

Developing Cultural Development Policy Research Programmes: A Focus on the Material Communities of Cultural Practice.

By Donald Guambe and Arnold Shepperson

Abstract

This article condenses the theoretical discussion carried out by the authors for a framing paper on cultural policy. In it, they begin from the position that most discourse about the term 'culture' makes it difficult to define an exact constituency which, for policy purposes, can propose and benefit from implementation. In the South African context within which they work, they point out that taking into account the dynamics and special needs of transition from apartheid to democracy makes this a doubly taxing problem.

The authors accept that the present circumstances favour a more radical appreciation of the concept of culture and need than enshrined in existing cultural policy, for example, in Australia. Therefore, they draw on the radical post-marxist approach of philosopher Agnes Heller to relocate cultural discourse within the pragmatic category of "raising endowments into talents". On this basis, they proceed to identify, in terms of a politics of equitable

Donald Guambe and Arnold Shepperson are lecturers at the Centre for Cultural and Media Studies, University of Natal.

The authors acknowledge research funding obtained through the Cultural Reconstruction and Development initiative of the Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria, South Africa, October, 1995.

transformation, the constituency most deprived in terms of raising endowments into talents under apartheid. These, the authors argue, are the women in single-parent or all-female households who have accomplished the business of seeing their children into higher education.

As principal actors in the ongoing business of raising endowments into talents, the authors argue, such women constitute the basic constituency in contemporary South Africa towards whom cultural policy research should initially be directed. As cultural actors, they do not as such exist in a vacuum, however. Thus the actual pragmatic relations between this constituency and others involved in cultural practice are what policy implementation should strive to strengthen, empower and protect until generations with other, more elaborated, needs mature.

Réalisation des Programmes de Recherche des Politiques de Développement Culturel: Focalisation Sur des Communautés Ainsi que sur Leur Pratiques Culturelles

Par Donald Guambe et Arnold Shepperson

Résumé:

Cette communication est une condensation des discussions théoriques de ces auteurs, de leurs travaux sur les politiques culturelles. On commence par l'affirmation qu'il est extrêmement difficile de donner une définition précise du terme culture. Or c'est un aspect incontournable du développement. Guambe et Shepperson se situent dans le contexte de leur pays, l'Afrique du Sud. Ces auteurs remarquent qu'il est encore plus difficile de rendre compte de la dynamique culturelle, dans la transition de leur pays, depuis la période de l'apartheid jusqu'à l'établissement d'un Etat démocratique. Guambe et Sheppers reconnaissent qu'il y a des pays, tel l'Australie, qui tiennent compte des aspects culturels dans la formulation des politiques. Cependant leur avis demeure qu'il faudrait adopter une appréciation plus radicale de ceux-ci, dans les circonstances actuelles de l'Afrique du Sud. Ils s'inspirent de l'approche radicale post-marxiste du philosophe Agnes Heller, pour re-situer les discussions culturelles

Donald Guambe et Arnold Shepperson travaillent comme Conférenciers au Centre des Etudes de la Culture et des Médias, Université de Natal.

Ils sont reconnaissants à l'organisation du Développement de la Reconstruction Culturelle, affiliée au Conseil de Recherche des Sciences Humaines, Pretoria, Afrique du Sud, Octobre 1995.

dans la catégorie pragmatique de développement des talents.

Ainsi guambe et Shepperson préconisent une politique de transformation équitable, afin de pallier aux effets de l'apartheid. Ces auteurs soulignent qu'il faudrait faire une attention particulière en ce qui concerne les parents seuls et les femmes seules, qui s'efforcent de soutenir l'éducation de leurs enfants, au niveau de l'éducation supérieure.

On constate qu'il faudrait commencer à ce niveau, dans la promotion du talent, car ces catégories sociales constituent une proportion non négligeable de la population de l'Afrique du Sud. Ces auteurs remarquent que ces acteurs sociaux ne mènent pas leur vie dans le vide. C'est pour cela qu'il faudrait étudier leur cas dans son propre contexte socio-politique.

Introduction

The 1990s marked a dramatic shift in the South African socio-political sphere. The demise of apartheid not only brought fully representative democracy and freedom of expression, but awakened the debate about cultural freedom. Political discourse in South Africa has retained the issue of cultural self-determination of all ethno-cultural groups. This issue arises as part of the inheritance from the use of culture in attaining the ends of apartheid. Indeed, this aspect of later apartheid can be seen as the precedent for the ways in which various groups in South Africa today want their culture constitutionally preserved.

