What Is Cultural Policy? A Research Agenda

Adrienne Scullion
Academic Director
Beatriz García
Research Fellow
Centre for Cultural Policy Research, University of Glasgow, Scotland

Adrienne Scullion is academic director of the CCPR, a role which she combines with her responsibilities as senior lecturer in the Department of Theatre, Film and Television Studies of the University of Glasgow, where she is head of the Theatre Studies Subject Group. Recent work for the CCPR includes: The Economic Impact of the Cultural Sector in Scotland, a joint project undertaken with the Fraser of Allander Institute of the University of Strathclyde; The Same… But Different: Rural Touring Arts in Scotland, the report of the 'Rural virtues' research project undertaken with Comedia; and, currently in progress, the 'Cities and culture' project, on the long-term legacies of Glasgow 1990.

Beatriz García is research fellow of the CCPR. She is the lead investigator of the three-year project 'Cities and culture: the long-term legacy of Glasgow 1990'. The focus of this and related projects is to explore approaches to cultural policy and planning in post-industrial cities. Completed research on this area includes: The Evaluation of Cultureshock the North West Cultural Programme of the 2002 Manchester Commonwealth Games, commissioned by the North West Cultural Consortium, with support from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office; and, Towards a Cultural Policy for Major Events, a four-year project financed by the Centre for Olympic Studies at Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, with support from the Olympic Museum and the International Olympic Committee.

Abstract
Cultural policy research exists in many contexts, asks many different kinds of questions and adopts a wide repertoire of research methodologies from a raft of academic discourses. This paper investigates the research questions and approaches being undertaken by those working in this field. To achieve this the paper draws upon readings of contemporary publications in the field and on the authors' experiences of building a research capacity in the area of cultural policy in a British – and more particularly a post-devolution Scottish – university. The paper traces the emergence of an academic discipline in the field and seeks to advance this by proposing a tripartite research agenda investigating: the history and historiography of cultural policy; the principles and strategies of cultural policy; and, the relationships between cultural policy and cultural theory/cultural studies.

Keywords
Cultural policy, research questions, disciplinarity, theory and practice.

Background

Cultural policy research exists in many contexts, asks many different kinds of questions and adopts a wide repertoire of research methodologies from a raft of academic discourses. But, in this diversity, is there more that unites than divides? In the growing number of voices contributing ideas, findings and commentaries, is there a danger that another kind of disciplinary development will be lost? In a relatively new subject area –

still making its arguments to research councils, university authorities and others – is this potential fragmentation or lack of cohesion a missed opportunity? As the work of cultural policy studies grows and responds to different and even competing institutional, social, political and cultural needs, do we lose the potential to communicate effectively amongst ourselves?   And what, if any, are the shared or common research questions, methodologies and critical references? Are we part of an evolving academic discipline, or should we acknowledge insufficient, common currency and merely enjoy the diversity of the research on offer as academic tourists?

Our reflections on these important questions draw upon readings of contemporary publications in the field and on our experience of building a research capacity in the area of cultural policy in a British – and more particularly a post-devolution Scottish – university.

Readings

Reviewing the recent literature we were particularly struck by the mix of consonance and dissonance in three high-profile publications in the field: Justin Lewis and Toby Miller's edited volume *Critical Cultural Policy Studies: A Reader* (2003); Toby Miller and George Yudice's co-authored *Cultural Policy* (2002); and, J Mark Schuster's *Informing Cultural Policy: The Research and Information Infrastructure* (2002). Each volume anticipates further practical and philosophical enquiry but none assumes, or rather none prescribes, a research culture. In responding to this implicit challenge this paper does not propose a formal review of these texts but seeks to extrapolate some ideas and principles about how they might relate to a cultural policy research agenda.

One of the challenges of cultural policy research is the variety of audiences that can (and, perhaps, must) be addressed. Each of these three recent volumes has a rather different conception of audience and, thereby, a different answer to the important question of 'for whom is cultural policy research – and/or cultural policy studies – undertaken?'

