HOW CAN CULTURAL POLICY STRENGTHEN THE ARTS AND CULTURAL SECTOR?

BY

SUSAN RICHER

A thesis submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Commerce (Public Policy)

Victoria University of Wellington

2021

Abstract

During the COVID-19 worldwide health pandemic, with gigs cancelled, seasons postponed, travel ceased and unemployment increasing, calls for new approaches to cultural policy have emerged despite there being no shared understanding of what cultural policy is, does and could be. Governments in Australia and New Zealand have responded to the sector's increased precarity with large-scale rescue funding packages, which are focussed on immediate relief and short-term survival. Even pre-COVID, it seems there was little interest in longer term cultural policy thinking.

This research explores the legitimacy of cultural policy as source of sector sustainability through a review of contemporary cultural policy literature and insights from key players in the cultural policy space - arts and cultural bureaucrats, whose perspectives are usually muted. Norwegian sociologist Per Mangset (2020) suggests that western democracies may actually be facing the end of cultural policy, which has not adapted or responded significantly to major societal, economic and cultural changes of the last 50 years. While not conceding that cultural policy is a redundant practice, this research responds to Mangset's provocation by identifying three key policy approaches through a survey of contemporary policy literature. The three approaches; policy as action, policy as sustainability and policy as democracy intersect to create a grey area in which new democratic approaches to policy development might be further explored.

This contribution to the contemporary cultural policy heritage narrative of the trans-Tasman region clarifies definitions and approaches utilised by policy makers in Australian and New Zealand government settings. It finds that cultural policy has been looping in a neo-liberal, post-democratic pattern of short-term cycles resulting in a cultural policy stasis and elitist decision making, which largely excludes the public. Recommendations for further research include exploration of new democratic approaches to cultural policy that could transform policy making to encompass multiple systems and perspectives that can strengthen the arts and cultural sector.

Contents

Chapter	Page
Introduction	5
1. Locating Cultural Policy	8
1.1 What is public policy?	8
1.2 Cultural policy as part of the cultural policy realm	9
1.3 Cultural policy range and reach	11
1.4 Cultural policy traditions and approaches	13
1.5 Three themes – Action, Sustainability, Democracy	17
1.6 Summary of chapter	22
2. Contemporary Cultural Policy in Australia and New Zealand	24
2.1 Post-war origins of contemporary cultural policy in the trans-Tasman region	24
2.1.1 <i>The influence of Keynesian mid-century cultural policy</i>	26
2.2.1 <i>Fostering excellence, access, and diversity</i>	27
2.2 Neo Liberalism and creative industries	28
2.2.1 <i>Creative industries and knowledge economies</i>	30
2.3 Cultural ecologies, values, and democracy	32
2.3.1 <i>Sustainability through utilitarian approaches</i>	32
2.3.2 <i>Public value and democratic policy approaches</i>	33
2.3.3 <i>Cultural policy during a crisis</i>	34
2.4 The arts and cultural sector's relationship with cultural policy	35
2.4.1 <i>A vulnerable ecology, a fragile sector</i>	36
2.4.2 <i>Public support, private support, and expertise</i>	36
2.4.3 <i>Advocacy and semi-public conversations</i>	37
2.5 Summary of chapter	38
3. Conceptual Framework and methodology	40
3.1 Conceptual framework	40
3.2 Scope	42
3.3 Methodology	42
3.4 Limitations	44
4. The Bureaucrats	46
4.1 The role of arts and cultural bureaucrats	46
4.2 Bureaucratic approaches to cultural policy	50
4.2.1 <i>Policy as action</i>	52
4.2.2 <i>Policy as sustainability</i>	55
4.2.3 <i>Cultural Policy as democracy</i>	57
4.3 Challenges and emergent approaches	59
4.3.1 <i>Theme 1 – More inclusive approaches to cultural policy</i>	61
4.3.2 <i>Theme 2 – Long view approaches to cultural policy</i>	63
5. Summary of findings – How can cultural policy strengthen the arts and cultural sector?	66
5.1 Finding 1 – Cultural policy needs to evolve from the neo-liberal and post democratic space so that the arts and cultural sector can evolve	66

5.2. Finding 2 – Cultural policy needs to sustain a long-term view so that the arts and cultural sector can adapt to the change around it and contribute to sustainable development	68
5.3. Conclusion – Expanding the grey area – testing new cultural policy approaches that strengthen the arts and cultural sector	69
References	72
Figures	
1.1 Throsby’s (2008) concentric circles model of cultural and creative industries	12
2.1 Key milestones in cultural policy in Australia and New Zealand	25
3.1 Conceptual framework	41
5.1 The grey area where three cultural policy approaches intersect	70
Tables	
1.1 Cultural policy approaches Source: Mulcahy (2017)	14
1.2 Four policy lenses Source: Bell et al (2015)	16
1.3 Aggregated cultural policy approach themes	17
3.1 Conceptual framework – three strands of cultural policy	41
4.1 The bureaucrats’ roles in cultural policy	49

Introduction

Cultural policy emerged post World War Two as western democracies sought to rebuild nations and civil societies, aiming for social cohesion through access to arts and cultural institutions and education (Throsby 2018, Caust 2017, Craik 2007). Approaches to cultural policy have been based in action such as legislation and funding programs and in types of discourse contained in cultural statement documents and cultural indicator frameworks. From its civilising objectives in the 1940s through to contemporary objectives fusing economic and social outcomes, cultural policy has shifted focus within its instrumental agenda from decade to decade (Mulcahy 2018, Bell & Oakley 2017, Craik 2007). Norwegian sociologist Per Mangset (2020), however, argues that there has been no significant policy evolution and that the relatively recent era of cultural policy may be coming to an end having failed to democratise the arts or grow resources for arts and culture.

This research explores the legitimacy of cultural policy as a twenty-first century driver of support for the arts and culture sector; its communities of interest and practice. The research focusses on cultural policy development in Australia and New Zealand as a distinctive region of praxis. This paper examines the location of cultural policy within public policy, engaging with the literature of the past two decades. The literature highlights the influence of English cultural policy in the trans-Tasman region, and the impact of enduring 1990s-style neo-liberal and post-democratic approaches to policy development and implementation.

Interviews with arts and cultural bureaucrats who have previously worked in, or are currently working in, central government departments and arts funding agencies are an important component of this research. As contemporary policy advisors and implementers, these professionals have helped illuminate the philosophical drivers of cultural policy in New Zealand and Australia, shedding light on what Althaus, Bridgman and Davis (2018) refer to as 'the grey zone' between politics and administration. Research conversations with bureaucrats – the people inside policy processes – are all too rare. In this study, these conversations provide valuable insights regarding processes and perceptions of recent policy making and how cultural policy action and inaction has impacted sectoral and community change leading up to and post-COVID-19.

While there are multiple definitions of cultural policy, with no firm agreement on any, this research is anchored by the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation's (UNESCO) 1967 Roundtable Meeting on Cultural Policies' definition. This definition is 'a body of operational principles, administrative and budgetary practices and procedures which provide a basis for cultural action by the State' (UNESCO, 1969, p10). The research has also examined contemporary definitions arriving at Gray's definition (2010), which is faithful to UNESCO's. His definition is also the most useful in describing the myriad of approaches and activities that represent cultural policy as it is practiced now.

Other definitions such as Throsby's (2006), 'public discussion about the role of arts and culture in society and the forging of a new cultural accord between Government and people' (p33) are visited with consideration of particular policy approaches. Throsby's culturally democratic aspiration echoes the work of Bourdieu (1984) and more recently, Belfiore (2018) and Jancovich (2019), who

argue that access is more than exposure, and that democratic engagement with cultural policy is more than consultation with a small group of representatives.

There is little agreement across the literature about what cultural policy is, and what it can do to strengthen the arts and cultural sector. The research highlights strategic action as the form of cultural policy most implemented by arts and cultural bureaucrats in Australia and New Zealand, reinforcing Gray's (2010) notion that cultural policy is 'whatever governments say it is' (p122). Within the arts and cultural sector, cultural policy is perceived as a clear framework or plan (developed in consultation with the sector), which acknowledges the importance of arts and culture and commits significant funding across as much of the professional spectrum as possible. The broader community are generally excluded from the conversation other than when focus groups or population samples are asked about how much they value arts and culture.

The 2020 COVID-19 pandemic has seen arts and cultural policy and funding agencies around the world implement emergency response and recovery packages, frontloading investment for short term relief. Arts and cultural sectors were not equipped or prepared for the disruption caused by the pandemic, and like other sectors such as tourism, sport and retail, have been profoundly impacted through loss of revenue and employment. Government funding packages to alleviate the impact of the pandemic are reactive, focussing on rescuing arts companies and providing employment assistance to a highly casualised workforce (Australian Government 2020, New Zealand Government 2020). The pandemic has enabled themes of cultural democracy, unchanged production models and the shrinkage of arts funding to surface yet again, exposing the sector's continuing precarity (Comunian et al 2020), and highlighting the potency of Mangset's (2020) provocation.

The conceptual framework for this study emphasises a 'grey area' where new cultural policy approaches might be explored and tested beyond the current boundaries and elitism of government, bureaucracy and arts and the dialogue of cultural experts. Cairney (2020) suggests policy is an activity space where problems, solutions, processes and outcomes 'churn' ready for outputs that can be both intentionally and unintentionally well or ill timed. The findings of this research suggest that this activity then, requires the participation of many more and different players, and a shift from short termism to long term thinking.

Nearly a quarter of the way into the 21st century, with aspirations for democracy and innovation in policy making seemingly unfulfilled (Throsby, 2018), this research explores the potential for departure from a 50-year loop of 'us and them' style government and sector dialogue to broader, longer-time, adaptive and inclusive policy behaviours that strengthen the arts and cultural sector.

Thesis structure

This thesis commences with an examination of the public policy literature to provide the reader with cultural policy definitions. Chapter 1 includes exploration of contemporary theories of cultural policy forms and approaches which are funneled into three key themes identified as contemporary approaches to policy development. Chapter 2 provides an historical overview of cultural policy approaches in New Zealand and Australian governments with a focus on the last seventy years. The

conceptual framework for the research, developed in response to literature review themes, is described in Chapter 3 along with its application to analysis of interview data gathered from arts and cultural bureaucrats. Chapter 4 presents the research results, the analysis of which is provided in Chapter 5. The thesis concludes with recommendations for further research to test and extend key findings.

Chapter 1 – Locating Cultural Policy

This chapter situates cultural policy within a public policy realm and outlines a working definition of each to explore the central research question, ‘How can cultural policy strengthen the arts and cultural sector?’. The positioning of cultural policy and its functions for post-war Western democracies are explored, with a focus on more recent literature (2010 – 2020), to identify key styles and approaches in contemporary cultural policy making. Literature review themes are explored at the end of the chapter.

1.1 What is public policy?

The meaning and purpose of ‘public policy’ is graspable, but slippery; and cultural policy even more so, given the multitude of definitions for culture (Gray 2015). In Latin, ‘publicus’ means of the people, of the state, done for the state, and ‘policy’ deriving from the French *politique* means way of management. Contemporary theorists and policy makers repeatedly assert that there is no one, shared definition of policy; that it eludes clear definition and is often ill defined (Cairney 2020, Mulcahy 2017, Gray 2010, Ahearne 2009, Dye 1998). It is worth heeding Dye’s (1998) advice that policy definition discussions are ‘exasperating’ (p3) and can detract from examination of policy itself. His own appealingly simple definition of policy as ‘whatever governments choose to do or not to do’ (p2) is quoted as often as Lasswell’s and Kaplan’s (1970) equally straightforward summary of policy as ‘who gets what, when and how’ through a ‘projected program of goals, values, and practices’ (p71).

Dye (1998) situates his definition within a top-down policy making approach, arguing that the influence and demands of communities and citizens in policy development (a bottom-up approach) does not necessarily alter ‘what governments choose to do’ (p3). In line with Dye’s definition, Pacquette and Radaelli (2015) suggest that public policy is as much about ‘action as inaction’ (p59). They argue that governments are not bound to respond to, or follow up on, the requests or demands of interest groups. Dye (2001) further asserts that the very notion of public policy as a response to populace demands and petitions is a myth; that even within a democratic style of government, policy is more likely to be developed and implemented by a small group of ‘national elites’ (p1) who plan and implement policy in response to a range of motives, including public good, self-preservation, and popular appeal.

While Dye’s and Lasswell’s definitions are both inclusive of policy activities such as regulation, organisation, decision making, resources allocation and distribution, they differ in their *framing* of policy. Lasswell et al (1970) assert that policy has a philosophical and strategic framework including goals and values (p71), which Cairney (2020) describes as a ‘comprehensive rationality’ model or an ‘unrealistic simplification of reality’ (p56). Dye (1998) suggests that government decisions are not always ‘purposeful and goal oriented’ (p3), and positions public policy within what Cairney (2020, p57) describes as a ‘bounded rationality’ model. Cairney argues that the bounded rationality model is a more realistic representation of how most policy works, where goals are blurry and information limited, cognitive capacity constrained and political imperatives dominant. In other words, policy makers make do, relying on heuristics to achieve outputs within these constraints.

Althaus, Bridgman and Davis (2018), in seeking to articulate potential for clarity and containment within an often-disordered process (Cairney 2020, Dye 1998), describe public policy characteristics in sequential terms, which may include a range of 'intentional, structured and orderly' activities (p8). These activities are likely to occur within a planned and 'ideal' policy development process, although intentional inactivity, reactive and urgent decisions may also count as part of a public policy process (Dye 2012, Paquette & Redaelli 2015). Althaus et al (2018) assert that public policy is neither politics nor administration, that it is situated in a 'grey zone' (p62) with its own processes and negotiations. Along with other proponents of sequential policy cycles (Bell et al 2015, Paquette et al 2015) they propose a cyclic approach that includes varying steps and stages such as issues identification, consultation, implementation, and evaluation.

Within the bounded rationality model, which Cairney (2020) argues 'is more important than ever' (p58), he proposes the 'garbage can' model (Cohen, March & Olsen 1972) is a more likely approach than a sequential, ideal policy cycle. He suggests that each of the stages of a policy cycle can be developed and implemented independently of each other and in a non-linear fashion. Cairney asserts that the archetypal evidence-based approach to policy is compromised or rendered impossible by political and resourcing limitations; the garbage can approach providing a 'receptacle into which a volatile mix of problems and solutions is dumped' (p196).

As a type of public policy, cultural policy can take many forms depending on the government of the day (Paquette & Beauregard 2017). In heading towards a workable definition of cultural policy, Cairney's (2020) definition of public policy, which is 'the sum total of government action, from signals of intent to the final outcome' (p2), provides a useful start. As a public policy definition this allows consideration of a variety of policy forming and policy implementation approaches including inaction. Cairney's definition accommodates notions of explicit policy including policy as a stated framework of values and goals, and/or implicit policy including action, knowable through decisions, appropriations, legislation, regulation, and reporting (Ahearne 2009, Paquette et al 2015).

As Ahearne (2009) observes, some policies are publicly accessible, while others must be approached through the reconstruction of the affects of that policy. He notes that explicit cultural policies can detract attention from implicit cultural strategy taking place in non-cultural fields of government and suggests implicit policy can 'usefully be analysed in terms of the patterns of inattention and neglect they imply' (p144). Gray (2010) asserts that it is perilous to assume there is 'one, true way' to define and analyse cultural policy, along with Ho (2017) who summarises cultural policy forms as 'not limited to texts but also involve(s) discussions, procedures and implementation' (p58). From here on, cultural policy will be considered through a range of approaches. It will be positioned as normative - whatever its form and praxis - as a field that continues to merit enquiry, analysis, and development.

1.2 Cultural policy as part of the public policy realm

Paquette and Beauregard (2017) argue that cultural policy is a subfield of public policy and 'not an extremely important one' (p20) in relation to larger government portfolios and policy realms such as health, education, and environment. Ahearne (2009) highlights the irony of cultural policy in that it can be peripheral and insubstantive to governments, then suddenly central and fundamental – he

describes this as an 'oscillating ambiguity' (p141). The relative importance of cultural policy to governments varies depending on political contexts and situations, with some harnessing the potential soft power of arts and culture for national identity and cultural diplomacy purposes. Others opt for strategies that support arts and culture as a sub sector of a larger industry, as was apparent during the early 2000s creative industries era (Hesmondhalgh, Nisbett, Oakley & Lee 2015). Therefore, to land on a workable definition of cultural policy that reflects its positioning as an analysable field of public policy, the ambiguous nature of culture itself will not be investigated, since this has been covered extensively by policy scholars (Throsby 2007, Williams 2012, Paquette et al 2017). The emphasis remains on the policy realm.

Cairney's (2020) definition of public policy can be extended through to cultural policy by using Gray's (2010) definition, which is, 'the range of activities that governments undertake – or do not undertake – in the arena of culture' (p222). Bell and Oakley (2015) reiterate the notion of cultural policy as a subset of public policy through their definition, which is: 'cultural policy is the branch of public policy concerned with the administration of culture' (p45). These definitions build on, without straying from UNESCO's 1967 definition of cultural policy as 'a body of operational principles, administrative and budgetary practices and procedures which provide a basis for cultural action by the State' and, 'the sum total of the conscious and deliberate usages, action or lack of action in a society, aimed at meeting certain cultural needs...' (UNESCO, 1969, p10).

Gray (2010) continues to broaden and almost obfuscate his definition, stating that cultural policy is 'whatever it is that governments say it is' (p222). He points out that cultural policy will manifest differently within and across countries and territories depending on selected narratives, actions, and inactions. This was emphasised in the UNESCO Roundtable Report, which acknowledged that each jurisdiction has its own interpretations and manifestations of cultural policy. Ahearne (2009) separates two definitions of cultural policy; one being concerned with the 'explicit and nominal' (p4), which he argues is cultural policy because government denotes it as such, and the other being 'implicit or effective' (p4), which is any government strategy or action concerned with the culture of the territory it governs.

Cultural economist David Throsby (2006, 2018) posits that explicit cultural policy has broader societal implications, defining cultural policy as 'public discussion about the role of arts and culture in society and the forging of a new cultural accord between Government and people' (p33). Over the last two decades, Throsby has been an active voice for clear and explicit articulation of cultural policy by governments. Along with other policy scholars including Hawkes (2005), Kangas, Duxbury and De Beukelaer (2019), he has argued for culture to be recognised as a key pillar in UNESCO's economic and sustainability pillars (2019). However, explicitness often demands accountability against stated priorities, measurement of progress and long-term thinking – exigencies that are difficult for short term Ministers and swinging electorates to commit to let alone enact (Tingle 2015).

The concept of cultural policy emerged in Western democracies post World War Two as governments sought to rebuild nations and identities, aiming for civil societies and social cohesion through access to arts and cultural institutions and education (Bell et al 2015, Upchurch 2016, Craik 2007). Paquette and Beauregard (2017) observe that the establishment of government funding bodies and agencies such as arts councils in the 1940s and 1950s created environments for cultural

policy to emerge and formalise as a government and ‘quasi government activity’ (p24). Many scholars acknowledge that UNESCO was, and continues to be, the key mediator of cultural policy as a distinct form of public policy (Rosenstein 2018, Toledo Silva 2015, Bell & Oakley 2015, Throsby 2010).

While cultural policy has arguably been practiced in various forms by governing parties for millennia, the term was coined at a UNESCO Roundtable meeting in 1967, in which the first definition of cultural policy, referred to earlier in this chapter, was drafted by an international group with considerable artist and cultural institution representation (Rosenstein 2018). In parallel, cultural policy scholarship grew in the 1970s (Paquette et al 2017), mushrooming in the nineties and early 2000s (Bell & Oakley 2015, Paquette et al 2015), resulting in a range of think tanks, journals and high-profile public intellectuals consulting to governments.

Echoing Dye’s (1998) notion that policy making is undertaken by an elite group, cultural policy scholars such as Holden (2006), Belfiore (2018) and Khan (2019) argue that cultural policy has largely been a dialogue between government policy makers, arts professionals, and academics. Holden argues that the contemporary cultural policy challenge is to create a ‘different alignment between culture, politics and the public’ (p59) and like Throsby (2018), he believes this can be achieved through informed discussion and debate between ‘politicians, the professionals themselves, and above all the public’ (p56).

1.3 Cultural policy range and reach

Primarily focussed on the arts, which Ahearne (2009) describes as a field denoting ‘the domain of consciously crafted symbolic works’ (p142), cultural policy has broadened over recent decades to include a raft of creative practices, sectors, and activities such as heritage, film, fashion, television, gaming, community cultural development, festivals and more. Bell and Oakley (2015) argue that in Western societies, cultural policy ‘tends to confine itself in the sense of artistic activities’ (p17), which they point out constitutes a broad base of forms and styles. This discussion confines the cultural policy scope to the arts and cultural sector, which includes amateur and professional production, conservation, support, and presentation of those forms.

Throsby (2008) provides scope guidance through his ‘concentric circles’ model (p149), which provides four classifications of industry that contribute to production and distribution of cultural goods and services (Figure 1.1). The central circle representing the creative arts includes literature, music, performing arts and visual arts. This category, and the next circle of the model, the display, preservation, distribution and recording functions provided by institutions such as museums, libraries, and galleries, represent the core components of the arts and cultural sector discussed in this paper, with the addition of performing arts venues to the ‘core cultural industries’ circle.

Figure 1.1 Throsby's (2008) concentric circles model of cultural and creative industries

This focus on Throsby's (2008) central spheres of the arts and cultural sector does not disregard the broader reach of cultural policy into commercial creative industries and other fields including health, education, community, and social development. Rather, Throsby positions the central circles of his model as the base or starting point for cultural production – the wellspring of artistic form and content from which other cultural and creative outputs can be developed. The model assumes that cultural goods and services have two key values: cultural and economic. By placing the core creative arts at the centre of the model, Throsby (2008) hopes it may 'strengthen the cultural orientation of cultural policy' (p156) rather than being considered a mere subset of economic policy. This notion will be revisited when we explore broad forms and styles of cultural policy, and which of these has applied to the Australian and New Zealand contexts.

Bakhshi and Cunningham (2016) suggest that following a period of evidence of 'value gains' for creative industries, it is time to direct our attention again to the value of the cultural industries. They argue that 'taking a 'breather' from the creative industries may mean moving into even more contested territory such as social impact stating, 'Evidence for the relations between culture and social inclusion, technological diffusion and health need to be marshalled' (p7). This highlights a gap in the contemporary literature regarding who and what cultural policy is *not* speaking to, particularly given the emergence of wellbeing indicators (Hong 2014) and participation studies (Janovich 2017, Belfiore & Gibson 2019).

Holden (2010, 2015) is one of the few contemporary scholars to consider the non-subsidised and non-commercial parts of the arts and cultural sector, which he refers to as the 'homemade sector'. He asserts that this part of the sector includes voluntary community activities such as amateur theatre and community choirs as well as individuals and groups uploading self-produced music and videos (2015, p8). Holden (2010) argues that the amateur and commercial sectors are largely ignored by cultural policy yet remain those parts of the cultural ecology that the public are more likely to be engaged with.