A clear example of this is the bid to accommodate all languages in the broadcasting media in South Africa. Other examples include the arguments surrounding traditional leadership, and calls to legalize if not to professionalize African traditional healers. Another issue of this nature concerns the diverse religious movements seeking space and time on the public broadcasting media and in educational curricula.

Given this trend, the fundamental question which arises is 'what is the definition of culture?' Another question is: how can we consolidate national identity on the one hand and preserve particularist self-determination on the other? It is difficult to categorize what can be drawn from different cultural segments in order to build a national culture. Similarly, one cannot simply declare that one or other specific 'cultural' aspect of South African life should be adopted as a unique index of national culture in isolation from the particularities of all other cultural groupings.

In the light of the above issues, one can justifiably state that the most problematic and puzzling aspect of a subject of this nature is its initial proposition of identifying "cultural needs" without defining that which is "culture" or "cultural". The primary goal of the Human Sciences Research Council's (HSRC)

Cultural Reconstruction will only be able to provide a framework within which cultural needs may be identified as a practical dimension in the wider development discourse. In other words, it provides instruments of analysis which are helpful to demystify many wrangles associated with the notion of and arguments about culture.

Culture: Difficulties with the analytical definition

In any historical context, essential aspects related to culture comprise land ownership, economic empowerment, recreational facilities, educational infrastructure, transmission of traditions, social control, etc. It could be stated flatly that culture is an integrated system of learned behaviour patterns, ideas and products characteristic of a people in their socio-historical and political process (Nida, 1984: 28). But this would be a simplistic way of aggregating cultural characteristics. Sociologists and anthropologists have different ways of defining culture. Hence the definition developed in this study is not exempted from the traditional controversy regarding the definition of culture.

Cultures tend to function and operate according to various local and historically specific assumptions. The total integrated aggregate of these assumptions is called world view or ideology. People perceive reality differently because they make different assumptions about reality. The assumptions are taken for granted, such that they become unexamined and therefore implicit (Ong, 1969). As Hannah Arendt (1958b) points out, it is a specifically modern phenomenon when these assumptions are elevated from factual observations into pure ideas which entail a strict logic. This is the circumstance under which cultural facts become ideology, and therefore our approach in this paper is to maintain an approach in which cultural issues are defined in terms of people's local experience in a general environment of transition into democratic forms of politics and government.

Generally, any given aspect of culture tends to be integrated in every other aspect. For example it can be argued that politics affects religion, or religion affects economics, etc. This is evident in the case of apartheid, a political advocacy, which found its divine sanction within the Dutch Reformed Church. Other world views are shaped by the belief that worshipping gods, or ancestors can bring about political eminence, economic prosperity, and joy.

The generic sense of the issues associated with various contemporary conceptions of culture outlined so far permits us to formulate the following preliminary definition of culture: culture is the whole system of living made up of what society knows and does. In such an approach, it is an essentially complete and detailed plan embracing all aspects or needs of human life. It is a *design for living* which includes items as food-getting, housing, ornamentation, eating habits, mating practices, marriage, family organization, kinship system, status, class, social role, ownership, trade, government, language, art, religion, etc. In summary, such an approach collapses into an anthropological description of some human aggregation's everyday life, and need not take into account the politics of how such an aggregation relates to other similarly describable groups.

Using as broad a definition of culture as that which can be derived from standard sources on the topic, results in what Richard Johnson (1979) described as a "persistent fuzziness" when it comes to dealing with concrete issues. What we therefore propose in this paper is methodological framework with which to develop assessments which will expose the overall socio-economic and political situation in any particular jurisdiction. This model of assessment can be replicated to assess different contexts. At the same time, the need for cultural development cannot be denied simply on the grounds that it is more urgent for the legacy of apartheid to be overcome first.

Making culture work in development and transformation

In reality, the legacy of apartheid has to be seen, along with other factors, as a cultural impoverishment of extraordinary scope and scale. The results of this impoverishment have to be seen against a much wider backdrop than that which is provided by the tendency in terms of which 'culture' is traditionally identified with 'the Arts' or 'Creative Activity'. Basically, we will argue that cultural needs do not necessarily arise from a lack of cultural capacity, but a lack of means by which people can achieve the radical status of being *rich in needs*.

