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KEY POINTS

> Approaches that national governments and other stakeholders take to addressing key public policy challenges—such as managing water, food, infrastructure, health, education, social welfare, economic development, the environment, international relations, security, and governance systems—can vary markedly between countries and regions too.

> Cultural factors influence economic behaviour, political participation, social solidarity and value formation and evolution, which are closely linked to how and why public policies are developed in different ways in different countries.

> There are increasing numbers of publications in the literature that seek to use culture-based theory and ‘national culture’ analytics to understand aspects of public policy.

> Considering the competing hypotheses that ‘National culture has [or does not have] a significant influence on public policy’, the weight of evidence from the literature, clearly supports the hypothesis that national culture has a significant influence on public policy. This underscores the utility of the concept of ‘national culture’ in relation to shaping public policy.

> This review highlights the use of example analytics for understanding the shaping of public policy processes through two case studies on: the use of national culture orientations for understanding public participation differences in public policy and the potential for procedural transfer between countries (including water policy); and using cultural theory for comparative analysis of policy narratives and problem structuring for different issues (including waste management).

> From this literature review, it is considered that there is much potential for developing a more in-depth understanding of national cultures and the impacts that cultural orientations or biases have on the development of public policy within countries and policy transfer between countries (e.g. looking at required adaptations to suit the receiving culture).

> There are also some important areas of public policy that could likely benefit from a more in-depth consideration of national cultures and their underlying combinations of societal cultural orientations and biases. These areas have been identified through an apparent lack of discussion in the literature:
  
  * Hypothesis testing of the impacts of cultural variables on public policy success/failure
  * Investigation of national culture impacts on the development and use of different policy-making ideologies/methodologies
  * The relationship between national cultures and preferences for different types of multi-level governance systems
  * The role of individuals and groups in developing public policy that appears counter to dominant national culture characterisations but is still widely perceived as successful
  * Methods for understanding and supporting multi-cultural policy dialogue and development
  * The role of public policy in developing and particularly shifting national cultures.

> More generally, there is a need for a ‘cultural turn’ in public policy to lead to the development of more culturally-aware public policy both in Australia and internationally.
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BACKGROUND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The HC Coombs Policy Forum is the Australian Government – Australian National University joint think tank that undertakes a range of public policy and research nexus activities under partnership arrangements to enhance Australia’s public policy. The 2013 HC Coombs Policy Forum Strategic Plan places a new emphasis on the development of international partnership arrangements and policy research projects. It has the aim of learning from other jurisdictions, enhancing its capacity to enhance Australian public policy and working cooperatively on public policy and research challenges of mutual national importance. As the HC Coombs Policy Forum develops these activities with partners in a range of countries, including the UK, USA, India and Japan, questions of comparability of policy systems, governance arrangements and public values are being increasingly encountered. It is in this context that a multi-disciplinary review of the literature on the role of national culture in shaping public policy was proposed. It aims to examine the similarities and differences of the cultures and public policy approaches that are shaped by them in different countries, with the eventual objective of determining how maximum benefit may be gained for Australia’s public policy from the Forum’s growing number of international partnership projects.

This review presents preliminary findings from a literature search across a range of disciplines, including political science, organisational management, geography, economics, anthropology and sociology. It is not intended to be a definitive view of this extensive area of study but is instead designed to encourage further discussion and development of more culturally aware international engagement, policy research programs and public policy learning. Anyone with comments on this paper is invited to contact the author.

1 INTRODUCTION

Governments across the world are dealing with a common range of challenges that include how to manage water, food, infrastructure, health, education, social welfare, economic development, the environment, international relations, security, and governance systems. Yet, approaches that national governments and other stakeholders take to addressing these key public policy challenges can vary markedly between countries and regions. It is widely understood that social and cultural factors shape human behaviour, and that the purpose of public policy is also to shape behaviour, or as Coyle and Ellis (1994) put it: ‘culture affects policy, and policy affects culture’. It therefore stands to reason that having a solid understanding of culture, on top of the socio-economic drivers of human behaviour which are commonly used in policy modelling and analysis, could help policy makers to shape public policies that might be more generally acceptable to the public and produce culturally desirable outcomes.

Policy ideas developed and implemented in one jurisdiction are often transferred to or transformed to meet the needs and objectives of other jurisdictions (McCann and Ward, 2012). However, such transfers are by no means always desired or implementable, due to a range of socio-political, economic, geographical and cultural differences that exist between jurisdictions. A better understanding of national culture and differences between national cultures could thus inform international policy transfer practices and joint policy learning exercises (e.g. looking at required adaptations to suit the receiving culture).

---

1 The Australian National Institute for Public Policy (ANIPP) and the HC Coombs Policy Forum received Australian Government funding under the Enhancing Public Policy Initiative. Since the initial drafting of this paper, the funding for the HC Coombs Policy Forum has ceased and its future activities are uncertain.
This paper seeks to investigate the question of what role national culture plays in shaping public policy. It will provide an introduction to some of the key literature across a range of disciplines that can help in defining this role, including from: public administration and management science; political science; economics; engineering; anthropology, cultural studies and geography; psychology; sociology; and international relations. It in no way intends to be exhaustive, but rather presents a diversity of perspectives relevant to the question and illuminates some perspectives for future investigations and international public policy learning discussions.

The paper will start by investigating the concept of ‘national culture’, provide a framing review of what is meant by ‘public policy’, and then outline how analytical frameworks of national culture might be used to understand and shape public policy. It will then outline what this understanding means for international cooperation and policy transfer or translation in different policy areas or phases (such as water and waste policy or problem structuring/public participation) and how a better understanding of national cultures and their role in shaping public policy might allow us to improve future joint working relationships and policy learning between countries.

2 CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF NATIONAL CULTURE

2.1 What is Culture?

Culture can be defined in a variety of ways. In 1952, Kroeber and Kluckhohn had already identified over 150 formal definitions of culture. Based on this analysis, they suggested that culture consists of behavioural patterns embodied in artifacts and traits that are fully acquired, such as knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, law, customs, capabilities and habits, and that the essential core of culture is made up of ideas and their attached values that have been historically derived and selected (Kluckhohn and Kroeber, 1963). Since that time, further definitions have proliferated; some that echo the essence of this definition and others that are based on alternative premises. Rao and Walton in their edited volume on ‘Culture and Public Action’ contend that:

> ‘culture is about relationality — the relationships among individuals within groups, among groups, and between ideas and perspectives. Culture is concerned with identity, aspiration, symbolic exchange, coordination, and structures and practices that serve relational ends, such as ethnicity, ritual, heritage, norms, meanings and beliefs’ (Rao and Walton, 2002: 4).

Of specific importance in their argument is that culture and this associated ‘relationality’ cannot be considered as something static and embedded in specific groups or individuals. It is instead dynamic and made up of sets of contested attributes that shape and can be shaped by human interaction (Rao and Walton, 2002). Other authors note the distinctions between different conceptualisations of culture that are more or less static, such as Keesing (1974) who identifies that culture can be considered as:

1) An ideational system of perceptions, beliefs and norms that is relatively stable, having stemmed from socialisation early in life as a child, including through the schooling system; and
2) An integrated and adaptive socio-cultural system that refers to characteristics of social groups that result from dynamic interactions between the group’s members (Enserink et al., 2007).

