

CULTURAL VALUE AS A NODE CHALLENGE: A VALUATION METHODOLOGY PROPOSAL

Patrycja Kaszynska, Senior Research Fellow, University of the Arts London

Dr Patrycja Kaszynska is a Senior Research Fellow at University of the Arts London, Creative PEC Research Fellow and Research Affiliate at Northeastern University London. She has a track record of shaping the cross-sectoral, and cross-disciplinary understanding of the value of arts, culture and creative practice in the context of decision-making in the UK.

Raphaela Henze, Professor of Cultural Management, Heilbronn University

Raphaela Henze is Professor of Cultural Management at Heilbronn University. She is co-founder of the international and transcultural AHRC funded Network Brokering Intercultural Exchange. Her research focuses inter alia on international collaboration and cultural policy.

ABSTRACT

Cultural value – the way the value of culture is expressed in decision-making – is an artifact of the ongoing process of translation, and an occasional breakdown of communication, across disciplines and sectors. Cultural value is an outcome of how different stakeholders – including policymakers, arts professionals and creative practitioners – struggle to legitimate their articulations of value. Accordingly, this article approaches cultural value as a ‘node challenge’ (Kaszynska, 2018) - a practical problem of collective agency where multiple discourses collide. In response, a research-underpinned, collaborative valuation methodology is proposed. The approach bridges situational analysis and mapping (Clarke, 2005) with deliberative facilitation (Elstub and Escobar, 2019) while recognizing that cultural value is a product of situated valuation (Dewey, 1939) constituted through struggle (Latour, 1987). Rather than using research to answer what cultural value is, or to critique cultural policy, research is harnessed here for the practical purpose of facilitating decision-making concerning culture.

Key words: cultural value, decision-making, cultural policy, creative practice, situational analysis, deliberation.

Introduction

Cultural value remains contested as an object of decision-making. This is hardly surprising given that there are many ways of articulating and demonstrating why the arts and culture matter to individuals, societies, the human population at large and indeed, to the health of the planet (Pyykkönen, 2024).

These originate across multiple discourses and practices and do not share the same language, nor the methods of demonstration (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016; Kaszynska et al., 2022). In particular, policymakers and decision-makers more broadly, and creative practitioners and arts professionals on the other side, have been divided by their – at time partisan – modes of argumentation and demonstration (Newsinger and Green, 2016; Weckerle et al., 2008). Historically, the language used by policymakers and creative practitioners to talk about the value of culture has been different, as have been the accepted methods of evidencing this value (Henze, 2013; Knüsel, 2014; Rush, 2020). Arguably, different objectives are at issue. Simply put, policymakers and ‘cultural-makers’ do not share each other’s accounts of why culture matters; nor do they align in their understandings of how, why and whether this needs to be demonstrated. This leads to a sense of double frustration. In the cultural sector, creative practitioners and arts professionals bemoan having to be assessed in terms of metrics and goals that, they argue, do not reflect the creative and cultural character of their achievements and what motivates them in the first place (Labaronne and Piber, 2020; Walmsley, 2022); policymakers, on the other hand, lament the begrudging attitudes from the cultural sector and claim to be unable to *make the case* for the arts and culture vis-à-vis different policy priorities and spending areas (Sagger et al., 2021).

Recognizing that ‘legitimacy struggles are more common in fields where judgement criteria are ambiguous, multiple players have a stake, and/or where resources are changing’ (Alexander and Bowler, p. 101485), we propose a valuation methodology that embraces the centrality of legitimacy struggles in the constitution of cultural value. While taking the existing research as a starting point – here acknowledging that cultural value has been a topic of research insofar this ongoing legitimation can be studied, for example, as a social phenomenon and through the analysis of the cultural policy discourse (Brook et al., 2020; Belfiore, 2022) – the proposal goes further in that it uses research constructively to address what fundamentally is a practical problem of coordination and collective agency. Cultural value is recognized as a *node challenge* – an issue ‘where different objectives and agendas clash to the extent that, although they can be managed, they cannot be resolved’ (Kaszynska, 2018, p. 3). Cultural value – as a node challenge – is a product of how people communicate in specific contexts, shaped by the attached institutional norms and socio-technical systems. Cultural value is a practical problem that has to be established empirically and experimentally; it is not something that can be deduced from existing research. This is however not to say that research is irrelevant from the point of view of cultural value.