The central clues for composing this backdrop are provided by apartheid's chief architect, H.F. Verwoerd himself. Black people, he declared, should be raised as hewers of wood and drawers of water, and have their cultural, social and political contexts arranged in a way that would prevent them from aspiring to any higher station. While resistance to this arrangement, and to the systems instituted for the entrenchment thereof, was never absent, the true nature of the backdrop lies in the extent to which successive apartheid governments *succeeded in realizing this vision*.

This is not the place for a detailed *historical* elaboration of how apartheid succeeded; what we want to do, however, is enumerate some of the cultural consequences of apartheid which will have to be addressed by the Government of National Unity generally. We will come to the issue of cultural reconstruction and development later. For the moment, therefore, we will clarify some key terms in order more easily to discern this cultural backdrop inherited from apartheid. To do this we will provide simple outlines of the way we will use the terms Culture, Development, Need and Value, and avoid long theoretical disquisitions. We will provide references to core theorists, and those who find our approach interesting for its theory can consult these at leisure.

Our approach does not begin from any identification of

culture with the arts or even creative expression. Our focus is instead on culture as the active environment within which particular human contexts condition the possibilities under which art and other creative expression become valid options for people *alongside all other possibilities*. This approach permits cultural experience (Shepperson 1995) to be distinguished from other areas of experience, and in distinguishing it thus, to reveal the common and personal values realised in people becoming active in the world.

Culture: Raymond Williams (1978) classified 'culture' as one of the two or three most difficult words in the English language. However, in this paper we will tend to consider the word in the phenomenological senses possible from the root meanings of the word in Latin *colo*, *colere*: to tend, till, nurture on the one hand, and to inhabit, worship, pay respect to, on the other (see Shepperson 1995 chap. 3). In line with our approach to community, therefore, people's culture(s) refer(s) to those linguistic, behavioural and customary practices absorbed, imposed, and even chosen by persons as members of cultural communities. In terms of radical philosophy, then, culture is primarily associated 'with the activity of *raising human endowments into talents* (Heller 1987).

To the extent that people's cultural experience incorporates values, therefore, we recognise that the evaluation of people's culture begins with evaluations of the pragmatic activity of nurture and of the environment inhabited by the community of nurture (i.e. cultural community) within which the business of raising endowments into talents begins. The core methodological issues, given our choice of a radical approach, consequently have to be sought in the relations of cultural practice; we therefore accept that the condition of those women who are agents of cultural experience in the inhabited realms of cultural activity, is the core topic to be addressed in any cultural reconstruction and development activity.

Development: Generally, this word has applied to strategies designed to transform whole societies (as national populations) from one historical and cultural condition to a supposedly higher condition. The critique of this approach in dependency theory has demonstrated its general poverty. We therefore shift the focus of development from the context of national populations to the plurality of relations represented by cultural, pragmatic and discursive communities. In this environment, development takes on a many-sidedness which addresses the plurality of the human condition (Heller 1985). In general, then, development refers to those strategies adopted at local, regional and (trans)national levels, intended to advance individual and community conditions in ways which take care of the necessity for people to grow, live, grow old, and die with dignity and integrity, while freeing their activities to develop their needs (see below).

Cultural development gets its focus from the discussions of culture and community above. It is considerably easier to frame development policies when one has a definable constituency with which to negotiate, and identifiable relations between this constituency and others, present in the development environment. The overall cultural development constituency upon which a radical development policy intervention can be based is therefore the community of women who are involved with the business of nurturing (tending, taking care of) those whose endowments are being raised into talents. The actual condition of these women is pluralistic. They inhabit (in a cultural sense) a wide range of environments, and at the same time also maintain a wide range of relationships within their particular contexts and with other cultural, pragmatic and discursive communities (see for example Moller 1995; Shepperson 1995).

Need(s): Concretely, needs are human endowments raised into talents, while in the abstract *Need* is that potential or possibility in the light of which human existence is separated from

necessity. By the latter we mean that under conditions of dire necessity (conditions of which under apartheid there was no shortage) the options open for the people's endowments were likely (not *necessarily*, in the sense of logical deduction or material determination) to be limited to those needed for the daily overcoming of necessity. Needs are indefinitely pluralistic, since they are proper to pragmatic and discursive communities. In the context of cultural community, radical democracy expects that conditions be of a nature which permits the widest possible range of options for individuals to be nurtured in the raising of their endowments into talents.