Belfiore (2018), whose work draws on Bourdieu's (1984) sociology and cultural taste research, highlights the power dynamics inherent in cultural policy development and implementation. She posits that '...different social groups enjoy not only different levels of access to different forms of artistic and cultural engagement, but also different access to the power to bestow value and legitimise aesthetic and cultural practices' (p383). Belfiore argues that discussion around cultural policy does not meaningfully connect with cultural power imbalances, leaving cultural policy to focus on 'government approved instrumental arguments' in which attention is only focussed on 'the winners' or those with the platform to evidence the legitimacy of their practice for subsidy (p382).

Throsby's (2008) contention as a cultural economist, that the orientation of cultural policy must be foremost cultural and involve a public conversation, supports Belfiore's (2018) assertion that new critical approaches are required for cultural policy discussion and development. She argues such approaches must go beyond 'box ticking' inclusion behaviours to enable communities to 'articulate their own claims to cultural authority and value' (p394). Cultural policy then, would need to extend past the group that Dye (2012) refers to as a small group of 'elite insiders', to include voices beyond government, financial consultants and the professional arts and cultural sector.

1.4 Cultural Policy traditions and approaches

In considering UNESCO's definition of the concept, Toledo Silva (2015) describes cultural policy as 'a way to both talk about and do something in a certain manner, according to certain principles' (p3). Miller and Yudice (2001) describe cultural policy as a bureaucratic exercise in which organisations 'solicit, train, distribute, finance, describe and reject actors and activities that go under the signs of artist or artwork, through the implementation of policy' (p1). Both descriptions imply that approaches to the development and implementation – the *making* of cultural policy - involves a range of activities and approaches by government and government funded agencies that involve describing, acting, and not acting.

Mulcahy (2017), a prominent narrator of the science of policy making, takes the definition further. He argues that cultural policy is about creating public 'spheres of influence' (p13) for non-commercial arts and culture. Mulcahy offers four categories of cultural policy approaches drawn from his empirical research, with each category positioning governments' uses of arts and culture to achieve outcomes in different public spheres. The following table provides an overview of Mulcahy's categories describing *why* governments make cultural policy.

Table 1.1 Cultural policy approaches Source: Mulcahy (2017)

Approach	Emphasis
<i>Culture as glorification</i> (arts and culture promote national identity)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - patronage of artists by church or state - cultural institutions that reflect the wealth and sophistication of a state's, family's or individual's heritage, objects, and stories - focus on the institutional value of arts and culture - the people and places that produce and display arts and culture to promote a nation, its cultural identities, and legacies - cultural diplomacy and cultural tourism are outputs of cultural policy that is driven by this approach
<i>Democratic cultural orientations</i> (arts and culture as a civilising influence)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - arts and culture promoted as a public good typically with a high culture, top-down approach that seeks to provide public access to cultural institutions, e.g., touring, free admission to government owned galleries - emphasis on access to excellence or world class experiences and cultural heritage - exposure rather than active engagement or participation
<i>Cultural Democracy</i> (arts and culture promote inclusivity and social cohesion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recognition of diversity and cultural differences with emphasis on bottom-up approaches – supporting arts and culture that exists beyond government owned or funded institutions - government funding held more accountable in terms of distribution and priorities - focus on the public's active engagement and participation in a wide range of cultural activities - policy representation of the cultural choices people make, and the forms with which they already engage, e.g., arts tuition, amateur groups, festivals
<i>Cultural Utilitarianism</i> (arts and culture as economic and social capital)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - focus on the broader benefits of arts and culture, from economic to social impacts - arts education programs, arts, and health initiatives, placemaking and grants programs by local governments and non-arts government departments - arts and cultural value narrated through economic benefits including cultural employment and contributions to GDP - evidence-based approaches to narrating social impact including arts education, crisis recovery and social cohesion initiatives

Over recent decades, considerable research has been undertaken regarding definitions and determinations of cultural value/s within power, taste, and class contexts (Bourdieu 1984, Certeau 1980, Holden 2006, Wright 2015, Belfiore 2018). The limitations of this study allow only a brief engagement with this body of work, however Mulcahy's categories help illuminate the role that cultural policy can play in assigning value to certain arts and cultural forms, purposes, and outcomes.

As indicated in Table 1.1, notions of elitism vs popularism, subsidised vs commercial, amateur vs professional, highbrow vs lowbrow run across all these categories – it is the positioning of the public that changes emphasis from the nineties onwards (Belfiore 2018, Jancovich 2015, Holden 2009). The means of cultural curation, production, distribution, and engagement have increasingly been in the hands of many more people via digital means (Dubray 2000) and arts and cultural consumers described this century as prosumers and conduces are more likely to be cultural omnivores rather than engaging solely with a particular category of high or popular arts and culture (Holden 2005).

Policy scholars and sector advocates have widely debated definitions and ways of measuring cultural value (Belfiore 2018, Meyrick, Barnett & Phiddian 2018). Mulcahy's (2017) four categories, both standalone and combined, can be argued and counter argued in terms of their relevance as a philosophical base from which to develop cultural policy. Writing in the context of the post 2008 Global Financial Crisis (GFC) recession, Jones (2010) argued, 'Society needs major institutions to provide representation to different forms of culture...repositories of the skills and expertise by which those cultural forms can be displayed and interpreted' (p91). This orientation is about access and exposure rather than participation, emphasizing institutional value – the art form, the artists and the institutions are the policy focus, or in Mulcahy's (2017) categories, 'culture as glorification' and 'democratic cultural orientations' (p16).

Mulcahy's (2006) 'Cultural Democracy' category (p326) describes an emphasis that was highlighted in UNESCO's 1967 Roundtable Report, which stated that cultural democratisation '...is no longer to promote wider access to "high-class culture", it is to promote active participation and stimulating powers of creations' (Recommendation 2, 1967). Contemporary policy scholars (Mangset 2020, Abbing 2020, Holden 2015, Belfiore 2018) argue that cultural policy continues to be challenged by this objective, with the top-down access to excellence approach being a continuing priority for arts and cultural funding.

According to Jancovich (2017), in the post-GFC decade, shifts made to democratise arts and culture through cultural policy were minor and token, with most arts and cultural funding (85% of Arts Council of England's funding) supporting the same group of organisations that had been funded over the previous decade. Jancovich notes that these organisations did not significantly change their attitudes towards public engagement; the approach being that the public suffered a cultural deficit and needed to be '...coaxed into engagement through education programmes or concessionary prices' (p4), rather than a deficit on the part of the cultural offer they provided. This (continuing) neo-liberalist and New Public Management (NPM) period gave rise to an emphasis on Mulcahy's (2018) fourth category, 'cultural utilitarianism', a sphere that places value on the ways in which arts and culture can contribute to economic and social agendas such as employment, city livability and tourism.

Meyrick et al (2021) posit that the COVID-19 pandemic provides opportunity to reconstruct culture's public value in holistic and multidisciplinary ways. In making a case for new democratic approaches to cultural policy, they assert that the instrumental value of arts and culture should be a 'social dialogue of the commons in which plural perspectives about what is of value co-exist in a non-hierarchy of proof' (p79). This instrumentality they argue, would need to support dialogue that

withstands ambiguity and pluralism regarding evidence, experience, and truth. They appear to be making the case for new democratic approaches to cultural policy.

Bell and Oakley (2015) argue that instrumentalism is not particular to the utilitarianism sphere, contending that cultural policy is inherently instrumental in that all government policy is aiming to achieve change (p58). With this lens, they suggest that there are four ways to consider cultural policy that insights into how it is developed and analysed. As with Mulcahy's categories of cultural policy purpose, we will briefly overview Bell et al's (2015) categories of cultural policy forms through a concise table:

Table 1.2 Four policy lenses Source: Bell et al (2015)

Ways to look at policy	Features of this lens
<i>Discourse</i>	Narratives provided through government reports and academic research, for example the 'sector resilience' discourse that emerged post GFC (Newsinger & Serafini 2019), which becomes policy through rhetorical use and application of discourse
<i>Text</i>	Funding priorities, commitments and initiatives translated through and within government documents, strategies and plans
<i>Process</i>	Methods and procedures for arriving at frameworks, priorities and commitments, which may include phases of 'ideal' policy cycles including research, consultation, and engagement tools such as surveys, forums and advisory committees
<i>Practice</i>	Policy and strategy that emerges through collaboration with the sector, its practice and data, e.g. reports on financial performance and employment, artistic and cultural achievements

In defining ways to observe and analyse cultural policy, Bell et al (2015) highlight Cairney's (2020) assertion that although ideal policy cycles may occur on occasion, *why* and *how* cultural policy is made is likely to involve consideration of messy, ongoing processes rather than ordered, rational phases. They argue that as an instrumentally focused and 'ordinary' field of public policy (p59), cultural policy has a range of scholarship traditions, from the practicalities of cultural economics and social impact to sociology and critique of culture's positioning within policy and society. Rosenstein (2020) describes these societal positionings as 'key values', identifying intrinsic purposes such as pleasure, identity and aspiration as 'primary' values and instrumental purposes such as sociability, wellbeing, health, democracy, education and prosperity as 'secondary' values (p63).

Having defined cultural policy, its uses, and ways of considering its forms, an overview of key themes arising from this literature review, reveals three lenses namely, policy as action, sustainability, and democracy. These three lenses are identified with the assumption that cultural policy, as a subset of public policy, can be as reactive, responsive and adaptative as other policy realms. These themes have as their background, the notion of policy as a 'bucket' of problems, solutions, and strategies (Cohen 1972, Ahearne 2009, Gray 2015) and are summarised in the following table.

Table 1.3 Aggregated cultural policy approach themes

Cultural Policy as subset of Public Policy	Cultural Policy approach	Sources
Cohen et al's (1972) – 'Garbage Can' Model and Ahearne's (2009) a 'bucket' of problems, issues, solutions for policy to be drawn from, policy as implicit and explicit Gray's (2015) 'whatever government says or does' to support arts and culture	Action (doing things for and in arts and culture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNESCO's (1967) body of operational approaches that support 'cultural action' by the state • Mulcahy's (2017) Culture as Glorification and Democratic cultural orientations categories • Bell & Oakley's (2015) Discourse category – key ideas or principles drive implicit policy through action/activity • Miller & Yudice's (2002) Performative rather than constative
	Sustainability (of and through arts and culture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mulcahy's (2017) Cultural Utilitarianism category • Bell & Oakley's Practice category – responding and adapting to sector data • Throsby's (2015) Culture as Contributor to sustainability the management of cultural capital, inter- and intra-generational equity • Rosenstein's (2018) secondary values
	Democracy (of and through arts and culture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mulcahy's (2017) Cultural Democracy category • Bell & Oakley's (2015) Text and Process categories – sector and public engage with explicit policy activity • Throsby's (2018) Cultural Accord between government and citizens being negotiated through public discussion • Jones' (2010), Jancovich's (2017), Mangset's (2020) and Holden's (2010)) discourse on democratising arts and culture beyond access and exposure and beyond sector consultation

Within and across these themes and sources lie discourses to do with power, class, and taste. These are examined further in the final part of this chapter prior to an exploration of how these cultural policy themes have played out in Australia and New Zealand.

1.5 Three themes – Action, Sustainability and Democracy

The key themes identified in the literature; cultural policy as action, sustainability and democracy are well worn in UNESCO's discourse, from its 1960s publications and coining of the term 'cultural policy' (Toledo-Silva 2015) through to its most recent publication proposing sustainable and democratic action to rethink cultural policies (UNESCO 2018). There is a wealth of cultural policy literature on each of the three themes, particularly the democracy theme. While this study does not examine the contemporary scholarship heritage in depth, the work of sociologists such as Bourdieu (1984) and de Certeau (1997) is illuminated through engagement with the recent work of researchers including Ahearne (2009), Vestheim (2012), Belfiore (2020) and Mulcahy (2018).

Regarding Holden's (2006) spectrum of cultural value with an historical lens, from economist John Maynard Keynes' post war institutional value rationale (Upchurch 2004) through to the contemporary neo-liberal focus on instrumental value, it appears that what is funded has not changed substantially (Jancovich 2015, Paquette et al 2015), although the rhetoric around it has. The emergence of arts and cultural 'eco-systems' and 'ecologies' language in the early 2000s equates not only with increased natural environment awareness in public policy settings; it also reflects increased awareness of the complexities of networks operating in and around subsidised arts and culture (Dovey, Moreton, Sparke & Sharpe 2016, Holden 2015).

The UNESCO 1967 Roundtable report included the recommendation that, 'Cultural policy should be as dynamic as culture' (Recommendation 2, UNESCO 1967). Throsby's concentric circles model (2008) represents a subsystem of the broader ecology or suprasystem (Throsby 2018, Ragsdale 2013), which policy network theory (Cairney 2020, Althaus et al 2018) makes further complex in terms of the cultural policy dynamism that UNESCO envisioned. Unpacking the three literature review themes further, the next section will briefly examine the dynamism (or lack thereof) inherent to cultural policy and its potential challenges for adaptation.

Theme 1 – *Action and cultural policy*

A trend identified in the literature is the common conflation of cultural policy with cultural action by governments and other authorising bodies. Toledo-Silva (2015) observes that UNESCO cultural policy papers regularly feature the term cultural action, which she notes is often used as a synonym for cultural policy (p21). Two years prior to the conclusion of UNESCO's Decade of Cultural Development (1988 – 1997), the World Commission for Culture and Development was commissioned to prepare the 'Valuing our Cultural Diversity' report (1995) to provide policy-oriented proposals for 'both urgent and long-term action to meet cultural needs in the context of development' (p9). The report highlights the importance of action and interaction between ministries and agencies to achieve cultural development outcomes. Key amongst its recommendations for policy are action-oriented initiatives such as funding partnerships, copyright legislation, awareness building and training in supporting creative and cultural plurality.

Describing policy action as largely bureaucratic, Miller et al (2002) state that 'Performativity, rather than constativity, characterizes policy, and it is frequently made "on the run", in response to unpredictable pressures' (p2). Mulcahy (2006) notes this melding of policy with action extends to practice and implementation where cultural policy is largely the outcomes of 'actions and decisions taken without expressed policy intention' (p4). Ahearne (2009) refers to this type of policy making as implicit or effective policy, meaning any strategy or decision that affects the culture of the governed territory can be considered cultural policy.

UNESCO's Roundtable Report (1969), which described cultural policy as a 'body of operational approaches that support cultural action by the state' (p7) suggests that whether guided by plans, principles or broader discourse, action is central to policy. Twenty-five years later, UNESCO's (1995) 'Valuing Our Creative Diversity' report highlighted the short-term nature of much cultural action: 'As prestigious cultural projects loom large in the short-term, election-oriented politicians rarely elaborate long-term policies. Hence the recurrence of the flagship building projects: expensive

concert halls, theatres and large sports stadiums absorb funds that might otherwise have been used for less visible and cheaper – and more numerous – training and community-based arts projects’ (p246). As Gray (2015) suggests, policy ambiguity supports short-termism in cultural action.

In considering ambiguity and its uses, Gray’s (2015) proposition that cultural policy as a ‘defined course of action to deal with a particular cultural issue – including doing nothing at all’ (p68) suggests that cultural policy can be a ‘political fig leaf’ designed to look like a government is doing something when it is not or not doing something when it should. Skilling (2005) warns against ambiguity, asserting that policy in practice must have explicit objectives so that the public can critique cultural action. In an era of implicit cultural policy, these objectives are most likely to be found in political discourse (Bell et al 2015) including announcements of funding for recovery or sustainability.

Theme 2 – Sustainability and cultural policy

The theme of sustainability manifests in three ways in the literature. The first strand is to do with sustaining the professional arts and cultural sector – supporting its resilience and endurance; the second is focused on sustaining arts and cultural support through utilitarianism; and the third focuses on the role of culture in sustainable development. To introduce the first strand, sustaining the professional sector, UNESCO’s ‘Our Creative Diversity’ report (1995) summarises the key challenge: ‘The reigning supply-led approach is expensive; it is also top-down and easily overlooks minority needs. Implementing a demand-led policy is more easily said than done, however’ (p239). Mangset (2020) warns that the public dollar for the arts and cultural sector is shrinking along with Ragsdale (2013) and Abbing (2008) who argue that current levels of public subsidy are unsustainable. Furthermore, Jancovich and Stevenson (2019) argue there is little will among policy makers to address a broad lack of public engagement with the most highly subsidised parts of the arts and cultural sector.

The post-war welfare state focus on intrinsic and institutional values-driven cultural policy gave way in the eighties and nineties to a focus on instrumental value - particularly the need for economic resilience and growth of the professional arts and cultural sector (Ho 2017). NPM, defined by Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZOG) as an ‘attempt to implement management ideas from business and the private sector to public services’ (ANZOG 2020, para 3) gave rise to a focus on effectiveness and efficiency in policy development. UNESCO’s (1986) World Commission for Culture and Development reporting reflected the need for economic efficiency as a correction for arts and cultural market failure stating that ‘funding is likely to come from the state for many years to come’ (p245). The growth and maintenance of neo-liberal ideologies and NPM in cultural departments and policies, in some instances, as a way of stretching shrinking public funds and justifying austerity measures (Mangset, Heian, Kleppe & Loyland 2018), are sometimes reframed as arts and cultural sustainability measures (Hesmondhalgh, Nisbett, Oakley & 2015, Mangset 2020).

Cultural policy researchers (Mulcahy 2018, Belfiore 2004, Bell & Oakley, 2015, Meyrick et al 2020) have observed that this new style of public administration places emphasis on measurement, data collection, evaluation, target setting, value for money, performance indicators and a range of new metrics for assessing success. Gray (2017) argues it is ‘not surprising’ that cultural policy emphasis

has shifted to instrumental objectives or what Rosenstein (2018) describes as secondary values, if the sustainability and development of the sector depends on its evidencing economic and social returns. While Mulcahy (2017) describes this approach as cultural utilitarianism, Gray (2007) describes it as cultural commodification.

The subsequent growth of creative economy discourse continues to ignite much debate in cultural policy studies regarding preferred approaches to the instrumentalisation of culture. Oakley and Banks (2020) critique the creative economy approach as unsustainable, suggesting that it seeks to retrofit an outmoded model of 'market and technology-led expansion' during 'economic, social and environmental emergencies' (p4). They assert that the neo-liberal ideal of sustainable economic growth is being challenged and that the use of GDP as a measure of growth is increasingly problematic.

The United Nations Statistical Commission (52nd session, March 2021) has adopted an ecosystem accounting method that measures and reports on natural capital. This significant practical step foregrounds a human wellbeing priority that can impact long term economic viability. Jones (2010) promotes the concept of sustainability as a key responsibility of cultural policy, asserting that it provides a framework for individuals and communities to participate in societal change and adaptation through arts and cultural forms available to them. Ragsdale (2013) asserts that sustainability is a moral issue for arts and culture, arguing that the 'speed and greed' associated with 'resilient organisations' and 'concentrated growth' should be shifted to a view that considers the suprasystem in which the subsidised arts and cultural sector is one subsystem of many cultural nodes (p11).

Throsby (2018) alludes to a suprasystem in what he describes as the 'interconnectedness principle' of a Cultural Sustainability Framework, where there are 'economic, social, cultural and environmental interdependencies' (p140). He argues that culture has an important role in sustainable development, and that in policy terms, 'interconnectedness relates particularly to the desirability of seeing economic and cultural development as proceeding hand in hand' (p141). Despite the efforts of UNESCO (2017) and scholars such as Throsby (2004, 2018), Kangas, Duxbury & Beukelaer (2019) and Hawkes (2001), the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (2015) do not include cultural sustainability as an input or outcome – culture's value in this context is again instrumental rather than being a resource in and of itself to be sustained (UNESCO 2017, Throsby 2018).

UNESCO continues to advocate for cultural policy-driven sustainable development, most recently through its 2030 'Thematic Indicators for Culture' (2019) in which cultural indicators are aligned with the United Nations' 'Sustainable Development Goals' (2015). UNESCO's 'Reshaping Cultural Policies' report (2018) monitoring the implementation of its 2005 'Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions' includes an update on cultural policies for sustainable development. It recommends that policy agencies ensure that 'culture is integrated into sustainable development policies, plans and programmes at all levels, and that they aim to achieve economic, social, cultural or environmental outcomes' (p20). In the same report, UNESCO finds that cultural sustainability is tightly bound to notions of cultural democracy.

Theme 3 – Cultural democracy

Entwined with the sustainability theme, the democracy theme similarly has more than one strand within the literature. UNESCO (2018) draws strong links between cultural democracy and sustainable development and recommends that civil society be actively involved in the ongoing development, advocacy, monitoring and evaluation of cultural policy, while observing that such approaches have not yet emerged. Unlike Mulcahy's (2006) democratic orientations category, which describes a top-down democratisation of culture through provision of access to elite forms, the cultural democracy theme concerns no-brow, culturally omnivorous approaches to cultural policy, and public participation in cultural policy making.

UNESCO's 'Our Creative Diversity' report (1995) foreshadowed the need for alternatives to the democratic orientations approach stating, 'The reigning supply-led approach is expensive; it is also top-down and easily overlooks minority needs. Implementing a demand-led policy is more easily said than done, however' (p239). More than two decades later, Mangset (2020) questions whether a more democratic approach to policy is even possible. He posits that a post cultural policy age may have commenced with the onset on neo-liberalism and NPM, and a general failure of cultural policy to adapt and respond to major cultural and societal shifts. The democratisation of culture Mangset argues, has largely failed despite broadening definitions of culture. He finds that although the public's access to cultural institutions has increased, public subsidy continues to favour elite 19th century art forms.

Similarly, Jancovich et al (2019) observe that despite two decades of work in the United Kingdom to increase cultural participation through cultural policy, the outcome has not been increased engagement with subsidised arts. At the same time, they note that while populations place a high value on their own arts and cultural activities, cultural policy has largely ignored amateur and community-based arts and cultural participation.

Holden (2007) argues that the 'cultural system' - his triangular values model that aligns *institutional* value with the sector, *intrinsic* value with the public and *instrumental* value with government and the public - is insular and exclusive. He describes it as 'a closed conversation between professionals and politicians, with too much emphasis placed on satisfying funders... Professionals talk among themselves, and talk to funders, but rarely talk to the public about what they do' (p52). Holden posits that government policy is also exclusive, particularly when attempting to articulate instrumental value, where he describes the language as 'maddeningly obscure, riddled with jargon, not understood by some of the people who use it, and not understood by the public at all...' (p29).