Accepting the framing of cultural value as a node challenge – a term inspired by Rittel’s and Webber’s ‘wicked problems’ (1973) – the proposal builds on the Latourian insight that situations of controversy are illuminating in that they bring into relief issues that matter in defining not just the problems at

hand but the attached fields of inquiry (Latour, 1987). Starting with this assumption, in the methodological approach that this article proposes cultural value is approached in terms of situated valuation (Dewey, 1939). Thus understood, the process of ascribing value is not just contextually specific but also normatively-informed, in that the stakeholders bring in their ideas as to what matters. These normative positions are institutionally codified in the way that may not be transparent to the individual stakeholders; however, often they reflect the established sectoral divisions, with the most prominent one being that between cultural policymakers and creative practitioners. In our methodological proposal, the instance of situated valuation constituted through the controversy over cultural value is first analyzed using the mapping approach of Situational Analysis (Clarke, 2005; Clarke et al., 2018; 22). This is to introduce clarity about who the stakeholders of cultural value are, what they want and need and, by extension, what they don't understand about the other stakeholders and what blind spots they display. Second, we argue that a process of facilitated deliberation should support the empirical constitution of cultural value. The area of Democratic Innovation research (Elstub and Escobar, 2019) is suggested as a territory rife with ideas for how stakeholder-coordination processes can be informed, structured and designed. The outcome is a valuation approach which does not sweep the stakeholder differences under the proverbial carpet and yet, arguably, can support decision-making. The methodology presents a research-informed, practical solution promising to put the legitimacy struggles converging in cultural value to a productive use, leading to better-grounded and more inclusive decision-making in culture.

Is cultural value a research topic?

People value the arts and culture. This has been recorded throughout history – verbally, orally, through the observation of people's behaviour, the symbolic interpretation of artefacts, etc. (Aristotle [340BC]/Crisp, 2014; Williams, [1958]1983; Graeber, 2001; Mbembe, 2017). The reasons and considerations for why the arts and culture are, and should be, valued – are a long-established topic of scholarly discussions. The term cultural value should be distinguished from this broader and fragmented body of literature aiming to understand the value of culture that has preoccupied scholars in philosophy and other humanities subjects, stretching back to antiquity (Bennett and Belfiore, 2008). This largely theoretical and speculative corpus – appealing to the notions of aesthetic significance, symbolic representations, identity formation, to name just some – has arguably informed debates through which the contemporary notion of cultural value has been channeled (for instance, with some of its valorization terms internalized by creative practitioners – see Newsinger and Green, 2016). It is however important to insist that the discourses of the value of culture are not synonymous with the narrower, but still multifaceted, discourse of cultural value.

As indicated, this article sees cultural value as an artefact of decision-making. This means responding to the demands of policymaking and often appealing to various constraints that do not align with how creative practitioners talk about the value of what they do (Newsinger and Green, 2016; Banks, 2017). Indeed, contemporary research in cultural policy has been preoccupied with how the notion of cultural value has been shaped by what some academics identified as the pressures to cast cultural value in the 'language' of policymaking, especially in terms of the types of impacts associated with domains other than culture (Belfiore, 2015; Hadley and Gray, 2017) and to 'square' cultural value with the monetized and/or commensurable forms of financial and/or economic value (Alexander, 2018; Ekström and Brembeck, 2020). Indeed, there is now a large corpus of writing critiquing the so-called *economism* of cultural policy – its tendency to use economic concepts and methods to talk about cultural value. In recent years, the criticism of the discourse of creative industries has highlighted the path-dependencies of how cultural value is articulated through its (over)reliance on the economic forms of understanding (O'Connor, 2024; Kaszynska, 2021). This branches out into wider discussions – spanning cultural sociology, cultural anthropology, political theory and the more recently established fields of Science and Technology Studies, or Science, Technology and Society – over how evidence and knowledge are constructed and what hegemonies this accepts (De Laet, 2001; Lury, 2013). A recent polemic from a group of Australian academics critical of the fact that economics remains the key register for decision-making concerning culture – is an interesting record of disciplinary wars whereby different approaches to knowledge formation struggle to take control of the same territory (Phiddian, et al., 2017 a; 2017 b).

Against this backdrop, it is possible to see that insofar as cultural value figures in research – as a research problem – it has been predominantly approached through a critical lens, and the critique of cultural policy in particular. A related research route touching on cultural value has been through the discourses concerned explicitly with participation and inclusion (Jancovich, 2011; Kaitavuori, 2020). The last decade has seen the establishment of a sociologically-grounded, statistically-informed field of research looking at the problems of inequalities in the production and consumption of culture (O'Brien and Oakley, 2015) with the increasing emphasis on how the social distinctions play out in the labour markets and the career prospects of creative labourer (Banks, 2017; Brook, et al., 2020). Intersecting with this, there are research strands focusing on the politics inherent in cultural value. Notably, the ambitions to make cultural value an object of dispassionate, technocratic exercise and a measurement challenge (Bakhshi et al., 2015) have been offset by some highly politicized discussions concerning the ground of public support and funding for the arts and culture: the legitimacy of state support for the arts and the allocation of public funding (Selwood, 2002) vis-à-vis 'everyday participation' (Miles and Gibson, 2016) and the

value of the traditionally state-subsidized vis-a-vis popular forms of engagement (Williams, 1983; Bennett et al. 2009). It is relatively recent that cultural value has been studied as an object in its own right, as a question of representation (Newsinger and Green, 2016; Belfiore, 2020 and increasingly, a problem of articulation and action co-ordination (Kaszynska, 2018; Kaszynska, forthcoming). The latter is embraced here with cultural value seen as an action co-ordination challenge and accordingly, framed as a node challenge (as discussed in the next section) and as a practical problem (as discussed in the section following the next one).