Another well know anthropologist, Geertz (1973), following Max Weber, understands culture as being the webs of significance in which people are suspended and which they themselves have spun (Geertz, 1973). Other context-based conceptualisations include Rayner’s (1991: 84) view that ‘Culture consists of the framework that we use to impose some sort of order and coherence on the stream of events’ and Latour and Woolgar (1979: 55) who ‘use culture to refer to the set of...
arguments and beliefs to which there is a constant appeal in daily life and which is the object of all passions, fears, and respect’.

Regardless of the differences in these conceptualisations of culture, it is widely (although not entirely) agreed that culture is a collective phenomenon and a result of learning linked to the construction of meaning in a shared social environment (physical, virtual, religious, etc.). Considering the important role that situated learning in a social environment plays in the development and manifestation of culture, Hofstede (1991) considers culture as ‘the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one category of people from others’, which is made up of core values and practices that are linked to rituals, heroes and symbols: the so-called ‘Onion model’ of culture where change in the programming typically takes longer the deeper the layer. As Hofstede notes in one of his recent books (Hofstede et al., 2010), this idea of culture as the ‘collective programming of the mind’ is similar to Bourdieu’s notion of ‘habitus’ which can be thought of as a set of durable and transferable principles that provide individuals with a sense of group identity and belonging, such as shared beliefs, representations, rules, taboos, symbols, rituals and practices (Bourdieu, 1980). This ‘habitus’ has the power to shape individual action and constrain preferences and aspirations based on an individual’s perceptions of his or her own chance or failure in taking a particular course of action (Swartz, 2000).

Bourdieu also considers culture as a form of capital that can be used by individuals or groups to modify their position or the position of others in the social order. Cultural capital can occur in embodied, objectified or institutionalised states: embodied cultural capital refers to schemes of understanding and appreciation which have been internalised by individuals via socialisation processes; objectified cultural capital refers to artifacts, such as music, books, art, information technology and scientific instruments (which themselves require cultural capital in order to be used and appreciated); and institutionalised cultural capital includes that which is maintained through systems of credentialing, such as those found in administrations or educational and religious establishments (Bourdieu, 1990; Swartz, 2000). Other authors such as Putnam (1993, 1995) also take a ‘capital’ approach to understanding certain cultural factors, such as levels of trust in society, although there are clear differences between Putnam’s and Bourdieu’s use and meanings of the concept (see, for example, Siisiäinen, 2000).

Understanding culture through these various lenses enables us to see how with the creation and destruction of different forms of cultural capital—and the mental models of group members this affects—can undergo change at different speeds, and in turn even effect how the human brain has evolved (see Ostrom, 2005; Boyd and Richerson, 1985; Richerson et al., 2010).

For the subsequent purposes of this paper, an intentionally broad view of culture is taken, drawing on the understanding that culture has some relatively stable and some more dynamic components and can be examined and shaped over time through a range of relationships between people and groups, objects and artefacts and organising systems such as administrations. Differences between cultures can also be examined by investigation of relationships between these aspects.

2.2 Does national culture exist?

The existence of the concept of ‘national culture’ has been widely debated and theorised in the literature (as indeed has ‘culture’ – see for example Mitchell (1995)). It rests on the premise that within countries individuals identify with others as members of the same nation or state, and that there are some shared aspects of context, including feelings of identity, underlying values and institutions, as well as history, through which a ‘national culture’ can develop. A number of authors dismiss the idea of national cultures or consider that many analyses of national cultures and their
impacts on human behaviour are based on poor assumptions and research methodologies (e.g. Maurice et al., 1982; Alexander and Seidman, 1990; Wallerstein, 1990; Anderson, 1991; McSweeney, 2002). For example, they consider that societies can have a common culture but not nations, which are a purely administrative construct, particularly in areas such as Africa where national borders are linked to arbitrary decisions of colonisation (Hofstede et al., 2010). Other authors are more positive about the usefulness of the concept and the feasibility of developing understanding and determining models or dimensions of national cultures for a variety of purposes (e.g. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Newman et al., 1977; Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Hofstede, 1980; Bottger et al., 1985; Ronan and Shenkar, 1985; d’Iribarne, 1991; Farmer and Matthews, 1991; Boyacigiller and Adler, 1991; Lewis, 1992; Lessem and Neubauer, 1994; Schwartz, 1994, 1999; Triandis, 1995; Fukuyama, 1995; House et al., 2004; Inglehart and Welzel, 2005; Minkov, 2007; Hofstede et al., 2010).

Critiques of national culture typically point to the heterogeneous nature of many countries in terms of language, ethnicity, religion, geography, socio-economic make-up, or legal systems (for example in the case of federations), a point that is increasingly accepted and studied by those who are more positive towards the concept (Singh and Parashar, 2005; Minkov and Hofstede 2011). Findings show that the orientation of different ‘cultural values’ (see Section 2.3 below) are better correlated across regions and ethnic groups of some countries than between countries but less so in other cases, such as in the case of New Zealand where a large homogeneous cluster of values across regions was not identified (Minkov and Hofstede 2011).

Box 1: The Australian ‘National Culture’

In the Australian political context, it can be seen that the Australian Government considers that a national culture exists and is constantly being co-created, as is described at the beginning of its ‘National Culture Policy: Creative Australia’:

‘Culture is created by us and defines us. It is the embodiment of the distinctive values, traditions and beliefs that make being Australian in the 21st century unique—democratic, diverse, adaptive and grounded in one of the world’s oldest living civilisations.

Australian culture has a firm base in heritage and tradition. It is also dynamic, evolving in response to a changing world and the increasing diversity, in all forms, of those who call this country home.

Culture is expressed in many ways—through the way we live, speak, conduct public life, relate to others, celebrate, remember the past, entertain ourselves and imagine the future. In sum, this captures the Australian spirit—a distinctive way of being that others recognise. Australian identity has a common core, but is not singular. Rather, it is like a constellation, greater than the sum of its parts.’ (Australian Government, 2013, p.27)

The Australian national culture described here, although developed in the frame of an ‘Arts’ policy, is thus recognised as linked to a number of elements: the history of the country; an identity that is partially shared by the country’s inhabitants and a set of values upon which public life and other activities in the country are conducted.

In other words, cultural values and practices cannot be fully captured by nationality. Yet, nationality defines the legal, political, social and territorial constraints within which public policies and national institutions are constructed (Ronen and Shenkar, 1985) and many nations have historically developed as ‘wholes’, even if they still comprise minority groups that are less well integrated (Minkov and Hofstede, 2011). A number of factors have been identified that enhance strong national
integration and that can provide the societal home for a ‘national culture’, including: a dominant national language; national defence forces; national education system; common mass media; national political system, national sports teams and cultural institutions (e.g. opera theatres, museums and landmarks) that have strong emotional and symbolic appeal; and national markets for skills, products and services (Hofstede et al., 2010). Perhaps more importantly, it needs to be recognised that ‘national culture’ does not take into account all the cultures that are found in the nation, but rather is defined in a political context (Bellier, 1997) (see Box 1).