Jancovich et al (2019) also problematise the lack of public participation in cultural policy including the provision of advice and decision-making for arts and cultural funding. They assert that arm's length decision making, a widely exported concept established by John Maynard Keynes, the first Chairman of the English Arts Council (Upchurch 2016), has helped create insularity and elitism within cultural policy, stating that, '...from the outset, the decision making of the Arts Council was informed far less by politicians or the public than by those within the artistic community itself' (p9). They argue that cultural policy is developed by and serves an insider group – a 'taste hierarchy', that

adapts discourse and priorities to suit their legitimacy of existence needs, resulting in a disconnect between what the public values and participates in, and what cultural policy supports.

Blühdorn and Butzlaf (2020) describe the democratic process as a 'struggle for the maintenance of difference, disagreement and conflict' (p374), which when applied to cultural policy development and implementation raises questions about *who* will manage the struggle and *how* it can be managed. They define a post-democratic approach to policy as 'a top-down rather than bottom-up process, initiated and controlled by policy elites' (p380). They argue that using surveys, mass data and retrospective policy approval can activate and engage citizens in decision-making procedures, however the objective is public compliance and prescribed responses rather than ongoing and active voices. Von Keyme (2018) argues that post-democratic concepts of public interest were narrowed to economic and administrative matters, whereas the transition into new democratic approaches embraces citizen notions of self-awareness (not just self-interest) with increasing orientations towards 'plurality and sympathy for other citizens' (p103).

While Ragsdale (2013) argues sustainability is a moral responsibility for cultural policy, she emphasises cultural policy's democracy obligation, describing the aforementioned suprasystem as the 'matteringness' of the arts to people, and the connection they have with each other through arts and culture' (p11). Jones (2010) too, asserts that cultural policy must be socially responsible 'providing people with the opportunity to participate in the continuous cultural conversation by which that is shaped' (p91). Gross and Wilson (2018) argue that the ecological and the democratic are inexorably bound and that this must be recognised as a 'normative commitment', which produces inclusive policy programs that respond to interconnectivity and interdependencies. This, they believe, will lead to an expansion in who and what are identified as cultural resources and in turn, people's cultural opportunities.

It may be those neo-liberal approaches to cultural policy, referred to by von Keyme (2018) as 'unimaginative' have not enabled the narratives about people and culture to emerge in ways that support public conversation. He argues that stories have powered greater awareness than political philosophy and that 'solidarity is not a product of objectivity but rather of narrative traditions' (p97). According to von Keyme's (2018) analysis of neo-democratic approaches, cultural policy, if it is to move beyond the neo-liberal paradigm, will need to foster pluralism in cultural conversations and debate, and support diverse publics' capacities to participate rather than rely on the expertise of an elite few.

Summary of chapter

This chapter has examined the notion of cultural policy as part of the public policy realm, using a loose definition of cultural policy based on Gray's (2010) being, 'the range of activities that governments undertake – or do not undertake – in the arena of culture' (p222). The breadth of this definition has allowed a survey of literature that explores diverse policy approaches, to identify three themes: action, sustainability, and democracy. These build on the empirical research of theorists such as Ahearne (2009), Mulcahy (2018), Bell et al (2015) Pacquette et al (2017), Belfiore (2018) and Throsby (2018) while acknowledging UNESCO's continuing influence on international cultural policy conversations and research.

Dye (2012) asserts that policy, which is most likely to manifest as action in the form of resources distribution, is developed by a small group of 'national elites' who plan and implement in response to a range of motives. Numerous policy scholars (Throsby 2008, 2018, Bell et al 2015, Belfiore et al 2019, Hadley et al 2018, Meyrick et al 2021) argue that such exclusivity is a marker of cultural policy. Mangset (2020) posits that cultural policy has come to an end because of this failure to achieve cultural democracy; a concept that UNESCO (1967, 1995) has long called on democratic nations to realise.

In describing cultural policy as 'an accord between government and the people' Throsby (2018) suggests the public should be part of the policy conversation. An emerging problem within the democracy theme is how to democratise cultural policy so that the arts and cultural sector might be better supported or incentivised to democratise itself (Belfiore 2020, Hadley et al 2018, Gross 2019, Jancovich et al 2019). Furthermore, in relation to the sustainability theme, there is room to explore how new democratic approaches can be sustained through the perpetual action and inaction of cultural policy, short termism (McConnell-Hart 2019, Kangas et al 2019) and oscillating ambiguity (Ahearne 2009), which are features of cultural policy in most democratic nations.

The emergence of discussion around new democratic approaches that promote a range of inclusive policy behaviours from research and consultation to decision making is yet to be taken up by all but a few governments (Holden 2015, von Keyme 2018, Blühdorn et al 2020). Theorists argue this lack of policy evolution undermines the supportive intention of cultural policy, and keeps the arts and cultural sector elitist, and in survival mode at the same time (Hadley et al 2018, Gray 2008, 2009, Throsby 2008, 2018).

The next chapter examines how the themes emerging from this literature survey have manifested in cultural policy trends and development in New Zealand and Australia over the last fifty years. Mulcahy's (2017) cultural policy categories (Table 1.1) and the three themes of action, sustainability and democracy underpin the exploration, which will include a trans-Tasman comparison of policy development.

Chapter 2 – Contemporary Cultural Policy in Australia and New Zealand

This chapter explores cultural policy praxis in Australia and New Zealand commencing with each nation's emulation of Keynes' English arts council model, and the policy transference that continued through neo-liberal policy approaches from the 1980s onwards. Both nations' governments created historical overviews of their cultural policy practices as part of a UNESCO audit in 2010 (Ministry of Arts, Culture and Heritage 2010, Seares 2010). These overviews, which provide government endorsed narratives, highlight a similar approach but slightly different emphasis, with New Zealand's cultural policy approach being one of sustainability orientations while Australia's is action oriented.

Researchers such as Volkerling (2010), Skilling (2010), Craik (2007), Throsby (2018) provide alternative narratives of key themes and influences in, and on, the region's cultural policy since the 1940s, and their work will be drawn upon here along with critiques of recent approaches to cultural policy in the trans-Tasman region.

2.1 Post-war origins of contemporary cultural policy in the trans-Tasman region

Australia and New Zealand have parallel and similar cultural policy histories through their mutual positioning last century as Commonwealth outposts and their similarly ambivalent positioning as part of the Asia Pacific region (Volkerling 2010, Doig 2013, Mackay 2018). Both countries have experienced and continue to participate in cultural policy transfer, which Prince (2010) defines as 'the manner in which policy programmes developed in a particular time and place come to influence the development of a similar programme in another time and place' (p169).

An outcome of internationalism and transnationalism (Prince 2010), cultural policy transfer in Australia and New Zealand has included adoption of post-war English arts council modelling. This has involved implementation of the arm's length principle in which arts councils supposedly provide separation between government and sector in decision-making regarding funding (Upchurch 2016, Bell et al 2015). Later, in the nineties and early 2000s, British and Northern American creative industries rhetoric and cultural value frameworks influenced each country's neo-liberalist policy approaches (Skilling 2010, Volkerling 2010, Craik 2007) and continue to do so.

Cultural policy, as 'a range of activities that governments undertake' (Gray 2010) commenced in both countries with a high arts focus, emphasising instrumental value and in particular the social value of arts access (Craik 2007, Skilling 2010). Like English cultural policy of the time (Upchurch 2016), European arts practice within amateur and community settings was supported through early 20th century funding programs. These preceded the arts council model of funding mainly professional practitioners and organisations. The Australian Government established a literary fund for 'needy writers' in 1908, with fund members including the Prime Minister and other politicians, who were advised in their decision making by publishers, writers and academics (Seares 2010). A Commonwealth Arts Advisory Board was established in 1912 (Craik 2007), which advised the government on the purchase of art works (Gardiner-Garden 2009). Both initiatives were eventually incorporated into what is now the Australia Council for the Arts. A timeline comparison (Figure 2.1) provides an overview of Australia's and New Zealand's parallel cultural policy trajectories.

Figure 2.1. Key milestones in cultural policy in Australia and New Zealand

The New Zealand Government established arts advisory boards and cultural funds in the 1920s to support amateur and community practitioners, as well as the Māori Purposes fund and the School of Māori Arts and Crafts, both the result of Apirana Ngata's advocacy, then Minister for Māori Affairs (King 2012). This period is viewed by some researchers (Craik 2007, King 2012) as one in which aspiring non-Indigenous professional artists who practiced European art forms left New Zealand and Australia to pursue artistic careers overseas. King's (2012) summary that the migration of such artists to Europe 'was a lack as much of an understanding audience as of supportive institutions' (p319) may explain the shift from the community focus of cultural policy in the twenties and thirties to the Keynesian institutional focus in the 1940s. Post war, both countries' governments funded the establishment of national professional European-style performing arts companies – a shift in support from amateur practice to funding 'excellence' (Craik 2007, A New Approach 2020).

2.1.1 The influence of Keynesian mid-century cultural policy

In the period following World War Two, New Zealand and Australia both established versions of arts councils, which were set up, as their names imply, in honour of the Queen of England - the Elizabethan Theatre Trust in Australia in 1954 and in New Zealand, the Queensland Elizabeth II Arts Council in 1963. Each country borrowed form from the Arts Council of England, which had been established in 1946, adopting arm's length funding for opera, ballet, orchestra, theatre, and touring exhibitions (Upchurch 2016). Post war cultural policy in the trans-Tasman region was, as observed by Skilling (2005) to 'support high culture and make it widely accessible' (p20). With no expectation of economic return, funding was viewed as a necessary subsidy rather than an investment, to rebuild national identity and ensure access to the 'civilising' influences of arts and culture (Skilling 2005).

Craik (2007) refers to perceptions of the 1950s and early 1960s period in Australia as the 'cultural ice age' (p10) during which cultural ties with England would not or could not be relinquished. New Zealand was similarly culturally bound. Institutions such as the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council in New Zealand, the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust, National Institute of Dramatic Art, Elizabethan Opera Company, and other government owned cultural institutions were established in the sixties as symbols of the region's cultural sophistication and national identities (Craik 2007, Skilling 2010, Homan 2013). Skilling (2005) describes the role of the public during this time as 'restricted to the role of educated spectator. Art, primarily, was something that was done to us; ideally, we should appreciate the experience. The goal for the mass of the population was not to create culture but to become cultured' (p23).

The arts council infrastructure developed slightly differently in the two countries; Australia's arts council became a Statutory Body in 1975, with its prescribed role to provide advice to government and to 'formulate and carry out policies' that support 'excellence' in the arts (Australian Government 1975). The functions of the Australia Council were updated in 2013 to include specific roles in relation to supporting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts; diversity of expression, research, and audience development (Australian Government 2013). New Zealand's arts council, reformed as Creative New Zealand in 1994, became an autonomous Crown Entity in 2004, with its role to 'have regard to government policy when directed by the responsible minister' (New Zealand Parliamentary Council Office, 2004). Both bodies are governed by a board comprised of Minister-appointed members drawn from business, arts, and education communities.

While the two agencies are similar in purpose as funding bodies, their cultural policy role differs in that the former advises on, and the other implements government policy when directed. A key difference in funding is that the Australia Council's funding is entirely comprised of Commonwealth Government funding, while Creative New Zealand relies on the New Zealand lottery fund for approximately 70% of its funding (Ministry for Culture and Heritage 2021). In practice, both organisations are accountable to the arts minister of the day and ideally, work in partnership with their central government's arts department.

2.1.2 Fostering excellence, access, and diversity

UNESCO's promotion of cultural development and democratisation of the arts following the 1967 roundtable discussion was influential in each nation's broadening of support from Euro-centric high arts to include forms that reflected the growing ethnic and cultural diversity of each population (Seares 2010, Ministry for Culture and Heritage 2010). New Zealand's reconceiving of its national identity through cultural policy is described by King (2012): '...the nation began to down-play its Anglo-Celtic heritage, which had previously been the only basis for public policy making in the culture and heritage sectors' (p467). The New Zealand Government overhauled the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council (QEIIACNZ) through the Arts Council Act of 1974, which shifted the institution's focus from professionalism towards community participation and the regionalisation of arts and cultural support (Skilling 2005).

Australia too was rethinking its 1970s cultural identity through cultural policy means. Homan (2013) observes that the consolidating of the Australia Council in the early 1970s, highlighted 'the competing aims of excellence and access/participation – and whether they were mutually exclusive...' (p384). The 1975 Whitlam Government Industry Assistance Commission inquiry into the performing arts, which produced its findings during the first term of the following Fraser Government in 1976, recommended that federal funding to flagship companies be reduced or removed over a five-year period in favour of broader cultural initiatives that supported 'innovation, education and community objectives' (Homan 2013, p384). The Government did not follow the report recommendations, maintaining a funding focus on 'institutional excellence', which remains the core objective of the Australia Council (Craik 2006).

The distinctiveness of the region's cultural policy and the differentiation of each nation's government's approach to arts and cultural consideration grew in the seventies with the increasing recognition that the Indigenous cultures of each country, provided unique and important policy anchors (Australian Government 1973, New Zealand Government 1975). This manifested earlier and with more energy in New Zealand with the legislative renewal of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1975 requiring that government owned cultural agencies be bi-cultural with at least equal emphasis in operations and resources given to Māori interests (Ministry for Culture and Heritage 2010).

Following several years of advocacy by Māori arts and cultural leaders (Borrell 2014) the Council for Māori and South Pacific Arts (MASPAC) was established as a statutory body in 1978 as part of the QEIIACNZ. Its purpose was to maintain and support traditional and contemporary arts and culture and advise the QEIIACNZ on related matters (New Zealand Government 1987). Subsequent restructures of the council to become Creative New Zealand have ensured that at least a third of the

council membership is held by Māori cultural leaders and that Pacific Islands arts and cultures are separately represented (Te Ara 2021).

In Australia, the Aboriginal Arts Board was established as part of the Australia Council model in 1973, intended to 'stimulate indigenous Australian arts and lead to the preservation of many art forms almost lost since the settlement of Australia by Europeans' (Australian Government 1973). While the board continued to promote and fund Indigenous arts, cultural and heritage initiatives over subsequent years, the federal government's cultural policy initiatives in the mid to late 1970s were focused on a different kind of national identity – the capital's cultural infrastructure and celebration of the bicentennial of Cook's landing. This cultural policy tension remains it would seem since over the three-year period 2017 to 2020, slightly more funding was allocated annually to programs commemorating the 250th anniversary of Cook's journey (approximately \$23 million per annum) than to the Indigenous Languages and Arts program (approximately \$20 million per annum) (Australian Government 2021).

Glow and Johanson (2009) assert that since the establishment of dedicated federal funding for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts and cultural expression and production there have been two key instrumental values driving Indigenous arts policies: improving the well-being of Indigenous peoples and supporting development of artistic excellence to grow local and international markets. Bennett (2014) argues that the 'Indigenous cultural field' in Australia, with its own presence and 'forms of peoplehood' (p158) challenges traditional Bourdieusian cultural field theory (1984). While it is not within the scope of this research to explore this vital area of cultural policy development in both countries, it is acknowledged this is a field that could challenge Mangset's (2020) provocation that cultural policy is not adapting to societal change.

The 2013 Australia Council act renewal specifically states support of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts as a function of the Australia Council. The emergence of a new Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural authority or framework in Australia may significantly influence the national cultural policy space (Australia Council 2020). Meanwhile, Toi Māori Aotearoa, established in 1996 and funded by Creative New Zealand, continues to 'promote, develop and preserve the integrity' of Māori arts and support national Māori art form committees (Toi Māori Aotearoa 2021).

2.2 Neo-liberalism and cultural industries

From the mid-eighties onwards, neo-liberalism and NPM influenced cultural policy in both nations. Policy language transitioned from an almost exclusive focus on intrinsic and institutional value to the combined instrumental benefits of economic development and social cohesion (Skilling 2005, Craik 2007) or Third Way politics. Skilling (2005) describes the Third Way approach as the 'reconciliation of a dynamic economy and a cohesive society' (p20). Neo-liberal approaches to cultural policy followed economic rationalist approaches in the eighties (Skilling 2005, Craik 2005), which had placed increasing focus on funding efficiency, diversification of arts finance and higher accountability for recipients of arts and cultural funding including funding agencies (Gardiner-Garden 2009, Volkerling 2010).

In the New Zealand context, Skilling (2005) asserts that the Third Way was a 'highly desirable evolution from the interventionism that found its highest expression in Muldoonism (the first way)' (p20), and the early economic rationalist reforms of the 1980s. Direct government funding for arts in New Zealand had contracted by the early nineties to be partially replaced by national lotteries income. In 1990, the Government established a standalone Ministry for Cultural Affairs resulting in increased government investment in arts and culture to the period 2009 and a softening of the neo-liberal rhetoric (Madden 2012). The creation of the Ministry was seen as an important marker of the Government's commitment to supporting arts and culture, and the significance it placed on these activities as central to national identity building (Ministry for Culture and Heritage 2021).

Australia's arts ministries on the other hand, have always been incorporated into larger departments, with the closest to a dedicated arts and cultural department being the former Department of Communications and the Arts, which hosted the Office for the Arts from 1994 to 1998. This department, assisted by a national advisory group of arts and cultural professionals, produced Creative Nation (Australian Government 1994), which some researchers (Craig 2013, Hawking 2014) refer to as Australia's first major cultural policy. Although cultural policy activity was undertaken by previous governments, including a series of sector reviews that informed Creative Nation, the policy was the first textual enunciation of action (outside of parliamentary bills) designed to stimulate creative economy and cultural development (Craig 2007).

The Creative Nation document exemplified the emerging neo-liberalism (Rowe, Noble, Bennett & Kelly 2016). Craig (2007) notes Creative Nation's contrast with the access and equity rhetoric of the seventies and eighties stating that 'cultural policy was cast in terms of 'cultural capital at both an individual and industry level' (p14). The policy used broad definitions of arts and culture to include popular and contemporary forms, commercial and creative industries activity, however, it maintained an emphasis on excellence, using this lens to narrate the growing success of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts industry and its potential to be an economic contributor and key definer of Australian national identity. This represented a policy shift from the 'helping' Indigenous communities rhetoric of the previous decade (Glow and Johanson 2009). The policy, largely unfulfilled, was disbanded by a new government in 1996, however its core tenet 'Democracy is the key to cultural value' (Australian Government 1994, p1) maintained relevancy for the Third Way policy influence to come.

Cultural policy activity in its neo-liberal form continued in Australia through what came to be known as the Howard Government's 'sector review' period (Craig 2007, A New Approach 2020), which resulted in increased funding to major performing arts companies and national cultural institutions. In New Zealand, the Clark Government, in which the Prime Minister adopted and maintained the cultural ministry, focussed on the connections between arts and culture, employment, cultural tourism and national identity (Madden 2012). Australia and New Zealand were again rethinking their national cultural identities; the Clark Government positioning New Zealand as an Asia-Pacific nation (Volkerling 2010) while the Howard Government focussed on domestic issues such as rural and regional arts, turning away from the Keating Government's positioning of Australia as part of Asia (Craig 2007). Both countries' governments were reinforcing cultural ties to England in the late nineties through the militarisation of history (Volkerling 2010, Gardiner-Garden 2009), increased

resources to flagship companies such as ballets, orchestras and museums, and adoption of English-style Third Way politics.

The instrumental focus shifted from the civilising influences of arts and culture to one of economic growth through individuals' production and consumption of products and experiences, and employment creation. Third Way policy approaches sought to combine neo-liberal economic settings with the social investment state where according to Volkerling, 'programs are predicated on the notion of positive welfare' (p117). Skilling (2005) summarises this approach as seeking both social cohesion and the '...creation and promotion of a dynamic economy through the creation of employment or commercialisable cultural product' (p20), which he argues narrows the function field for arts and culture.

In Australia, building on the previous government's recognition that private support for the arts in Australia was 'lamentable' (Keating in Gardiner-Garden 2009) the Howard Government placed emphasis on the development of partnerships with the private sector to diversify sources of revenue and 'lighten the load on the public purse' (Craig 2007). The Australian Foundation for Culture and the Humanities was supported to transition into the Australia Business Arts Foundation, an organisation designed to facilitate partnerships with the private sector to encourage tax deductible donations to cultural organisations. At the same time in New Zealand, the Arts Foundation of New Zealand Te Tumu Toi was established by a small group of philanthropists, providing 'financial gifts to outstanding New Zealand artists' (The Arts Foundation 2020).

2.2.1 Creative Industries and knowledge economies

Creative industries rhetoric emerged in England in the nineties as part of the Blair Government's Third Way Cool Britannia knowledge economy. Australia and New Zealand cultural policy followed suit, adopting creative economies rhetoric (Skilling 2005, Craig 2007, Volkerling 2010). Craig (2005) argues that the arts and cultural sector moved away from advocacy focused on perceptions that elite arts enhance national identity to notions of 'increasing the cultural capital of citizens...' and contributing to the democratising process by 'empowering people through creative knowledge and skills' (p8). In this way Skilling (2005) argues, the onus was placed on individuals to act as cultural entrepreneurs developing their own social capital within a cultural democracy.

In 2000, the New Zealand Clark Government established a Ministry for Culture and Heritage 'to enrich the lives of all New Zealanders by promoting a confident and connected culture' (Ministry for Culture and Heritage 2021). In the same year, the Prime Minister launched a NZ\$146 million cultural recovery package which sought to promote the intrinsic value of the arts, grow a unique national identity, and contribute to creative industries' growth (Shuker 2008). This announcement, according to Skilling (2005) 'marked a turning point in financial terms, but also – and more significantly in how arts and culture is talked about by government' (p20).

Along with the adoption of the Creative Industries agenda, the Clark Ministry adapted arts funding language to arts investment language with cultural and creative industries' contribution to GDP featuring strongly in cultural policy discourse. Volkerling (2010) notes, 'Just as Clark depended on Blair's New Labour government for guidance with overall political strategy, a more specific policy

borrowing concerned the transfer of the creative industries policy concept to New Zealand' (p101). Volkerling (2010) also observes that there was a resistance to changing existing structures and systems for distributing arts and cultural funding, with the bulk of the creative recovery package awarded to 'old institutions and failed to generate widespread innovation' (p103).

Cultural policy researchers at the time (Craik, McAllister & Davis 2003, Craik 2005) observed the need for governments adopting the creative industries agenda to justify public expenditure on arts and culture through demonstration of economic and social outcomes. Hawkes (2001) and Throsby (2007) noted however, that data driven evidence-based approaches to cultural policy were neither democratising nor sustaining of arts and culture. Hawkes (2001) asserted that cultural policies of the previous decade has placed too much emphasis on industry with the arts having to 'justify itself as a producer of material wealth, as a significant employer, as an industry' (p7). He argued that the focus on self-sufficiency, sustainable business and transactional relationships with the public (attendances and sales) had forsaken wider issues for arts and culture such as 'social meaning, values and aspirations' (p7).