Critical Cultural Policy Studies is a reader text – that is, an anthology of key essays and articles that, the editors judge, are crucial to the historical development and/or contemporary expression of an area of study. In dissecting the status and purpose of any area of research and/or study the role of the critical reader is crucial – acting as a snapshot of the subject and, by its very existence, establishing its thematic area as a mature, academic 'discipline' with conventions, shared assumptions and, to some degree, common cause. Like the subject-specific conference, the academic reader is a quintessential part of the language of the academy: its existence implies the presence of an intellectual audience, that is the incidence of a community of scholars engaged in the discipline in a particular way. One might also suggest that the economics of publishing implies a wider market, specifically an audience of students learning in the field.

The reader is, of course, marked as much by its exclusions as its inclusions and, thereby, becomes a valuable teaching tool for the exploration of the parameters and the ambitions, the rhetorics and the methodologies of the subject: as such this reader is simultaneously a pragmatic tool; a statement of academic maturity; and, a kind of *meta*-study of the subject area. In Lewis and Miller's terms the reader 'offer[s] a sense of what we have learnt thus far' (p. 8) in this multifaceted area of cultural production and consumption. The 'we' of this assertion projects to a wider community of, by implication, academic scholars, and the 'thus far' implies a challenge to those readers to take the project on beyond the terms of study delineated by the collection. In this instance, the

editors' approach is rooted in the discourses of cultural studies and political economy, and the object of investigation is the study and management of cultural provision – encompassing the arts, broadcasting, the Internet, sport as well as urban planning and international organisations and infrastructures.

Despite their contention that 'This volume is not a manifesto' (p. 8), Lewis and Miller's reader is a polemical intervention: this flagged by the use of the words 'critical' and 'studies' in the title; and, asserted in their commitment to the political and social role of culture. For Lewis and Miller the 'critical' aspect of their collection is not an explicit critique of their individual editorial choices but a wider assertion that works in the area 'must concern itself with progressive politics and […] social movements' (p. 8). In comparison the appellation 'studies' suggests disciplinarity and academisation: a purpose within rather than outwith the academy. Lewis and Miller's acknowledge the potential for 'Cultural policy [to be] a site for the production of cultural citizens' (p. 1) and it is at this level of application – the engagement with the hegemonic and counter-cultural implementation of cultural policies – that this reader operates.

The provenance of the essays included in *Critical Cultural Policy Studies* is similarly revealing: predominantly they are drawn from cultural studies texts and journals. This context yields a mix of, what one might term, 'classic' texts – such as an extract from Tony Bennett's 1995 essay 'The political rationality of the museum', an extract from Jim McGuigan's *Culture and the Public Sphere* (1996), and Sylvia Harvey's 'Doing it my way – broadcasting regulation in capitalist cultures: the case of "fairness" and "impartiality"' (1998) – and new interventions aimed to widen the reach of cultural policy studies towards the new media and to render explicit the cultural planning aspects of the subject in urban planning debates. Whilst one might not see (nor want to see) a seamless delineation of 'cultural policy studies' in this anthology, nevertheless, the research methodologies are almost exclusively qualitative and the debate is focused on representation, meaning and interpretation. The theoretical bent of the editors' 'Introduction' underlines the fact that the key research question for the volume is 'How does cultural studies relate to policy orientated theorizing and research?' (p. 23). The volume articulates and explores tensions along the cultural policy/cultural studies divide and it is, therefore, no accident that McGuigan's chapter, and Stuart Cunningham's 1991 essay 'Cultural studies from the viewpoint of cultural policy', constitute the book's opening section. Against this backdrop it is easy to see the programme of work represented in this collection as a deliberate response to Angela McRobbie's now famous declaration that cultural policy is 'the missing agenda' of cultural studies (1996, p. 335), with Lewis and Miller seeking to inhabit that gap.

In summary, one might interpret this collection as representing the arts-humanities wing of the cultural policy players engaged in debates of aesthetics and taste, art and culture, policy and citizenship. This application of the cultural studies agenda towards not just praxis but public policy is central to contemporary work in the field of the cultural policy research: and has certainly proved influential in casting and testing our shared research culture.