A few words need to be added here about endowments and talents. We start with Agnes Heller's (1985; 1987) philosophical anthropology which begins with the belief that humans are born free and endowed with reason. As an endowment, however, reason does not exist in full flower in the human person at birth: it is like all other endowments a *potentiality* circumscribed by our other genetic endowments. Reason *becomes* in the sense that the individual grows into a community in which reasons are sought and given for questions which might be asked by the growing person of those around her or him (Shepperson 1995).

Talents, on the other hand, are those practical and pragmatic active social contexts of action into which people are encouraged to develop their endowments. In the present global social environment, Heller (1987) identifies two core talents which are approved by industrial society: the making of money, and manoeuvring between institutions.

However, while these might be *hegemonically approved* talents, there are also those other classes of talents which willy-nilly emerge to fill up the cracks, so to speak, between what is approved and what is possible. Thus we can expect to find a lot of activities into which people become habituated keeping in mind the etymological connection between *culture* such that they are better able as individuals and communities to overcome

necessity. Talents therefore relate to need(s) as follows: people exhibit a need as a claim, in which they justify on the grounds of right their satisfaction in the form of realizing specific talents in action.

For there to be any kind of *cultural* reconstruction, then, a radical approach to culture has to acknowledge that apartheid opened spaces within which many different kinds of activities were elaborated so that money could be made and/or advantage could be gained through manoeuvring between institutions. The objective is neither to approve nor excoriate these activities (the law deals with this, and is itself subject to continuous development). Cultural development therefore first examines how these conditions were possible, and then elaborates ways and means whereby conditions can be changed such that

i) valued talents might be developed for recognition by the wider community, and

ii) talents of little value to the wider community, in terms of people's carrying-on in a democratic environment, become marginalized as options.

Value: Values are central to culture. People's endowments are raised into talents which are *valued* for the extent to which those who practice them gain recognition by their peers. The consequences of the exercise of talents are *judged* in all manner of contexts, ranging from courts of law to the conclusions of history (historiography). In traditional societies, values are fixed in the form of imperatives, taboos, codes of conduct, and so on, which are transmitted as lists from one generation to the next. As Heller (1987) points out, however, the inheritance of the modern age is the dissensus between generations manifest in the *dissatisfaction* which it has become possible for the younger to display toward the older.

In general, therefore, cultural reconstruction and development has to begin from an acceptance that future generations will question the values entrenched as a result of its programmes.

Yet the possibility of value dissatisfaction also entails the continuous negotiation of value, precisely because new generations are being raised into the world all the time (Arendt 1958; Shepperson 1995). What cultural policy research therefore has to recognize is that policy cannot legislate satisfaction, and that as a result it cannot recommend the legislation of lists of values.

In the context of radical democracy, then, the permanent possibility of dissatisfaction is confronted by approaching value-related discussion from two points:

i) long lists of values are eschewed in favour of concise value ideas which are relevant to the concept of radical democracy. These value ideas are freedom (humans are born free), and life (the quality of which is dependent on the potential for endowments to be raised into talents);

ii) situational evaluation proper involves the interpretation of events, structures, processes, legislation and so on, in relation to the interpretation of the value ideas of life and freedom. Value thus has to relate to both politics (freedom) and social issues (life chances).

As far as these considerations apply to cultural reconstruction and development, the actual realization of value cannot be the objective of policy research. Instead, such research has to concentrate on recommending the institutionalization of conditions under which endowments can be raised into talents such that people's freedom is not compromised in the process.

The political value of freedom concerns the evaluation of relations as far as they place one or more participants in conditions of tutelage. Heller (1985; 1987; 1991) consistently develops this theme in terms of Kant's practical imperative. We see no reason to reject her interpretation of the idea, because the means- end relationship between people remains a valid area of concern today. The point is that cultural policy has to proceed

not only from the evaluation of the raising of endowments into talents, but also from the point of view of the extent to which talents require people to be treated as mere means and not as ends in themselves.

Policy research in the present South African cultural environment, if radical principles are to be employed as a basis for policy, has to proceed from the position that many cultural practices are evaluated within the means-end relationship. In essence, cultural activity has to be redefined from a functional (means) context of evaluation, to one in which it is evaluated teleologically, that is in terms of *people as ends in themselves*. Because achievement of these ends is continuously deferred into the next generation, any kind of policy intervention in this realm must therefore focus not on the activity itself, but on the interpretation of the present and potential life and freedom effects of this activity.