Various authors summarise such sources or antecedents of (national) culture in different ways. For example, Hofstede et al. (2010) identify history, identity, values and institutions (see Figure 1) and the source of particular national cultures and differences between them.

![Figure 1: Sources of differences between countries and groups (Hofstede et al., 2010).](image)

In their review of the literature on national cultures, Singh and Parashar (2005) identify and discuss five antecedents of different cultures: social identity; historical context; economic parameters; institutional factors; and geography, as summarised in Table 1.

**Table 1: Antecedents of culture (adapted from Singh and Parashar, 2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social identity</th>
<th>Historical context</th>
<th>Economic parameters</th>
<th>Institutional Factors</th>
<th>Geography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mass public cultures, languages, religions, ethnicities, literacy levels, sex ratio, territorial mobility for members</td>
<td>myths and symbols, historical memory, historical territory or homeland, colonisation, extent of external influences</td>
<td>economic systems, economic development, technological development, industrial/occupational profile</td>
<td>systems of governance, legal systems, rights and duties, rule of law</td>
<td>climate, topography, ecology, habitation structure, boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These cultural elements all impact on individuals, groups, organisations and industries, and careful analysis of them across nations or finer scale regions could lead to a more sophisticated cultural map of the world, which may or may not coincide with existing political boundaries (Singh and Parashar, 2005).

2.3 What usefulness does the concept of national culture have?

Understanding these elements of national cultures and their interactions has long been recognised as the key to cross-cultural research and practice, including in cross-cultural psychology (Triandis, 1972, 1994, 1995), international business (e.g. Harris and Moran, 1979; Copeland and Griggs, 1985; Adler, 1983, 1986; Ronen, 1986) and international and cross-cultural relations (Roberts, 1970; Stenning, 1979; Oddou and Mendenhall, 1984; Brislin, 1981; Bochner, 1982). In particular, the values and preferences associated with these elements of culture are investigated using individual survey instruments that allow generalisations about national culture (or regional, organisational or other group level culture) to be made on a statistical basis. These generalisations will, of course, not represent the culture of all groups of people or individuals in a country but are considered useful for some purposes, such as international comparison studies for preparing international engagement activities. This use is particularly prevalent in the organisational management domain for understanding business practices in different countries and for preparing and improving international ventures (e.g. Lewis, 2006) but can equally be used for understanding some public sector differences (e.g. Rao and Walton, 2002; Maleki and Bots, 2013). Specific streams of the international relations and political sciences literature also reflect upon the role of culture and its underlying elements in shaping nations’ political and governance systems and the subsequent impacts this has on their inhabitants (e.g. Crozier, 1964; Fisher, 1988; Inglehart, 1997; Helgesen and Kim, 2002).

Despite important jurisdictional variations that are noted across the globe through these analyses, trans-national policy learning and transfer processes are common and have been spurred on by globalisation. In particular, this is related to the need for countries to develop their own national public policies which allow them to: 1) compete more effectively in global markets; 2) cooperate over shared issues, such as human migration and climate change; and 3) participate in the development of multi-level governance regimes (interacting up to the international level) that function effectively for addressing their own specific local, national, and regional challenges (Bache and Flinders, 2005; Hoppe, 2007; Minkov, 2011). In such situations, it becomes increasingly necessary for national governments to understand their own needs and objectives, as well as those they seek to work with, or compete against, on issues of mutual interest, in order to govern as best they can. Although an understanding of ‘national culture’ cannot provide all the required prerequisite knowledge to understand how and why public policies are shaped in different ways in different countries, it could provide a useful lens with which to view their development in, and transfer between, different countries.

2.4 Analytical frameworks for understanding national cultures

Most models or analytical frameworks of use for understanding national cultures take the form of commonly manifested issues (Inkeles and Levinson, 1969), ‘cultural dimensions’, value orientations, scales or indices (Singh and Parashar, 2005; Hofstede et al., 2010). Values are considered to be more easily studied than other basic assumptions and cultural artefacts, which are difficult to explicit or decipher (Schein, 1985), and they are considered to be tightly linked to actions and behaviours of social groups (Posner and Munson, 1979; Keesing 1974; Ali and Brooks, 2008). Manifestations of culture are then mapped onto these values-based dimensions to develop a national cultural profile. A
number of authors consider such work is just a sophisticated form of stereotyping (e.g. Osland and Bird, 2000; McCrae et al., 2008), but many others see value in understanding cultural differences through these lenses, which is why such a healthy body of literature has developed in this area. The models of culture developed have either been single or multi-dimensional, and a summary of a variety of dimensions which have either been statistically determined or empirically proposed is presented in Table 2.

The dimensions presented in Table 2 have been intuitively grouped relative to six general ‘issue areas’. All of these dimensions have been developed using different research methodologies. Some are based on analyses of factors in the sociology, psychology and anthropology literature (e.g. Benedict, 1934; Mead, 1962; Rokeach, 1973; Inkeles and Levinson, 1969) with survey instruments developed based on these factors, and other authors take large-scale value survey data and attempt to uncover significant correlations in the data, which become their independent value orientations that relate to specific dimensions in the literature. For example, the GLOBE project (House et al., 2004) initially identified a number of dimensions (see Table 2) and then constructed a set of as is/as should be questions around these dimensions. The survey was then distributed to large numbers of managers in local organisations in 170 countries. It yielded large amounts of data but was strongly criticised on methodological grounds, including the wording of the questions (e.g. Hofstede, 2006). Hofstede’s work was based on a survey he conducted with IBM employees and correlations found in the responses. Minkov’s work (e.g. 2007, 2011) and that of others (e.g. Inglehart and Baker, 2000; Silver and Dowley, 2000) mined the results of the World Values Survey (Inglehart and Wetzel, 2005) to uncover correlations leading to his dimensions. Countries’ scores on these dimensions then allowed rankings and cross-cultural comparisons to be made (Hofstede et al., 2010). Meta-analyses of these findings have also been performed to understand the correlation between factors and for the purpose of clustering these dimensions into independent groups (see for example Maleki and de Jong (2014) for one of the most recent and in-depth attempts that finds nine clusters rather than the six identified above). Meta-analyses have also been used to identify larger scale national culture clusters, as shown in Figure 2.

Table 2: Summary of cultural dimensions and orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue area</th>
<th>Cultural Dimension names and references</th>
<th>Summary description (non-exhaustive/specific to particular authors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between the individual and society</td>
<td>Individualism (Hofstede 1980, 1983 a,b, 1991; Hofstede et al., 1990; 2010)</td>
<td>Individualist vs collectivist ways of living and learning to act, including the perceived importance of the group’s needs over the individual’s needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusionism vs. universalism (Minkov, 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universalism – Particularism (Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars, 1994)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idiocentric – Allocentric (Triandis, 1995)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional collectivism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-group collectivism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualism/Communitarianism (Trompenaars, 1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communal Sharing Relationships (Fiske, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Particularism—Cultural Pluralism—Cultural Homogenization (Cultural Variation) (Burrell &amp; Morgan, 1979)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wide sharing vs. Non sharing (Newman et al., 1977)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue area</td>
<td>Cultural Dimension names and references</td>
<td>Summary description (non-exhaustive/specific to particular authors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk and uncertainty, and their links to freedom, trust and conflict resolution</td>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1980, 1983a,b, 1991; Hofstede et al., 1990, 2010) (House et al., 2004) High Trust vs. Low Trust (Fukuyama, 1995) Free Will vs. Determinism (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961) Hypometropia vs. prudence (Minkov, 2011) Interpersonal trust index (Gallup, 2012; Legatum Prosperity Index, 2012; and Freedom House, 2012 in Maleki and Bots, 2013) Confidence in government index Gallup, 2012; Legatum Prosperity Index, 2012; and Freedom House, 2012 in Maleki and Bots, 2013)</td>
<td>Tolerance vs intolerance to ambiguity and risk which impacts whether people are risk taking or risk averse, like to live in structured or unstructured environments, and control (or not) aggression and the expression of feelings or a sense of trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National cultural clusters such as those presented in Figure 2 can provide a useful basis for developing crude heuristics for use in decision-making, specifically related to understanding likelihoods of cultural similarity and difference between different countries. Those in the same culture cluster are, for example, more likely to share a greater number of elements from Table 1.