The Creative Australia policy launched in 2013 by the Gillard Government (Australian Government 2013) continued the Creative Nation (Australian Government 1994) neo-liberal paradigm with Prime Minister Gillard stating the policy 'affirms the centrality of the arts to our national identity, social cohesion and economic success' (Gillard in Coombs 2013). Likewise, in New Zealand, the neo-liberal influence of England's creative industries calculative approach to cultural policy continued (Volkerling 2010, Prince 2010), where the utilitarian arts and cultural funding pattern bifurcated the sector's capacity to contribute economically (creative industries) with its capacity to develop culture (cultural sector). This was encapsulated in Skilling's (2005) observation at the time that '...more than ever before, arts funding has been articulated with economic progress...but the economic is always tempered with the socio-cultural' (p26).

Researchers (Throsby 2006, Craik 2007, Shuker 2008, Prince 2010, Volkerling 2010) observed a divide between the policy locations of creative industries and arts and cultural sectors, with the former tending to be located in economic policy contexts and the latter in cultural policy settings, both discrete and attached. Craik (2007) described this cultural policy divergence as being 'between promotion of creative industries and sustainable cultural forms and shoring up of unsustainable and elite cultural forms by a return to neo-patronage' (p78). In New Zealand, while creative industry sectors were included in the 2002 'Growth and Innovation Framework' as a significant contributor to GDP, the arts and cultural sector remained positioned as a subsidy-based sector supported by Creative New Zealand's programs (Prince 2010). Craik (2007) argued that this bifurcation resulted in 'perverse policy outcomes' (p52) because it ensured both support for, and ghettoisation of elite arts (most of the population were alienated from them) while ignoring the potential to support every day, popular cultural activities including participative and amateur arts.

The next section explores the transition of cultural policy from an either/or approach to the instrumental divide to applying an ecological lens. This brought a more complex cultural value spectrum to cultural policy, with rhetoric borrowed from environmental sustainability discourse.

2.3 Cultural ecologies, values, and democracy

Over the last two decades, Australian and New Zealand governments have largely favoured strategic action or implicit effective (Ahearne 2009) approaches to cultural policy (Throsby 2018, A New Approach 2020, Madden 2012). As explored in the previous section, cultural policy patterns have continued in the neo-liberal vein, seeking to balance economic and social objectives. This decade, however, there has been a post-creative industry move towards cultural ecologies discourse. This seemingly more inclusive term is used to encompass the broad range of arts, cultural and creative activities and sectors, including commercial, subsidised, and amateur, which interdependently have potential to contribute economically, socially and culturally to societies (Shultz 2015, Dovey, Moreton, Sparke & Sharpe 2016, Holden 2015, Throsby 2018).

Cultural ecology rhetoric emerged from 2010 onwards, when it was recognised that the infrastructure of the combined creative and cultural industries and sectors and their various components required a reconciling concept for measurement and communication purposes (Bailey, Booth-Kurpnieks, Davies & Delsante 2019). Holden (2009, 2015), Knell (2007, 2011) and Ragsdale (2013), the latter two having been guest speakers and consultants for Australian and/or New Zealand arts bureaucracies, argued that cultural ecology frameworks allowed for consideration of the qualitative, whereas there was too much emphasis in creative industries frameworks on the quantitative. In an influential paper commissioned by the Arts and Humanities Research Council of Britain, Holden (2015) asserted that, 'Seeing culture as an ecology is congruent with cultural value approaches that take into account a wide range of non-monetary values' (p2).

2.3.1 Sustainability through utilitarian approaches

The proliferation of public data to do with cultural engagement and consumption in the early 2000s helped fuel a utilitarian approach to cultural policy development and reporting, and increased governments' potential to respond and adapt to the sustainability needs of the arts and cultural sector (Hong 2014, Belfiore 2018, Meyrick, O'Connor & Shultz 2020). Hong (2014) and Throsby (2018) have argued for the instrumental value of arts and cultural to be measured on a national scale through appropriate indicator sets. Hong argues that creating cultural indicators of social good, and reporting on outcomes to do with engagement, identity, diversity, social cohesion, and economic development, have an enduring role in providing a sound evidence base to inform cultural policy in New Zealand.

The New Zealand Government currently employs a cultural policy as sustainability (Bell et al 2015, p68) approach, measuring the instrumental value of arts and culture against a societal wellbeing index called the 'Living Standards Framework' (LSF) (New Zealand Treasury, 2019). The framework contains four Capital categories: Natural, Social, Human, and Financial/Physical, wherein arts and culture are positioned to deliver on several wellbeing domains. The LSF approach was preceded by a cultural indicators framework adopted by the Ministry for Culture and Heritage in 2009 to 'monitor trends in the contribution of cultural activity to New Zealand society and its economy' (New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage 2009, p2). Australia's short-lived 'Vital Signs Cultural Indicators Framework' (Cultural Ministers Council 2010) proposed a similar approach, which was disbanded

when a change of government in 2013 reduced funding to the Australian Bureau of Statistics diminishing its capacity to collect cultural data.

Both countries' aspirations for national cultural indicators and corresponding long term data collection were abandoned by governments that prioritised policy action through funding distribution and funding partnerships over the 'expense' of datafication (Meyrick, Barnett & Phiddian 2018). As Tregear (2018) points out, the most 'conspicuously practical aspect of cultural policy is deciding what, and who, gets funded and what does not' (30 November, NTRO) while Meyrick et al (2018) argue 'the statistical habit' doesn't help secure more funding for the sector, or change the ways in which it is distributed (p3). The ABS continued to collect limited data regarding cultural funding by Government, and jurisdictions took a public value approach, focussing their data collection on outputs and outcomes of investment (Meeting of Cultural Ministers 2018).

2.3.2 Public value and democratic policy approaches

The public value approach to cultural policy has included attempts to sustain *and* democratise arts and culture (Mulcahy 2017, Janovich 2017), although Lee, Oakley and Naylor (2011) argue this has largely resulted in a 'tendency to displace questions of power, people and politics' (p291). In critiquing Arts Council England's use of the concept, Gray (2008) asserts that public value is an ill-defined term, and the sense he makes of it is that delivery of public services should be focused on the 'improvement of both general processes within government' and 'developing a better linkage between public sector organisations and the general public' (p4).

Cultural policy researchers (Gray 2008, Lee, Oakley & Naylor 2011, O'Brien 2012) have argued that government departments, funding agencies and cultural institutions have used their measurement of the public value of arts and culture as a defence mechanism to justify their existence and create a buffer between themselves and the direct policy involvement of politicians - the erstwhile policy makers. O'Brien (2012) observes that public value rhetoric in policy settings has encouraged individuals' consideration of their experiences of public services rather than collective or community consideration of such services. Likewise, Meyrick and Tully's (2021) argue that 'Public value is not... a scaling-up of utility from the single consumer...It is a social dialogue of the commons in which plural perspectives about what is of value co-exist in a non-hierarchy of proof (p79).

The Creative Australia policy, the government of the day claimed, was developed in consultation with the community (Coombs 2013); a community represented by 100 self-nominated and committee selected arts, cultural and creative sector professionals invited to participate in the creative stream of the Australia 2020 Summit. The themes of the summit discussion were tested through an online survey of 2000 self-selected participants prior to being crafted into a policy document by the department with the guidance of a specialist reference group (Australian Government 2013). Craik (2015) described the policy document as 'not offering anything distinctively new or exciting' and that it 'appears to have been produced by a committee and bureaucratic machine' (p49).

The policy development process may not have exemplified the public conversation or the 'cultural accord between the government and the people' that Throsby (2006, 2018) describes in his two

seminal papers about the need for cultural policy in Australia. The Creative Australia exercise could be described as an ideal policy process (Althaus et al 2018, Cairney 2020) however a more accurate description might be reflected in what Craik (2015) and Janovich (2015) refer to as the status quo of participation in policy making by cultural elites. Janovich et al (2019) refers to such processes as ‘tokenistic consultation masquerading as participation in policy making’ and argue that ‘in order to challenge institutionalisation such participatory methods must be allowed to produce learning that may change both the values and indeed the practices of the arts themselves’ (p16).

2.3.3 Cultural policy during a crisis

Calls for new explicit cultural policy have re-emerged in Australia and New Zealand, perhaps reflecting an assumption that governments’ articulation of the importance of arts and culture will be followed by higher levels of commitment to practical support for the sector, or at least provide the sector with clarity regarding government funding priorities (Meyrick, J., O’Connor, J., & Shultz, J. 2020, Amery 2020). In the lead up to the 2020 national election in New Zealand, an online forum (The Big Idea September 2020) asked party representatives to share their arts and cultural policies. The current Arts Minister indicated that there would be no explicit policy forthcoming; stressing that where the government puts its funds in a clear indicator of its strategy (Amery 2020). This implicit approach (Ahearne 2009) is also evident in the Australian Government’s current cultural policy activity, delivered through funding announcements and frameworks rather than policy documents.

The Australian arts ministry is presently situated in the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communication. The department states its responsibility for arts and culture as, ‘We support inclusiveness and growth in Australia’s creative sector, and we protect and promote Australian content and culture’ (Australian Government 2021). Shultz (2015) argues that the Australian Government’s failure to form a ‘coherent portfolio’ and aggregate cultural policy activity within a dedicated ministry is a continued bipartisan oversight. More than a decade ago Craik (2007) asked whether a lack of a dedicated portfolio in Australia had ‘undermined the integrity of cultural policy as a distinctive domain of public policy’ (p54). Mangset (2020) suggests that ‘the absence or the disappearance of a ministry of culture does not necessarily imply the ‘end of cultural policy’ although he offers that ‘would probably signal lower priority.’

Arguably, the policy profile of arts and culture has risen because of the 2020 global health pandemic and its negative impact on the sector. Althaus et al (2018) state that, ‘Crisis exploitation injects a new way of framing otherwise negative disasters into policy opportunities’ (p69). New Zealand’s dedicated ministry with one arts minister and two associate ministers (one of which is the Prime Minister), was rapid in its practical response to the arts and cultural sector’s employment and revenue crisis in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. In May 2020, as part of a media announcement regarding a COVID-19 recovery package to support arts jobs, the Prime Minister in justifying the spend, stated that the ‘arts and creative sector...contributes nearly \$11 billion a year to GDP’ (Small 2020). To date, the New Zealand Government has provided \$374 million funding across four years through short-term relief programs and longer-term sector adaptation and sustainability initiatives (Ministry of Culture and Heritage 2021).

The Australian Government announced the Creative Economy Jobmaker Package in June 2020, which included the \$75 million Restart Investment to Sustain and Expand (RISE) fund and a \$35 million Arts Sustainability Fund. This was followed by a relief package of \$22.9 million in September 2020 to support government owned cultural institutions and Indigenous Art Centres. The Ministry states that the government has committed a total \$800,000 million recovery funding over 2020/21 to supporting the arts, cultural, entertainment and creative industries (Australian Government 2021).

While both countries' COVID recovery funding announcements continued the instrumental emphasis on the arts and cultural sector's economic contributions to GDP, there was particular emphasis on arts and cultural employment. Banks and O'Connor (2021) assert that the Australian COVID-19 cultural recovery stimulus is 'framed in terms of Keynesian "effective demand", getting the economy up and running again' (p12). Althaus et al (2018) describe this type of crisis policy response as, 'alarmed discovery and brave promises inspire a scramble by political, policy and administrative players for solutions, followed by growing realisation of the cost of achieving change' (p63). As Ian Potter, CEO of Australia's Centre for Mind and Brain, speaking about the mental health system on television show 'The Drum' recently pointed out, 'During a crisis, you find out that what wasn't working is now amplified' (The Drum, ABC 8/3/21).

The next section explores issues of employment precarity and cultural value in the arts and cultural sector, and its sense of itself in relation to government, public policy, and communities it may or may not serve.

2.4 The arts and cultural sector's relationship with cultural policy

Abbing (2008) and Throsby (2006) have observed that artists have experienced no improvement to their insecure work situations since the 1970s. This precarity has been further exposed during the 2020-21 COVID-19 pandemic, in which freelance artists and artsworkers have suffered profoundly through the loss of contracted work (Brook, O'Brien and Taylor 2020, Comunian & England 2020, Pacella, Luckman & O'Connor 2021, Banks & O'Connor 2021). Furthermore, Brook et al (2020) assert that inequities in cultural employment will be compounded post-Pandemic by diminishing funding for arts and cultural budgets, with workers from non-white-middle- and upper-class backgrounds being most at risk of underemployment and low pay because the institutions they seek to work with have not fundamentally changed since their post-war establishment (Mangset 2018, Brook et al 2020).

UNESCO's (2020) guide for practical cultural policy responses to the COVID-19 pandemic states, 'it has created a crisis with a devastating effect on the cultural and creative industries, revealing and magnifying their pre-existing volatility' (p53). This marks a contrast with the sector's post-GFC positioning by governments as resilient and having potential to contribute to economic growth (Caust 2019). Banks and O'Connor (2021) critique UNESCO's (2020) global series of seminars aimed at the arts and cultural sector and government rhetoric as confusing 'resilience with survival' (p5). They observe that the arts and cultural sector has, on the one hand, asserted itself as an industry with employment and engagement statistics offered up as proof of demand, and on the other hand, claiming public value 'beyond its economic weight' (p5).

2.4.1 A vulnerable ecology – a fragile sector

The arts ecology approach to cultural policy, popular in this decade (Holden 2015, Ragsdale 2013, Throsby 2018), positions the health of the sector as reliant on a balance of major institutions, small to medium companies, commercial and independent practitioners. UNESCO (2020) describes the sector through the fragile-interdependent lens: ‘The arts and culture community is a fragile ecosystem to which governments have devoted years, if not decades, of patient and methodical support, through cultural policies and major public investment’ (p6). Pacella et al (2021) describe a siloed, less communal ecology in which the precarity of arts and cultural work in Australia is ‘frequently informal, network-based... effectively operating as a barrier to gender, ethnic, class and wider social inclusion in the creative economy’ (p46).

In her keynote to a New Zealand arts conference, Ragsdale (2016) warned artists and artsworkers that they ‘face growing income inequality...pressure for the arts to contribute to economic growth...and the threat of an increasingly winner-take-all arts sector’. Along with Holden (2015) and Knell (2006, 2011), Ragsdale views funded arts and cultural companies and institutions as community organisations, their main purpose being to engage and provide services to their publics. During the post-GFC austerity era consulting to Arts Council England, Knell (2011) argued against what he described as ‘crude instrumentalism’ such as claiming crime reduction or contribution to GDP. He proposed that the arts and cultural sector needed to be much clearer about its claim for public funding by engaging meaningfully with communities of interest and the values they ascribe to the sector’s products.

Cultural policy researchers (Khan 2019, Janovich 2017, 2019, Belfiore 2014) observe that what has followed is a form of defensive instrumentalism in which sector advocacy is based on its capacity to provide: a) ‘unique transformative experiences’ requiring funding to broaden access to such experiences (Janovich 2019, p18); and b) secondary value such as economic and health benefits (Rosenstein 2020). Banks et al (2021) summarise the sector’s position as being between ‘a rock and a hard place; asking to be treated as an industry driven by profit maximisation and ROI, and as a public service viewed either mendicant “welfare” or self-funded human capital investment’ (p5). Janovich (2017) asserts that this positioning has set up a closed cultural policy conversation between funding agencies and the sector resulting in government performance targets such as visitation and income generation to assess public value – quantifiable returns on investment. Belfiore (2012) argues that this situation enables the sector to sidestep ‘difficult and thorny questions of cultural value’ (p5) and advocate their ‘value for money’ rather than ‘money for values’ (p13).

2.4.2 Public support, private support, and expertise

The notion of cultural democracy raises questions regarding who makes decisions about what gets funded and why (Throsby 2018, Hadley et al 2019, Banks et al 2021). In England, despite increased funding for the arts and cultural sector over the period 2006 to 2011, subsidised sector activities still only attracted certain socio-economic groups and the main barriers to inclusion were identified as ‘psychological feeling of exclusion or lack of interest in the arts on offer’ (Janovich 2017, p4). While Australian and New Zealand funding agencies’ market research claims high engagement with arts and culture (Creative New Zealand 2021, Australia Council for the Arts 2019), ABS cultural

participation data, last collected in 2009, indicates similar patterns to the finding in the English study.

In the five years leading up to 2009, the vast majority of Australians' cultural expenditure was on television sets, pay TV fees, books, and cinema tickets (ABS 2021). Similarly, in the same period, New Zealanders' cultural expenditure was largely for audio visual appliances and related content costs (over a third of total expenditure by household). The next largest category of cultural spending was literature (including newspapers and magazines), with an average of \$6.70 spent per household per week – more than double the amount spent on accessing live performing arts at \$2.70 per household per week (Ministry of Culture and Heritage 2009).

The public's in-principle support of the sector does not appear to be a problem. Most survey participants in Australia and New Zealand agree that arts and culture should be funded by Government (Creative New Zealand 2017, Australia Council for the Arts 2017), with high value placed on local cultural institutions, at home engagement activities, both online and offline and active cultural participation. The perceived participation problem Jancovich (2017) and Mangset (2018) assert, is primarily with the subsidised parts of the sector – those institutions and activities that have remained unchanged despite the public's changing engagement with culture. Others have been sustained by funding despite a lack of interest or demand for their products and services (Meyrick et al 2021). Knell (2011) argues that to strengthen the arts and cultural sector, 'a more democratised cultural sphere' is required so that philanthropic support for the arts will not be reliant on a small group of wealthy individuals, but on the 'intentions of every citizen fully engaged in a cultural life' (p34).

2.4.3 Advocacy and semi-public conversations

The New Zealand sector has appeared relatively quiet advocacy wise since the September 2020 election and the announcement of COVID-19 relief funding including a \$70 million Creative Arts Recovery and Employment (CARE) Fund to support creative employment and access and participation for 'underserved communities' (Ministry of Culture and Heritage 2021). While more than \$30 million has been allocated by central government over the next two years to maintain the operations of national cultural institutions, more than \$100 million has been allocated over the same period for the sector to maintain programs and deliver new productions and projects. Recovery funding has supported the supply components of the ecology with the sector positioned as a sustainable economic and social contributor to the country's post-pandemic recovery.

In Australia, where relief funding was initially prioritised towards a broad provision of basic living wage through the Jobseeker and Jobkeeper initiatives, the national government was perceived by the sector as slow to understand and support the arts and cultural sector's crisis (Meyrick et al 2020). Pacella et al (2021) critiqued the Australian Government's 'counter-cultural policy' as 'leaving COVID-19 to do the work of hollowing out the arts...whilst promoting fossil fuels and other extractive industries as the only way forward in a "business led" recovery' (p44). During this perceived national cultural policy vacuum (Meyrick et al 2020), Australian think tank A New Approach (ANA), released a report asserting the need for new national policy to clarify the role arts and culture have in addressing environmental and economic crises in Australia.

Adopting a policy as discourse approach (Bell et al 2015), the ANA report (2020) is focussed on the four policy drivers of collective identity, reputation building, social improvement, and economic contribution. It includes the recommendation for a national inquiry to investigate the effectiveness of current policy settings, which the current Australian Government instigated in August 2020 through its Standing Committee on Communications and the Arts. The Inquiry's Terms of Reference appear to have been drafted in direct response to the ANA report (Parliament of Australia 2020). The Committee's report due mid 2021 was not available at time of writing, however, the ANA's suggestion during the hearings that a national culture plan be developed in line with the Sport 2030 plan was reiterated and well received by the committee (Standing Committee on Communications and the Arts, Australian Parliament 2021).

Unlike New Zealand's sports department, which is part of the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, Australia's sports ministry sits within the Health department and is responsible for a national sport plan and a sports diplomacy strategy. The 2020 National Sport Plan included discussion with the sports sector *and* members of the general public – arguably a democratisation of public policy that has not applied to arts and culture in either country despite the Creative Nation aspiration that 'Democracy is the key to cultural value' (Australian Government 1994). New Zealand's co-location of sports and arts enables complementary use of both, e.g., Kapa Haka groups gaining international exposure and touring opportunities through rugby performances, and the competitive elements of sports applying to New Zealand's national Kapa Haka festival.

Presently, the relationship between the arts and cultural sectors and cultural policy in New Zealand and Australia remains exclusive with expectations that dialogue with the sector will inform the development of policy, and in turn, clarity, and predictability of funding for the sector. New Zealand artist and founder of Black Creatives Aotearoa, Dione Joseph (2020), argued in a pre-election arts and cultural forum that:

...old definitions have proven to have limited functionality and we need funds to be diverted from just another manual on "how to" to actually ensuring there are seats at the table, not just to be part of the discussion, but to be influential in the decisions. The bigger the circle, the better the conversation. (The Big Idea, October 2020)

It appears that this artist is arguing for greater diversity in sector representation, and perhaps a greater democratisation of cultural policy that includes both discussion and action.

2.5 Summary of Chapter

This chapter has explored the last fifty years of cultural policy praxis in the trans-Tasman region, demonstrating the continuous influence of English cultural policy including arts council infrastructure and arm's length decision making, neo-liberalist approaches, creative industries and value frameworks, sustainability, and ecology rhetoric. Much of the contemporary literature works with the assumption that the arts and cultural sector is fragile – an eco-system of interdependence. Comunian & England (2020) assert that a sector sustainability crisis was in place pre-pandemic – disguised by a 'glamour filter' (p114), which had obscured high levels of underemployment and insecurity.

The arts ecology approach to cultural policy, prevalent in this decade (Holden 2015), positions the health of the sector as reliant on a balance of major institutions, as well as small to medium companies, commercial and independent practitioners. The policy responses of the Australian and New Zealand governments during the 2020 and 2021 health pandemic's negative impact on the sector, aligns with the OECD's (2020) and UNESCO's (2020) advice. This included recommendations to sustain full time employment in major institutions and companies by providing funding uplifts; supporting continued production by the small to medium sector through competitive relief and recovery funding and leveraging existing welfare programs for individual practitioners to access a temporary basic wage. These are short term measures, which are unlikely to extend beyond current government terms.

The trends and patterns evident in cultural policy approaches in the trans-Tasman region highlight the orientation towards policy as action with a distinct gradation since the 1940s of Mulcahy's (2017) democratic orientations, followed by cultural democracy approaches in the 1970s, then cultural utilitarianism from the 1980s onwards. The three themes identified through the literature survey; policy through action, sustainability and democracy approaches are prevalent in the New Zealand and Australian national cultural policy contexts of the last two decades. The ways in which these themes can define a conceptual framework for data analysis to explore the problem of cultural policy legitimacy as a supportive mechanism for the arts and cultural sector will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 3 – Conceptual framework/Methodology

This chapter provides an overview of the conceptual framework for the research; developed through a review of contemporary public policy and cultural policy literature. It describes the framework's application to the analysis of a contained data set collected from the policy making field. The central research question, 'How can cultural policy strengthen the arts and cultural sector?' holds the underlying assumption that cultural policy in its various forms and approaches is a valid activity of government, and an activity worthy of non-government actors' involvement. The research question emerges from a post-positivist paradigm – that is, the research proposes that cultural policy exists as a non-static object of study, which can be objectively analysed through qualitative means. The research participants may alter perceptions of cultural policy, its definitions and manifestations, however cultural policy's actuality as a broad set of activities is not in question.

