## THE PROBLEMATIC OF CULTURE

While the precise amounts that are spent on cultural policies by governments are difficult to identify in a satisfactorily unambiguous fashion, it is clear that it is becoming an increasing arena of state intervention. Even adopting relatively restricted definitions of the content of culture indicates that in European Union countries between 0.2 and 1.9 per cent of GDP is spent on governmental support for this policy area; a broader definition suggests that the amount spent is between 0.4 and 2.0 per cent of GDP (European Parliament 2006, p. 28). Even at this relatively low level of support, this still means large levels of absolute expenditure: Arts Council England, the dominant arts funding body in England, for example, spent over £580 million in 2004/05 (including lottery funding distributed through Arts Council England) (Arts Council England 2006, p. 47), and still spent less than the combined expenditure of the English local authorities in this same field (European Parliament 2006, p. 29). A concern for the practical difficulties of managing the policy sector is therefore of some interest to governments around the world.

Attempts to utilize 'culture' in the pursuit of policy goals (whether these goals are 'cultural' or not) is a difficult one for governments (see, for example, Gray 2004, 2006; Craik 2006a). The underlying reasons for these problems can be found in a number of distinct issues that have yet to be entirely satisfactorily resolved – even if governments have often managed to find a *modus operandi* that allows for the creation of a variety of effective cultural policies (for discussions on Australia, see, for example, Craik *et al.* 2003; Craik 2006b; for discussions on Scandinavia, see Duelund 2003).

The issues that are involved here vary from the definitional to the technical and limit the extent to which 'culture' can be straightforwardly accepted as the appropriate solution for the range of policy concerns to which it is currently attached. In brief, the problems that will be discussed here are:

1. Problems of definition;
2. Problems of causality;
3. Problems of measurement;
4. Problems of attribution;
5. Problems intrinsic to the policy sector.

These problematic issues do not, of course, exist independently of the entire policy framework within which 'culture' operates (Gray 1996), and their significance and impact upon questions of policy will be, at least in part, determined by the policy context in which they are to be considered. To this extent, a comparative awareness of policy systems is necessary to avoid mistaking the particularities of the British example for the more general nature of the problems that are involved. Given that 'culture' has also become a rapidly developing sector for state intervention around the world, the extent to which these problems can be demonstrated to have clear cross-national similarities and consequences, the greater the potential to develop a common basis in the search for solutions.

Public Administration Vol. 87, No. 3, 2009 (574–585)

**The issue of definition**

Williams (1976, p. 76) argued that 'culture is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language', and it is this complexity that lies at the heart of many of the problems that are associated with the use of 'culture' as both a word and an entity for policy purposes. The difficulty is not so much that the word is hard to pin down in a definitional sense as that the word is an essentially contested concept. (Gallie 1955/6, pp. 181–3, in his original discussion of these concepts, used 'art' – which is generally assumed to have something to do with 'culture' – as a specific example of them). As a contested concept (as noted above, the word 'culture' cannot be defined with any precision), this opens the probability that any particular usage will be subject to debate, with attendant difficulties in resolving such debates in an unambiguously satisfactory fashion. Indeed, the explosion in usage of the concept to cover a host of almost entirely distinct concerns – cultural policy alone can be taken to include community cultural development, cultural diversity, cultural sustainability, cultural heritage, the cultural and creative industries (Craik 2006a, p. 7), planning for the intercultural city (Bloomfield and Bianchini 2004) cultural planning *per se* (Evans 2001), support for national languages (Gray and Hugoson 2004), to the 'culture wars' in the United States (see Singh 2003, especially Chs. 1–2) – can be seen to have muddied the waters of definitional clarity to such an extent that a good deal of care needs to be exercised in identifying precisely which meaning of 'culture' is actually being employed, whether by governments, academics or commentators (McGuigan 2004, Ch. 1). A clear consequence of this variety of meanings is that the identification of an exact definition that is acceptable to all users is unlikely to occur, as each directs attention to specific aspects of 'culture', and identifies different processes, actors and institutional arrays as being of analytical concern (see Bennett 2004).