However, as noted earlier, such approaches to understanding national cultures and international comparisons developed on this basis are not without their critics. In addition to the criticism from anthropologists, sociologists and other culture researchers about these ‘positivist’ or ‘reductionist’ analyses of culture that is a dynamic social construct and needs to be analysed in its own situated context through ethnographic and other constructivist methodologies (e.g. Smelser, 1992; MacIntyre, 1971; Groeschl and Doherty, 2000), a number of researchers have pointed to issues they have with the models and their underlying assumptions. For example, types of models that attempt to measure ‘cultural distance’ between countries are criticised on the grounds that the symmetry, stability, causality, and linearity assumptions inherent in the models are flawed (Boyacigiller et al., 1996). Equally, although Hofstede’s work has a strong following and is used as the basis of many cultural studies, numerous authors have pointed out flaws in his reasoning and methods, including how the questions asked shape the dimensions that are ‘uncovered’ from the analysis, and the bipolar nature of the dimensions (see McSweeney (2002) and Baskerville (2003) for a summary of these criticisms and more). This last point is important since it is widely recognised that all individuals and groups can hold incompatible or competing ideas and values in different situations – in other words, that both poles of a dimension co-exist at the same time in individuals or groups (Triandis, 1994; Leach 1954; Smelser 1992; Slater 1970).

This co-existence of competing cultures is in fact a key idea behind grid-group cultural theory (e.g. Douglas, 1970, 1978, 1986, 1996; Wildavsky, 1987; Thompson et al., 1990, 1999; Douglas and Wildavsky, 1992; Schmutzer, 1994), which was based on Bernstein’s (1959) two-dimensional system.
of socio-cultural linguistics and shares roots with institutionalism (Douglas, 1986) and complexity science (Thompson, 2002). This cultural theory supports the idea that there are almost always co-existing proportions of fatalistic/isolationist, hierarchic, individualistic and collectivistic tendencies in societies. Analysis using this framework seeks to understand these interactions, the forms of policy and social action linked to these cultural types, and their results (see Figure 3 for the types and Mamadouh (1999) for examples of applications).

Figure 3: Cultural types (adapted from Frosdick (1995), Jackson (2011), Tukker and Butter, 2007)

The cultural types represented in Figure 3 are linked to the strength of the ‘grid’ which refers to the network of assumptions/rules that guide the behaviour of individuals, and the level of shared social expectations and the strength of the ‘group’ which refer to the level of allegiance, control, conformity and pressure on individuals. Cultural Theory can be applicable for helping to understand the role that some cultural factors or characteristics play in shaping public policy (e.g. Hood, 1998; Hoppe, 2002; 2007). Some of the relevant characteristics of the cultural types that compete with each other to shape public policy and other decision-making processes are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Characteristics of idealised types in Cultural Theory of relevance to public policy decision-making. Adapted from Thompson et al. (1990), Frosdick (1995), Tukker and Butter (2007) and Jackson (2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Fatalist</th>
<th>Individualist</th>
<th>Hierarchist</th>
<th>Egalitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key drivers of world view</td>
<td>Apathy, futility, sense of chaos, feeling of powerlessness</td>
<td>Spontaneity, transparency, openness, spirit of entrepreneurialism</td>
<td>Stability, need for structure, clear procedures and rule-bound institutions</td>
<td>Solidarity, peer pressure, cooperation and mutualism, spirit of participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management approaches and styles</td>
<td>No management, passive approach, despotic leadership</td>
<td>Adaptive or laissez-faire</td>
<td>Controlling or regulatory, directive</td>
<td>Preventive or attentive, participative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Fatalist</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>Hierarchist</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of decision-making power</strong></td>
<td>Isolate/individual</td>
<td>Consumer/individual</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures and criteria applied</strong></td>
<td>Nil – reliance on power imbalances and windows of opportunity</td>
<td>Skills and experience</td>
<td>Rules and evidence</td>
<td>Ethical standards and arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View of risk and liability</strong></td>
<td>Risk is all pervasive; danger no gain</td>
<td>Risk-seeking, loss spreading</td>
<td>Risk accepting, redistributive (e.g. taxation)</td>
<td>Risk-averse, strict-fault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevailing understanding of means and ends</strong></td>
<td>Actors in stalemate over means and ends</td>
<td>Ends known and the market can solve all remaining issues</td>
<td>Means and ends clear</td>
<td>Means and ends to be clarified, no dominant actor but group can tend to agree on a rough direction of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude towards other humans and needs/resources</strong></td>
<td>Passive, no influence</td>
<td>Channel rather than change others, manage needs and resources to limits of skills</td>
<td>Restrict behavior and aim to increase resources</td>
<td>Aim to construct an egalitarian society, need-reducing strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time depth/bias and view on future generations</strong></td>
<td>Instantaneous, pessimistic about the future, like about the powerlessness of current generations</td>
<td>Short-term, optimistic view that future generations will be self-sufficient and able to solve their own problems like current generations</td>
<td>Long-term, measured optimism that future generations will be resilient, especially with effective planning and regulation in place</td>
<td>Compressed, measured pessimism that future generations will be fragile and precautionary measures are needed now to protect them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Cultural Theory, like the models of culture based on dimensions previously highlighted, has not been immune from criticism, many researchers and practitioners have found these two types of analytical frameworks useful for investigating the links between (national) cultures and linked topics of interest (business innovation, public participation in decision-making, development policy, etc.). It therefore seems reasonable to assume for the purposes of this review that understanding and then unpacking these dimensions and Cultural Theory’s tendencies in specific country contexts in a critical but open-minded fashion are likely to provide some interesting insights into how and why particular public policies are shaped in the ways they are in different countries.
3 SHAPING PUBLIC POLICY

3.1 What is public policy?

Public policy, like culture, can be defined in a multitude of ways and is seen to be closely linked to, or results from, politics, which Lasswell (1936) defined simply as ‘who gets what, when and how?’. This means that public policy helps to determine who wins and who loses (Lascoumes and Le Galès, 2007), and theoretically this could be influenced by anyone or any group that garners sufficient power to change resource distributions across society. Dimock et al. (1983, p.40) see policy more in the light of a problem-solving process where public policy is ‘deciding at any time or place what objectives and substantive measures should be chosen in order to deal with a particular problem, issue or innovation’. Other definitions are more government specific, considering that public policy just relates to what governments choose to do or not, including why and with what consequences (Dye, 1972; Fenna, 2004).