The central research question further assumes that the arts and cultural sector needs fortification, an assumption inherent in the literature review themes, particularly in recent works concerning employment precarity highlighted by the COVID-19 pandemic. The research problem's focus on *how* rather than *why* places the study firmly within a reality ontology – cultural policy *can* strengthen the sector; *how* can it do this? The research seeks knowledge through qualitative means, assembling meaning through identification of patterns and gaps, with a drive to identify findings in praxis development between and beyond the siloes of government, sector, and public transactions.

3.1 Conceptual framework

This study's literature review encompasses contemporary research by public policy and cultural policy scientists analysing policy in Western democracies. Cultural policy is situated by several researchers (Mulcahy 2018, Cairney 2020, Paquette et al 2017, Bell et al 2015, Gray 2010, Ahearne 2009) within public policy and it is therefore subject to similar contexts and influences as other policy fields, such as the enduring effects of neo-liberalism, oscillating ambiguity (Ahearne 2009) and bounded rationality (Cairney 2020). The analysis of data collected for this study is conducted with the assumption that cultural policy, its various definitions and manifestations will not be dissimilar to other policy areas, for example, cultural policy equals all the actions a government describes and implements to support arts and culture (Dye 1998, Ahearne 2009, Bell et al 2015).

The conceptual framework for this study notes Cohen, March and Olsen's (1972) garbage can model of a multi agent system for decision making, as interpreted through Cairney's (2020) analysis of bounded rationality approaches to policy making: 'The garbage can is where a mix of problems, solutions and choices are dumped' (p196). In line with Cohen et al (1972) and Cairney (2020), this conceptual framework considers that cultural policy within Australia and New Zealand occurs largely outside of the ideal policy cycle (Althaus et al 2015, Bell and Oakley 2015), and over recent decades has been developed and implemented in one or a combination of the three styles identified in the literature review. The following table (Table 3.1) outlines the three styles, their characteristics and lineage.

Table 3.1 Conceptual framework table – three strands of cultural policy

Strand/style	Characteristics	Theoretical lineage/heritage
Cultural Policy as <i>Action</i>	<i>Doing</i> behaviours – implementing funding programs, legislation, regulation measures, projects Implicit and Explicit approaches	Cohen, March and Olsen's (1972) Garbage Can Model of a multi agent system for decision making, as interpreted through Cairney (2020) - The garbage can is where a mix of problems, solutions and choices are dumped)
Cultural policy as <i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Adapting</i> behaviours – altering and changing program and strategy design in response to sectoral need, research and/or consultation Implicit and Explicit approaches	Baumgartner, Jones and Mortensen's (2014) Punctuated Equilibrium Theory, Ahearne's (2009) Oscillating Ambiguity Theory
Cultural policy as <i>Democracy</i>	<i>Discussing</i> behaviours – facilitating public dialogue, consultation, surveys, and partnerships Explicit approaches	Belfiore's (2017) cultural democracy lens noting Bourdieu's (1984) cultural policy as democratising culture theories

These three strands of cultural policy can be represented in a Venn diagram (Figure 3.1) with each sphere operating independently or in combination with another:

Figure 3.1 Conceptual framework diagram

The gap in the literature relates to approaches that could enhance interactions between these strands of cultural policy (action, sustainability, democracy) and three policy actor groups, which include government (including arts and cultural bureaucrats), the arts and cultural sector and the broader general public; its diverse communities of interest and practice. The research question, 'How can cultural policy strengthen the arts and cultural sector?' seeks insights beyond the idea of more funding, which is often though not always a helpful input. Rather, the analysis seeks to identify broader policy behaviours and action, particularly in the underexplored grey area, which venture beyond the consultation process of an idealised policy cycle to strengthen the sector in a myriad of ways.

3.2 Scope

In keeping with Throsby's concentric circles model definition (2018, Figure 1.1), the research considers the arts and cultural sector to be that which is concerned with the core creative arts including performing arts, music, visual arts, literature, museums, libraries, galleries, multi-arts events such as festivals and performing arts spaces. The broader creative industries such as film, architecture and advertising are outside of the scope of this research and are well covered in the literature. The research is informed by cultural policy theory as it has occurred in Western democracies over the last thirty years, with a focus on New Zealand and Australian policy contexts. While both countries have adopted policy approaches from English, and to a lesser degree, North American contemporary policy praxes, their distinctive and shared approaches are compared with the notion that cultural policy is not a static object (Paquette & Redaelli 2015).

This research is framed within a positivist paradigm, employing an ontology described by Moses and Knutsen (2015) as 'the correspondence theory of truth' (p49), that is, this thesis presents assumptions and findings that correspond to policy contexts and situations as they are in the real world. In acknowledgement of Leedy and Ormrod's (2016) view that positivists 'bring certain bias to research endeavours' (p8) I recognise that as a public servant who has worked in the cultural policy realm, I have preconceptions of what effective and ineffective cultural policy, strategy and planning look like. As such, my epistemology centres on the socio-cultural and power-based contexts within which the documents I examine are created, and from which the experts I interview speak.

3.3 Methodology

The qualitative research used an approach comprised of an extensive analysis of cultural policy literature supported by semi-structured interviews with current and former arts bureaucrats. The bureaucrats were invited to reflect on cultural policy approaches they had been involved with; their experiences of approaches being utilised at the time of interview, and how cultural policy approaches might change and adapt. The methodology was informed by the theoretical concept identified through the literature review (Figure 3.1) and had three key phases of data collection and analysis as follows.

Phase 1 - Literature Review

A survey of contemporary cultural policy theory and practice was undertaken, spanning work published from the mid-20th century to the present decade. Priority was placed on literature that

regarded contemporary cultural praxis in Western democracies over the last two decades, with attention paid to very recent work that addressed policy responses to the global health pandemic of 2020 and 2021. Drawing on highly regarded texts by policy scientists and peer reviewed journal articles, the first stage of review sought to identify and explore definitions of public policy and the place of cultural policy within the public policy realm, along with contemporary approaches to policy making and policy analysis. The second stage of the review sought to identify and compare approaches to cultural policy development and implementation in Australia and New Zealand over the last thirty years including cultural policy and strategy documents, their published critiques, and evaluations.

Phase 2 - Semi-structured interviews

Interviews were conducted with four current and three former arts bureaucrats, four from Australia and three from New Zealand. Six of the interviewed bureaucrats were involved with cultural policy development for central government arts agencies while one worked for a regional jurisdiction. At the time of interviews, the COVID-19 pandemic had been disrupting workplaces and community life for several months. The bureaucrats' work was in turn affected and much of their focus was on the pandemic's impact on the arts and cultural sector and communities' access to, and engagement with, arts and culture. The semi-structured interviews, each of approximately 30 minutes' duration, were conducted via the Microsoft Teams platform as COVID-19 restrictions did not permit travel for face-to-face meetings. These factors may have impacted the nature and depth of the conversations, the emphasis in the bureaucrats' responses and the time pressure experienced by interviewees since interviews took place during their workdays.

Interviews were guided by a set of questions designed to identify processes utilised by governments to develop state or national cultural policy, and the perceived outcomes of such policies including legacies. The first part of the interview structure focussed on the roles of arts and cultural bureaucrats and their relationships with cultural policy processes. Related questions included:

How have you been involved in cultural policy development?

How do you define cultural policy?

Tell me about an instance where cultural policy you worked on, or with, had unexpected outcomes.

The second part of the interviews sought to gain the bureaucrats' insights on the legitimacy of cultural policy within the broader public policy realm and its impact on the arts and cultural sector. Questions included:

What responsibility do you think Governments should take in developing cultural policy?

What impact, if any, has cultural policy had on the arts and cultural sector?

What role does the arts and cultural sector have in cultural policy development?

What impact, if any, has cultural policy had on the broader community?

The final part of the interviews sought the bureaucrats' consideration of the future of cultural policy, its forms and purpose, and alternative approaches to cultural policy making. Related questions included:

Tell me about your cultural policy heroes or hero moments, e.g., courage, outstanding achievements, or noble qualities, and why this/these stand out.

What do you think the role of cultural policy is now?

Could we do without cultural policy?

What might be a future role for cultural policy?

The bureaucrats were invited to select their own pseudonyms, which are used in place of their real names and do not necessarily denote gender, age, or ethnicity. None of the bureaucrats interviewed identified as Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander or Maori peoples.

Ethical approval for recruitment of research participants and conducting interviews with the was obtained from the Faculty of Commerce Human Ethics Committee of Victoria University of Wellington in October 2020.

Phase 3 - Analysis of interview data using the conceptual framework developed through the literature review

Analysis was approached in several phases, commencing with a comparison of the bureaucrats' definitions of their roles and cultural policy with those identified in the literature review. Data coding was undertaken using the conceptual framework's (Figure 3.1) three spheres to compare the bureaucrats' described approaches to cultural policy with those identified in the literature as being most prevalent in Western democracies, particularly in Australia and New Zealand. The conceptual framework's intersections, including the grey area provided analytical spaces for data concerning new and emerging praxis which was identified in data collected from the second and third parts of the interviews.

3.4 Limitations

Limitations of this study include:

- *Limited field of experts* – by selecting a small sample set of interviewees there is potential for the data to be skewed.
- *Researcher bias* – I have experience as an arts bureaucrat working in cultural policy contexts and bring preconceptions of cultural policy practice and worth to the study, along with relationships in the field that impacted my choice of texts and interviewees.
- *COVID-19 restrictions* – face-to-face interviews are preferable for quality and depth; however, travel restrictions limited my capacity to conduct interviews in this way. Live online video interviews did not enable reading of body language and was not particularly conducive to establishing trust and depth in the interview space.
- *Time limitations* – the interviewees selected have demanding work schedules, particularly at the time of interview when most were dealing with higher than usual workload due to the pandemic. Although interviewees were generous with what little time they had in following

up on requests to check their comfort level with accuracy of interview transcriptions, further interviews with participants were unfeasible.

- *Cultural limitations* – some of the concepts explored in the literature, which arose in the interviews data are specific to First Nations philosophical, political and cultural frameworks. The small scale of this study and ethical considerations did not allow for deeper engagement with the owners and narrators of these concepts, hence they are only briefly referred to via non-Indigenous authors and interviewees.

Chapter 4 – The Bureaucrats

This chapter provides an analysis of data collected through interviews with seven arts and cultural bureaucrats, who presently work in a government department or arts and cultural funding institution or have previously worked in either setting. According to Dye (1998) bureaucrats can have a significant influence on public policy through their decision making and implementation. This form of influence, most often performed in what Althaus et al (2018) refer to as the ‘grey zone’ between administration and politics, is considered in this chapter through the three lenses of the conceptual framework (Figure 3.1), which are policy as action, sustainability, and democracy. The grey *area* of the conceptual framework is distinct from Althaus et al’s (2017) grey *zone*, however, the framework’s grey area does include similar elements such as administration and politics, as well as sector, community, and public zones.

In the cultural policy context, bureaucrats are among the few who work in and across these zones, but they are rarely provided with, or take, a public platform or voice. Their influence is seemingly discrete as they traverse Althaus et al’s (2018) grey zone between sector and government. Their insider view is a unique and a dormant resource in post-democratic settings (Blühdorn et al 2020, Crouch 2011), muted by public service role definitions and agency protocols. To shed more light on their experiences of the conceptual framework’s policy spheres and its intersections, this research sought the bureaucrats’ knowledge and insights, taking care to ensure privacy and confidentiality, abidance with protocols and public service codes of conduct.

The interviews took place during the COVID-19 pandemic, which significantly impacted the nature of the work that those working in government bureaucracies were undertaking. The research participants’ provision of time and consideration for this research was particularly generous given how little they had to spare in their juggling of government and sector needs nine months into the global health pandemic. The interviewees, herein referred to as ‘the bureaucrats’ were, or are senior in terms of experience, role and rank and represent a range of professional backgrounds in public service and private sector settings.

This first section of this chapter will discuss the bureaucrats’ roles as they understand and perform them, and groups their policy activities into three main categories. This is followed by an exploration of the bureaucrats’ experienced approaches to cultural policy, drawing comparisons with the three approaches outlined in the conceptual framework (Figure 3.1); policy as action, sustainability, and democracy. The chapter concludes with discussion concerning the bureaucrats’ observations of challenges and emergent approaches to cultural policy and finds two themes emerging from this discussion: the need for more inclusive approaches and the need for longer term views in cultural policy development.

4.1 The role of arts and cultural bureaucrats

In the mid-sixties, the emergence of cultural policy as an overt government activity necessitated a new type of bureaucrat (Rosenstein 2018). This need was expressed in the UNESCO (1969) Cultural Policy Roundtable Report, which raised the issue that cultural affairs in many countries were being managed by arts experts ‘without any administrative ability’ (p23) or alternatively, civil servants with

no understanding of the arts and cultural sector. Rosenstein (2018) notes the report expressed the need for cultural affairs to be managed by cultural administrators; professionals with expertise in the arts combined with a 'commitment to bureaucracy' (p15). The report states that for cultural policy to be effective, 'Financial resources are not enough: professional personnel is required' and discusses new research departments being set up in the civil service to 'draw up research programmes, follow their implementation, and see that they are turned to account by the various services' (UNESCO 1969, p13).

Cultural policy scholars (Khan 2019, Bennett 2016, O'Brien 2016, Vestheim 2012, du Gay 2008) have debated the roles of arts and cultural bureaucrats, their political and cultural contexts, the ethics they are required to adhere to and their influence on cultural policy. Vestheim (2012) argues the role of public servants and professional bureaucrats in cultural policy is crucial, their function being 'to prepare political discussion and to implement political decisions once they have been made' (p537). While employees of government owned agencies and institutions may be bound by codes of conduct that are separate to the public service, they and their boards are still accountable to a Minister and often, that Minister's portfolio department.

The distinction between the role of the bureaucrat and that of the politician is summarised by O'Brien (2016) as 'the division between technical and political expertise' (p129). The bureaucrat, who may be expert in two ways; in public administration and technically expert in the field they serve (Vestheim 2012), advises on, and implements decisions, while the domain of the elected office bearer is to make policy decisions. Vestheim (2008) states that 'by producing reports and other documents, civil servants of high rank have in practice much influence on the substantial content of political discussions and decisions made by politicians' (p538). However, the Minister as the final policy maker may choose to take the advice of the senior bureaucrat or refuse that advice. This represents the so-called separation between the government and the department, and the balance that bureaucrats must strike in providing advice within an ethical framework – speaking truth to power – while being prepared to implement a decision that may not be the result of that advice.

The bureaucrat must be impartial and act impersonally without forsaking their ethical principles (du Gay 2008, O'Brien 2016). The bureaucrats interviewed for this research were careful to adhere to their agency's conduct protocols during interviews while providing experienced-based insights into government, the arts and cultural sector and expectations of the broader community. Those who no longer work for government agencies were less guarded in their opinions about cultural policy, however the majority emphasised the necessity for, and expectation of impartiality in performing their roles to inform and serve governments' and ministers' policy objectives. Bill described the impartiality required to do both in the following way:

Somebody told me once, coming into the public service, "you make your case but if you don't get your way, you get on board with the decision".

(Bill)

While this comment might suggest a requirement for a dispassionate approach to performing the role, the bureaucrats articulated frustration with, and more often empathy and admiration for, the arts and cultural sector. They appreciated that the sector is perpetually in need of more funding

and other forms of support, however, they spoke most passionately about the work of individuals and organisations who were able to demonstrate proactivism, community-mindedness and quick adaptation to stakeholder needs. It may be that this appreciation reflected (or projected) bureaucrats' own work priorities at the time of interview, however the stories shared by the bureaucrats about sector approaches they regarded most highly spanned a decade or more. They included working in partnership with sector representatives to address immediate service needs such as arts led responses to community crisis, and longer-term needs such as services sustainability.

Bureaucratic roles in government require a head in, hands out approach when working with the arts and cultural sector. They can see and hear sector issues, analyse, and advise on these issues within government and facilitate government initiatives in response, however partnership approaches to development and delivery were not as common in bureaucrats' experiences as they might wish. While they understood this as a symptom of being under resourced, Micky described the sector as 'self-defeating' when it engages in 'patch protection' or is unclear about priorities when communicating with bureaucrats and ministers. Micky expressed the difference that effective sector leadership makes to the bureaucrat's capacity to work in partnership with the sector:

...the leaders there live and breathe what they preach...it's such a respectful environment. Every time I go there, I am just pretty much on the verge of tears - they are just so inspiring.

(Micky)

This was not part of a romantic narration of the arts and cultural development outputs of the sector organisation, rather, a description of the organisation's ability to work in partnership with artists, communities and funding partners including governments and philanthropists. The bureaucrats expressed how effectively they can achieve cultural policy action and adaptation when they are able to work in collaborative and networked ways within and across government, sectors, and communities.

The following table outlines key components of the bureaucrats' roles, identified in the data relating to their descriptions of their roles and their involvement with cultural policy. These components can be grouped into three main categories of cultural policy activity: strategic action, strategic advice and facilitating policy networks. Each category is illustrated with a bureaucrat's example of how the component manifests in and through their work.

Table 4.1. The bureaucrats' roles in cultural policy

Role	Activity	Examples
Strategic action	Implementing decisions, strategies, programs, and activities that support the arts and cultural sector.	...the development of new legislation and the implementation of compliance...regulatory kind of things...development and implementation of new programs within government, working with (other jurisdictions) to implement where we could national frameworks... (Jessie)
Strategic advice	Offering expert technical and administrative intelligence, gathering and analysing evidence through research and consultation to inform reporting, advice and feedback to policy makers	...a strategic advisory role - people come to you for peer review, trying to shape some of the bigger ambitions we might have...are we able to use culture to shape society in a different way? (Bill)
Facilitating policy networks	Building, maintaining, and developing policy and governance networks to support consultative and inclusive approaches to cultural policy	...so many areas that arts connects with - on the social side there's social services, ageing, education and on the economic side there's industry, finance, foreign affairs as well so it's about making sure that all those parts of government are signed up... (Micky)

The three spheres of the conceptual framework; policy as action, sustainability, and democracy, emerged early in the interviews as roles were described and discussed. The three categories of professional activity in Table 4.1 appear to align with the conceptual framework lenses as follows:

- Strategic action – Cultural policy as action (doing policy)
- Strategic advice – Cultural policy as sustainability (adapting policy)
- Facilitating policy networks – Cultural policy as democracy (discussing policy)

While the bureaucrats communicated the nature of activities within their professional roles with clarity and sureness, they shared academic writers' wariness of defining cultural policy, recognising that its meaning varies across government, sector, and regions. They problematised the term throughout interview discussions, acknowledging that 'cultural' can be a difficult concept to define and work with, and that 'policy' need not, and often does not, occur within an ideal development cycle or have a published output such as a policy document. John's response typifies the bureaucrats' consideration of cultural policy definitions:

...we don't really have a settled definition...policy is the word we use to define how we're going to go about reaching some of those longer-term objectives - kind of sounds like strategy - kind of is...

(John)

John's use of the term strategy implies a focus on policy as action or *doing* policy. Definitional discussions with the bureaucrats highlighted their orientation towards what policy *does* rather than

what cultural policy *is*, resonating with Dye's (1998) advice that focussing on cultural policy definitions can be exasperating. Although the bureaucrats were disinclined to arrive at fixed definitions of cultural policy, most were definite in their view that cultural policy is a government-led activity and is largely government-enacted.

A policy is a government statement of what it wants to do to address a public issue...so the government always leads and owns and delivers a cultural policy.
(David)

Opinions varied on whether policy was best considered as discourse, text, process, or practice (Bell et al 2015, see Table 1.2) with a bias towards the latter two forms. The bureaucrats, in describing the range of cultural policy activities they implemented for and on behalf of government, related characteristics that align with Gray's (2010) definition explored earlier, as 'the range of activities that governments undertake – or do not undertake – in the arena of culture' (p222), while reflecting Ahearne's (2009) observation that cultural policy can be explicit or implicit and oscillate between and around these positions.

This section (4.1) has explored the *who* and the *what* of cultural policy in bureaucratic settings. The bureaucrats' insights regarding their cultural policy roles and functions reflect the literature themes in Chapter 1 (1.2, 1.4) regarding cultural policy as a subset of public policy. The bureaucrats demonstrated awareness of the line they must carefully walk between sector expertise, cultural administration, and politics (UNESCO 1969, Vestheim 2012, Rosenstein 2018), and emphasised that while they can influence policy with evidence and advice, decision making power sits largely with the Minister. The following section moves on from who delivers cultural policy to explore the bureaucrats' experiences of how cultural policy occurs across the spectrum of government and bureaucratic activity.

4.2 Bureaucratic approaches to cultural policy

The literature reviewed in Chapter 1 (1.4) highlighted several contemporary approaches to cultural policy including Mulcahy's (2017) categories and Ahearne's (2009) oscillating ambiguity concept, which describes policy as alternating between implicit and explicit manifestations. These categories and concepts featured prominently in the bureaucrats' descriptions of the ways in which they work with cultural policy. They described policy as alternatively peripheralised; an insubstantial component of public policy or substantialised as a contributor to national identity or economic frameworks, however, their direct experience generally involved implicit approaches (Ahearne 2009). These are the strategies and actions of any department that has to do with cultural territory (p4), for example, a department of foreign affairs presenting an arts program to support cultural diplomacy. Ongoing implicit approaches appeared to be intermittently peppered with explicit approaches (Ahearne 2009) such as those discussed in Chapter 2, including arts funding packages, frameworks, and statements.

The bureaucrats narrated the dominant approach in the trans-Tasman region over the last twenty-year period (2000 – 2020) as being one of implicit and effective action interspersed with bursts of explicit and nominal labelling through documents and statements. They referred to key cultural

policy moments such as the Keating Government's 1994 Creative Nation Policy in Australia and the Clark Government's 2000 Cultural Recovery Package in New Zealand as explicit policy moments. There was some ambivalence, however, about the effectiveness of policy expressed in this way given that cultural policy action did not cease when these policies were discontinued by a change of government. The bureaucrats acknowledged that explicit cultural policy could provide the arts and cultural sector with clarity regarding government intent and funding priorities, yet they held a clear bias towards action rather than policy expression through public texts. Micky's preference for discourse that follows and is informed by action illustrates the bureaucrats' need for an evidence base to inform government policy praxis.

I think the potential for (cultural policy) to have an impact is absolutely there but you can't have that by just releasing a document that says, "this will be the impact" - the way you get that is by having runs on the board now...be working with other communities, be working with other sectors, be working with other parts of government to have it in action and then I would have thought a cultural policy can kind of reinforce it.