Present effects concern the ways in which those who are involved with cultural practice are treated as mere means, while potential effect concerns the extent to which those subject to cultural activity are limited in their potential to express themselves as ends.

Epistemological relations of power in cultural policy research

In the experiences gained from Australian cultural policy studies and cultural policy research, a tradition has evolved in which cultural studies occupies a Hegelian 'critical' position somehow at odds with the bureaucratic Weberian 'instrumentalist' position (Hunter 1993/4). At the same time, methodological dilemmas emerge from this, because of the different requirements involved with research of culture (critical), and research for cultural policy which is supposedly instrumental (Hawkins 1994). As Ian Hunter points out, this but replicates a tradition which arose

from post-Kantian thought, in which some kind of "transcendental subject" exists in whom critical and instrumental reason are somehow unified in terms of the Moral Law.

In our particular case, however, it is still too early to assume the existence of some recognizably Weberian state which embodies the post-Hobbesian peacekeeping functions of the modern polity (Hunter 1993/4). In general, Hunter is correct in assessing critical debate in Australia as stemming from an assured ethical position of critical practice, enshrined in the university, and completing a socio-political triad of citizen, critic and bureaucrat. One can accept that the Australian political climate (at least for some time) has not been such that critical practice in the Kantian sense could lead to the state-sanctioned murder of critical practitioners. Conditions there have not been the equivalent of those under which intellectuals like Steve Biko, Richard Turner, David Webster, Victoria and Griffiths Mxenge, or Neil Aggett lost their lives.

In short, although the Australian experience has been instructive in many areas, particularly with regard to analysis of the abstract relation between human sciences practitioners and bureaucrats, there are significant differences between there and South Africa. These, we suggest, are of a nature which render the relationship between cultural policy research and the state somewhat more problematic, in one sense, and yet very much more straightforward in another.

On the one hand, there is reason to view the Australian state's ethical position as relatively *adiaphoric*; in relation to Australian civil society, that is to say, interaction with the state does not result in an inevitable moral conflict for the individuals involved. The state can thus be seen to be, if not benign, at least morally and ethically neutral. Humanist intellectual criticism can be carried out from within the environs of an ethically secure academic tradition in which such critical analysis can be carried out as a professional procedure irrespective of the moral feelings

of the practitioner.

In South Africa, however, the situation of the state has given rise to a different kind of tradition: until recently, criticism of the state from any quarter was discouraged quite violently. Later 'total onslaught' paradigms actually set up a whole bureaucratic process for approving the 'tactical removal from society' of those who, like Webster and the Mnxeenges, chose to exercise their professional *and personal* options to criticize the state. While the actual organs of state have been changing since the 1994 elections, what still has to change significantly is the culture of distrust against the state on the part of civil society, on the one side, and residual traditions of procedural conduct on the bureaucratic side in terms of which the *raison d'état* for constitutional unilateralism was sufficient reason for any action whatever.

On the other hand, the situation in South Africa is also considerably more straightforward. In the realm of cultural policy, at the level of the national state, at least, there is a commitment to recognize the plurality of cultural options which exist at the level of certain kinds of civil conduct. The constitutional entrenchment of women's rights, and protection of people's choices of sexual orientation, for example, have opened up areas of potential intellectual activity in which the exploration of policy options can be undertaken in adventurous ways. In other words, while it is not exactly the case that anything goes, there are areas which are relatively new on the South African scene and which, precisely because of recent history, permit people to test options not tried elsewhere.

In the case of cultural policy, historical emphases on a legislated division between 'high' 'culture for white people, on one side, and 'traditional ethnographic cultures' (*volkekunde*) for blacks on other side, provide a clear non-option for cultural policy research. While there may be some, or even many, cultural bureaucrats still in harness from the old dispensation, we can and ought to expect that as *professionals* in the Weberian

sense, as pointed out by Hunter, this cadre of functionaries will implement whatever policies emerge from within the consultative processes which have been entrenched between civil, intellectual and political society.