A single public policy is considered by Page (2006) to encompass four specific elements: principles – an overarching framework on how to manage public affairs; objectives – specific priorities that are defined related to identified challenges, problems or issues; measures – concrete decisions and proposed instruments to effect change; and practical actions – behaviour of the public servants (and potentially other stakeholders) charged with implementing the policy. Althaus et al. (2007) provide an overview of the typical views on public policy where it can be considered as: 1) an authoritative choice; 2) an objective; and 3) an hypothesis (of cause and effect). A range of other views exist, including that public policy can be: 4) a form of institutionalisation (Muller, 1990); 5) a mechanism of regulating market failures (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1968); 6) a sequence of actions and their rationalisation (March, 1994); 7) interactions between actions and institutions (Considine, 2005); 8) the processes associated with shaping attention (Forrester, 1993); 9) a space where negotiation of social interests can occur; 10) developed by the public through deliberation and discourse, instead of intentionally for the public (Dryzek, 2000, 2006). Not fitting easily into any of these categories, Shore and Wright (1997) further considers that ‘policies work as instruments of governance, as ideological vehicles, and as agents for constructing subjectivities and organising people within systems of power and authority’.

In other words, public policy is characterised by a complex collection of concepts stemming from a variety of academic disciplines and epistemological positions. French sociologists, Lascoumes and Le Galès (2007a) consider that public policy ‘is a sociopolitical space constructed as much through techniques and instruments as through aims or content’ where a public policy instrument is: ‘a device that is both technical and social, that organizes specific social relations between the state and those it is addressed to, according to the representations and meanings it carries. It is a particular type of institution, a technical device with the generic purpose of carrying a concrete concept of the politics/society relationship and sustained by a concept of regulation.’ This complex public policy space can be summarised into five interlinked elements: actors; institutions; representations; processes; and results (Lascoumes and Le Galès, 2007b), as depicted in Figure 4.
Further discussion on potential cultural and academic differences between typical French and UK/US views of public policy can be found in Smith (1999).

3.2 Public policy processes

To understand the shaping of public policy, all of the five factors and their interactions represented in Figure 4 can form the basis of an analysis. A number of other models of the public policy process also exist, which include those that concentrate on how it is shaped through time and those which focus on policy actors’ actions and interactions. Some of the most common policy time-related models include those that conceptualise the policy process as a set of sequential or cyclical phases (e.g. Lasswell, 1951; Jones, 1970; Simon, 1977; Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1993; Anderson, 2006; Althaus et al., 2007), as in the example phases shown in Figure 5.

![Figure 4: The public policy pentagon (adapted from Lascoumes and Le Galès, 2007b)](image)

**Figure 4: The public policy pentagon (adapted from Lascoumes and Le Galès, 2007b)**

Further discussion on potential cultural and academic differences between typical French and UK/US views of public policy can be found in Smith (1999).

3.2 Public policy processes

To understand the shaping of public policy, all of the five factors and their interactions represented in Figure 4 can form the basis of an analysis. A number of other models of the public policy process also exist, which include those that concentrate on how it is shaped through time and those which focus on policy actors’ actions and interactions. Some of the most common policy time-related models include those that conceptualise the policy process as a set of sequential or cyclical phases (e.g. Lasswell, 1951; Jones, 1970; Simon, 1977; Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1993; Anderson, 2006; Althaus et al., 2007), as in the example phases shown in Figure 5.

![Figure 5: Example stages of a public policy process cycle](image)
Actor interaction focussed models include the ‘Advocacy coalition framework’ of Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993), Pross’ (1986) ‘Policy Communities’ or Haas’ (1991) ‘Epistemic communities’ (not always policy-specific), Colebatch’s (2006) ‘Systems approach’ which looks at policy development as ‘an exercise in social construction’, and ‘communicative action’ approaches where the policy process is composed of participation, deliberation and relationship building (e.g. Habermas, 1984; Dryzek, 1990; Forester, 1993). Other policy process models based on alternative premises include the: ‘Garbage Can Approach’, which sees the policy process as messy and commonly non-sequential (Cohen et al., 1972) and which has similarities to Kingdon’s (1984) view of policy which is constituted of interacting parallel problem, policy and politics ‘streams’; ‘Value-adding’ approaches where policy-related interactions are aimed at enhancing public value (e.g. Moore, 1995; Bozeman, 2002; Jackson, 2001; Stoker 2003); and ‘Risk and Uncertainty Management’ approaches, which see the public policy-making process as one of managing risk, uncertainty and crisis (e.g. Perrow, 1984; Boin et al., 2005; Matthews, 2009).

In any public policy process, each of these models emphasises the importance of different values and different means or preferred ways of working through policy issues. A synthesis view of some of the policy analysis and expertise roles, key shaping processes and associated actor types involved in the public policy process is provided by Mayer et al. (2004), as shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Processes, actor roles and development styles in the public policy process linked to a values typology (Mayer et al, 2004)

Such a values-based overview could be of interest in attempting to understand the role of national culture in shaping public policy, and particularly in understanding the analysis and adjustment processes it might be necessary to undergo if a public policy from one country is to be adopted and transformed to fit the needs of another.
3.3 Public policy transfer and learning

Inspiration, advice or pre-defined frameworks for addressing public policy challenges in one jurisdiction can commonly be found in other jurisdictions. Due to the important practice of searching for and reflecting on others’ policies with the aim of improving governance effectiveness (Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000; Radaelli, 2000; Rose 1991), a rich literature has developed around how one country’s or jurisdiction’s policies and experience can be learnt from, transferred or adapted for use in another country or jurisdiction. Such an inter-jurisdictional or cross-country process is referred to by a variety of names in the literature, including:

- **policy transfer** (e.g. Westney, 1987; Wolman, 1992; Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996; Evans and Davies, 1999; Dolowitz, 2000; James and Lodge, 2003; Evans, 2004, 2009; Fawcett and Marsh, 2012; Carroll and Common, 2013);
- **lesson drawing** (e.g. Rose, 1991, 1993, 2005; Robertson, 1991; Stone, 2001; Asare and Studlar, 2009);
- **institutional transplantation** (e.g. De Jong et al., 2002);
- **policy diffusion** (e.g. Majone, 1991; Peters, 1997; Simmons and Elkins, 2004; Braun and Gilardi, 2006; Lee and Strang, 2006; Howlett and Rayner, 2008; Wolman, 2009; Meseguer and Gilardi, 2009);
- **policy borrowing** (e.g. Robertson and Waltman, 1993);
- **policy (or social) learning** (e.g. May, 1992; Bennett and Howlett, 1992; Hall, 1993; Checkel, 1997; Blyth, 2002; Common, 2004; Levitt and March, 1988; Dovers et al. 1996; Dovers, 2000; Stone, 2004; Radaelli, 2009; Gilardi 2010);
- **policy innovation** (Walker, 1969; Welch and Thompson, 1980; Berry and Berry, 1990, 1999; NESTA, 2008; Brannan et al. 2008);
- **bandwagoning** (e.g. Ikenberry, 1990);
- **institutional isomorphism** (e.g. DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Strang and Meyer, 1993; Strang and Soule, 1998);
- ** emulation** (e.g. Howlett, 2000);
- **copying** (e.g. Waltman, 1980);
- **policy imitation, mimesis or mimicry** (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991; Jacoby, 2000; Massey, 2009; Marsh and Sharman, 2009);
- ‘systematically pinching ideas’ (Schneider and Ingram, 1988);
- **policy convergence** (Bennett, 1991; Radaelli, 2000; Pollitt, 2001; Knill, 2005; Lenschow et al., 2005; Drezner, 2001, 2005);
- **policy mutations, mobilities and assemblages** (e.g. Peck and Theodore, 2010; McCann and Ward, 2012); and

On closer observation, many of these concepts have strong similarities (Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996), although some important distinctions between them still exist, as exemplified in the discussions of Dussauge-Laguna (2012) and Stone (2012).