Cultural value as a node challenge

The proposal of this article is to explicitly recognize politics at the heart of cultural value; perhaps going even further, it is to acknowledge that cultural value suffers from an on-going, *constitutive* legitimation crisis. The proposal, in short, is to approach cultural as a node challenge.

The notion of node challenges is inspired by the concept of ‘wicked problems’ – which was characterised in system theory and urban planning back in the 1970s. These are essentially problems that cannot be solved once and for all for reasons such as: their solution would require an unrealistic change in material circumstances; there are many opinions (including ideological views) involved; there is contradictory or incomplete information available; the problems are connected with other problems; the level of resources needed to address them is too large. Instead, wicked problems can be tackled and managed.’ (Kaszynska, 2018, p.24)

While the quote above references the term ‘wicked problems’ from the discourse of urban planning (Rittle and Webber, 1973)), another apt connection would be with the Latourian Mapping Controversies (MC) (Latour, 1987). Introduced in the context of Science and Technology Studies, the concept, later developed into a method of Cartography of Controversies and a pedagogical approach (Venturini, 2010). What matters from the point of view of the present article is that MC aims to draw attention to how scientific knowledge is produced, rather than the content of this knowledge. The stated objective is to observe the artifice of how understanding, knowledge and evidence are constructed and to do so, precisely, by studying those situations where the usual channels of communications break down. In this context, controversy is defined in terms of several characteristics, including being ‘reduction-resistant’ which has some resemblance with wicked problems.

Disputes are, by definition, situations where old simplifications are rejected and new simplifications are still to be accepted or imposed. In controversies, actors tend to disagree on pretty much anything, including their dis-agreement itself. That’s why issues are so difficult to solve, because they are impossible to reduce to a single resuming question. Ask an easy question

such as “is world temperature increasing?” and actors will immediately start arguing about what world means (some area of the world? The world average? The surface or the atmosphere? Urban, rural or wild areas?), about what temperature means (how is temperature measured? Which instruments are used? Which temperature scale is to be considered?) and about what increasing means (is temperature augmenting or fluctuating? On which time scale should variation be evaluated? Can past trends suggest present and future evolution?). The difficulty of controversy is not that actors disagree on answers, but that they cannot even agree on questions. (Venturini, 2010, p. 262)

This description is apt for our purposes. In this vein, and escalating in the Latourian style, the notion of cultural value could be said the proverbial battleground where the key stakeholders such as creative practitioners and cultural policymakers do not see eye-to-eye and where the grounds of disagreement are not always clear. Where the analogy with Latour’s MC breaks down is when it comes to the proscribed way of dealing with the controversies of cultural value, if we can call them that. Here Latour and followers are adamant that beyond describing, recording and documenting – not much else can be done. In contrast, as discussed in what follows – we appeal to reasons-giving and normative dimensions in communication to operationalize controversies in our methodological proposal. In short, we agree with the diagnosis found in Latour – namely that cultural value is a real-life controversy and that approaching it as such is productive; we offer a different remedy.

Cultural value as a practical problem

Historically, an attempt to ‘tackle’ cultural value as a practical problem of decision-making can be traced to the UK’s cultural value debate. This was an early effort to talk about the grounds of decision-making concerning the value of arts, culture and heritage in the context of public funding in the UK (Hewison, 2012). As a public policy initiative, the debate can be dated back to a conference *Valuing Culture* organized by Demos and attended by The Secretary of State for Culture (Jowell, 2004). Inspired by the public value model initially proposed in Public Administration and Management (Moore, 1995), the core idea for this debate was to approach cultural value as a multi-stakeholder construct. The model of *Cultural Value Triangle* proposed by Demos (Holden, 2006) is an explicit attempt to represent the different perspectives at hand with the intrinsic, instrumental and institutional dimensions of value each speaking to different sectoral agendas. Arguably, the cultural value debate opened a possibility for more participatory evaluation and assessment. The public value-inspired thinking had temporarily informed how organizations such as the Heritage Lottery Fund (Clark and Maaer, 2008) and the Arts Council England (Bunting, 2008) approached evaluation (see also Coyle and Woolard, 2010). These effects however were relatively short lived and failed to provide a lasting connection between the field of

policymaking and the cultural sector (Alexander, 2018). Indeed, the ‘auditing culture’ of the New Public Management (Belfiore, 2004) and the progressing *sectorization* of culture through the ascendancy of the creative industries narrative (O’Connor, 2024), might have contributed to the premature dwindling on the public value approach as a way of making cultural value a collective problem in decision-making.