Such a variety of usages does have advantages, however, for actors in the cultural policy sector, since it allows a great deal of room for manoeuvre in choosing between potential policy options. It is possible for a wide range of actions and solutions to perceived problems to be labelled 'cultural' without creating contradictions between these widely differing approaches to both action and choice. This would, then, allow for a variety of policy options to be made available to participants within the sector, each of which could, with justification, be subsumed under the catch-all title of 'cultural policy'. Such flexibility has obvious political advantages in demonstrating the commitment of actors to 'culture', even if what is undertaken lacks much in the way of overall sectoral coherence or, in some cases, even sense.

This has not, however, prevented attempts to delineate the central components of 'culture': a common starting-point for discussing the niceties of the definitional problems that are involved is with the work of Williams (see especially Williams 1958, 1961) where a tri-partite division is drawn between 'culture' as a form of Platonic ideal, 'culture' as recorded experience, or 'culture' as 'a way of life'. Williams (1981, pp. 10–4) draws a simpler binary division between idealist and materialist conceptions of culture but this separation has been much less frequently adopted in discussion. The 'way of life' conception appears to have become a dominant model in policy terms for discussing the focus and intentions of governmental actions, and is frequently labelled an anthropological approach – even though anthropology itself has changed the conception of culture that it employs to refer to a continuous process of rule and meaning negotiation instead (Wright 1998). A consequence, however, of adopting a 'way of life' model of culture is that it becomes possible to disaggregate this 'way of life' to identify the precise elements of which it is composed. These components can then be manipulated in various ways,

through policy means, to affect people's behaviour. This approach to 'culture' implies a highly mechanistic view of what 'culture' is and how it operates, and it is questionable whether such a view is actually appropriate for what is meant, at least in anthropological terms, to be a living process. There are, however, clear analytical consequences that arise from this dominant approach that, themselves, generate further difficulties for using the term 'culture'; these are discussed below.

**The issue of causality**

One difficulty in adopting such a mechanical model of culture lies in demonstrating how culture has an effect (see Belfiore and Bennett 2008). At a superficial level, on the basis of the definition as a 'way of life', culture appears to be assumed to have an effect upon the ways in which people behave and interact with each other and their environments. Demonstrating precisely how culture does this is a much more difficult proposition however. Given that policy is often predicated on the idea of utilizing culture because of its assumed effects, the extent to which the mechanisms by which it operates in this way can be explained remains unclear and thus casts doubts upon whether assumed effects are, in fact, real ones. The lack of clarity about the precise mechanisms that are involved in this process is a long-standing one and works on the doubtful causal (and circular) logic that: if culture is everything concerned with a way of life then the detail of this way of life can be explained by reference to culture. Following this line of argument, the idea of needing to specify the explicit detail concerning the mechanisms that are involved in this process is not one that is particularly strongly pursued.

It is possible to undertake ethnographic and anthropological investigations to uncover the assumptions and interpretations that policy actors use in social exchanges (see, for example, Bevir and Rhodes 2003; Richards and Smith 2004), or even to identify and interpret the patterns of formal and informal structures and behaviours within which social life takes place (as with new institutionalist approaches: see Lowndes 2002), but these are not the same as identifying the specific details of precisely how these things have an effect. While the chains of causality that lead from 'culture' to 'behaviour' remain unclear, it is difficult to see how an assumed mechanistic model can be demonstrated to be a reasonable approximation of reality. While there is some implicit evidence to indicate that certain patterns of behaviour can be understood to have been at least constrained by dimensions of culture, the mechanisms of transmission from the latter to the former remain unclear. For example, Knill's (1999) explanation of differences in national management of European Union environmental policy depends upon differences in administrative culture between states as being the dominant variable. At a general level, the differences in administrative culture can be used to make sense of the management of European Union environmental policy, but only at this level: at the specific level, the explanatory value of the variable rests on somewhat less steady foundations.

Whether a deterministic model of causality in the area of culture can ever be identified is an open question, and is likely to remain so as long as alternative assumptions about free will and choice are available. At best it may be possible to identify a range of contributory factors that lead towards the determination of boundaries within which choices will be made by policy actors, but this is not the same thing as demonstrating that there is an unambiguously cultural causality to choice. In this respect the acceptance of mechanistic assumptions about cultural effects needs to be treated carefully, and the presumption that cultural policies will have mechanistic effects requires serious reappraisal bearing in mind the above.