Taking the first and perhaps most cited appellation as an encompassing concept (Benson and Jordan, 2011; Dussauge-Laguna, 2012) for the purposes of this review, **policy transfer** can be considered as a cross-cultural process in which ‘knowledge about policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in one political system (past or present) is used in development of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in another political system’ (Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000: 5), either in the same or different countries. The process can be further characterised based on the:

1) ‘objects’ being transferred, such as the: goals, structure and content of policies; policy instruments, procedures or administrative techniques and institutions; ideologies or
justifications; ideas, attitudes and concepts; outcomes, policy styles and negative lessons (Bennett, 1991; Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996; Dolowitz, 1997; Evans, 2004; Stone, 2012);

2) prerequisites or context of the transfer jurisdictions, including political, cultural and institutional conditions (including power structures) in both jurisdictions and the political feasibility of implementation in the receiving jurisdiction (Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996; Evans, 2004); and

3) the degree to which transfer occurs, which could take the form of: copying or complete duplication (typically only possible within the same governance system); adaptation; hybridisation, synthesis, emulation and inspiration (Rose, 1993; Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996; Evans, 2004; Lavenex and UçArer, 2004).

The process for how the transfer takes place, in terms of to what extent it is voluntary or not, can also be defined (for example, Lal, 2001; Evans 2004, 2009): a voluntary transfer or lesson-drawing exercise that can be rationally and freely thought through and acted upon; a negotiated or conditional transfer where governments are compelled to make policy changes based on the signalling, directives or inducements of other organisations, institutions or governments (e.g. financial donors and international or supranational institutions) (partially coercive); and a direct coercive transfer, where governments are compelled to introduce governance changes by other governments or institutions and have no freedom of decision (e.g. as occurred under processes of colonisation).

3.4 Transfer, translation and brokering actors involved in shaping public policy

The importance of the actors involved in policy transfer and learning processes have not gone unnoticed in the literature (e.g. Jörgens, 2000; Stone, 2004; Lendvai and Stubbs, 2007; Randma-Liiv and Kruusenberg, 2012) as the central driving force of policy change, whether it is coercive or not. In this context, the concept of ‘translation’ (Callon, 1986; Latour, 1986, 2005; Sakai, 2006) of public policy appears appropriate for helping to understand inter-cultural interactions and how they shape policy in different ways. In particular, it allows attention to be paid to how ‘policies and their schemes, content, technologies and instruments are constantly changing according to sites, meanings and agencies’ (Lendvai and Stubbs, 2007) or are edited and recontextualised (Sahlin and Wedlin, 2008), and sheds light on the ‘translators’ involved in this process.

In particular, there is an important strand of literature that focusses on the role of policy entrepreneurs and other intermediaries (e.g. Walker, 1974; Cobb and Elder; 1983; Kingdon, 1984; Polsby, 1984; Roberts and King, 1991; Mintrom, 1997; Weisert, 1991) in shaping policy agendas, picking up or developing policy ideas, and driving these through the policy development and political processes to ensure their implementation. Such entrepreneurs or intermediaries can be located either within or outside the bureaucracy (i.e. they may be public servants, elected officials, researchers, business leaders or other members of the community) but typically need to possess and use a variety of translation or ‘brokering’ expertise and political nous to work across boundaries achieve their public policy objectives.

This brokering role for shaping public policy can also be undertaken by so-called ‘boundary spanners’, ‘knowledge brokers’ or boundary or bridging organisations (e.g. Clarke and Fujimura, 1992; Gieryn, 1999; Miller, 2001; van Kerkhoff and Lebel, 2006; Vogel et al. 2007; O’Mahony and Bechky, 2008), when it is recognised that there are groups rather than specific individuals that consistently perform such a role. Such organisations (or individuals) typically span the boundary between two or more distinct cultures or knowledge systems (e.g. science and policy; research and practice; policy and politics; community members, experts and decision-makers) at either the local,
national or international level. The understanding of how such organisations operate related to the shaping of public policy has been deeply studied in the Science and Technology Studies literature (e.g. Jasanoff, 1990; Gieryn 1999; Guston, 1999, Miller, 2001); focussed on, for example, organisations such as think-tanks, expert advisory committees, consensus conferences, policy review committees, international organisations like the World Bank, OECD or IMF). However, more generalised understandings that fit any cross-cultural translation role also exist. For example, Cash et al. (2003) speaks about boundary organisations providing institutionalised spaces where: relationship-building and two-way communication can be fostered and can evolve through time; tools such as shared models for decision-making can be developed and used—also termed ‘boundary’ or ‘intermediary’ objects in the decision sciences literature (e.g. Vinck and Jeantet, 1995; Vinck, 1999; Daniell 2012); and the issues, different knowledges and cultures, and boundaries or interfaces associated with them can themselves be negotiated (see also Ulrich, 1983; 1991 and Midgley, 2000, on boundary definition). Such organisations also typically bridge distinct social or cultural worlds with specific responsibility and accountability to both sides of the ‘boundary’ (Cash et al., 2003). Specifically in the public policy and potential transfer context (as in many other contexts), effective boundary organisations are able to mediate cultural differences, such as those that occur between countries or other interfaces previously outlined, encouraging those from each side to recognise these other ways of knowing and allow them to return, when necessary, to the comfort of their own culture and knowledge practices (Carr and Wilkinson, 2005). In the process new hybrid ways of knowing and acting can be created that could lead to innovations and changes in the different cultural contexts, in our case in public policy in different countries.

4 PRELIMINARY UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE ROLE OF NATIONAL CULTURE IN SHAPING PUBLIC POLICY

Having now introduced the concept of ‘national’ cultures and what can encompass understandings of ‘shaping public policy’, this review will now move to the more practical endpoint of developing a framework that can be used for understanding the role of national culture in shaping public policy. For these purposes, Carr and Wilkinson’s advice can be followed where they suggest that it is the pragmatic utility of an idea that is important and that ‘The question to be asked of any cultural map is not ‘Is it accurate?’ but ‘Is it useful? If so by whom, for what?’ (Gieryn, 1999, xi-xii)’ (Carr and Wilkinson, 2005).