In some degree of rhetorical contrast to the implied scopings and disciplinary perambulations of *Critical Cultural Policy Studies* is the bald assurance of a text entitled *Cultural Policy*. Here, it seems, is a particular 'state of the discipline' address, with the writers aspiring to an authoritative positioning of the topic within their preferred discourses of history, economics and society. Charting a history of 'Cultural policy studies', for Miller and Yudice the disciplinary nexus is that of economics, social theory and arts provision. The frame is, again, cultural studies and the methodologies those of historical and philosophical enquiry, as well as literary and cultural theory. Historically and geographically specific case studies are deployed to illustrate research into the

discipline's rhetoric as much as the potential of the discipline itself: 'our categories of culture […] were chosen partly because they are the areas in which a critical cultural policy literature exists' (p. 3).   This study, thereby, adopts something of a historiographical approach to the topic – implying a history of both the policy making and implementation in the field *and* a history of the explanations, justifications and critiques of that policy making. This is an essential aspect of the academic research agenda – its history and historiography – and we will return to it as a crucial plank of cultural policy research later in this paper.

Drawing on Cunningham's 'reformist' or 'centrist' agenda (Lewis and Miller, p. 14ff; Miller and Yudice, p. 29-30), Miller and Yudice seek to harness the counter-cultural potential of cultural studies and its rhetoric.   Miller and Yudice argue that cultural policy 'could provide a radical recontextualization of the present, such that our understanding of ourselves is itself subject to critical historicization via a questioning of each statement's conditions of existence'. They continue: 'This turn will not be welcome to all, especially those inclined to critique for its own sake […]. But getting to know cultural policy and intervening in it is an important part of participating in culture.' (p. 34) The implied challenge is to strike a balance between the ideas, meaning and theories of cultural policy and their application, between work that reflects back on the academisation of cultural policy and applied research – perhaps responsive or consultancy-led research – that feeds into policy formulation, implementation and evaluation.

As might be deduced from the prioritising of Bennett, Cunningham and McGuigan, the volume is strongly influenced by the Foucaudian concept of governmentality and the exercise and control of power through culture and the role of the individual and communities within that (Foucault, 1979; Burchell, et al, 1991; Rose and Miller, 1992; Rose 1999a, b).   And it is in relation to this trope that we would see a two key interrelated research questions for cultural policy research as being: how is culture shaping contemporary notions of governance; and, how is culture administered and regulated.

This, then, marks a further aspect of our cultural policy research agenda – and linking back to our first area of research concern – the articulation of cultural policy research with cultural theory and cultural studies. It is also a particularly important strand of the academic research agenda as it evolves from and is rooted in the academy and its theoretical and critical concerns. It is not, therefore, reactive of a government or sectoral agenda: this being an ever present pull for research activity in this area.

This is an important point that links this arts-humanities approach to the applied research tradition: cultural policy activities (research and teaching) within the academy is not just historically rooted and conceptually robust, but it is also fully justified in its active engagement with making as well as commenting on policy. This also constitutes a further building block of cultural policy research: an engagement with policy formulation, policy delivery, and evaluation.   We will comment more on the practical and philosophical challenges inherent in this applied work.

Whist the reader might articulate in historical and theoretical ways with the co-authored *Cultural Policy*, one might suggest that neither of these important texts – the implied critical weight of the academic reader and the disciplinary provenance that is declared by *Cultural Policy* – feature as part of the 'infrastructure' mapped by Schuster's book. Whilst *Critical Cultural Policy Studies* and *Cultural Policy* assume an academic consumption, *Informing Cultural Policy* points to different kinds of engagement. The 'tell' is the active verb in the title, implying its utilitarian purpose and guidebook potential. Certainly this text has something of the directory about it: it offers itself as a mapping exercise, a reference text of resources and sources of information.   To link to

McGuigan's review of policy analysis, Schuster's text is more explicitly about the 'applied' (or in Adorno's terms 'administrative') aspects of cultural policy research rather than the 'critical' ones: although, of course, he does ask some testing questions around data analysis and the relationship of researchers to funders.

Case Study

Devolution in 1999 provided the impetus for higher education in Scotland to examine ways in which it could contribute to the new forms of governance – and specifically how academic research could contribute to public policy making in keeping with contemporary notions of 'knowledge transfer'.

For the Scottish Executive – the government in Scotland – one of the issues which quickly emerged in the post devolution context was the lack of a resource in the new Scottish government with the capability to undertake research into areas of policy which had previously been the responsibility of Whitehall. With new forms of political scrutiny in the structures of the Parliament, and with a target-driven administration, the issue of 'evidence-based policy making' came to the fore. The Centre for Cultural Policy Research at the University of Glasgow was established in 2000 to address some of these (and related) policy (or 'administrative') concerns within and outwith the cultural sector in Scotland and beyond.