Public Administration Vol. 87, No. 3, 2009 (574–585)

**The issue of measurement**

Given the difficulties of pinning down a definition of 'culture', it is not surprising that there are difficulties in developing any clear devices for measuring its impact on, or contribution to, particular policy outcomes. This problem is of some concern if evidence of such cultural contributions is required or desired – particularly in terms of instrumental policy considerations. How is it possible to know precisely what impact 'cultural' interventions have had on the regeneration of run-down areas, for example, or in increasing people's sense of self-worth, or in relieving general social exclusion, if there are no clear measurement criteria available? While it may be possible to identify the quantity and types of resources that have been dedicated to cultural matters (input measures), the estimation of the effects of such resource usage (output measures) is rather more difficult.

The fact that there are difficulties in measuring the effects of cultural interventions has not, of course, stood in the way of attempts to do precisely this. The usual methods that have been employed involve either some form of economic cost-benefit analysis (Myerscough 1988 being an early example), the use of impact and input/output studies (see Heilbrun and Gray 1993, Ch. 15), or the assignment of weightings or rankings to various categories deemed to have relevance and/or significance for the phenomena under consideration (an example here is the 'creativity index' of Florida 2002, pp. 244–8, 327–66). Such studies have generally indicated that being 'cultural' provides large-scale benefits for local areas that are generally second-order spin-offs from its presence. In other words, the benefits that are generated from either the provision of direct cultural interventions, or from having members of the 'cultural' class living in an area, have little to do with culture *per se* and are more to do with the general environmental features of an area, of which cultural factors are, of course, one component.

Identifying an unambiguously 'cultural' component to such measurements is inherently difficult given the multi-causal nature of the effects that are being investigated, quite regardless of whether they are actually relevant forms of measurement in the first place (see Self 1975, for example, on cost-benefit analysis). Such difficulties are also to be found, however, in other attempts to measure culture that seek to identify precisely what leads to the creation of cultural benefits in the first place, as in the case of attempts to identify 'cultural value' (Throsby 2001; Holden 2004). In such cases the forms of analysis that are required move beyond the 'simply' economic and may require the utilization of aesthetic judgements (see Gerlach 2006, for example) which are, themselves, somewhat difficult to quantify. In these circumstances the already difficult task of measuring such a nebulous concern as 'culture' becomes even more so as the identification of precise and unambiguous tools of measurement become multiplied.

Such methodological difficulties in the search to develop measurements of culture for analytical purposes are not the only ones. Even at the level of descriptive quantified data there are problems in identifying what are appropriate measures to use for the assessment of, for example, public expenditure on culture, regardless of the difficulties in then obtaining the actual data that is required to undertake the measurement (Casey *et al.* 1996, pp. 179–85; Selwood 2002). The UK Audit Commission measures for the assessment of cultural services in English local government, for example, are divided between matters of access, participation, quality and value for money (see Audit Commission 2006, pp. 29–33). The extent to which the measures that have been adopted are actually capable of doing any more than applying a level of basic quantification to complex issues is another matter altogether. In some respects the measures simply reflect what can be measured rather than anything else ('quality', for example, being measured through satisfaction

surveys of facilities, library stock standards and library stock levels: at best these are rather blunt measures of what is meant by 'quality' in terms of, for example, the pleasure derived from actually reading books or piecing together a family tree from library archives).

In the field of cultural policy, this issue is one that appears to be endemic, with similar problems of appropriate data availability being present in many countries (Madden 2005). Likewise, there are problems with measurement in other policy sectors (on education, see, for example, Bache 2003), indicating that there may actually be deeper-rooted problems of data and measurement in the specifically cultural case than is immediately apparent at the methodological level.

**The issue of attribution**

Despite the claims that have been advanced for the contribution of 'culture' to employment (Myerscough 1988), regeneration (Evans and Shaw 2004), health, transport, education, 'creating safer and stronger communities' (for all of these, see IDeA 2004; see also Cowling 2004), as well as a host of other policy issues, the extent to which the claimed consequences are unambiguously derived from 'cultural' activities is open to some question.