(Micky)

This comment reflects the bureaucrats' bias towards policy that is grounded in *doing*, which reflects their description of their roles as being strategic action oriented (see Table 4.1). While they more often referred to funding programs, legislation and responsive action as cultural policy, the bureaucrats emphasised the importance of transparency of intent as crucial to cultural policy integrity. Integrity was also linked to action as indicated in Micky's comment about cultural policy impact. The bureaucrats perceived policy words without action as hollow, and policy action without stated purpose as incoherent. Rhonda's comment below is an example of the bureaucrats' ambiguity regarding cultural policy as text (Bell et al 2015), coupled with their certainty that regardless of whether its form is explicit or implicit, cultural policy must provide its purpose explicitly.

...whether you've got cultural policy (text) or not I think it's important to be explicit about it...making it explicit is crucial and part of the role that cultural policy has...

(Rhonda)

Having briefly examined the bureaucrats' perceptions of implicit and explicit styles of cultural policy and their opinions on what is required to effectively enact policy, the next section will move into an exploration of the bureaucrats' insights and experiences of cultural policy approaches. These are discussed using the three lenses of the conceptual framework – action, sustainability, and democracy (Figure 3.1). Commencing with policy as action approaches, some activities and behaviours that occur where the lenses intersect will be highlighted, including themes and issues that emerge in the grey area.

4.2.1. Policy as Action

The policy as action approach emerged as a strong theme in the bureaucrats' interviews. It was the approach most likely to be utilised; and usually occurred within the context of resources management and distribution. Dye's (1998) and Lasswell's (1936) descriptions of policy as government 'doing what it chooses to do' (or not to do) and 'who gets what support and how' resonated with the data. Whether the bureaucrats were describing peer-assessed, competitive, or discretionary funding, deciding on who gets funding and stewarding resources to communicable outcomes were described as the most essential policy actions. The practical processes of negotiating and distributing funding; addressing perceived market failure and responding to risk or crisis featured prominently in bureaucrats' descriptions of what they and their teams administer on behalf of policy decision makers.

...a lot of the policy is about the funding going out and supporting it.

(Rhonda)

Although speaking to agency purpose, Bill's 'we make decisions' comment below can be seen as relating to Althaus et al's (2018) description of the grey zone – the space between public administration and politics.

The big area is where does the money go? We make decisions about who gets funded and that influences what we see...

(Bill)

In discretionary funding and procurement situations, bureaucrats are sometimes required to make decisions about 'who gets what' (Lasswell 1936) although more often such decisions require funding panel/committee/board and ministerial approval. The bureaucrats described their funding influence as mostly relating to preparation and evaluation of funding frameworks and programs, which held stories that correspond with concepts of an enduring neo-liberalist era (Crouch 2016, Butzlaff 2020).

As outlined in Chapter 2.2 neo-liberal cultural policy frameworks seek to utilise arts and culture to achieve a combination of economic and social outcomes. Such frameworks have corresponded with governments' outsourcing of policy research and advice. In describing the network facilitation and advisory components of their roles, the bureaucrats referred to contracts or partnerships with marketing and consulting firms, sector advocacy groups and philanthropists, all of which informed or are informing cultural policy. The bureaucrats recognised that whether a policy direction is provided via bureaucratic, consultant or sector advice (or a combination of these), it will likely be actioned from the grey zone (Althaus et al 2018) between administration and politics.

The bureaucrats described the tension they experience regarding where their delivery emphasis should be. In an ideal policy cycle (Bell et al 2015, Althaus et al 2018), policy action serves the government of the day, the sector, and public interests, which may or may not always neatly align or balance. While the bureaucrats were clear about their obligation to serve the government of the day, their narratives swung between policy emphasis on sector and policy emphasis on the broader

public. For example, David described the oscillation between these foci as an organisational tension, observing that each team member has a different idea about which public they serve.

...the tension in our organisation is whether our main stakeholder is the arts community or the public. There are always Ministers and other stakeholders but are we there to just throw money at artists because they'll do fantastic things...or are we there because we've been given control of taxpayers' money and taxpayers should get something out of what we do for them? I'm torn...

(David)

The bureaucrats' descriptions of their outward facing action is largely situated in the conceptual framework lenses' intersection between action and sustainability where focus is on partnerships with (mostly) the sector, private business and (sometimes) communities. The bureaucrats described the need for, and value of consulting with experts from the arts and cultural sector. Micky argued however, that the arts and cultural sector's relationship with government is problematic and that unlike other sectors, it does not advise or advocate with a unified voice, common interest, or clear message.

... there can be a fair bit of tension amongst the stakeholders...and that can mean there is not necessarily a unified voice...if you don't have a unified voice from the sector, and you've got a Minister who is trying to cut through to get anything useful for the sector, they are actually doing themselves damage.

(Micky)

The bureaucrats perceived this fragmentation as a key barrier to growing and sustaining the sector's profile and resources. They observed that while quick response and adaptation are possible in crisis situations, without a collective voice and shared data, the sector cannot transcend the interests of the few who are successful in communicating their value to government. They expressed awareness that competitive and limited funding can create a sense of patch protection and unwillingness to collaborate and identified the most successful sector professionals as those who were able to form partnerships with other sectors, business, and government through a clear sense of the communities they serve. These individuals and organisations were perceived as doing good by leading engagement and change through pro-active collaborations and cultural entrepreneurship.

...the change I would quite like to see in the cultural sector, and it is being driven by young women, and young Indigenous women coming through and challenging an awful lot of things...not so much policy but giving effect to policy, giving effect to changing attitudes... within their organisations and within their sectors.

(Bill)

There were several examples such as Bill's, in which sector organisations adapted in alignment with cultural policy through effective communication with policy makers. However, policy implementation in partnership with the sector was described by the bureaucrats as rare, with the sector's involvement more likely to occur at the evidence gathering stages of policy development.

The bureaucrats indicated that consultation with the sector is facilitated using formal and informal methods, including surveys, forums, meetings and most recently in Australia, a parliamentary inquiry led by a Senate committee. Cultural policy action resulting from sector consultation often occurs without broader public consultation due to time constraints and perceptions of engagement fatigue or democracy fatigue. Butzlaff (2020) describes this fatigue as a state in which citizens distrust politicians and rely on public authorities and experts to make decisions on their behalf.

Within a crisis or pressured timeframe, rapid consultation and decision-making feature in fast cultural policy making, as illustrated by Micky and Bill in describing their COVID-19 pandemic work with the sector.

...that really sums up the work of the last nearly 12 months...and that has been understanding the impact on the arts sector and knowing how best to respond.
(Micky)

I think COVID sped up a lot of decisions everywhere - everything had to be done very quickly...it turned out we weren't even operating under a legal framework at the time.
(Bill)

These examples can be situated within the conceptual framework diagram (Figure 3.1) where the policy as action and policy as sustainability approaches intersect. This intersection contains rapidly adjusting and adapting policy behaviours, particularly when timeframes require fast, relief and recovery responses. While non-crisis timeframes might involve broader sector consultation to identify future needs, the COVID-19 pandemic (and other crises) have required the bureaucrats to gather and distil information quickly and work with government for fast action that supports continued creation and employment.

The bureaucrats valued opportunities to blur the us-and-them boundaries between bureaucracy, sector, and communities as a way of achieving stronger cultural policy. They described their policy as action activities as achieving outcomes that are tangible and measurable – legislation, regulation and administration of cultural infrastructure including funding, all of which were enhanced when partnerships underpinning them were successful.

The following sub section analyses data concerning adaptive policy approaches, which extend from policy action to policy outcomes measurement, to sustain arts and cultural support. These approaches extend the partnership and collaboration roles of the bureaucrats, particularly in terms of cultural data collection and interpretation that can inform what Dye (1998) calls 'bottom up' approaches.

4.2.2 Policy as Sustainability

The bureaucrats held a strong sense that the levels of COVID pandemic related rescue and recovery funding provided by Australian and New Zealand governments could not be sustained, and that there would be some impact on the numbers of organisations and jobs that can be supported in coming years. They anticipated that difficult decisions and adaptations would need to be made and were dubious about the cultural policy subsystem's capacity to maintain current approaches. This wariness is evident in John's observations of short-term stimulus funding that occurs without the frame of a clearer, longer view.

...you have global pandemics to act as the impetus for significant further investments and what we are seeing now is a lot of money...but without the agreed ultimate long term direction for what we want to achieve for the sector, it comes in as stimulus money in effect and then stops because it's all based on a problem rather than 'what is the opportunity, what's the correct level of investment to achieve what we want to achieve?

(John)

As outlined in Chapter 2, the existing precarity of arts and cultural sector employment and business was exacerbated by the global health pandemic, however, the bureaucrats warned that the current short-term injections of funding were unlikely serve the entire ecology in the longer term. The bureaucrats were considering the need for longer term clarity or cultural policy as sustainability counteractions to unsustainable short term relief measures; approaches that quickly evaluate the current situation and adjust cultural policy accordingly.

There was a normative sub-theme to the bureaucrats' assumption that cultural policy is necessary for sector sustainability, which was that to sustain the sector well, or the right way, the right data is required. The bureaucrats stressed the weight that should be given to non-economic data, asserting that economic data should be a continuous database, but that the value account should be more substantial than this. They asserted that broad and continually developing data sets are vital to enabling evidence-based approaches to determine what should be sustained, why and how. As demonstrated in Rhonda's comment below, the bureaucrats anticipate continuing neo-liberal policy incrementalism post and hope for a broadening evidence-based approach to sustaining the sector rather than a return to old funding habits.

...when you are under an economic viewpoint of something it's actually a lot easier...when you go into the wellbeing framing you have to think about it a lot more broadly... discussion around the value of culture again but what I've seen is it hasn't been able to abstract itself from an economic aspect to that, and I think that that needs to shift...

(Rhonda)

Bill emphasised the need for a consistent economic data base to narrate the state of the sector in response to the broader economic environment while stressing the need to provide a fuller value story within and across government.

...there are all these other outcomes that are affected by culture, and I think we need to get smarter about how we articulate those arguments and work far more constructively with the departments and ministries who have control over those bits of policy...

(Bill)

These comments highlight the emphasis on instrumental value in the bureaucrats' perceptions of what data is important to collect and why. Bill's comment indicates the need for collaboration across government while Micky's and John's earlier comments regarding sector fragmentation indicate the need for collaboration and common sustainability goals across the sector. While the bureaucrats identified sector fragmentation as problematic for 'cut through' to government, broadening understandings of arts and cultural value across government departments, sectors and communities through bottom-up democratic approaches featured in their narratives as a potentially strong contributor to sector sustainability.

Cultural policy and sector activities that support cultural democracy approaches (Mulcahy 2017) were described by the bureaucrats as enabling more sustainable arts and cultural programs and organisations. Activity that does more than let the public in to enable communities' cultural expression, participation and meaningful influence on arts and culture were described by the bureaucrats as providing enduring value.

...the focus on providing free to the public festivals and free events as part of festivals...it's a really good strategy and it's driven by the desire to be inclusive and go where the people are rather than expecting everyone to go to a gallery or a concert hall.

(Francis)

John's recognition that the COVID-19 pandemic revealed the value the public places on arts and culture was shared by all the bureaucrats as was his speculation about sustaining that sense of value within government.

It's almost capturing that moment - to hopefully be able to use this point in time...how might we not lose sight of that fact that there was a renewed recognition of the impact of arts and culture in people's daily lives?

(John)

While they emphasised the need for the sector to connect with broader communities, and with other parts of government, the bureaucrats did not share experiences of supporting public inclusion or participation in cultural policy itself. Moving further into and through the conceptual framework's (Figure 3.1) intersection between sustainability and democracy in the next section, reveals more of the bureaucrats' hopeful speculation about 'not losing sight' of peoples' intrinsic connections with arts and culture and the instrumental value that can grow from this.

4.2.3 Policy as Democracy

The policy as democracy lens concerns cultural policy approaches that seek to: a) democratise arts and culture through strategies that support or create greater public access to cultural institutions and experiences, and b) democratise cultural policy itself through broadening the consultation and/or conversation beyond a government/sector dialogue. Analysis of the interview data using the sustainability lens indicated that the first approach, democratising culture, was predominant in the bureaucrats' experiences. This is also true of analysis using the democracy lens. Mulcahy's (2006, 2017) democratic orientations category – the top-down approach, was the democracy slant most evident in bureaucrats' narratives. For example, Francis' comment in the previous section regarding free festival events describes top-down provision of access, as does the following comment in which David speaks to institutional value.

I think that policy did turn that all around - it certainly increased access. Suddenly all of our institutions were opening up their doors - it was about people getting ownership.

(David)

Bill's observation that the public were reminded of the value of cultural institutions when they could no longer access them due to pandemic related lock downs, continued into consideration of existence value and future value.

...being able to use beautiful public spaces and public museums and libraries...I think people have been reminded of how important those things are. I don't know if it's got so far that people realise those things don't happen by chance but I think that is a role of cultural policy in making sure those things exist...

(Bill)

Looking for some good to come out of what was, at time of interview, nine months into the global health pandemic, the bureaucrats noted that some parts of the sector had adapted their services and experiences through online delivery of products and experiences. The bureaucrats could see that the crisis was a potential accelerant for democratising arts and culture beyond public access to institutions and programs. As Bill went on to share:

...digital has been around for an awful long time and some producers have not worked out how to transition to that or build any effective models... this kind of forced that decision on them to an extent. I don't think incrementally we ever would have got there.

(Bill)

The bureaucrats' observations that professional arts and cultural products and services were becoming more accessible during or because of the health pandemic raises the concept of community or market driven cultural democracy processes. Such change tends to occur outside of the subsidised sector (Jancovich 2019), rather than being an outcome of cultural policy's democratic orientations (Mulcahy 2006, 2017). Cultural policy that focusses on the provision of public access to

arts and culture through cultural infrastructure management and funding to the sector does not necessarily include support for community based, amateur and homemade culture (Holden 2007).

Bottom-up approaches and support of homemade arts and culture (Holden 2007) were discussed by bureaucrats as a COVID-19 accelerated trend, alongside consideration of supporting other parts of the ecology that are usually not included in cultural policy conversations, for example, commercial music festivals and multi-platform publishing companies. However, the bureaucrats viewed the democratising of culture (Mulcahy 2017, Holden 2007) as primarily a sector responsibility, despite their observations that the sector presented barriers to cultural democracy. Micky described a range of democratising initiatives such as touring and artistic collaborations with communities, though perceived that elitist attitudes in the sector remain a challenge:

We've made a huge amount of progress in dismantling some of the elitism that surrounds it, but it is actually still there and that is something that the sector needs to work through because they're often the ones putting up barriers.

(Micky)

The elitist barriers according to Rhonda, are not exclusive to the sector. As discussed by contemporary policy scholars (Belfiore, Jancovich 2019, Baumgartner et al 2014) elitism is a feature of the policy bubble as well, where only a few, described by Rhonda below as 'the haves', determine what cultural policy will support.

...the haves will dictate what happens because you come back to this idea of supply and demand...so that concept of that voice and having access...there's no acknowledgement...let alone active ability to try and provide opportunities and facilitate a shift away from those inequities.

(Rhonda)

This highlights the contradiction observed by the bureaucrats in current cultural democracy approaches to policy. The sector is viewed as a policy partner – its institutional knowledge is valued as an important policy input, however the sector's and governments' top-down approaches to access can maintain the elitist bubble (Jancovich 2019). Sector stakeholders' input into policy processes, as Rhonda points out, may or may not represent the diverse needs and interests of the public, prescribing cultural value based on sector and investor insights and expertise. This too can be categorised as a post-democratic approach to cultural policy (Butzlaff 2020, von Beyme 2018, Crouch 2011), situated within the conceptual framework's (Figure 3.1) action/sustainability intersection. This form of cultural policy as democracy appears to be undertaken mostly through government-to-sector dialogue, which as John highlights, results in better policy results for the sector.

...you just tend to end up with a better result at the end of it if you are engaging with the people (the sector) who are going to be affected the most by the policy that you are working on.

(John)

Presumably, this notion also applies to cultural policy that is public facing rather than just sector facing. The democracy/action intersection (Figure 3.1), which contains *discussing* policy and *doing* policy approaches, can include cultural policy praxis that opens the discussion beyond the policy bubble to include the public and all its layers, groups, and communities (Jancovich et al 2019, von Beyme 2018). While this approach did not feature in the bureaucrats' experiences of cultural policy development and implementation, which may reflect their general view that cultural policy is a government activity, there were some longer-term visions shared about the potential for the public to have input and perhaps even participate in cultural policy.

It's about being organised in the multiple voices within (community)...getting together and thinking 'well if we're going to have this conversation who are they going to have the conversation with? We need to start working towards it', and it's still not there, it's still an ongoing, evolving thing...

(Rhonda)

Rhonda described communities readying themselves for policy conversations with government, through data, stories and actions that demonstrate the support for cultural maintenance, sustainability and change they require. Rhonda's advice that 'being organised in the multiple voices' provides insight into how the issue of sector fragmentation might be overcome and how cultural policy could effectively connect with diverse needs through democratic means.

The literature review themes – action, sustainability, and democracy, as lenses for interview data analysis, have helped to clarify approaches that are experienced and utilised by bureaucrats working in contemporary cultural policy settings. By exploring the three approaches present within and between each sphere of the conceptual framework, it has been possible to consider cultural policy praxis in Australia and New Zealand across Mulcahy's (2017) *whys* of cultural policy and Bell et al's (2015) *ways* of cultural policy (Chapter 1.4). The data relating to emergent approaches and challenges within the framework's underexplored space – the central grey area where action, sustainability and democracy intersect is the focus of the next section.

4.3 Challenges and emergent approaches

Examining the bureaucrats' interview data through the conceptual framework's (Figure 3.1) three lenses and their intersections has revealed two emerging data themes that can be identified as nascent approaches to cultural policy development and implementation. These two themes, which surfaced in the bureaucrats' reflections on cultural policy challenges and opportunities, relate to the framework's grey area, where action, sustainability and democracy converge. The first theme (4.3.1) is focused on new approaches to democratising cultural policy, and the second theme (4.3.2) concerns short termism and long-term thinking in cultural policy. The themes move the focus from the conceptual framework's sustainability/democracy intersection where they first emerge to seek out a broader, longer view in the grey area.

As discussed in Chapter 1.4, policy researchers (von Beyme 2018, Belfiore 2018, Jancovich 2019, Butzlaff 2020, Crouch 2005) have problematised contemporary democratic approaches to cultural policy as being post-democratic in nature. They argue there has been a public policy stasis resulting

from enduring neo-liberal approaches in which a small group of policy elites determine arts and cultural values, support, and outcomes. The bureaucrats' narratives reflected this stasis, which included experiences of Ahearne's (2009) oscillating ambiguity ranging from governments that positioned policy at the forefront with high profile consultation processes, policy documents and wellbeing frameworks, and others that enacted decisions with little or no consultation or data. Jessie described manifestations of this swing from one political party to the next:

I've seen it on both sides of the fence. One Minister of one party who didn't particularly like traditional arts so wasn't really interested in funding them. We had another Minister of another party who liked that so you can have it both ways. Really, they've got to step back from their own preferences and be looking at the whole and the balance and be listening to stakeholders.

(Jessie)

Regardless of the policy makers' approaches they work with; the bureaucrats are aware of the constant expectation by government that cultural policy justifies attention and investment using a utilitarian (mostly economic) rationale. The bureaucrats compared cultural policy processes to those of health, disability, and education, which although significantly larger in scale, have clarity and certainty about the reasons for government involvement in these sectors. The notion that arts and cultural expression and participation is a luxury rather than a human right (UNESCO 2005) is evident in Bill's experience who describes cultural policy as a vehicle for funding justification.

...often you are not trying to solve problems; you are out to get some benefits out of what many people see as a 'nice to have' and you are often having to use cultural policy as a way of justifying the existence of culture and justifying the existence of government intervention.

(Bill)

Such experiences were spoken about by all the bureaucrats as constants. The sector, the bureaucracy and cultural ministers must continually validate cultural policy as a form of government support for arts and culture, as demonstrated in the following comment from Micky.

Any dollar that is going into the arts is not going into aged care or disability services or social security so it needs to demonstrate why it has to be spent on the arts.

(Micky)

The bureaucrats' considerations of practices that could help to counter this neo liberal, post democratic looping and broaden engagement with cultural policy are discussed in subsection 4.3.1.

Short-termism in politics and policy cycles, alluded to in Jessie's comment about the swings that occur from one minister to the next, is the focus of the second data theme emerging from the bureaucrats' interviews. The bureaucrats observed that much of the sector, particularly at the time of interview, is in survival mode rather than being sustainable and as such, cannot contribute to the broader sustainable development agenda. Micky described this vicious circle as a lack of strategic

thinking and strategic leadership across the sector, while acknowledging that both can be difficult to attain without a strong resource base.

I don't think it is strategic sometimes. There are people who do it really well in the sector but they are individuals - it's not something that you see across the sector as a whole - it's fairly short-term in its thinking. And again, I think that's an artefact of not having a lot of money and focussing on survival.

(Micky)

There were very few examples in the bureaucrats' experiences of government or sector long termism outside of well-established funding patterns, which commenced last century (see Figure 2.1). The bureaucrats discussed their own longer term thinking in relation to some continuing and future roles for cultural policy, aware that they were constrained by the will of elected policy makers and a perceived lack of unity or policy community within and around the sector. These emerging concepts will be discussed in the following sections.

4.3.1 Theme 1 - More inclusive approaches to cultural policy

The endurance of neo-liberal policy approaches has created ongoing challenges for policy actants requiring an evidence base for setting and achieving policy goals and outcomes. The provision of evidence to justify government support for arts and culture appeared to be an ongoing quest for the bureaucrats. Although there was general acknowledgement that economic data has an accessible and important story to tell, there was frustration with the lack of progress by government and sectors in evolving the cultural value conversation using inclusive and sovereign data sources. For David, the issue is one of unreal value calculations based on redundant Third Way politics, while for Rhonda, the focus on the financial return at the elite end of the professional spectrum has neglected communities' artistic and cultural values.

Creative Industries doesn't really tell the story that we're trying to tell...I don't have a problem with the subsidised sector being mixed in with that, but...I think they are distorting the value of the industry and what its public value is.

(David)

...there is huge criticism in terms of the funding bodies and their choices. It's shifted again with (a different) government coming in, but we've been through a very strong focus of funding the elite arts and the elite sports, and that's about tourism, that's about financial return on investment, those kinds of things, rather than having the focus at a community level of funding arts in its own right.

(Rhonda)

Lasswell's (1936) public policy definition, 'who gets what and why' resonates with Rhonda's 'funding bodies and their choices' comment. As discussed in section 4.2, the bureaucrats indicated that it is the policy bubble - elected officials and bureaucrats, with occasional consultants or industry spokespeople, who determine value sets and allocate resources accordingly. These approaches –

advisory groups, forums, and roadshows, which sit within the policy as action/sustainability intersection are situated in the post democratic space. The irony here, is that the elected officials' role is to serve their constituents, as pointed out by Micky below, yet those constituents are not invited into the policy or values conversation regarding 'who gets what'.