While – arguably – cradled in the UK, and in London specifically, the controversies of cultural value can be echoed throughout the world (UNESCO, 2022) and particularly so in countries where arts and culture receive some form of public funding (Rush, 2020; Henze, 2018; Lee and Lim, 2014). Indeed, due to the similarities in cultural policy, Australia in particular has been an arena to many parallel discussions (Geursen and Rentschler, 2003; Scott, 2010). As noted above, these are far from settled, with cultural value debated in the Australian academia (Phiddian, et al. 2017a; 2017b) and beyond (Gattenhof, et al. 2022).

By comparison, Germany is considered and considers itself a country where culture is closely tied to national history, language and identity. In contrast to the UK where the conception of culture emerged from a tradition of liberal individualism and British empiricism (Gillespie et. al., 2018), the idea of cultural value arises out of the contexts of education and nation-building (Lepenies, 2006). One translation of this is that, until recently, the value of culture was considered as an unquestioned given in Germany, comparable to a customary law (Wesner, 2010). German cultural policy rests on the assumption that art and culture are the basis for all spiritual and imaginary dimensions of mankind (Deutscher Bundestag, 2008; see also Lepenies, 2006) and therefore that culture is an unquestioned good (Wesner, 2010). However, there are some indications of change. As much as there is a fear of opening up a genie in the bottle when starting to debate value, the squeeze on public funding and the pressures for more transparency about public spending means that the value of culture is becoming increasingly debated with the all-too-familiar topics of measurement and evaluation on the raise (Svensson, 2017; Labaronne, 2017; Hennefeld and Stockmann, 2023). Even though, for the time being, the discussions are limited and institutionally circumscribed, cultural value is becoming a practical problem in Germany.

Like the UK and Australia, Germany has a tradition of public funding of the arts and relatively strong democratic structures. In contrast, apart from Uruguay, the confidence in government bodies is low in all of South America (Ebert, 2020). However, the potential for cultural value discussions are not entirely absent. The relationship between cultural practitioners and cultural policies can be described as ambivalent in many of the South American countries. Ambivalent because, despite the deep-rooted (and often more than justified) mistrust of state organizations, the desire of cultural professionals for

(financial and social) security, improvement of their working conditions and recognition of their achievements – is enormous, especially with regard to social challenges in the ethically and culturally diverse region (Henze and Dinardi, 2021). There are national differences. For example, in Argentina the discussions of cultural value have been repressed for the same reasons as those that Brazil has witnessed in the past years – namely, the neoliberal privatization of not just culture but also of the discourse of value propounded by the Argentinian president Milei's. This said, creative practitioners and arts professionals remain, for historical reasons, highly politicized and committed to the struggle to develop and maintain more inclusive cultural institutions (Henze, 2021). This perhaps is an indication that the methodological proposal made in this paper could get some traction in South America. Indeed, looking at a bordering country of Chile, there the election of Professor Elisa Loncon from the indigenous Mapuche population into the Chilean Constitutional Convention in 2021 was for many cultural practitioners in the region an important step towards a more inclusive approach to cultural value, not least because Loncon is leading the drafting of the country's new constitution and has claimed to give cultural rights the highest priority on her political agenda (Henze and Dinardi, 2021).

This overview shows that the considerations underpinning the cultural value debate need not be limited to the UK context. This is because, rather than a technocratic problem of measurement, cultural value is a problem of and for collective decision-making. It is a node challenge: a site of struggle for legitimation and contestation. This holds across different international contexts.

Towards a valuation methodology for cultural value

Cultural value presents thus a practical challenge for collective articulation and action co-ordination, particularly in countries with democratic governance and public funding for the arts and culture, but arguably, elsewhere too and anywhere where creative practitioners and arts professionals are seeking to establish their 'values' vis-a-vis those espoused by the state. This means that cultural value is an object of decision-making across multiple contexts but that the multiplicity of voices is not always recognized. This is where research can help.

In this paper we propose a dedicated methodological approach to valuing culture in the context of decision-making. Our specific proposal is to call on three distinctive strands of research: situational understanding of valuation; the method of social analysis and mapping developed in the sociology of Adele E. Clarke; and to mobilize insights from the growing field of Deliberative Innovation. In what follows we introduce each in turn and explain why these elements can be productively combined to create an integrated methodological approach for cultural value.

- Situational understanding of valuation

Situational understanding of valuation, as a conceptual starting point for our methodology, combines the comprehension of what constitutes value from the perspective of Pragmatism (Dewey's participatory social problem-solving in particular, e.g., Dewey, 1939), with Critical Theory's insistence on the need to unveil the normative grounds of social activity (specifically how actors manifest the normative attitudes implicit in their practical knowledge – see for instance, Habermas, 2015). This allows us to consider valuation in terms of problematic situations where the perspectives of variously situated agents – together with the symbolic systems, institutional practices and material-technological circumstances they espouse – come to meet in an activity of interpretation and communication that is susceptible to reason-giving (Bohman, 2000). This understanding of valuation situations is further enriched by Neo-Institutional approaches (Fligstein and McAdam, 2012)). This is needed because the institutional logics enveloping individuals influence their reason-going but may not be apparent to the individuals themselves, in any case they give actors 'cognitive frames or sets of meanings to interpret the behaviour of others' (2001, p. 108). The institutional logics (such as a cultural policy arena or a cultural production arena, either of which will be embedded in specific nation-state) have to be taken into account and represented in the situational valuation arising in the context of cultural value.