At one level this could be seen as a simple matter of organizational politics, where access to resources depends upon the attachment of cultural activities to better resourced and, politically at least, more significant policy issues (Gray 2002). In this respect, matters of the precise contribution that 'culture' has made to the achievement of wider organizational goals is largely irrelevant as long as it is 'claimed' to be significant (and as long as nobody casts doubt on the claim). At another level, this is a central problem for the use of culture as a tool for instrumental purposes in a climate where a body of evidence is required for the justification of expenditure and/or investment. In this context, it is necessary not only to *claim* that 'culture' has been the effective factor in producing policy results but also to *show* it.

The difficulties of developing a clear-cut evidence trail are not, in themselves, peculiar to 'culture' alone (Sanderson 2002); however, it can be argued that these difficulties are multiplied in the cultural case, making attributions of policy effectiveness even more difficult to make. The major reasons for this multiplication are concerned with the ways in which 'culture' is utilized within the political process. In the case of Britain, for example, it is clear that 'culture' is used as a toolbox of resources that can be managed (or manipulated) for pre-determined (and seemingly unproblematic) policy ends (see Gray 2006, pp. 102–3). As such, a degree of multi-causality must be anticipated in terms of how 'culture' has an effect and, as cultural resources consist of multiple components (see Bianchini 1996, p. 21; Department for Culture, Media and Sport 2000, p. 7), which operate both independently of, and co-dependently with, each other, an unambiguous evaluation of the contribution that each makes to the final policy outcome is likely to be at least difficult, if not actually impossible, to determine.

The question of whether attribution in this sense is actually a relevant concern for culture is a further matter of debate. While governments may be concerned with attribution for reasons connected with the validity or effectiveness – or otherwise – of public expenditure – or investment – it can be argued that this is actually only capturing one particular dimension of what cultural policies exist for. Holden (2006, pp. 9, 14–18), for example, argues that cultural policy is concerned with three distinct forms of value: intrinsic, instrumental and institutional. A concern with the public expenditure aspect of policy

attribution is primarily related in this view to the second of these values, and is not concerned with other aspects of policy, such as the actual quality of the cultural products and interventions that are being discussed. In effect, the search for attribution in the cultural field could be argued to divert attention from the prime purposes of cultural policies towards secondary considerations. By making these secondary considerations the prime ones in terms of evaluating policy, as the British Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport has acknowledged (Jowell 2004, p. 8), there can be a lack of concern for what Holden would see as the intrinsic value of cultural policies themselves. In this respect the question of what effects are being evaluated in terms of policy attribution becomes an important one to consider, and there is no simple, let alone objective, answer to it. At the very least issues of evaluation are likely to become increasingly important ones for cultural policy as the pressures to demonstrate effectiveness grow, and the interests of those doing the evaluations, and attributing effects to the component parts of such policies, are equally as likely to become important in the future.

## THE ISSUE OF THE CULTURAL POLICY SECTOR IN GENERAL

While there are considerable problems with attempting to utilize 'culture' as a policy device in terms of the methodological and analytical problems that have been discussed above, there are further problems at an organizational level that can also limit the possibility of developing effective cultural policy, however defined, in a practical sense. While many of these difficulties stem, in the first instance, from the methodological problems that exist in this area, others are concerned with questions of political choice about how the policy sector should be managed within the political system. The answers that have been given to these questions have had clear policy consequences for the management of 'culture', and these have contributed to the confusions about what cultural policy is intended to achieve.

The first major issue in this respect concerns the approach that is adopted towards 'culture' by governments. In many countries the general line appears to be that culture should be a governmental concern – but one that is preferably dealt with at arm's length, and certainly one that involves as little direct, central governmental, activity as possible. Characterizations of state involvement with cultural policy tend to differentiate between those which seek to work through funding via intermediate institutions (such as Arts Council England (Gray 2000) or the Australia Council for the Arts (Craik 2006a)) or through tax incentive schemes as in the United States (see O'Hagan 1998, Ch. 5), and those which more positively take responsibility for forms of cultural production and management, usually in either an 'architect' mode (as in France) or 'engineer' mode (as in China) (see Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey 1989; Craik 2006a, Appendix C). These more directly interventionist forms of state involvement tend to form a distinct minority amongst governments, with most adopting a less directly activist role. The advantages of operating in this fashion are that governments are able to have an effect by laying down general policies but they can then avoid direct accountability or responsibility for the choices that are made on their behalf by the intermediate organizations that are involved.