In conclusion, it is possible to use this window of opportunity to approach cultural policy study from a position based on the radical interpretation of the whole concept of culture. Instead of Hunter's Weberian view of mature and essentially west European society, and seemingly assumed by most policy study practitioners in Australia, our paper starts from a post-Weberian radical interpretation of the relations between the realms of society. We draw on the work of Agnes Heller for her examination of the conditions under which it is possible for certain ethical issues of thought and conduct to exist. In another vein, we draw on Hannah Arendt's (1958) critical interpretation of the concept of society in order to establish the sphere of radical cultural analysis within the private (Arendt's *intimate*) de facto agents of cultural action are women - *with or without men*

Methodological problems in cultural policy research

Cultural activity begins from the position that people have endowments which can be raised to talents in greater or lesser measure depending on their genetic inheritance. Under apartheid, these inheritances were crudely judged by people's skin colour at birth (or, going from the sublime to the ridiculous, by means of various 'racial character tests'). On the basis of such classification, therefore, whole social clusters were defined as much as they were permitted both freedom (as ends in themselves) and life chances (in so far as people's endowments could be raised into talents).

These contextual remarks can be interpreted as fixing cultural policy research methodology firmly in the qualitative camp. However, it would be quite misleading to leave the issue there.

Essentially, the kind of judgement implicit in interpreting the inheritance of apartheid in this way is in reality only the result of a *preliminary research assessment*. In its own locally specific way, this interpretation arises not only from targeted human and social sciences research, but also from within what people on the ground have learned from their own experience. Consequently, the first task of cultural policy research, in the radical paradigm anyway, is to quantify the scale of the actual reconstruction needed. However, this remains in itself preliminary to *policy* research, given that the interpretation upon which the very need for cultural reconstruction and development arose from a paradigm of *radical resistance*. Policy research is by definition directed toward that which is not-resistance, and that which in our context is *post-resistance*. Therefore the quantitative preliminaries of cultural policy research serve solely to establish

- i) how many people and communities are to be addressed, and
- (ii) the distribution of these people and communities among other people and communities in the wider context of reconstruction and development.

What we envisage in the area of cultural policy research methodology is a kind of dialogue between the results of both qualitative and quantitative sub-programmes. Each can be seen to develop from the other until such time as workable and effective policies have been proved in their implementation. In this kind of operational environment, then, 'the qualitative component of the 'conversation' begins *qua* cultural policy research by interpreting the relations between target people and communities and their immediate socio-political surroundings. Here a special caution is necessary: relations cannot be isolated and studied as objects. As *relations*, researchers have to ac-

knowledge that the object of study is what one person or cluster of people *relates in the form of a history, story, explanation, elucidation, and so on* about some human aggregation which is not that person or community (see Shepperson 1994).

What this means, therefore, is that in the very process of researching (a) relation(s), the institution carrying on the research is developing a relation in the form of potential histories, stories etc. associated with the activity of study. In one sense, therefore, it becomes necessary to disengage from qualitative engagement and shift to qualitative study in order

(i) to limit the human dimension of the study engagement's potential for evolving itself into a pragmatic and discursive community, and

(ii) to permit quantitative assessment of the effectiveness of the implementation of policies arising from the study.

What this suggests is that simply to begin to engage in cultural policy. In other words, just to begin developing cultural reconstruction and development policy. The implications of this terms of actual research include several potential benefits and pitfalls.

(a) Benefits would take the form of

(i) an awareness among targeted persons and communities that certain fundamental areas of experience are indeed being addressed;

(ii) that in their being targeted, these people and communities are being taken seriously from the point of view of their influence on the condition of future generations; and

(iii) the evolution of a new and hopefully non-paternalistic relationship between intellectual strata, implementation agencies, and targeted communities and persons.

(b) Potential pitfalls, which can by definition not be defined with any exactness, include

(i) the engendering of resentment on the part of non-targeted persons and communities on account of their not being considered for immediate policy attention;

(ii) the evolution of a kind of culture of dependence on becoming the targets of research.

This phenomenon has been observed after several generations of anthropological research in a number of localities (Tomaselli and Shepperson, forthcoming);

(iii) the emergence of a cultural economy of research, a whole system of practices in terms of which persons and/or communities come to define themselves on the basis of their 'saleability' as researchable 'commodities'. This has some relation to b.(ii) above, but has wider implications in that these particular persons/communities actually set themselves in relations to each other defined on some kind of semi-formal policy of exploiting the research relationship to their own ends ;

iv) the evolution of the cultural policy research establishment into a discursive community based on the transformation of cultural policy research from a definite socio-political need into an *interest* based on the making of money and defended by manoeuvring between institutions.