- Situational Analysis

Situational Analysis (SA) is a method of qualitative analysis and visual mapping, developed by Adele E. Clarke and colleagues, which our methodology uses to represent and map valuation situations (Clarke, 2003; Clarke 2005; Clarke et al., 2018). As an approach, SA has evolved from Grounded Theory by stressing the Pragmatist interactionist elements in how situations unfold (Bryant and Charmaz, 2007). Usefully, it defines situations as 'emergent and loosely bounded entity' (Clarke et al., 2018, p.49) that can be empirically grasped as frames spanning individuals, objects, institutions, ideologies and events; moreover, it treats variously construed situations as units of analysis which can be cartographically represented to aid analysis. In practical terms, SA involves producing three kinds of maps: situational maps, social worlds and arenas maps, and positional maps. Each type depicts a different aspect of the situation at hand and thus assisting analysis in a different way. *Situational maps* focus on mapping individual elements (be they human, discursive or objectual), *social worlds* capture group structures (such as organizations and institutions with the attached logics) and *positional maps* depict major positions taken and not taken in the discussions and debates on important issues. Some resemblance with Latour's cartography of controversies is apparent, with a crucial difference that SA

seeks to apprehend situations from the third-person *as well as* the first person perspective – that is, unlike in Latour, through the interpretations of the agents involved. This renders SA suitable to represent how reason-giving and the normative considerations are related to institutional logics and how these, in turn, can be characterized by tension, or routine contestation, among the actors over understandings of cultural value.

- Democratic Innovation

The term Democratic Innovation refers to the ideas and practices behind the growing family of participatory processes – digital, analogue and hybrid – aimed at involving citizens in decision-making through innovative models deliberation and other forms of participation (Elstub and Escobar, 2019). The underlying idea is simple. As Habermas (2015) argues, ‘true’ democracy is founded on discussion and reflection – or deliberation – and this entails participants listening to each other’s reasons. Epistemically, deliberative democracy promises to produce better-informed decisions, which are made through public exchanges of argumentation. Arguments that are perceived as self-serving are unlikely to gain much support within a space including diverse interests engaging on an equal playing field. Ethically, deliberative reasoning can encourage mutual respect and trust amongst participants (Parkinson and Mansbridge, 2012). Democratically, by including all those affected by a decision, deliberative processes can advance more socially just policies (Fung, 2015).

In broadest terms, individuals must participate in deliberating on an equal footing and engage in coercion-free, inclusive and public discussion. Some early approaches held that individuals should respond to the power of a better argument alone and deliberate only those issues that were of truly public relevance, leaving those that could not be universalized aside; moreover, that they should aim for consensus. The later generations of theorists – and, increasingly, of practitioners – have questioned these assumptions, including whether self-interest has to be suspended or can be an object of deliberation, whether consensus is too strong an ambition in the face of persisting agonism, and whether the narrowly conceived notion of reason-giving and the rationalistic bias sets standards that are effectively exclusionary, including with respect to affects, feelings and emotions (Young, 2002; Mouffe, 2000). These criticisms have been reflected in the recent approaches testing actual deliberative formats and processes (Escobar and Elstub, 2017). These developments are given a Pragmatic orientation with the normative principles being empirically tested, rather than theoretically assumed (Curato et al., 2017).

Collectively, the situational understanding of valuation, Situational Analysis and Democratic (Deliberative) Innovation are the research strands that inform the development of the valuation

methodology we propose. Simply put, we want to use deliberative facilitation to develop a collective, situated valuation processes that bridge the sectors of policymaking and creative practices, drawing on the cartographic materials developed through Situational Analysis. Approaching cultural value as a node challenge, this process will allow stakeholders to acknowledge those areas where no shared language exists – where communications break down and mutual expectations diverge so radically as to preclude the possibility of not just agreement but even understanding. Our research question is: can an appropriately facilitated and framed deliberative valuation process lead to a convergence in the valuation discourses and practices among cultural practitioners and policymakers with respect to cultural value? Answering this question will require experimental practice research approaches. Significantly, for the time being, this remains an untested methodological proposal. Next step for our research agenda is to put this proposal to a test through a project involving partners from the relevant constituencies, including cultural policymaking and cultural practices from different contexts.