...government doesn't have to do what the sector wants - they are elected by constituents not by stakeholders so that is where their final obligation is - with constituents.

(Micky)

Consultation and engagement approaches that might sit within the conceptual framework's underexplored grey area; regarding new, more democratic approaches to developing, implementing, and evaluating cultural policy were either rare or aspirational in the bureaucrats' experience. Rhonda described very early stages of 'multiple voices' and culturally layered approaches to cultural values conversations. The excerpt below emphasises the importance of community/government exchange rather than treating communities as a 'marketplace of ideas' (Meyrick et al 2021) or a homogenous consultation crowd.

...we are coming of age with increased focus on the bi-cultural platform and then increased focus on what that means from a multicultural platform...there's starting to be the conversations even from a migrant cultural perspective. It's about more than what their contribution is to GDP and that reciprocity conversation, which is actually where cultural policy comes in right?

(Rhonda)

John's observation, which extends the starting of conversations with community into co-design and long-term thinking, acknowledges that cultural policy is slow to evolve to new democratic policy approaches.

...the move more into strategic development, longer term thinking, community engagement not just at the consultation stage but co-design at the beginning of the process as well - you start to see more of that come in...it's the way it should be, but wheels of practice seem to move a bit slowly.

(John)

The bureaucrats' ideals about the way policy development should or could be, were constrained by the bounded rationality (Ahearne 2009) of contemporary policy making approaches. These constraints included the need for rapid action in the face of crisis and the policy swings dictated by short term ministers and departments. Possibilities for slow, steady, and continuous policy development that actively engages multiple voices appeared a long way off, and in some narratives, no more than a long shot. The second theme unpacks this short termism constraint and further explores long term visioning in cultural policy.

4.3.2 Theme 2 - Longer view approaches to cultural policy

Policy decision makers come and go, with different priorities for policy outcomes and with eyes and ears for certain agendas and communities of interest. This is part of the short-term looping that the bureaucrats experience in their policy advice and implementation. The bureaucrats' perceptions that policy approaches may change sometime in the future or gradually over time were based on their present experiences of policy stasis and short termism. Bill described a left and right economic and social value swing as a predictable but unhelpful pattern in terms of consistent data collecting and sustaining a consistent value narrative.

...centre right-wing government comes in and they want to know all about the dollars, and we scramble round trying to find the data...we then swing back to a centre left government and they think, 'oh well, they don't really need to know about the dollars' and we won't bother collecting it... so we get into this sort of swing situation.

(Bill)

Such swings create a bind for the bureaucrats who are working with broad and sometimes nebulous departmental objectives that include words such as public 'access', 'enrichment' and 'benefits', which take on different meanings in light (or shade) of party policies. Their efforts to stimulate change or reform in cultural policy praxis, and support continuity in policy adaptation can be stymied by politicised short-term thinking as demonstrated by Micky's experience of a sudden policy change:

...after a change in government...a lot of the measures in there were wound back, the funding was taken out so within a matter of months there had been funding announced and then pulled back so there was really not time to implement a lot of the measures from that policy.

(Micky)

Not all the bureaucrats shared Micky's stoicism in the face of such swings, however there was acceptance that serving the government of the day means, as Bill indicated earlier in this chapter, 'getting on board with the decisions'. A common antidote to the frustration of short termism, articulated by the bureaucrats in various parts of their interviews, was their taking of a longer-term view – expressing hope rather than cynicism for possible future approaches that are more inclusive and sustained.

There is a massive opportunity right now and we just keep fighting the good fight about trying to get the wheels in motion around some kind of shared articulation of why arts and culture matter to this country and where we might want to go into the future.

(John)

A shared articulation of value is perceived by John as an immediate democratic policy approach to determine longer-term objectives. While realistic about financial constraints, John expressed the opportunity for a 'matteringness' (Ragsdale 2013) conversation. By speaking to the idea of

connectedness within and across sectors and community – ‘some kind of shared articulation’, John is hoping for longer term thinking grounded in a shared sense of value. Getting ‘the wheels’ in motion around this idea is what appears to be the challenge although the will and energy for the conversation is evident in the excerpt from John’s interview.

Rhonda asserted that cultural change happens regardless of government direction, and that the role of cultural policy, while supporting cultural conversation and engagement, is to anticipate and keep up with the change to support government and sector preparedness. For Rhonda, building fitness for the future is also about maintaining a strong connection with the past, suggesting that foresight relies on hindsight for clarity.

...the speed of change is so fast - the future role is to keep abreast of the change and to look to the future for those changes and to ensure that we are anchored well in the past in that journey so we can see the possibilities for the future and we can look to prepare ourselves for the future.

(Rhonda)

The bureaucrats shared John’s observation of the ‘opportunity right now’, viewing the 2020-2021 pandemic as a chance for a reset given the heightened vulnerability of the sector, and the different ways in which the public engaged with, and valued, arts and culture during lock downs. At the time of interviews, the ‘right now’ for most of the bureaucrats was consumed with policy as action approaches to support the sector’s operational survival during the pandemic. John and Micky however, flagged cultural policy discussion and collaboration across government as a strategy that needs to commence now and continue to ensure longevity, broader and longer sight for arts and cultural value.

...how do we use the system, ingrain, and embed the importance and the understanding into a much broader range of government activity, strategy, policy?’ That’s the space we can go in to...

(John)

...if you get every government agency thinking ‘what does the arts think about this, how can we draw on the arts?’, that’s how you embed it, and it has endurance then.

(Micky)

The bureaucrats saw a future for cultural policy as one in which it is embedded across government and positioned as an enabler of instrumental outcomes. These two approaches to cultural policy; embedding and enabling, combine the conceptual framework’s (Figure 3.1) action, sustainability, and democracy approaches. The concepts of embedding cultural policy and enabling broader outcomes through cultural policy, inhabit the conceptual framework’s grey area and seek more inclusive cultural policy conversations, which evolve shared definitions of arts and cultural value across government and community.

The bureaucrats' perceptions and experiences of cultural policy in Australia and New Zealand over the past decade or so, as narrated through interviews have provided some valuable insights, which complement the literature themes and animate the conceptual framework. While bureaucrats do not feature largely in the cultural policy literature, their roles and influence are discussed in relation to Althaus et al's (2018) grey zone. Vestheim's (2012) assertion that public servants play a crucial role in 'preparing political discussion and implementing political decisions' (p129) rings true in the interview data. There are, however, some new sustainability and democracy approaches emerging, particularly in relation to crisis action, which indicate that the roles of the bureaucrats in relation to cultural policy may themselves be adapting and changing.

The work that I've been trying to do is to be preventative...it's that ambulance thing....you wait until something really traumatic or bad happens...and then you respond...what arts and culture sector gives you is the ability to have the conversation and create a strength based approach...

(Rhonda)

As noted previously, the bureaucrats, despite being conscious of a post pandemic recession threat, were hopeful about the positive role of cultural policy in supporting the future of the arts and cultural sector. Rhonda's preventative approach typifies the bureaucrats' belief that action based on present knowledge of sector and community need will serve the future well. This longer-term thinking, informed by the insights of many different voices and systems animates the grey area of the conceptual framework, where action, sustainability and democracy meet. These insights will be further unpacked in the next and final chapter, which presents research findings.

Chapter 5 – Summary of findings - How can cultural policy strengthen the arts and cultural sector?

The research methodology combined two approaches to explore the central question, 'How can cultural policy strengthen the arts and cultural sector'. Firstly, the literature review enabled exploration of the problem from the outside-in to examine some of the key theoretical frameworks of the last few decades. The review also examined how these cultural policy approaches and trends manifest in New Zealand and Australia, particularly during the neo-liberal era, which has continued as a dominant political framework in both countries since the eighties. Secondly, through interviews with the bureaucrats, an all too rare view from the inside-out was provided, allowing some insights about the intersections and boundaries, both hard and porous, between government, bureaucracy, the sector, broader communities, and policy making. The research enabled the literature review themes and the resulting conceptual framework with its three spheres of cultural policy approaches (action, sustainability, and democracy) to be tested in relation to established and emerging policy praxis as experienced in government agency settings.

This chapter summarises the research findings in two parts. The first section (5.1) clarifies the gaps and contradictions in the data regarding the conceptual framework's grey area where the three contemporary approaches to policy making intersect, and from where new democratic approaches to policy making could emerge. Post democratic approaches to cultural policy development and implementation as identified in the literature will be included in this discussion. The next section (5.2) summarises the short termism of contemporary cultural policy, and how this bi-partisan trend could be seen as negating the democratisation and the sustainability of policy and the arts and cultural sector.

The chapter concludes with observations of how these findings provide opportunities for further research into the three spheres of contemporary cultural policy approaches; action, sustainability and democracy, and how they can intersect to support new democratic approaches that strengthen the arts and cultural sector.

5.1. Finding 1 - Cultural policy needs to evolve from the neo-liberal and post democratic space so that the arts and cultural sector can evolve

The literature review and interviews highlighted the endurance of neo-liberal, post democratic approaches to cultural policy making across Western democracies, and their influence on New Zealand and Australian policy making approaches. Both countries have been influenced by England's neo-liberal centralist policy approach since the nineties, and the Keynesian arts council and arm's length approach from the fifties onwards.

The COVID-19 pandemic has further exposed the pre-existing precarity of the arts and cultural sector. Australian and New Zealand governments are alternatively rescuing a fragile sector while promoting that same sector's capacity to contribute to wellbeing outcomes and economic recovery. This approach reads as a continuance of England's Third Way centralist politics driving cultural policy. This version of neo-liberalism seeks to marry economic and social objectives with a post-democratic approach. This approach has constrained the capacity of cultural policy to support the genuine democratisation of arts and culture, which scholars such as Mangset (2018) argue, has been

largely facilitated from a top-down perspective. It is the market and the populace outside of the elitist policy conversation who are driving the democratisation of arts and culture, leaving policy makers and the sector in their wake.

The bureaucrats' narrations of contemporary cultural policy histories indicate that the development of a policy framework, plan or policy document will not necessarily strengthen the arts and cultural sector, although such measures would enable the sector and perhaps the public to see where present government priorities lie. Yet another national conversation with cultural policy insiders, while providing the sector with a useful forum for expression, will not necessarily result in policy that strengthens the sector. These delivery partnerships are built within what Crouch (2004, 2011) describes as a post democratic (see Chapter 1.4) approach to public policy, which coupled with neo-liberalism results in experts from the arts and cultural sector, tertiary sector and private business deputising for broader arts and cultural public interests.

Policy makers and implementers clearly prioritise responsive or strategic action over conversation and text, and ideal policy cycles (Althaus et al 2017) do not apply to their cultural policy making most of the time. Ahearne's (2020) concept of bounded rationality, describing heuristics-based policy decisions drawing from a 'garbage can' (Cohen, March & Olsen 1972) of ideas, solutions and problems underpins contemporary policy making. Expanding this process to include many more and multiple perspectives, voices and actants, need not result in disorder – just complexity (Khan 2019).

The conceptual framework's three intersecting spheres (Figure 3.1) demonstrate the ways in which combinations of action, sustainability and democracy-driven policy approaches can provide evidence based, informed and inclusive approaches to policy development. This is what the literature and the interview data indicate is occurring within the current post democratic cultural policy space. However, the data also indicate that despite these seemingly progressive and pro-active approaches, the arts and cultural sector remains fragile, with large parts of its ecology prone to what policy makers and implementers call 'market failure'. They are referring to a lack of demand for certain products and services, lack of engagement with communities, redundant business models, provision of services for communities who cannot meet the costs of provision and/or combinations of these issues. Policy implementation within the dominant neo-liberal post democratic paradigm, as Mangset (2018) suggests, has not been able to meaningfully address this failure.

The conceptual framework's grey area is where new democratic approaches to cultural policy may be emerging – it is the evolutionary petri dish for emerging cultural policy praxis. Researchers such as Belfiore (2018), Paquette (2019) and Jancovich (2019) have highlighted the potential for innovative action in this space, while the bureaucrats see a future in which broader data sets, multiple perspectives and diverse communities participate not only in determining arts and cultural values, but the direction of cultural policy itself. The grey area is where the grey zone (Althaus et al 2018) between administration and politics, and the elite bubble of politicians, bureaucrats, and arts experts, has potential to soften and dissolve to grow connectedness with the suprasystem beyond government funded and owned cultural infrastructure. It invites the public into the conversation about, and the implementation of, cultural policy.

This grey area where action, sustainability and democracy policy approaches intersect is not a straightforward area of exploration – like all grey areas, there are no clear rules or universal standards. The exploration will, as Cairney (2020) suggests, be messy, ongoing, and irrational. It will need to hold, manage, and act on multiple perspectives which may at times conflict, which is the very essence of democratised cultural policy approaches (Gross 2019, Jancovich 2019). Blühdorn et al's (2020) description of the democratic process as 'struggle for the maintenance of difference, disagreement and conflict' (p374), applies to evolving or new democratic approaches for cultural policy. Policy elites will need to share power and platforms. The doing, adapting, and discussing of cultural policy will need to include diverse communities of interest and the broader public. Conversations will need to shift from foci on high versus low culture, elite versus amateur, inclusivity and shared values to conversations that seek out and hold multiple perspectives, manage conflicting values and supporting agreed upon anti-stasis and anti-fragile tradeoffs for action. The grey area is a porous change-as-usual space in which new democratic approaches may improve ongoing praxis rather than repeating cycles of stasis.

Cultural policy in Australia and New Zealand seems to be only recently and tentatively connecting with new democratic approaches, which Blühdorn et al (2020) call the 'post democratic turn' meaning the next democratic evolution. New democratic approaches may have potential to transform the ways in which cultural policy is implemented in these countries, including changed relationships between governments, bureaucracies, arts and cultural sectors, communities, and publics. This aligns with some of the bureaucrats' aspirations to broaden and deepen the cultural policy conversation so that the sector and communities are empowered to determine cultural value, the ways in which it is measured and the impact it should have, when and where. It may be that as Hadley et al (2018) suggest, a 'generational turn of the policy wheel' is rubbing against what they see as a now problematic Keynesian subsidy system (p1).

When Throsby (2018) calls for 'a more fluid and dynamic discussion, constantly reinvigorating debate and questioning the directions in which our cultural life is heading' (p63), perhaps he is hoping for this post-democratic direction, which emerged as a key theme of this study. The important word he uses here is 'constantly', which suggests sustained debate. The next section discusses this idea further through the second research finding to do with short termism, long term thinking, sustainability, and cultural policy.

5.2 Finding 2 - Cultural policy needs to sustain a long-term view so that the arts and cultural sector can adapt to the change around it and contribute to sustainable development

The data highlight the theme of sustainability as a cultural policy approach that supports the arts and cultural sector, which in neo-liberal terms, is about seeking to reduce its dependence on government funding. As Mangset (2018) points out, government funding for arts and culture remains static – there will never be enough funding, particularly if the sector is expected to grow as a contributor to the economy. The work of culture and sustainability scholars such as Hawkes (2005), Throsby (2018) and Duxbury (2017) lingers quietly in the background as a reminder that the arts and cultural sector as a part of culture generally, could be an important contributor to sustainable development. To achieve this, however, would require more than a budget-to-budget lurch where fingers are crossed for greater contributions to GDP and comparisons with other

sectors' contributions are made as justification for government support of arts and culture. Sustainable development of the sector and the sector's contribution to sustainable development requires long term – not year to year – cultural policy thinking.

The long-term, bi-partisan aspiration of Western democratic governments, arising from the creative industries era, is that the arts and cultural sector could eventually self-sustain, or at least have most of its revenue derived from non-government sources. This would seem to be an enduring bi-partisan neo-liberal fantasy along with the notion that arm's length funding somehow insulates policy makers from having to make difficult decisions about which parts of the sector are sustained by subsidy and which should be left to the market. Neo-liberalist approaches to cultural policy, with the combined objectives of economic and social returns on investment, anticipate a virtuous cycle of short-term planning, adaptation, and implementation. The cycle is easily disrupted by crisis events such as the COVID-19 pandemic in which economic returns are replaced with stop gaps and consumers find alternative ways to engage with creative and cultural activities.

The conceptual framework's grey area has potential for a new, continuous cycle to emerge, which incorporates long term (long view) and long-time (generations gone before and those coming after) thinking. Jones' (2010) assertion that cultural policy can provide a space for individuals and communities to participate in societal change and adaptation through available arts and cultural forms could exist as a method in the grey area. Ragsdale's (2016) notion of the arts and cultural sector as a community-facing subsystem or ecology within a cultural suprasystem could be situated in the grey area. Both ideas invite consideration of democratic adaptation and action that can happen now for the benefit of the long term. Just as Ragsdale views the democratisation of culture as a moral obligation of cultural policy, so too it can be argued, is long term thinking.

The Long Term Thinking Project (Saltmarshe and Pembroke 2021) an initiative funded by EIT Climate KIC, a body of the European Union, has as its objective, 'expanding and creating experimental probes with partners to test different approaches to working with art and culture to cultivate long-termism at scale'. The project founders argue, as have many First Nations communities before them, that a tangible connection to former and future generations is crucial to preserving the future (McGrath 2020, Krznaric 2021). The capacity of cultural policy, and in turn the arts and cultural sector to contribute to sustainable development and sustainable futures could be explored further by combining new democratic approaches with long term thinking, and by continually testing these approaches through cultural policy discussion and implementation.

The next section will bring these two key finding areas; new democratic approaches to policy and long termism together, to illuminate the grey area's further research needs.

5.3 Conclusion - Expanding the grey area – testing new cultural policy approaches that strengthen the arts and cultural sector

This study has found potential for contemporary cultural policy to strengthen the arts and cultural sector by adapting its approaches in two ways, which are, a) testing the application of new democratic approaches to cultural policy development and implementation, and b) embedding long-term thinking into cultural policy. These key findings emerge from the conceptual framework's grey

area, an intersection between the current approaches of cultural policy as action, sustainability and/or democracy. These approaches are good enough within a neo-liberal, post democratic public policy context, however, as governments and communities move into new democratic ways of discussing, adapting and doing policy, cultural policy must transform its approaches.

Transforming cultural policy approaches can be tested in the grey area by expanding the actant space to include multiple public voices in policy discussion, planning, implementation, and evaluation in a continual cycle of adaptation. These activities will need to be conducted with long-term views and a collective commitment to considering intergenerational impact. An interesting touchstone here is the Welsh Wellbeing of Future Generations Act 2015, which has legislated for all public bodies to take responsibility for sustainable development and wellbeing of present and future peoples. Might such an act, when applied to cultural policy and the arts and cultural sector, diminish a focus on growth for institutional ends to expand and deepen diverse community relationships with the sector? In turn, might the public have an ongoing say in ‘who gets what, when and how?’

The diagram below (Figure 5.1) illustrates how the intersection of all three spheres of cultural policy approaches; action, sustainability and democracy, when combined with new democratic approaches and long-term thinking, create a bigger grey space for exploration and testing of new approaches.

Figure 5.1 The grey area where three cultural policy approaches intersect

This expanded grey area requires further research to identify and trial ways of applying collaborative and transformative cultural policy making in which government, bureaucracy, the arts and cultural sector and multiple communities can act, adapt and decide together. The roles that each of these

actant subsystems could take in determining cultural value should endure beyond consultation and conversation, to include adaptation and action.

The limitations of this small study have not enabled collaboration or dialogue with First Nations researchers, in particular, Māori, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, whose communities' cultural and intellectual properties including long time and long-term frameworks have influenced some of the scholars cited in this research. Further research to explore the implications and applications of this study's findings will need to engage with appropriate cultural authorities and First Nations scholars for deeper, more accurate insights into collective policy making and long-term thinking.

It may be those neo-liberal approaches to cultural policy, referred to by von Keyme (2018) as 'unimaginative' have not enabled the narratives about people and culture to emerge in ways that support public conversation. He argues that stories have powered greater awareness than political philosophy and that 'solidarity is not a product of objectivity but rather of narrative traditions' (p97). According to von Keyme's (2018) analysis of neo-democratic approaches, cultural policy, if it is to move beyond the neo-liberal paradigm, will need to foster pluralism in cultural conversations and debate, and support diverse publics' capacities to participate rather than rely on the expertise of a few.

What do we need the arts and cultural sector to be and do in thirty years, one hundred years, five hundred years' time? How might this be realised without exclusion, greed or harm? If, as several scholars and bureaucrats suggest, the arts and cultural sector must be community facing to be strong and relevant beyond the lives of its founders and experts, the public must be allowed into the cultural policy space. As von Keyme (2018) outlines in his hopeful vision of new democratic behaviours, stories have the power to foster awareness and solidarity. There is much more to be done to expand the grey area where action, democracy and sustainability intersect to enable cultural policy to be stewarded by the narrative traditions of communities and pluralism in cultural conversations.