If the competing hypotheses are considered that ‘National culture has [or does not have] a significant influence on public policy’, the weight of evidence from the literature, some of which is presented in this review, clearly refutes the hypothesis that national culture does not have a significant influence on public policy, underscoring the utility of the concept of ‘national culture’ in relation to shaping public policy. Taking this as a given, the question then becomes who could find this concept most useful and for what in relation to the vast area that public policy encompasses?

As part of the development of a framework for understanding the role of national culture in shaping public policy, it is suggested that there are a range of public policy-related stakeholders who could

---

2 However, the potentially significant issues in establishing causation between different aspects of ‘national culture’ and ‘public policy’ are acknowledged, even though some authors are attempting to establish such understandings. As Holzinger and Knill (2005: 776) note on issues of causation, ‘The difficulty lies in comparing the relative significance of emulation with all the other influences (domestic and transnational) that may affect the assumptions and perceptions of the multiple actors who shape public policy’. Further discussion on such analysis challenges and causal complexity is outlined in Ragin (1987) and Elster (1999).
find this concept useful for different reasons, including policymakers (politicians, public servants and ministerial advisors), academic and research consultants, and business, NGO and community stakeholders affected by, or seeking to influence, public policy processes in their own communities or around the world.

For this range of stakeholders, there are then different inter-connected sub-questions that could be of most interest to them, including what aspects of national cultures are most:

> **Policy relevant** (e.g. that shape perceptions of the role of the government or State in society, choice of key issues and what constitutes public value)?
>
> **Relevant to the processes of policy-making** (e.g. to certain phases in the policy cycle (see Figure 5); process support roles (see Figure 6) or process inputs and outputs)?
>
> **Useful for understanding national policy-making cultures** (e.g. role of public participation, role of expertise, role and make-up of staffing, relationships to media, relationships to non-government stakeholders, and the relative places of economics, law and technocratic wisdom)? And
>
> **Critical for understanding or aiding policy transfer and learning between jurisdictions** (e.g. compatibility of cultural antecedents (see Table 1); levels of similarity/difference between cultural dimensions and orientations (see Table 2), and the make-up of Cultural Theory’s idealised types in the different contexts (see Table 3)?

It is beyond the scope of this review to carry out additional research on each of these sub-questions at this stage. However, so as to demonstrate the current thinking on some of these issues and the role that national culture has already been analysed to play in some cases of shaping public policy, two case studies from the literature that cut across issues from the above sub-questions will be used to demonstrate existing applications of concepts associated with understanding national cultures to questions of public policy.

From this review, it can be seen that there are increasing numbers of publications in the literature that are seeking to use culture-based theory and analytics to understand aspects of public policy (e.g. Douglas and Wildavsky, 1982; Coyle and Ellis, 1994; Thompson et al., 1999; Geva-May 2002; Swedlow, 2002; Mamadouh, 2002; Rao and Walton, 2002; Hoppe 2007; Enserink et al., 2007; Maleki and Bots, 2013). This means that there are a number of different source documents that could be used to provide case studies of certain ways in which research finds that national culture plays a role in public policy development. Here two cases have been chosen based on different analytics for understanding the role of (national) culture in shaping public policy—national culture orientations and cultural theory (both described in Section 2.3). The use of these analytics for understanding the shaping of public policy processes and content is then the subject of our two cases: the first on the use of national culture orientations for understanding public participation differences in public policy and the potential for procedural transfer between countries; and the second on using cultural theory for comparative analysis of policy narratives and problem structuring for different issues. Drawing on the insights from these example case studies and the rest of the review, an agenda for future research and policy practice will be developed in the concluding section.

### 4.1 Case study 1: Using national culture orientations to understand public participation differences in public policy and potential for procedural transfer between countries

Different countries have different preferences and practices for how to include stakeholders who are affected by, or can affect, public policy-making processes. Internationally, the importance of public participation in decision-making or ‘participatory approaches’ to public policy has been increasingly
highlighted, especially in areas such as environmental and technological risk focused decision-making, and development policy (e.g. Fiorino, 1990; Laird, 1993; Abraham and Platteau, 2004). This is demonstrated by numerous UN statements, including the Aarhus Convention of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE, 1998) on ‘Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters’ and policies of international organisations such as the World Bank. However, the approaches that different nations take to including (or largely ignoring) public participation in their own public policy processes vary enormously, and it has been reported that cultural aspects of different public policy contexts have a significant role to play in driving these differences and comparative success in participatory process transfer efforts (e.g. IAP2, 2009; Mansuri and Rao, 2012). Many documents outlining ‘good practice’ in public participation in decision-making and public policy more broadly (e.g. Stern and Fineberg, 1996; Beierle and Cayford, 2002; Creighton, 2005; Andre et al., 2006; von Korff et al., 2010; 2012; Daniell, 2012) stem from particular (often western) countries, and the applicability of the suggested processes and indicators for evaluating this good practice (e.g. Renn et al., 1995; Rowe and Frewer, 2000; 2004; Beierle and Konisky, 2000; Newig and Fritsch, 2009) may not necessarily be accepted or their relative importance interpreted in the same ways in other countries.

A few authors have recently attempted to describe, evaluate and provide advice or analytics for future cross-cultural use of public participation in policy-making (e.g. Enserink et al., 2007; Dryzek and Tucker, 2008; Maleki and Bots, 2013). It is from this work that this case study will be drawn, with a specific focus on how the kinds of cultural dimensions and orientations outlined in Table 2 can be used for describing and understanding differences in national approaches to public participation in public policy.

For this review, the work of Enserink et al. (2007) is first drawn upon who looks specifically at cultural factors as co-determinants of participation in river-basin management linked to the European Union’s Water Framework Directive (the overarching European water policy document). Drawing directly on Hofstede’s five cultural dimensions of power distance, individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity and long-term orientation (see Table 2 for references), the authors interpret cases of implementation of the Water Framework Directive in the United Kingdom, Netherlands, Germany, Spain and Belgium studied through the HarmoniCOP project (Patel and Stel, 2004). From this largely qualitative and descriptive study they derived a number of hypotheses from their empirical findings that could be used to develop future research and potentially inform the development of future public participation schemes:

– ‘A high power distance index is not conducive to public participation;
– Individualism is not a determining factor for the extent and success of public participation in a country;
– Collectivism facilitates a high degree of public participation, but this may be left to informal processes if the power distance is high;
– A high masculinity score is not conducive to public participation; and
– High power distance and high uncertainty avoidance inhibit public participation because they support centralized and control-oriented systems of water management’ (Enserink et al., 2007).