Conclusion

There is ample literature – in the field of cultural management, cultural policy, cultural sociology and other cognate fields, as well as in grey literature – discussing the fraught nature of the relationships between creative professionals and cultural policymakers (McGuigan, 2004; Holden, 2006; Belfiore, 2022). The intellectual agenda for the proposed project should be considered against this backdrop but crucially, as stemming from an effort to use research constructively to address the challenges confronting people working in the cultural and creative sectors, more broadly, the challenges of democratic inclusion and legitimation as these arise in relation to cultural value.

This article speaks to the challenge of making decisions concerning culture, where the notion of cultural value remains both contested and constituted by the key stakeholders: cultural practitioners and policymakers. The proposal goes further in that it claims that cultural value is constituted through a permanent legitimation crisis with multiple stakeholders struggling to establish their articulations of value. Cultural value is accordingly framed as a node challenge (Kaszynska, 2018) and a practical problem of and for collective agency. As such, it is not something that can be settled with more and better research alone. This, however, does not render research irrelevant. The article shows how three existing strands of research can be brought together as a basis of a methodological proposal addressing this practical challenge. Specifically, the approach bridges situational analysis and mapping (Clarke, 2003; 2005; 2018) with deliberative facilitation (Elstub and Escobar, 2019) recognizing that cultural value is a product of situated valuation (Dewey, 1939) constituted through struggle (Latour, 1987).

The article makes thus a number of original contributions. It makes a useful analytic distinction between cultural value and the value of culture and maps different strands of research where cultural value has been discussed, including cultural policy and the sociology of culture. Against this background, it proposes a valuation methodology. This methodology uses research constructively, rather than for the purpose of critique, and to tackle a practical problem arising in cultural management and cultural policy – namely that of making decisions about culture. The methodology puts the politics inherent in cultural value to a productive use – without denying the real contestation over the source of value, nor by trying to side-step the controversies by accepting one specific stakeholder articulation of value as dominant – the methodological proposal addresses the need for more inclusive, meaningful and better-informed decision-making concerning culture. The cultural value as a node challenge methodology can therefore support decision-making without reducing cultural value to something that creative practitioners and arts professionals do not recognize as what they value.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge that Victoria D. Alexander, Goldsmiths, and Sonia Bussu, University of Birmingham, have contributed to the shaping of this research agenda.

References

- Alexander, V. D. (2018). Heteronomy in the arts field: state funding and British arts organizations. *The British journal of sociology*, 69(1), 23-43.
- Alexander, V.D. & Bowler, A.E. 2021. Aesthetic fields and the legitimation of Outsider Art: The persistence of contestation in legitimated fields, *Poetics*, 84: 101485.
- Bakhshi, H., Fujiwara, D., Lawton, R., Mourato, S., & Dolan, P. 2015. *Measuring economic value in cultural institutions*. AHRC.
- Banks, M. 2017. *Creative justice: Cultural industries, work and inequality*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Belfiore, E. 2004. Auditing culture: The subsidised cultural sector in the New Public Management. *International journal of cultural policy*, 10(2), 183-202.
- Belfiore, E. 2015. 'Impact', 'value' and 'bad economics': Making sense of the problem of value in the arts and humanities. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 14(1), 95-110.
- Belfiore, E. 2020. Whose cultural value? Representation, power and creative industries. *International journal of cultural policy*, 26(3), 383-397.

- Belfiore, E. 2022. Is it really about the evidence? Argument, persuasion, and the power of ideas in cultural policy. *Cultural trends*, 31(4), 293-310.
- Bohman, J. 2000. *Public deliberation: Pluralism, complexity, and democracy*. MIT Press.
- Brook, O., O'Brien, D., & Taylor, M. 2020. *Culture is bad for you*. Manchester University Press.
- Bryant, A., & Charmaz, K. (Eds.). (2007). *The Sage handbook of grounded theory*. Sage.
- Bunting, C. (2008). What instrumentalism? A public perception of value. *Cultural trends*, 17(4), 323-328.
- Clark, K., & Maeer, G. (2008). The cultural value of heritage: evidence from the Heritage Lottery Fund. *Cultural trends*, 17(1), 23-56.
- Clarke, A. E. 2003. Situational analyses: Grounded theory mapping after the postmodern turn. *Symbolic interaction*, 26(4), 553-576.
- Clarke, A. E. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Sage Publications,
- Clarke, A. E., Friese, C., & Washburn, R. S. 2018. *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the interpretive turn*. Sage publications.
- Coyle, D., & Woolard, C. 2010. *Public Value in Practice: Restoring the ethos of public service*. BBC Trust Report.
- Crisp, R. (Ed.). 2014. *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crossick, G., & Kaszynska, P. 2016. Understanding the value of arts and culture: The AHRC Cultural Value Project. AHRC.
- Curato, N., Dryzek, J. S., Ercan, S. A., Hendriks, C. M., & Niemeyer, S. 2017. Twelve key findings in deliberative democracy research. *Daedalus*, 146(3), 28-38.
- De Laet, M. 2001. Notes on the traffic between cultural studies and science and technology studies. In *A Companion to Cultural Studies*, edited by Toby Miller. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 101-15.
- Dewey, J. 1939. Theory of valuation. In *The later works of John Dewey, 1925-1953*, edited by J.A.Boydston, Volume 13. SIU Press, 189-253.