Our cultural policy research begins in an academic tradition that explores the relations between culture and society; between cultural forms and expressions and practices; between institutional modes of production and dissemination. It is an academic tradition that is, at root, about understanding and critiquing cultural production and reception. Equally an academic tradition that is fundamentally engaged with performance is, to a greater or lesser degree, studying policies as they are experienced at some point along a supply/demand chain of production.

Within a UK-context, the academic tradition that frames this work is, of course, that of the Birmingham School and, as we have alluded, the influence of Foucault and ideas of 'policing' and 'governmentality'. It is a route to cultural policy studies most clearly associated with Tony Bennett – whose engagement with cultural representation and analysis moved so significantly to issues of policy and an exploration of the 'critical' and the 'applied'.

The Birmingham School-Tony Bennett line of development is not, of course, uncontested particularly in the United States where, in 1993, Fredric Jameson questioned the intellectual robustness of the left wing, liberal academy working with and within public policy.[1] In addition, and despite Jameson's distaste – and the traditional façade of academic objectivity (generally cast as 'neutrality') – academics cannot and do not sit on the sidelines of policy development and implementation. In this tradition, Cunningham outlines the theoretical paradigm that activates the cultural studies agenda and 'commits [it] to a reformist strategy [and] engagement with policy' (p. 19) but there are other, more pragmatic, influences. While Jameson attacked the 'applied' potential of British cultural studies, Bennett's work also (very directly) influenced the so-called 'cultural policy' school in Australia where an explicit deployment of the Foucaudian concept of governmentality forged a new (or at least refreshed) role for the academy through connections between intellectuals and state institutions. (Bennett, 2003) Underpinning this was, of course, a concern around citizenship. This was not only explored within academic discourse but was also, for a time, an area of policy concern and investment for government (marked as an area of priority by the Australian Research Council). In

contemporary Scotland one of the most immediate challenges to the academy is its role in relation to post-devolution government and the governance infrastructure. Again, the Foucaudian model of governmentality facilitates an appropriate understanding modern forms of rule, new forms of political power, the proliferation of public policies and systems of social administration that affect the conduct of individuals.

In responding to this complex political and theoretical frame – and the tension of 'applied' and 'critical' – we have identified some key points – two pragmatic and two more conceptual – for cultural policy making in Scotland. They are that: there is a pressing need for high-quality research and robust data to establish a clear evidence base; policy makers and practitioners have to be realistic about the economics of culture and the creative industries; policy makers and researchers need to review their understanding of the 'national' in a post devolution context and in relation to an expanding Europe; and, policy makers, researchers and practitioners must review structures and agencies in light of the above. The citizenship debate, in some respects framed by national discourses, is a key feature of contemporary British and Scottish politics. This debate may be cast transnationally both conceptually – not least in relation to the cultural rights debate and the UN Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) – and administratively – perhaps in relation to UNESCO-engagements with culture.

The culture/citizenship/creativity nexus is a potent one for policy makers and cultural theorists alike as it plays out at both local and global levels. All western and most developing countries have a role to play in the world economy and are simultaneously devolving power to sub-national, regional, local governments and communities. In short, the centralised nation-state is giving way to both supra-national and sub-national institutions: this combination of globalisation and localisation often referred to by the ugly neologism 'glocalisation'. It may be argued that both pulls are about the empowerment of individuals and communities at the expense of the monolithic nation state. Our experience in working in post-devolution Scotland – and responding to the political agenda (see McConnell, 2003) – as well as building an academic research agenda similarly negotiates the small and the large, the near and the far, the local and the global.

In some respects these pragmatic issues could be addressed by a consultancy agenda of data gathering, sector mapping and management review. However, the danger of such an approach is its potential to fragmentation and its limited view of the audience (defined as the government client or the cultural sector itself). Since devolution, the cultural sector in Scotland has found itself closer to ministers and politicians than had ever previously been the case. This has been regarded as both an advantage and disadvantage. There has been a growing interest in policy debates – but the cultural sector has realised that they lack quality information with which to engage fully in these. Such practical issues – the new role for HE, the need for evidence to underpin policymaking and, the demands of the sector – have helped to shape our research agenda but they do not constitute it entirely.