The reluctance of national governments to become directly involved in cultural production is often reflected in a preference for making cultural policy a discretionary, rather than statutory, function for regional and local governments. Policy consequences arising from this are that there is the possibility for the development of diverse forms of policy

intervention by sub-national actors – where, that is, they actually intervene in the first place – and also, as a concomitant of this diversity, the subsequent creation of a lack of policy co-ordination within states at any level. The result of this is not simply the creation of a mass of un-co-ordinated policies but also the possibility, if not probability, of the creation of contradictory policies within the sector, where the intentions and expectations of local and central policies, for example, not only fail to meet but actively oppose each other (on the results of this for France, see Kiwan 2007; see also Craik 2006a).

Such negative policy consequences are exacerbated by the problems of attempting to develop more co-ordinated approaches to cultural policy through the adoption of 'joined-up government' strategies (Gray 2004). Leaving to one side the definitional problems that governments are confronted with (and which can lead to the creation of widely diverse policy approaches within the sector), the multiple organizations, plans, types of policy and foci of policy that are involved in the provision of cultural goods and services increases the possibilities of failure in establishing any form of overall policy commitment and implementation, and often leaves governments to make grand-sounding but operationally vacuous statements about what policy is meant to achieve (Gray 2006). At the very least, the territorial tensions between national, regional and local policy concerns in the field of culture (Gray 2001) cannot be simply overcome by a demand for a 'joined-up' or 'whole of government' approach to the sector: a more coherent appreciation from governments of what their cultural policies exist for and are intended to achieve is required in the first place.

State reluctance to become involved in the cultural field has tended to lead to a concentration of effort on particular areas of activity (such as libraries, museums, sport and theatres) rather than others (such as circuses or direct cultural production through recording studios). Even where the latter forms of intervention exist, it is often the case that they are dealt with in a directly instrumental fashion – such as using studios to not only teach the technical skills to enable young people to become club DJs but also to equip them with electronics qualifications that can be used in the wider job market (as has been done in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in London, for example). Whether this means that activity in this area is more properly described as forming part of an education policy rather than a cultural one is not necessarily the point: the attachment of cultural policies to other policy sectors in this fashion contributes to the instrumentalization of culture whatever the reasons may be for doing so (Gray 2007).

This instrumentalization of culture, whether it is an intended or unintended consequence of policy attachment, is not peculiar to systems where the function is discretionary. It is also commonly found where the duty is a statutory one (see Vestheim 1994; for further discussions of individual Scandinavian countries, see Duelund 2003, Chs 2–6). This is symptomatic of a further problem affecting the policy sector, that of the lack of political support that it commonly has within individual political systems. Regardless of governmental rhetoric that emphasizes the importance of cultural policy, not only for instrumental means but for the country as a whole (in the British case, see Smith 1998; Jowell 2004), it is commonly the case that further political commitment to the sector is relatively weak. In this respect cultural policy forms a clear example of 'low politics' – 'residual matters' of 'embellishment and detail' (Bulpitt 1983, pp. 3, 29) that central political actors neither need to nor, often, wish to, become centrally involved with.

Even where individual politicians become closely associated with cultural policy as an arena for action (perhaps most obviously seen in the French case with the influences of Malraux and Lang, and the personalizing of the development of the *grands travaux*

under Mitterand), the significance of this in making culture a central matter for political debate across the wider political community is open to question. The continuing dominance of technocratic forms of professional and bureaucratic control over the policy sector in France, for example (Collard 1998; Eling 1999, Ch. 8), indicates that there are severe limits to what individual elected politicians can actually do in circumstances where the major debates exclude, rather than are led by, them. Such constraining of the impact of elected politicians is not peculiar to cultural policy (Peters 2001, Ch. 6), and neither is it restricted to France (see Jenkins 1979, especially Part III). If, however, the policy sector is not seen as being a particularly significant or politically important one then an absence of political support can have potentially limiting effects in overcoming this restraint.