Deutscher Bundestag. 2008. Achter Bericht der Bundesregierung über ihre Menschenrechtspolitik in den auswärtigen Beziehungen und in anderen Politikbereichen. Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung. <https://dserver.bundestag.de/btd/16/100/1610037.pdf> [Accessed May 20, 2024]

Ebert, M. 2020. In Uruguay von Krise keine Spur. <https://www.dw.com/de/uruguay-von-krise-keine-spur/video-55672674> [Accessed, October 5, 2020].

Ekström, K. M., & Brembeck, H. (Eds.). 2020. *Elusive consumption*. Routledge.

Elstub, S., & Escobar, O. 2019. *Handbook of Democratic Innovation*. Edward Elgar.

Escobar, O., & Elstub, S. (2017). Forms of mini-publics: An introduction to deliberative innovations in democratic practice. *Research and Development Note*, 4(1-14).

Fligstein, N. & McAdam, D. 2012. *A theory of fields*. Oxford University Press.

Fung, A. 2015. Putting the Public Back into Governance: The Challenges of Citizen Participation and Its Future. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 75, (4): 513–522.

Gattenhof, S., Hancox, D., Mackay, S., Kelly, K., Rakena, T. O., & Baron, G. 2022. *Valuing the Arts in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Creative Australia.

Geursen, G., & Rentschler, R. 2003. Unraveling cultural value. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 33(3), 196-210.

Gillespie, M., O'Loughlin, B., Nieto McAvoy, E., & Berneaud-Kötz, M. 2018. *Cultural Value. Cultural Relations in Societies in Transition: A Literature Review*. British Council.

Graeber, D. 2001. *Toward an anthropological theory of value: The false coin of our own dreams*. Springer.

Habermas, J. 2015. *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. John Wiley & Sons.

Hadley, S., & Gray, C. (2017). Hyperinstrumentalism and cultural policy: means to an end or an end to meaning?. *Cultural Trends*, 26(2), 95-106.

Hennefed, V., & Stockmann, R. 2023. *Evaluation in Kultur und Kulturpolitik*. Waxmann.

Henze, R. 2013. Kunst und Management – zwei Seiten einer Medaille. In *Kultur und Management, Eine Annäherung*, edited by Raphaela Henze. Springer VS, 141-156.

Henze, R. 2017. Kultur mit allen statt Kultur für alle. Die Demokratisierung von Kunst und Kultur. In *21. Jahrhundert. Jahrbuch der Kulturpolitischen Gesellschaft 2017/2018*, Transcript Verlag, Bielefeld, 315 - 330.

Henze, R. 2018. Eurocentrism in European Arts Management. In *Cultural Policy and the rise of Populism*, edited by Milena Dragičević Šešić and Jonathan Vickery. KPY – Cultural Policy and Yearbook 2017/2018, Istanbul, Bilgi University Press, 31 – 43.

Henze, R. & Dinardi, C. 2020. Kulturpolitische Herausforderungen in Lateinamerika. In *Kulturpolitische Mitteilungen*, 174(3), 35-37.

Henze, R. 2021. Thinking Cultural Management from the South: New Frames for the “Western” discourse informed by the Latin America, In *Cultural Management and Policy from Latin America*, edited by Raphaela Henze and Federico Escribal. Routledge, 3-21.

Hewison, R. 2012. The benefits of the valuing culture debate, 2003–2011. *Cultural trends*, 21(3), 209-210.

Holden, J. 2006. *Cultural value and the crisis of legitimacy*. Demos.

Jancovich, L. 2011. Great art for everyone? Engagement and participation policy in the arts. *Cultural trends*, 20(3-4), 271-279.

Jowell, T. 2004. *Government and the value of culture*. Leisure Manager, 22(7), 8-10.

Kaitavuori, K. 2020. Participation in cultural legislation. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 26(5), 668-680.

Kaszynska, P. 2018. *Cultural Value Scoping Project*. King’s College London. https://www.ukri.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/AHRC-291121_AHRCCulturalValueScopingProjectReport.pdf [Accessed May 20, 2024]

Kaszynska, P. 2021. From calculation to deliberation: the contemporaneity of Dewey. *Culture, Theory and Critique*, 62(1-2), 154-166.