Within the context of a Modernising Government Agenda and an emphasis on 'evidence-based policy making', culture is lagging behind. In policy terms the cultural sector is not a 'special case'. It must be able to 'talk the talk' of government, present its arguments alongside other issues and other portfolios. Part of that is about presenting the right kinds of information in the right kinds of way. The politicians, the civil servants, the public agencies need good quality qualitative and quantitative research data and analysis. Similarly, the cultural sector has realised that it lacked quality information with which to engage fully in policy debates. However, it faces some fundamental challenges around research: firstly, it is often the case that there is simply not enough money in the

sector to support good quality research programmes; and, secondly, what the cultural sector really wants from research is the killer evidence that will release dizzying amounts of money into the sector. Its expectations of research can be unrealistic.

And yet, as Schuster's audit of the variety of locations of cultural policy research demonstrates, there is more to 'applied' research and the immediate policy demands of government than justifications and supporting evidence. Cultural policy research can facilitate important conceptual change. However, one element that makes this difficult is that applied research is so often context driven.

For example, the re-emergence of political and ethnic nationalism in Europe and beyond has led historians, social scientists, artists and critics alike to reconsider issues of identity. This has led to an interrogation of the critical orthodoxies of cultural imperialism, colonialism, marginalisation, and their neat binary oppositions. The ideas of nations as 'imagined communities' (Anderson, 1983), and of identity in modern societies, in modern Britain, as fragmentary and 'fuzzy' (for example, Cohen, 1994) have significant ubiquity when considering the evolution of identity politics, and its impact on our critical vocabulary. Within Scotland the debate around the 'national', representation, hybridity and interculturalism has developed very significantly within the academy (for example McCrone, 1992; Craig, 2002) but we might as whether this critical frame, so important in resetting ideas around national and gender identity, been picked up in policy debates and decision making?

The huge changes in the political life of Scotland – delivering a new model of governance – build on history and on the traditions and institutions of the existing and independent civil society. But these changes and these innovations also create new structures, new modes of organisation and new policies. Both the social science discourse of McCrone and the arts/humanities context of Craig have identified something new in the critical construction and understanding of Scotland. An important question might be, does this intellectual and theoretical resetting also impact in terms of policy and, in particular, in terms of cultural policy?

In relationship to the systems and structures of cultural policy, a starting point might involve a rethinking of the ideological frame of cultural policy management. It is a subtle but important point that the locus of the Scottish Executive's authority is not predicated on areas dispensed from Westminster. In fact, quite the opposite is the case, as the devolution settlement empowers the Holyrood parliament legislative powers over everything not reserved to Westminster. The Executive can legislate on absolutely anything – up to and including taxation – that is not reserved by Westminster. Is there something here with which we can rethink policy making in Scotland? A new cultural policy infrastructure should address the distinctive structures of the new Scottish democracy as well as society's contemporary concerns, values and ideologies. This might require a fundamental rethink around the role of culture and government and an interrogation of concepts such as 'arm's length', 'citizenship' and 'cultural rights'. The type of thinking required around these ideas might not sit so easily within a context of evidence based research and yet they raise fundamental questions about the principles of cultural policy provision, its historical ubiquity, and its theoretical conceptualisation – the key building blocks of a cultural policy research agenda.

Commentary

The policy and disciplinary readings that we had to undertake establishing our research protocols has proved a useful one: rooting our work within both an 'applied' and a

'critical' discourse. Such self-reflection should not be restricted to establishing a new research capacity but must be inherent in out shared research agenda.

Cultural policy studies and cultural policy research are part of a new and distinctive kind of academic discipline – one that is predicated on competing (and sometimes contradictory) audiences, purposes and even academic traditions – and, as such, we might see it forefront of reflexive research practices, implicitly questioning the role of the academy and its contribution to ideas and practice.

Cultural policy research is interdisciplinary. It draws on the social sciences for both quantatitive and qualitative research methodologies and, to articulate its social and economic role, its models of application and territorial difference. From the arts/humanities it draws on history and historiography – to understand policy making in the past and influence its future development and implementation – as well as cultural studies from which come a concern with sign, representation and identity and, indeed, definitions and experiences of culture and its role in society.