References

- A New Approach. (2020). Behind the Scenes - Drivers of Arts and Cultural Policy Settings in Australia and Beyond. Australian National University. <https://www.humanities.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/ANA-InsightReportFour-FullReport.pdf>
- Abbing, H. (2008). Why are artists poor?: the exceptional economy of the arts. Amsterdam University Press. <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/35101>
- Ahearne, J. (n.d.). Between Cultural Theory and Policy: The cultural policy thinking of Pierre Bourdieu, Michel de Certeau and Régis Debray. Retrieved March 16, 2021, from https://www.warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/modernlanguages/academic/ja/ahearne_between_cultural_theory_and_policy.pdf
- Ahearne, J. (2009). Cultural policy explicit and implicit: a distinction and some uses. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15(2), 141–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630902746245>
- Althaus, C., Bridgman, P., & Davis, G. (2017). The Australian policy handbook: A practical guide to the policy making process. Allen & Unwin.
- ANZOG (2020) Has New Public Management improved public services? In Research – Resources Library, ANZOG website, 15 July 2020. <https://www.anzsog.edu.au/resource-library/research/has-new-public-management-improved-public-services>
- Australian Government (2021) Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications, Office for the Arts website. <https://www.arts.gov.au/>
- Australia Council (2020) Creating Our Future, Results of the National Arts Participation Survey August 2020. <https://www.australiacouncil.gov.au/research/creating-our-future>
- Bakhshi, H. & Cunningham, S. & Briggs, P. (2016) Cultural Policy in the Time of the Creative Industries. Nesta, United Kingdom. <http://www.nesta.org.uk>
<https://www.culturenet.cz/coKmv4d994Swax/uploads/2018/06/Cultural-Policy-in-the-Time-of-the-Creative-Industries.pdf>
- Bailey R, Booth-Kurpnieks C, Davies K, Delsante I. (2019) Cultural Ecology and Cultural Critique. *Arts*. 2019; 8(4):166. <https://doi.org/10.3390/arts8040166>
- Banks, M. & O'Connor, J (2021) “A plague upon your howling”: art and culture in the viral emergency. In *Cultural Trends*, 30:1, 3-18, DOI: 10.1080/09548963.2020.1827931
- Baumgartner, F. R., Jones, B. D., & Mortensen, P. B. (2018). Punctuated Equilibrium Theory: Explaining Stability and Change in Public Policymaking. In *Theories of the Policy Process* (pp. 55–101). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494284-3>
- Belfiore, E. (2004). Auditing culture: The subsidised cultural sector in the New Public Management. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(2), 183–202.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10286630042000255808?casa_token=HLJEXIGaliMAAAAA:xrwnTMgQzn0WhW91BqWhy0LyUj_vPWcBe3eGglS62wjtEyyv601W6Pe45eQ6iplAmh0ANf_L3jGwhE
- Belfiore, E. (2009). On bullshit in cultural policy practice and research: notes from the British case. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15(3), 343–359.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630902806080>

- Belfiore, E. (2012). "Defensive instrumentalism" and the legacy of New Labour's cultural policies. *Cultural Trends*, 21(2), 103–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2012.674750>
- Belfiore, E. (2016). Cultural policy research in the real world: curating "impact", facilitating "enlightenment." *Cultural Trends*, 25(3), 205–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2016.1204050>
- Belfiore, E. (2020). Whose cultural value? Representation, power and creative industries. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (Vol. 26, Issue 3, pp. 383–397). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2018.1495713>
- Belfiore, E., & Bennett, O. (2010). Beyond the "Toolkit Approach": Arts Impact Evaluation Research and the Realities of Cultural Policy-Making. *Journal for Cultural Research*, 14(2), 121–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14797580903481280>
- Belfiore, E., & Gibson, L. (2019). *Histories of Cultural Participation, Values and Governance*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=I94KtAEACAAJ>
- Bell, D. & Oakley, K. (2015) *Cultural Policy*. Routledge, New York.
- Bennett, O. (1997). Cultural policy, cultural pessimism and postmodernity1. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (Vol. 4, Issue 1, pp. 67–84). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286639709358063>
- Bennett, O. (2006). Intellectuals, Romantics and Cultural Policy. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (Vol. 12, Issue 2, pp. 117–134). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630600813636>
- Beyme, K. von, & von Beyme, K. (2018). Normative Models of Democratic Development. From Post-Democracy to Neo-Democracy? In *From Post-democracy to Neo-Democracy* (pp. 88–115). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66661-7_5
- Blühdorn, I., & Butzlaff, F. (2020). Democratization beyond the post-democratic turn: towards a research agenda on new conceptions of citizen participation. *Democratization*, 27(3), 369–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2019.1707808>
- Borrell, N. (2014) *Te Ātinga 25 Years of Contemporary Māori Art*. Te Ātinga. New Zealand https://www.teatinga.com/site_files/14637/upload_files/teatinga_book.pdf?dl=1
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press, USA.
- Brook, O., O'Brien, D. & Taylor, M. (2020) *Culture is Bad for You*. Manchester University Press, UK.
- Butzlaff, F. (2020). Between empowerment and abuse: citizen participation beyond the post-democratic turn. In *Democratization* (Vol. 27, Issue 3, pp. 477–493). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2019.1707809>
- Cairney, P. (2020). *Understanding Public Policy: Theories and Issues* (2nd Edition). Red Globe Press, McMillan International, London.
- Caust, J. (2015). Cultural wars in an Australian context: challenges in developing a national cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 21(2), 168–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2014.890607>

- Caust, J. (2017). The continuing saga around arts funding and the cultural wars in Australia. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (pp. 1–15). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2017.1353604>
- Caust, J. (2018). Culture and Arts Leadership. In *Arts Leadership in Contemporary Contexts* (pp. 23–39). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315559599-2>
- Cohen, M., March, J. & Olsen, J. (1972) A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Mar., 1972, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Mar., 1972), pp. 1- 25 Published by: Sage Publications, Inc. on behalf of the Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2392088>
- Comunian, R. (2017). Creative Collaborations: The Role of Networks, Power and Policy. In *Cultural Policy, Innovation and the Creative Economy* (pp. 231–244). https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95112-3_16
- Comunian, R., & Conor, B. (2017). Making cultural work visible in cultural policy. In *The Routledge Handbook of Global Cultural Policy* (pp. 265–280). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315718408-17>
- Comunian, R., & England, L. (2020). Creative and cultural work without filters: Covid-19 and exposed precarity in the creative economy. In *Cultural Trends* (Vol. 29, Issue 2, pp. 112–128). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2020.1770577>
- Coombs, H. C. (1970). The Economics of the Performing Arts. In *Economic Papers: A journal of applied economics and policy* (Vol. E1, Issue 35, pp. 32–46). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-3441.1970.tb00709.x>
- Coombs, M. (2013) Creative Australia, National Cultural Policy 2013. In Flagpost blog. 2 April, 2013 Australian Parliament. https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/FlagPost/2013/April/Creative_Australia_National_Cultural_Policy_2013
- Craik, J. (2007). Re-visioning arts and cultural policy: Current impasses and future directions. ANU Press. https://doi.org/10.26530/oapen_459486
- Craik, J. (2013). Creative Australia: Missed opportunity or new paradigm for a national cultural policy? *Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management*, 10(1). <http://apjacm.arts.unimelb.edu.au/article/view/132>
- Craik, J. (2006). A horse with no name: Arts and cultural policy in Australia. Australian Political Studies Association Conference, September, 25–27. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.629.7670&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Craik, J., McAllister, L., & Davis, G. (2003). Paradoxes and contradictions in government approaches to contemporary cultural policy: an Australian perspective1. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 9(1), 17–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1028663032000069167>
- Craik, J. (2005). Dilemmas in Policy Support for the Arts and Cultural Sector. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 64(4), 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2005.00460a.x>
- Creative New Zealand. (2018). New Zealanders and the Arts. https://www.creativenz.govt.nz/assets/paperclip/publication_documents/documents/606/original/new-zealanders-and-the-arts-summary-report.pdf?1526981303

- Crossick, G., & Kaszynska, P. (2014). Under construction: Towards a framework for cultural value. *Cultural Trends*, 23(2), 120–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2014.897453>
- Crouch, C. (2004) *Post Democracy*. Polity Press, UK.
- Crouch, C. (2011) *The Strange Non-death of Neo-Liberalism*. Polity Press, UK.
- Debray, R. (2000) *Transmitting Culture*. Columbia University Press, USA. ISBN 0231113447
- de Certeau, M. (1997). *Culture in the Plural*. University of Minnesota Press, USA.
- Dewinter, H., Rutten, K., & Bradt, L. (2020). Policy attachment in the arts: the underlying agendas of arts' social role. In *Cultural Trends* (Vol. 29, Issue 2, pp. 96–111). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2020.1763780>
- Doerer, J. (2014). This England: how Arts Council England uses its investment to shape a national cultural ecology. In *Cultural Trends* (Vol. 23, Issue 4, pp. 298–303). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2014.961299>
- Doig, J. (2013) New Nationalism in Australia and New Zealand: The Construction of National Identities by Two Labo(u)r Governments in the Early 1970s. In *Australian Journal of Politics and History*. p559-579, Issue 4, Volume 59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajph.12033>
- Dovey, J., Moreton, S., Sparke, S., & Sharpe, B. (2016). The practice of cultural ecology: network connectivity in the creative economy. *Cultural Trends*, 25(2), 87–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2016.1170922>
- Du Gay, P. (1996) *Organizing identity: entrepreneurial governance and public management in Questions of Cultural Identity*, 151–169. Sage Publications, London.
- Duxbury, N. (2017). Cultural policies for sustainable development: four strategic paths. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23(2), 214–230.
- Dye, T. (2001). *Top Down Policymaking*. CQ Press, Sage Publishing. <https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781483330150.n1>
- Dye, T. (1998) *Understanding Public Policy*. (9th Edition) Prentice Hall Inc. Simon and Schuster, USA.
- Gardiner-Garten, J. (2009) *Commonwealth arts policy and administration*. Australian Parliament. Parliamentary Library, Social Policy Section. https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/BN/0809/ArtsPolicy#_Toc229456422
- Gilfillan, E., & Morrow, G. (2018). Sustaining artistic practices post George Brandis's controversial Australia Council arts funding changes: cultural policy and visual artists' careers in Australia. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (Vol. 24, Issue 2, pp. 186–204). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2016.1153083>
- Gilmore, A., Glow, H., & Johanson, K. (2017). Accounting for quality: arts evaluation, public value and the case of "Culture counts." *Cultural Trends*, 26(4), 282–294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2017.1382761>
- Glow, H., & Johanson, K. (2009). Instrumentalism and the "helping" discourse: Australian Indigenous performing arts and policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15(3), 315–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630902822137>

- Gray, C. (2008). Arts Council England and public value: a critical review. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(2), 209–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630802106383>
- Gray, C. (2009). Managing cultural policy: Pitfalls and prospects. *Public Administration*, 87(3), 574–585. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2008.01748.x>
- Gray, C. (2010). Analysing cultural policy: incorrigibly plural or ontologically incompatible? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 16(2), 215–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630902935160>
- Gray, C. (2015). Ambiguity and cultural policy. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift*. https://www.idunn.no/nkt/2015/01/ambiguity_and_cultural_policy
- Gross, J. (2019). Practices of hope: care, narrative and cultural democracy. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (pp. 1–15). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2019.1702032>
- Hadley, S., & Belfiore, E. (2018). Cultural democracy and cultural policy. *Cultural Trends*, 27(3), 218–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2018.1474009>
- Hawkes, J. (2001). The fourth pillar of sustainability. Culture's Essential Role in Public Planning. Melbourne, Australia. <http://www.culturaldevelopment.net/downloads/OrderFourthPillarbook.doc>
- Hawkes, J. (2005). Culture as a fourth pillar of sustainability. Common Ground, Melbourne.
- Hesmondhalgh, D., Nisbett, M., Oakley, K., & Lee, D. (2015). Were New Labour's cultural policies neo-liberal? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 21(1), 97–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2013.879126>
- Hetherington, S. (2017) Arm's-length funding of the arts as an expression of laissez-faire. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23:4, 482-494, DOI: 10.1080/10286632.2015.1068766
- Holden, J. (2004). *Creating cultural value: how culture has become a tool of government policy*. Demos. London. Available at <https://www.demos.co.uk/files/CapturingCulturalValue.pdf>
- Holden, J. (2006). *Cultural value and the crisis of legitimacy*. Demos London. Available at <http://www.demos.co.uk/files/Culturalvaluweb.pdf>
- Holden, J. (2015). *The ecology of culture*. Arts and humanities research council. UK. Available at <http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/downloads/news/AHRC%20Ecology%20of%20Culture.pdf>
- Homan, S. (2013). From Coombs to Crean: popular music and cultural policy in Australia. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 19(3), 382–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2013.788164>
- Hong, B. (2014). National cultural indicators in New Zealand. *Cultural Trends*, 23(2), 93–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2014.897450>
- James, C. (2000) *Funding Our Culture*. Victoria University, School of Government · Te Kura Kāwanatanga: Institute for Governance and Policy Studies: Policy Papers. URI: <http://hdl.handle.net/10063/2607>
- Jancovich, L. (2017). The participation myth. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23(1), 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1027698>

- Jancovich, L., & Stevenson, D. (2019). The “problem” of participation in cultural policy. In *Cultures of Participation* (pp. 167–184). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429266454-10>
- Johanson, K. (2008). How Australian industry policy shaped cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(2), 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630802106300>
- Kangas, A., Duxbury, N., & De Beukelaer, C. (2019). *Cultural Policies for Sustainable Development*. Routledge. UK.
- Keynes, J. M., Johnson, E., & Moggridge, D. (1978). Keynes and the Arts. In *The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes* (pp. 295–372). Royal Economic Society. <https://doi.org/10.1017/UPO9781139524254.005>
- Khan, R. (2019). Researchers, bureaucrats and the lifeworlds of cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 25(4), 528–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2017.1341498>
- King, M. (2012) *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Penguin Books. New Zealand.
- Knell, J., & Taylor, M. (2011). Arts funding, austerity and the big society. *R Soc Arts*, 27–28. Available at https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/pdfs/reports/rsa-pamphlets-arts_funding_austerity_bigsociety.pdf
- Krznaric, R. (2021). *The Good Ancestor*. Penguin Books. WH Allen. London. ISBN: 9780753554517
- Lasswell, H. & Kaplan, A. (1970) *Power and Society*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Lasswell, H. (1936) *Politics; who gets what, when, how*. Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc. New York
- Lee, C. B. (2011). Creative economies, creative cities. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (Vol. 17, Issue 3, pp. 356–357). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2010.531718>
- Mackay, H. (2018) *Australia Reimagined: Towards a more compassionate, less anxious society*. Pan Macmillan, Australia. ISBN: 9781743534823
- Madden, C. (2013) *Cultural policies Australasia - Essays on cultural policy in Australia and New Zealand* Available at artspolicies.org Christopher Madden
- Mangset, P. (2020). The end of cultural policy? In *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 26(3), 398–411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2018.1500560>
- Mangset, P., Heian, M. T., Kleppe, B., & Løyland, K. (2018). Why are artists getting poorer? About the reproduction of low income among artists. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 24(4), 539–558. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2016.1218860>
- Maxwell, R., & Miller, T. (2017). Greening cultural policy. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (Vol. 23, Issue 2, pp. 174–185). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2017.1280786>
- McConnell, A. & Hart, P. (2019). Inaction and public policy: understanding why policymakers “do nothing.” In *Policy Sciences*, 52(4), 645–661. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-019-09362-2>
- McGuigan, J. (2004). *Rethinking Cultural Policy*. McGraw-Hill Education. UK.
- Meyrick, J., & Barnett, T. (2017). Culture without “world”: Australian cultural policy in the age of stupid. In *Cultural Trends*, 26(2), 107–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2017.1323840>

- Meyrick, J., Barnett, T., & Phiddian, R. (2018). *What Matters?: Talking Value in Australian Culture*. Monash University Publishing. Australia.
- Miller, C. R. (2020). What is Post-Democracy? In *Living under Post-Democracy* (pp. 21–39). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429317446-2>
- Miller, T., & Yudice, G. (2002). *Cultural Policy*. Sage Publications, London, UK.
- Moses, J. & Knutsen, T. (2004, 2012) *Ways of Knowing*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Mulcahy, K. V. (2006). Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches. In *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 35(4), 319–330. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JAML.35.4.319-330>
- Mulcahy, K. V. (2017). *Public Culture, Cultural Identity, Cultural Policy: Comparative Perspectives*. Springer, New York.
- New Zealand Government (2021) Ministry for Culture and Heritage Manatū Taonga website. <https://mch.govt.nz/#:~:text=Manat%C5%AB%20Taonga%2C%20the%20Ministry%20for,a%20confident%20and%20connected%20culture>
- Oakley, K. & Banks, M. (2020) & Oakley, K. & Banks, M. (eds.) *Cultural Industries and Environmental Crisis: An Introduction*. In *Cultural Industries and the Environmental Crisis* (pp. 1-10), Springer Nature Switzerland https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49384-4_1
- O'Brien, D. (2015a). Cultural value: empirical perspectives. In *Cultural Trends* (Vol. 24, Issue 3, pp. 209–210). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2015.1066070>
- O'Brien, D. (2015b). Cultural value, measurement and policy making. In *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 14(1), 79–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022214533892>
- O'Brien, D. (2016). What price evidence? The ethics of office and the ethics of social science in British cultural policy. In *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 9(2), 127–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2015.1100649>
- O'Connor, J. (2015). Assessing the Cultural Impact of Economics. In *Making Culture Count. New Directions in Cultural Policy Research*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paquette, J. (2019). Configuration of Cultural Powers. In J. Paquette (Ed.), *Cultural Policy and Federalism* (pp. 31–76). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12680-3_2
- Paquette, J. & Beauregard, D. (2017) Cultural policy in political science research. In *The Routledge Handbook of Global Cultural Policy*. Durrer, V., Miller, T. & O'Brien, D. (1st Edition 2017) Imprint Routledge eBook ISBN9781315718408
- Paquette, J., & Redaelli, E. (2015). *Arts Management and Cultural Policy Research*. Springer, New York.
- Pembroke, B. & Saltmarshe, E. (2021) The Long Time Project. UK. <https://www.thelongtimeproject.org/#about>
- Prince, R. (2010). Policy Transfer as Policy Assemblage: Making Policy for the Creative Industries in New Zealand. In *Environment & Planning A*, 42(1), 169–186. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a4224>

- Raghavan, R. (2018). Aah! Aha! Ha-Ha!: Building a Creative Nation from the Ground Up. In *Current Science* (Vol. 114, Issue 05, p. 941). <https://doi.org/10.18520/cs/v114/i05/941-942>
- Ragsdale, D. E. (2008). *Surviving the culture change*. Australia Council Arts Marketing Summit. <https://www.artsbuildontario.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Surviving-the-Culture-Change-Version-3.0-Diane-E.-Ragsdale.pdf>
- Ragsdale, D. E. (2009). *The Excellence Barrier*. Keynote available at <https://m.mntabbj.com/jumper/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Ragsdale-The-Excellence-Barrier-WSAA-2010.pdf>
- Ragsdale, D. E. (2013) *Holding Up the Arts: Can we sustain what we've created? Should we?* (Version 2.0) Keynote Address, State of the (Arts) Nation in Belfast, Ireland, Audiences Northern Ireland. <https://www.artsjournal.com/jumper/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Holding-Up-the-Arts-DE-Ragsdale-2013.pdf>
- Ragsdale, D. E. (2016) *Transformation or Bust: When Hustling Tickets and Contributions is Just Not Cutting it Anymore*. Keynote for the 2016 Creative New Zealand Conference: The Big Conversation. Creative New Zealand. https://www.creativenz.govt.nz/assets/ckeditor/attachments/1504/transformation_or_bust_by_diane_ragsdale_transcript_for_cnz_june_2016.pdf
- Rayman-Bacchus, L., & Radavoi, C. N. (2019). Advancing culture's role in sustainable development: social change through cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 1–19. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10286632.2019.1624735>
- Rosenstein, C. (2018). What Is Cultural Policy? In *Understanding Cultural Policy* (pp. 48–67). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315526850-3>
- Rosenstein, C. (2019). Cultural policy archetypes: the bathwater and the baby. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (pp. 1–14). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2019.1691175>
- Rowe, D., Noble, G., Bennett, T., & Kelly, M. (2016). Transforming cultures? From Creative Nation to Creative Australia. In *Media International Australia*, 158(1), 6–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X16629544>
- Scott, C. A. (2010). Searching for the “public” in Public Value: arts and cultural heritage in Australia. In *Cultural Trends*, 19(4), 273–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2010.515003>
- Shuker, R. (2008) New Zealand Popular Music, Government Policy, and Cultural Identity. In *Popular Music*. Vol. 27, No. 2, Popular Music Policy (May, 2008), pp. 271-287, Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Shultz, J. (2015) Cultural Economy and the soft power of the forgotten portfolio. In *The Mandarin*. 1ShuJune, 2015. <https://www.themandarin.com.au/35492-julianne-schultz-culture-arts-economy/>
- Skilling, P. (2005). Trajectories of arts and culture policy in New Zealand. In *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 64(4), 20–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2005.00461a.x>
- Throsby, D. (1995). Culture, economics and sustainability. In *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 19(3), 199–206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01074049>

- Throsby, D. (1997). Sustainability and culture some theoretical issues. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 4(1), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286639709358060>
- Throsby, D. (2008a). Linking Cultural and Ecological Sustainability. In *The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations*, 8(1). Available at <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=14479532&AN=33979725&h=v3yqb8wYGcQhQt65JLp8ITs1RosTsfcAql4T%2BrSGVy2Bbckdcs48MYaQyEpC3YcjvJAYec7WA8lo%2BcxLD3KJqA%3D%3D&crl=c>
- Throsby, D. (2008b). The concentric circles model of the cultural industries. In *Cultural Trends*, 17(3), 147–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548960802361951>
- Throsby, D. (2010). *The Economics of Cultural Policy*. Cambridge University Press. London
- Throsby, D. (2013). Cultural sustainability. In *A Handbook of Cultural Economics*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781008003.00028>
- Throsby, D. (2018). *Platform Papers 55: Art, Politics, Money: Revisiting Australia's Cultural Policy*. Currency House. Australia.
- Throsby, D., & Others. (2006) *Platform Papers 7: Does Australia need a cultural policy?* Currency House. Australia.
- Tingle, L. (2015) Political Amnesia – How We Forgot to Govern. In *Quarterly Essay*, p1-87, Issue 60, Black Inc. ISBN 978-1-86395-786-1
- Toledo-Silva, G. (2015). *UNESCO and the coining of cultural policy*. Conference: 10th International Conference in Interpretive Policy Analysis. At: Lille (France) (PDF) UNESCO and the coining of cultural policy (researchgate.net)
- Tregear, P. (2018) The MPA Framework and the Culture of Cultural Funding. In *Non Traditional Research Outcomes* (NTRO), 30 November, 2018. Australian Council of Deans and Directors of Creative Arts. <https://nitro.edu.au/articles/2018/11/30/the-mpa-framework-and-the-culture-of-cultural-funding>
- UNESCO (2017) *Re/shaping cultural policies: advancing creativity for development: 2005 Convention global report, 2018*. UNESCO Publishing. <https://en.unesco.org/creativity/global-report-2018>
- UNESCO (2015) *Basic Texts of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. UNESCO Publishing. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000370521_eng
- UNESCO (1969) *Cultural Policy, a preliminary study*. UNESCO Publishing. Paris. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000001173>
- Upchurch, A. (2004). John Maynard Keynes, the Bloomsbury group and the origins of the arts council movement. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(2), 203–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1028663042000255817>
- Valentine, J. (2017). Cultural governance and cultural policy. In *The Routledge Handbook of Global Cultural Policy* (pp. 148–164). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315718408-10>
- Vestheim, G. (2016). *Cultural Policy and Democracy*. Routledge, UK.

- Volkerling, M. (1996). Deconstructing the difference-engine: A theory of cultural policy. In *The European Journal of Cultural Policy*, 2(2), 189–212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286639609358014>
- Volkerling, M. (2000). *Heart of the Nation: An international perspective*. McDermott Miller, NZ.
- Volkerling, M. (2010a). The Helen Clark Years: Cultural Policy in New Zealand 1999–2008. In *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* (Vol. 40, Issue 2, pp. 95–104). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2010.485101>
- Volkerling, M. (2010b). Raymond Williams, The long revolution. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 16(1), 92–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630903038915>
- Williams, R. (1980, 2020). *Culture and Materialism*. Verso Books. UK
- Wright, D. (2015) *Understanding Cultural Taste: Sensation, Skill and Sensibility*. Springerlink. University of Warwick. UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137447074>