The reasons for such a lack of political support clearly vary between political systems and can involve questions of ideology (such as the idea that culture is best dealt with through market mechanisms rather than state intervention), a concern with accusations of either state censorship of cultural production, or of the idea of state 'approved' art (that is, a concern for complaints about direct control by the state of cultural expression for directly 'political' reasons), or a wish to simply avoid being given increased responsibility and accountability for a vexatious set of policy concerns. Whichever precise set of reasons are involved, however, the lack of political significance that is attached to the policy sector is evident – not least in terms of the amount of resources (financial and human) that are normally devoted to it. A consequence of this is that the sector is vulnerable to pressures from other policy sectors that have greater political importance or credibility, and this can encourage the development of either attachment strategies or the instrumentalization of the sector itself (Gray 2002, 2007), with a subsequent diminution of concern for the specifically cultural, rather than the educational, health, regeneration or other sectoral, content of policy.

## CONCLUSIONS

Clearly these sectoral concerns are closely related and, in conjunction, serve to limit the extent to which the sector can develop an effective role in terms that are not dictated by the requirements of other policy sectors. The result of this is to reinforce the lack of policy significance that the sector has and this, as a consequence, makes attempts at the resolution of the other problems that afflict the policy sector more difficult to undertake successfully. Regardless of the complexities and methodological challenges that confront the sector in terms of causality, measurement and attribution, and the political challenges arising from the structure of the sector, major issues still exist around the definitional quagmire that has developed about the subject.

Without clarity about the precise content, meaning and intentions of undertaking 'cultural' activity, state actors will be consistently confronted with competing pressures that cannot be dealt with in a simple manner by imposition from above. The inherent complexities of usage that are generated by the essentially contested nature of the concept of 'culture' will be a sufficient condition for the creation of multiple forms of cultural policy at different levels within the political system and in different organizations operating at the same level, regardless of whether this is desirable or simply an unintended consequence of this definitional ambiguity. Each of these forms of policy will contain their own requirements for identifying what are appropriate forms of measurement, attribution and causal structure for analysing and assessing how they are operating. As such, the

alternatives for state actors would appear to be to either develop single paths of analysis that are simply inappropriate for many, if not most, forms of cultural policy, or to recognize the multiplicity of forms of policy that exist by developing multiple forms of analysis that are incompatible with each other and non-comparable in effect. Neither, however, is likely to remove the political and administrative problems that exist within the policy sector.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My thanks to Eleonora Belfiore, Jenni Craik, Paola Merli and two anonymous referees for their comments on an earlier version of this paper. Responsibility for this version of it rests with me.

## REFERENCES

Arts Council England. 2006. *Annual Review 2005*. London: Arts Council England.

Audit Commission. 2006. *CPA – The Harder Test 2006* (available at http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/cpa/stcc/downloads/STCCServiceAssessments.doc), accessed 30 November 2006.

Bache, I. 2003. 'Not Everything That Matters is Measurable, and Not Everything That is Measurable Matters', *Local Government Studies*, 29, 4, 76–94.

Belfiore, E. 2002. 'Art as a Means of Alleviating Social Exclusion: Does it Really Work? A Critique of Instrumental Cultural Policies and Social Impact Studies in the UK', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8, 1, 91–106.

Belfiore, E. 2006. 'The Social Impact of the Arts: Myth or Reality?', in M. Munira (ed.), *Culture Vultures: Is UK Arts Policy Damaging the Arts?* London: Policy Exchange, pp. 20–37.

Belfiore, E. and O. Bennett. 2008. *The Social Impact of the Arts: An Intellectual History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bennett, O. 2004. 'Review Essay: The Torn Halves of Cultural Policy Research', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10, 2, 237–48.

Bevir, M. and R.A.W. Rhodes (2003), *Interpreting British Governance*. London: Routledge.

Bianchini, F. 1996. 'Cultural Planning: An Innovative Approach to Urban Development', in J. Verwijnen and P. Lehtovuori (eds), *Managing Urban Change*. Helsinki: University of Art and Design Helsinki, pp. 18–25.