It is undertaken in government, in non-departmental bodies, in consultancies and in university units of varying kinds. It is funded through equally diverse routes and its audiences are similarly various – government (local, municipal, regional, national, transnational), culture makers, audiences, participants, academics.

However, from this wider frame we are concerned to extrapolate a research agenda for cultural policy that is rooted within (if not limited to) the academy. With this aim in mind, we might suggest that research in cultural policy might develop in three interconnected areas:

- the history and historiography of cultural policy;
- the principles and strategies of cultural policy; and,
- cultural policy and cultural theory/cultural studies.

These are broad categorises of history, practice and theory resonate across the humanities, social science and might allow cultural policy research to evolve its own questions, as well as articulate with other research areas in each category.

Schuster's study notes that much cultural policy research in the UK often driven by consultancy income, or has come through individual works of scholarship. (p. 15) For many academic cultural policy researchers there is a temptation, sometimes a need and always a pressure to think about the quick buck through consultancy. This is not an approach which should be completely dismissed – in addition to financial benefits such work raises profile and gains researchers particular access to the processes of decision-making and policy evaluation. But the weakness of an over emphasis on consultancy is that it makes it difficult to develop a coherent body of research and near impossible to develop longitudinal projects. In addition if cultural policy research is undertaken on the back of consultancies and commissions then researchers turn less frequently to the core budgets of their institution or research councils. The negative side of this is that, if funders see cultural policy-related applications only infrequently they will not develop the skills and vocabulary appropriate for their fair evaluation, 'case-law' will be slow to develop, and, consequently, more myths and half-truths will circulate as to what cultural policy research might actually be.

More crucially, a significant obstacle to developing coherent area of research is the difficulty inherent in cross or inter or multi disciplinary working. If we accept that this area called cultural policy research crosses discipline boundaries – particularly across

that arts/humanities and social sciences Rubicon – then we are faced with a practical and conceptual challenge.

What we have been pursuing, and are keen to continue to pursue, is a model for cultural policy research which does not exclude these approaches but which offers a collaborative model – which is, perhaps, more in line with social science protocols – and understands that at root we are researching in a university context.

Reviewing the contemporary literature and reflecting on the work of research units and individuals working in this field, we see that the key challenge of cultural policy research is to negotiate a path between: a pragmatic or 'applied' research agenda that produces policy-relevant research and contributes to the evidence base; *and*, research that is critical, reflective, self-aware and rooted within the contemporary theoretical paradigms.[2] This is a continuum along which researchers move in line with the research questions in which they are engaged. It is important to say that we do not see the research methodologies of the social sciences being located at one extreme and those of the arts and humanities at the other. The spectrum arranged by research question first and methodology second. In seeing the cultural policy discourse as existing along this spectrum the oppositional social sciences/arts-humanities stand-off is rejected.

We agree with Cunningham, undertaking cultural policy research is not about adopting a magpie-like approach to the tools of research but is about locating the discipline of cultural policy research in a theoretical rather than methodological frame. In this the ambition is to move the cultural policy research agenda debate beyond the uneasy peace of social sciences/humanities discourses and recast its essential interdisciplinarity as a relevant, flexible and robust model for public policy research that is sufficiently distinctive, sufficiently self-reflexive as to represent an academic discipline of ubiquity and utility. Indeed, such a contextualised and potentially shared research agenda necessarily implies the conditions of an academic discipline with shared questions, methodologies and critical practices.

In addition, the lessons from Australian experience of cultural policy research, as well as the implicit and explicit critiques undertaken by Lewis and Miller, and Miller and Yudice, we might extrapolate four useful propositions regarding cultural policy research. They are that –

1. cultural policy research engages in politics and can be – perhaps ought to be – politically engaged;
2. cultural policy research can be interdisciplinary and might have a propensity to be collaborative – both within and outwith the academy;
3. cultural policy research has a range of different audiences – academics in this discipline and others, government (at all levels), practitioners, policy makers and others; and,
4. cultural policy research within the academy is critical, reflexive and self-aware.

It is, of course, the case that many of the factors that affect the way cultural policy can evolve as a discipline are country/nation-specific: and, herein, is a further challenge for establishing the parameters and the rhetorics of a potentially shared or common research agenda.