Policy Research Programme Outline

In the foregoing discussion, our paper outlined a theoretical revision of the discourse of cultural policy research. In practice,

however, such research still has to recognize the mundane but thorny issues of economics, fiscal limits, and the management and organization of policy implementation (Mercer 1994; Santamaria 1994; Molloy 1994). This simply means that we still have to demonstrate how our paper's discussion might translate into concrete research projects. In this final section, therefore, we will describe a provisional outline of how our way of interpreting cultural discourse can be developed concretely into a dialogue between quantitative and qualitative methods.

A: Initial qualitative assessment.

We take this to be basically given in the existing research literature on the social conditions resulting from apartheid. In general, we accept that the most consistently deprived group in terms of cultural activity has been black women who have been de facto responsible for the raising of their children's endowments into talents. While other groups have been equally or more deprived in material terms than these women, in cultural terms following our interpretation of the concept offered earlier, the latter form a significant constituency for policies based on the political principle of equity. However, this does not preclude studies of, for example, youth cultural groups (e.g. Sondlo 1991) from serving as a starting point.

The initial qualitative issue in this project, then, involves a review of the literature. If this is assessed as not providing sufficient data for action, then it will be necessary to carry out some form of targeted assessment of one or more study community(ies). Selection of the best research instruments for this can begin on the basis of what already exists in the literature. In general, this phase will serve to identify in conjunction with the study community those groups of women who are least well-off in terms of their material resources for keeping a family, but who nevertheless are accomplishing at least the basics and

also getting their children to attend school (Shepperson 1995; Moller 1995)

B: Initial quantitative assessment

This will involve two stages.

(i) Establishing the ratio of the number of households headed by women in the target area, to the total number of households _ formal and informal.

(ii) Establishing the ratio of the number of children - school-going and preschool _ from households headed by women, to the total number of school-going and preschool children in the target area in the same age groups.

These figures will serve to assess the economic scale of at least those basic provisions which will eventually be decided upon. At this stage, there is however no fixed conception as to what this provision will entail; this issue will emerge from the next qualitative step of the project.

C: Qualitative assessment of cultural (raising endowments to talents) needs

To be carried out by means of a questionnaire distributed among a sample of female-headed households, or of focus groups convened from among them, with a control group drawn from among more 'conventional' nuclear family units. The latter does not imply a judgement of the target group's style of home life; it is done on the understanding that the latter kind of household is likely to enjoy a higher total income. We assume for the present that such family units can provide greater material resources for the raising of endowments into talents.

The questionnaire or focus topics will probe attitudes toward

education, received ideas of culture generally, preferred forms of employment (as elicited from both parents and children), and general expectations about what improvements are considered necessary in order to improve the chances of achieving the levels of education required for the kinds of careers respondents expect themselves/their children to achieve.

These data will serve to indicate the expectations entertained by members of the target cultural community, and whether or not these are higher, lower, or the same as those encountered in more 'conventional' home environments. It is anticipated that women who head households will take a strongly positive stance toward improved material conditions of education (see Moller 1995), while the men who head more conventional households will more or less follow the lead given by their wives/partners. Also, the data will provide a basis upon which to compile a provisional inventory of services and facilities which will form the basis of the following survey.

D: Qualitative assessment of material provision perceived as necessary for the meeting of cultural needs.

This specific sub-project will focus on the actual distribution of responses favouring the provision of educational, health-care and other similar kinds of infrastructure as a necessity for meeting cultural needs, in comparison with those who favour more conventionally 'cultural' provision. The former kind of provision will focus on the building of schools, libraries, utilities which improve the potential for study (electricity, for example, so that scholars can work in greater comfort until later at night), and improved transport so that school attendance is ensured. The latter kind of provision will focus on provision of facilities for and the improved supply of traditionally understood cultural activities such as theatre, dance, music and so on.

It is anticipated that the former kind of provision will be favoured by households headed by women, particularly those

who themselves are less well educated than their children are, or who anticipate that their children will achieve a higher standard of education than they themselves enjoy. By the same token, it is anticipated that the other kind of provision will be favoured by men who head 'conventional' households, and by *a significant proportion of women who have achieved a high standard of education* .

However, the data obtained from this phase of research will help to determine the overall level of material provision necessary to achieve a basically equitable distribution of those cultural goods which are considered necessary by the women who, in our paradigm, constitute a significant constituency of cultural practitioners. In combination with the data C above, the final quantitative assessment can proceed, based on how the cost of each kind of provision can be shared in ways which limit the exposure of the fiscus while simultaneously expediting provision at the lowest service charge to the community.