Bloomfield, J. and F. Bianchini. 2004. *Planning for the Intercultural City.* Stroud: Comedia.

Bulpitt, J. 1983. *Territory and Power in the United Kingdom: An Interpretation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Casey, B., R. Dunlop and S. Selwood. 1996. *Culture as Commodity: The Economics of the Arts and Built Heritage in the UK*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Collard, S. 1998. 'Architectural Gestures and Political Patronage: the Case of the Grands Travaux', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 5, 1, 33–47.

Cowling, J. 2004. *For Art's Sake: Society and the Arts in the 21st Century*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Craik, J. 2006a. *Facilitating and Funding the Arts and Cultural Sector in Australia: Challenges and Policy Options*. Canberra: Australia and New Zealand School of Government.

Craik, J. 2006b. 'A Horse With No Name: Arts and Cultural Policy in Australia', paper to the Australian Political Studies Annual Conference, Newcastle (also at http://www.newcastle.edu.au/school/spt/politics/apsa/PaperFV/Media&PopularCulture/Craik,Jenni), accessed 23 November 2006.

Craik, J., L. McAllister and G. Davis. 2003. 'Paradoxes and Contradictions in Government Approaches to Contemporary Cultural Policy: An Australian Perspective', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 9, 1, 17–33.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport. 2000. *Creating Opportunities*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport (http://www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/9C710585-52B9-44C8-980F-5BiFCCC801A8/0/localculturalstrategies), accessed 23 November 2006.

Duelund, P. (ed.). 2006. *The Nordic Cultural Model*. Copenhagen: Nordic Cultural Institute.

Eling, K. 1999. *The Politics of Cultural Policy in France*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

European Parliament. 2006. *Financing the Arts and Culture in the European Union*. Brussels: European Parliament (http://www.hegatruepel.de/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf_datein/Financing_the_arts_and_culture_in_the_European_Union.pdf), accessed 6 March 2007.

Evans, G. 2001. *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?* London: Routledge.

Evans, G. and P. Shaw. 2004. *The Contribution of Culture to Regeneration in the UK*. London: London Metropolitan University.

Florida, R. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books.

Gallie, W. 1955/6. 'Essentially Contested Concepts', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 56, 167–98.

Gerlach, R. (2006), *British and German Theatre: Which is Best?* (Paper to the International Conference on Cultural Policy Research, Vienna)

Gray, C. 1996. 'Comparing Cultural Policy: A Reformulation', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 2, 2, 213–22.

Gray, C. 2000. *The Politics of the Arts in Britain*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Gray, C. 2001. 'Selling the Arts: Centre-Periphery Tensions in Commodification Processes', in J. Horne (ed.), *Leisure Cultures, Consumption and Commodification*. Eastbourne: Leisure Studies Association, pp. 53–63.

Gray, C. 2002. 'Local Government and the Arts', *Local Government Studies*, 28, 1, 77–90.

Gray, C. 2004. 'Joining-Up or Tagging On?: The Arts, Cultural Planning and the View From Below', *Public Policy and Administration*, 19, 2, 38–49.

Gray, C. 2006. 'Managing the Unmanageable: The Politics of Cultural Planning', *Public Policy and Administration*, 21, 2, 101–13.

Gray, C. 2007. 'Commodification and Instrumentality in Cultural Policy', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13, 2, 203–15.

Gray, C. and R. Hugoson. 2004. 'Culture', in H. Compston (ed.), *Handbook of Public Policy in Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 365–72.

Heilbrun, J. and C.M. Gray. 1993. *The Economics of Arts and Culture: An American Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hillman-Chartrand, H. and C. McCaughey. 1989. 'The Arm's Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perspective – Past, Present and Future', in M. Cummings and M. Schuster (eds), *Who's to Pay for the Arts?* New York: American Council for the Arts, pp. 43–80.

Holden, J. 2004. *Capturing Cultural Value: How Culture Has Become a Tool of Government Policy*. London: Demos.

Holden, J. 2006. *Cultural Value and the Crisis of Legitimacy*. London: Demos.

Jenkins, H. 1979. *The Culture Gap: An Experience of Government and the Arts*. London: Marion Boyars.