One of the important things about our research centre is its location within Scotland, and, further, within post-devolution Scotland. But as well as that being an important and indeed unique selling point for out work, it might also limit our research and narrow the view others have of us – with the implication that both our critical and applied work circulates and resonates only within that immediate legislative frame. Whilst the Scottish

context and frame offers crucial research questions across all three of our research themes – history, application and theory – the wider resonance of citizenship and radical shifts of governance allow the recasting of the close investigation of the representations, structures and policies of Scotland.

Conclusions

Cultural policy research – not least that rooted in an arts-humanities tradition – aspires to undertake 'policy-relevant research', to contribute to 'evidence-based research' and applied policy studies, *and* advance demands to make research critical, reflective, self-aware and rooted within the contemporary theoretical paradigms. In this the lessons of both British cultural studies and Australian cultural policy move the research debate beyond the uneasy peace of social sciences/humanities discourses. Cultural policy research is about understanding the 'policing' (in Foucault's terms) of the state and combines an engagement in representation and formulation. Addressing both sides of the supply-demand chain insists that the research questions are, in traditional terms, *multi*-disciplinary. However, this is research that inhabits the gaps and fissure of making, doing and interpreting and requires research approaches that are (truly) *inter*-disciplinary. Indeed, such a contextualised and potentially shared research agenda necessarily implies the conditions of an academic discipline with shared questions, methodologies and critical practices.

Notes

[1] Jameson's essay, ''On cultural studies'', might have been an interesting one to have seen anthologised in Lewis and Miller's anthology, if only as an explicit counterpoint to the volume's thesis of cultural policy studies.

[2] For example, this range of activity might encompass two current CCPR projects: the empirical assessment of selected case studies, such as the evolution of cultural policy in Glasgow after hosing a major cultural event in 1990, on the one hand; and, a discussion around the implications for developing city-based cultural policies as tools for urban regeneration in post-industrial cities, on the other.

References

Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Rise of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Bennett, T. 2003. "Culture and governmentality," in *Foucault, Cultural Studies and Governmentality*, J. Z. Bratich, J. Packer and C. McCarthy, eds., Albany: State University of New York Press, p. 47-63.

Burchell, G., C. Gordon, and P. Miller, eds. 1991. *The Foucault Effect*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, R. 1994. *Frontiers of Identity: The British and Others.* London: Longman.

Craig, C. 2002. "Constituting Scotland." *Edinburgh Review*, n° 109, p. 5-35.

Foucault, M. 1979. "On governmentality." *Ideology and Consciousness*, Vol. 6, p. 5-22.

Jameson, F. 1993. "On cultural studies." *Social Texts*, n° 34, p. 17-52.

Lewis, J., and T. Miller, eds. 2003. *Critical Cultural Policy Studies: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

McConnell, J. 2003. "St Andrew's Day speech." Edinburgh: Scottish Executive, http://www.scotland.gov.uk/pages/news/extras/00017600.aspx

McCrone, D. 1992. *Understanding Scotland: The Sociology of a Stateless Nation*. London and New York: Routledge.

McGuigan, J. 1996. *Culture and the Public Sphere*. London and New York: Routledge.

McRobbie, A. 1996. "All the world's a stage, screen or magazine: when culture is the logic of late capitalism." *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol. 18, n° 3, p. 335-42.

Miller, T., and G. Yudice. 2002. *Cultural Policy*. London: Sage.

Rose, N. 1999a. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Free Association Books.

_____. 1999b. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N. and P. Miller. 1992. "Political power beyond the state: problematics of government." *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 43, n° 2, p. 173-205.

Rothfield, L. 1999. "Cultural policy studies?! Cultural policy studies?! Cultural policy studies?!: a guide for perplexed humanists." *The Cultural Policy Centre Working Paper.* Chicago: University of Chicago, http://culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/workingpapers/Rothfield1.pdf

Schuster, J. M. 2002. *Informing Cultural Policy: The Research and Information Infrastructure*. New Brunswick, NH: Centre for Urban Policy Research.

Tepper, S. J. 2004. Review. Schuster, J Mark, Informing Cultural Policy. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, Vol. 28, n° 1, p. 83-8.

UN. 1966. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, resolution 2200A (XXI), http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_cescr.htm

UNESCO, Culture, http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/