E: Final quantitative assessment

This will take the form of integrating the expectations ascertained through C and D above with the distribution of different kinds of household taken over the whole of the target township, and considering which form(s) of service/facility will best be provided as social services and which as commercial services. We take this step precisely to make allowance for the fact that most conventionally 'cultural' activities are most effectively provided by the entertainment and leisure industries, and that many people see these as the most practical and satisfying source of such activities. On the other hand, we expect that there will be a considerable constituency - even if not a majority - for whom provision of facilities which meet their conception of cultural

needs will in any event be covered by the budgets allocated to other forms of provision like education.

Cultural policy recommendations possible under this approach

The questions to be asked at this point are 'what exactly does this kind of research yield in terms of results which can be incorporated in cultural policy recommendations? Indeed, just what does this yield as cultural policy?' The actual answers are largely dependent on the kinds of community in which the projects are to be carried out. Our point in structuring this project as we have is that this is purely a pilot project designed to test the actual extent to which cultural needs are separate from other social needs which will in any event be provided either from the budgets of other ministries, or by commercial providers.

As far as cultural policy itself is concerned, the object of this kind of needs assessment helps to locate cultural policy practice in the realm of local government. While the actual research practitioners can come from both universities and state or parastatal bodies, the point is that the plurality of need(s) demands that cultural rather than pragmatic or discursive communities are where policy research has to be focused. While apartheid has left a divided society in terms of both political and traditional organization, the material condition is less confused: in general, it can be anticipated that Historically Disadvantaged Regions will exhibit broadly similar material necessities. At the same time, previous migrant labour and homeland citizenship policies will have ensured that in many or even most areas the kinds of family arrangements assumed in this paper will occur in roughly the same distribution.

In terms of how this helps to constitute a cultural policy strategy, we anticipate that the thrust of policy research should

focus on advising local authorities on such issues as the zoning of commercial leisure and entertainment premises, and the provision of subsidized public transport for schoolchildren. Policy can also focus on contributing to the formulation of zoning procedures for schools and other educational facilities like libraries and resource centres, and monitoring the ways in which facilities are used.

At national and provincial levels, cultural policy research has little to contribute outside those areas which have exercised existing approaches. Thus regional and national policy research can concentrate on issues similar to those addressed by Australian practitioners: museum policy, film making and distribution policies, broadcast regulation, and so on. A lot of this kind of work is already in hand elsewhere in the form of the Independent Broadcasting Authority, the Arts and Culture Action Group, and so on. We feel that the present outline leaves such groups to get on with issues which essentially are the outcome of people's claims to needs. To assume these issues once again under the rubric of cultural needs is to set up duplications of research and administration which are an expensive luxury.

References

- Arendt, Hannah (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Heller, Agnes (1976). *The Theory of Need in Marx*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- ____ (1985). *A Radical Philosophy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- ____ (1987). *Beyond Justice*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hunter, Ian (1993/4). "Bureaucrat, Critic, Citizen: On Some Styles of Ethical Life". *Arena Journal*. 2-1993/4: pp.77- 102.

- Mercer, Colin (1994). "Cultural Policy: Research & the Governmental Imperative". *Media Information Australia*. 73: August: pp. 16-22.
- Molloy, Simon (1994). "Arguing with Economists: Winning Cultural Industry Debate". in *Media Information Australia* : pp. 26- 28.
- Nida, Eugene (1984), *Customs and Cultures*, Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, p.28.
- Nida, Eugene and William D. Reymann (1981), *Meaning Across Cultures*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, p.45.
- Ong, Walter (1969), "World as View and World as Event". *American Anthropologist* , 71:634-47.
- Santamaria, Cathy (1994). "Contract Research: The Bureaucracy-Researcher Relationship". In *Media Information Australia* : pp. 8-10.
- Shepperson, Arnold (1994). "On Pessimism in the Human Sciences: Towards a Method of Generality". HSRC Methodology in the Human Sciences Project.
- ____ (1995). "On the Social Interpretation of Cultural Experience: Reflections on Raymond Williams's Early Cultural Writings 1958-61". Durban: MA Dissertation, University of Natal.
- Sondlo, Zola (1991). "South African Urban Youth Cultures as a Form of Political Resistance: LAUCA 1986-1990". Honours Dissertation, Durban: University of Natal.