Jowell, T. 2004. *Government and the Value of Culture*. London: Department of Culture, Media and Sport (http://www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/DE2ECA49-7F3D-46BF-9D11-A3AD8OBE54D6/0/valueofculture.pdf), accessed 20 November 2006.

Kiwan, N. 2007. 'When the Cultural and the Social Meet: A Critical Perspective on Socially-Embedded Cultural Policy in France', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13, 2, 153–67.

Knill, C. 1999. 'Explaining Cross-National Variations in Administrative Reform', *Journal of Public Policy*, 19, 1,113–39.

Long, J. and P. Bramham. 2006. 'Joining Up Policy Discourses and Fragmented Practices: the Precarious Contribution of Cultural Projects to Social Inclusion', *Policy and Politics*, 34, 1, 133–51.

Looseley, D. 1995. *The Politics of Fun*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Lowndes, V. 2002. 'Institutionalism', in D. Marsh and G. Stoker (eds), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*. London: Palgrave, pp. 90–108.

Madden, C. 2005. 'Cross-Country Comparisons of Cultural Statistics: Issues and Good Practice', *Cultural Trends*, 14, 56, 299–316.

Madden, C. and T. Bloom. 2004. 'Creativity, Health and Arts Advocacy', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10, 2, 133–56.

Matarasso, F. and C. Landry. 1999. *Balancing Act: 21 Strategic Dilemmas in Cultural Policy*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

McGuigan, J. 2004. *Rethinking Cultural Policy*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Merli, P. 2002. 'Evaluating the Social Impact of Participation in Arts Activities', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8, 1, 107–18.

Myerscough, J. 1988. *The Economic Importance of the Arts*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

O'Hagan, J. 1998. *The State and the Arts: An Analysis of Key Economic Policy Issues* in *Europe and the United States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Peters, B. 2001. *The Politics of Bureaucracy*, 5th edn. London: Routledge.

Richards, D. and M. Smith. 2004. 'Interpreting the Worlds of Political Elites', *Public Administration*, 82, 4, 777–800.

Ruiz, J. 2004. *A Literature Review of the Evidence Base for Culture, the Arts and Sports Policy*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department (http://www.sportdevelopment.org.uk/evidencebase2004.pdf), accessed 20 November 2006.

Sanderson, I. 2002. 'Evaluation, Policy Learning and Evidence-Based Policy Making', *Public Administration*, 80, 1, 1–22.

Scottish Executive. 2006. *Quality of Life and Well-Being: Measuring the Benefits of Culture and Sport – A Literature Review*. Edinburgh: Education Department Research Programme Research Findings, No. 12 (http://uk.sitestat.com/scottishexecutive/ext/s?publications.2006.01.13110743.23.p&ns_t=11640358988768ns_referrer=http%3A/www), accessed 20 November 2006.

Self, P. 1975. *Econocrats and the Policy Process: the Politics and Philosophy of Cost-Benefit Analysis*. London: Macmillan.

Selwood, S. 2002. 'The Politics of Data Collection: Gathering, Analysing and Using Data About the Subsidised Cultural Sector in England', *Cultural Trends*, 12, 47, 14–84.

Singh, R. 2003. *Contemporary American Politics and Society*. London: Sage.

Smith, C. 1998. *Creative Britain*. London: Faber and Faber.

Throsby, D. 2001. *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vestheim, G. 1994. 'Instrumental Cultural Policy in Scandinavian Countries', *European Journal of Cultural Policy*, 1, 1, 57–71.
Williams, R. 1958. *Culture and Society*. London: Chatto and Windus.
Williams, R. 1961. *The Long Revolution*. London: Chatto and Windus.
Williams, R. 1976. *Keywords*. London: Fontana.
Williams, R. 1981. *Culture*. London: Fontana.
Wolf, R. 2002. *Poems for the Waiting Room: An Evaluation* (http://www.Hyphen-21.org/publicsite/uploads/File/projects/pwr/Full%20PWR%20Evaluation%20Report%20Generic%20.pdf), accessed 7 November 2008.
Wright, S. 1998. 'The Politicization of Culture', *Anthropology Today*, 14, 1, 7–15.

*Date received 1 December 2006. Date accepted 26 April 2007.*