Kaszynska, P., Coyle, D., Dwyer, E., Lawton, R., Riganti, P., Watson, S., ... & Wang, Y. 2022. *Scoping Culture and Heritage Capital Report*. DCMS. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/scoping-culture-and-heritage-capital-report> [Accessed May 20, 2024]

- Kaszynska, P. Forthcoming. Cultural value as meaning-making. *Cultural trends*.
- Knüsel, P. 2014. A slippery slope- state, the arts and international reconciliation. In *Exporting Culture: Which Role for Europe in a Global World*, edited by Raphaela Henze and Gernot Wolfram. Springer. 97-108.
- Labaronne, L., & Piber, M. 2020. Performance measurement and evaluation in the arts and cultural sector: State-of-the-art in theory and practice and prolegomena for further developments. *Management, participation and entrepreneurship in the cultural and creative sector*, edited by Martin Piber. Springer, 219-240.
- Latour., B. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. MIT Press.
- Lee, H-K., & Lim, L. 2014. *Cultural Policies in East Asia. Dynamics between the State, Arts and Creative Industries*. Springer Nature Customer Service Center LLC.
- Lepenies, W. 2006. *The seduction of culture in German history*. Princeton University Press.
- Lury, C. 2013. Brand as assemblage: Assembling culture. In *Assembling Culture*, edited by Tony Bennett, Chris Healy. Routledge, 63-78.
- Mbembe, A. 2017. *Critique of black reason*. Duke University Press.
- McGuigan, J. (2004). *Rethinking cultural policy*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Miles, A., & Gibson, L. 2016. Everyday participation and cultural value. *Cultural trends*, 25(3), 151-157.
- Moore, M. H. 1995. *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard University Press.
- Mouffe, C. 2000. *The democratic paradox*. Verso.
- Newsinger, J., & Green, W. 2016. The infrapolitics of cultural value: cultural policy, evaluation and the marginalisation of practitioner perspectives. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 9(4), 382-395.
- O'Brien, D., & Oakley, K. 2015. *Cultural value and inequality: A critical literature review*. AHRC.
- O'Connor, J. (2024). *Culture is not an industry: Reclaiming art and culture for the common good*. Manchester University Press.

Parkinson, J., & Mansbridge, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Deliberative systems: Deliberative democracy at the large scale*. Cambridge University Press.

Phiddian, R., Meyrick, J., Barnett, T., & Maltby, R. 2017a. Counting culture to death: An Australian perspective on culture counts and quality metrics. *Cultural trends*, 26(2), 174-180.

Phiddian, R., Meyrick, J., Barnett, T., & Maltby, R. 2017b. Response: Culture counts: “A step along the way” or a step back?. *Cultural trends*, 26(4), 317-320.

Pyykkönen, M. 2024. Naturalizing culture—time for an ecological understanding of “culture” in international culture and sustainability policies. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 6, 1252771.

Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. 1973. Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), 155–169.

Rush, K. 2020. Value as Fiction: An Anthropological Perspective. In *Managing Culture: Reflecting on Exchange in Global Times*, edited by Victoria Durrer & Raphaela Henze. Routledge, 81-96.

Sagger, H., Philips, J., & Haque, M. (2021). Valuing culture and heritage capital: A framework towards informing decision making. Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport.

Scott, C. A. 2010. Searching for the “public” in Public Value: arts and cultural heritage in Australia. *Cultural trends*, 19(4), 273-289.

Selwood, S. 2002. The politics of data collection: Gathering, analysing and using data about the subsidised cultural sector in England. *Cultural trends*, 12(47), 13-84.

Simon, R., & Aalbers, G. 2020. The capacity to combat corruption (CCC) index. AS/COA, 15.

Svensson, J. 2017. *Die Kunst, Kultur (nicht nur) zu messen. Evaluation im Theater- und Kulturbetrieb*. Lit Verlag.

UNESCO. 2020. *Re|shaping policies for creativity: addressing culture as a global public good*. UNESCO.

<https://www.unesco.org/creativity/sites/default/files/medias/fichiers/2023/01/380474eng.pdf>

[Accessed May 20, 2024]

Van der Velden, M., & Mörtberg, C. 2015. Participatory design and design for values. In *Handbook of Ethics, Values, and Technological Design: Sources, Theory, Values and Application Domains*, edited by Jeroen van den Hoven, Pieter E. Vermaas, Ibo van de Poel. Springer, 41-66.

Venturini, T. (2010). Diving in magma: how to explore controversies with actor-network theory. *Public understanding of science*, 19(3), 258-273.

Walmsley, B. 2022. Evaluating Cultural Value: The Quintessential Wicked Problem. In *The Oxford Handbook of Arts and Cultural Management*, edited by Yuha Jung, Neville Vakharia and Marilena Vecco. Oxford University Press, C39S1–C39N3.

Weckerle, C., Gerig, M., & Söndermann, M. 2008. *Creative industries Switzerland: Facts, models, culture*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Wesner, S. 2010. Cultural fingerprints – the legacy of cultural values in the current cultural policy agenda in Germany, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 16:4, 433-448.

Williams, R. 1983. *Culture and society, 1780-1950*. Columbia University Press.

Young, I. M. 2002. *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford University Press.