Pushing this kind of analysis much further, Maleki and Bots (2013) have recently developed a ‘framework for operationalizing the effect of national culture on participatory policy analysis’ that draws on a greater range of the dimensions in Table 2 to develop and test a set of ‘culturally sensitive factors affecting participation (FAPs)’, as presented in Table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor affecting participation code number</th>
<th>Factor name</th>
<th>Factor description</th>
<th>Relevant cultural dimensions/orientations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAP1</td>
<td>Public demand</td>
<td>Extent to which people want to participate</td>
<td>Power distance; institutional collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP2</td>
<td>Preferred participants</td>
<td>Acceptance of, and/or preference for, powerless vs. powerful participants</td>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance; masculinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP3</td>
<td>Role and intention of participants</td>
<td>Participation as individual vs. representative, for taking care of self-interest vs. collective interest</td>
<td>Individualism/collectivism; institutional collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP4</td>
<td>Process format</td>
<td>Structure, style, formality, and arrangement of the participatory process</td>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance; indulgence/restraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP5</td>
<td>Process scope</td>
<td>Duration, speed, and number of participants of the participatory process</td>
<td>Future orientation; masculinity/femininity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP6</td>
<td>Interparty trust</td>
<td>Trust between policymakers and the public and/or within these two parties in the participatory process</td>
<td>Interpersonal trust index; uncertainty avoidance; confidence in government index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP7</td>
<td>Communicativeness</td>
<td>Extent of being communicative, participative, explicit, critical, and reflexive in interactions, and indifferent to rank</td>
<td>Individualism/collectivism; assertiveness; power distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP8</td>
<td>Outcome expectation</td>
<td>Acceptance and/or expectance of optimal solution vs. satisficing consensus</td>
<td>Masculinity/femininity; assertiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP9</td>
<td>Conflict resolution mentality</td>
<td>Acceptance of and/or preference for compromise vs. defeat in conflicts</td>
<td>Monumentalism; future orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This framework is then used to analyse the implementation of consensus conferences on genetically modified food in France, Denmark, Japan and the United States between 1998 and 2002 drawing on the work of Dryzek and Tucker (2008), Einsiedel et al. (2001), Wakamatsu (1999), Lieberman and Taylor (2005) and Nishizawa (2005). As well as mapping the scores of the relevant cultural dimensions/orientations outlined in Table 4, they use qualitative descriptions of the cases to check the meaning of these scores in the context of the specific consensus conferences. This leads to them postulating on a number of elements of participation in different countries that could inform practitioners and policy analysts in designing more culturally appropriate and potentially successful participation processes for supporting policy-making around: 1) what to aim for, especially considering the 'level' of participation from consultation to co-decision-making; 2) whom to involve, including whether organised or more powerful stakeholders would be more welcome than individual citizens, and whether external moderators might be welcome or not; 3) which methods to use,
including whether more structured or informal processes are preferred, to what extent there is a
need for transparent processes and face-to-face meetings, and whether impartial facilitators are
required to encourage the participation of more culturally modest and non-communicative
participants; and 4) what risks to manage, including whether incentives will be needed to encourage
participation, whether there is a likelihood of consultation fatigue due to length of processes and
whether there are strong risks of conflict and escalation of conflict.

The framework used for this analysis, with the numerical values for each of the relevant cultural
dimensions/orientations, is available online3 for interested analysts to perform their own comparative
investigations across countries and visualise these differences on a series of ‘slide bars’.

Although this case study is focussed on the role of culture in shaping public participation linked to
public policy, similar analyses could be developed for other public policy issues such as those
mentioned at the beginning of this section, including how cultural dimensions affect the role of
expertise in policy-making or the perceptions of the role of government in a country.

4.2 Case study 2: Using cultural theory for comparative
analysis of policy narratives and problem structuring

Each phase of the policy-making process, such as those represented in a policy-cycle approach
(Figure 4), could potentially benefit from a deeper understanding of cultural understandings and how
these play out in different countries.

Cultural theory has already been found to be useful in understanding a range of public policy-related
domains, including the workings of the State (e.g. Hood, 1998), political culture (e.g. Mamadouh,
1997), risk perception (e.g. Dake, 1991; 1992; Slovic, 2000), knowledge co-production (based on
Jasanoff’s (2004) conceptualisation) (e.g. Swedlow, 2011) and the development of international
treaties (e.g. Rayner, 1991). As discussed previously and outlined in Figure 3 and Table 3, the theory
provides four main cultural-institutional focal points or biases (Hoppe, 2007), the relative strength of
which can be examined for different policies or political framings of issues and how the content and
processes used in different phases of the policy cycle (Figure 5) are likely to be interpreted and
preferentially enacted by different parts of society and interested stakeholders. For example, by
determining the most dominant discourses or ways of interacting and their relative strength
compared to each other (Swedlow, 2002), a useful picture of dominant value-systems can be built,
along with the potential for change in certain directions. In other words, it allows the political
discursive space of a country, or other geographical or issue area, to be better understood by
examining how many plausible narratives can be used, who is likely to use these, and who is likely to
find each more credible, based on compatibility with their own mix of cultural biases (Ney and
Thompson, 1999; Hoppe, 2007).

For example, in the development of waste policy, specifically looking at the siting of waste facilities
in the Netherlands, Van Baren (2001) (cited in Hoppe, 2007) demonstrated that there were three
dominant discourses that could be linked to certain cultural biases, as outlined in Table 5.
Each of the discourses is based on one or a combination of different cultural biases, a careful
understanding of which can help policy analysts or policymakers to more successfully navigate
conflict-ridden and challenging policy-making processes.

3 http://actoranalysis.com/fap-framework/
Table 5: Van Baren’s (2001) reconstruction of policy belief systems linked to cultural biases for local waste facility siting in the Netherlands (adapted from Hoppe, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Belief System</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical narrative</strong></td>
<td>‘Do we need more waste capacity? Yes, on the condition that careful but decisive decisions are made’</td>
<td>‘More waste capacity is necessary! Government intervention is needed’</td>
<td>‘Do we need more waste capacity? No, only in consultation with the actors involved’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main cultural biases (dominant style of thinking and acting – refer to Figure 3/ Table 3)</strong></td>
<td>Moderately egalitarian and individualistic</td>
<td>Hierarchical and moderately individualistic</td>
<td>Strongly egalitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key waste policy concerns</strong></td>
<td>Waste prevention; Method of waste treatment</td>
<td>Realising sufficient waste facility capacity</td>
<td>Environmental impact of waste facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant perspective on physical planning</strong></td>
<td>A need to be careful but decisive</td>
<td>A need to speed up the decision-making process</td>
<td>A need to be careful instead of quick when making decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, in Van Baren’s waste policy case, it was possible to see that where the dominant policy belief system was hierarchical (no. 2 in Table 5), followers of this value system would attempt to ‘close-down’ the decision-making process and marginalise or exclude followers of alternative policy belief systems, effectively resulting in their issues being excluded from the agenda of policy discussions (Hoppe, 2007). This antagonised followers of the strongly egalitarian policy belief system (no. 3 in Table 5) who created their own advocacy coalition to attempt to influence the waste facility siting process but which was considered to be a NIMBY (‘Not In My Back Yard’) movement by the still dominant hierarchical system followers (Hoppe, 2007). The clash of these two cultural biases resulted in policy deadlock that was only able to be broken down when brokers entered the negotiations, that were able to bridge the two sparring groups (who held beliefs closer to No. 1 in Table 5) and develop culturally hybrid solutions to which both other groups could accept as a compromise solution (Hoppe, 2007).

This case is valuable for our discussion for a few reasons, including highlighting: the role that culture plays in shaping policy processes, democracy and the conflicts inherent in them; how cultural theory can be used to better understand these different cultural biases and how they manifest themselves through policy narratives and policy process shaping (e.g. the marginalisation or bringing together of different stakeholders); and the importance of the policy brokering role that this review referred to in Section 3.4.

Looking in more depth at policy brokering, it can also be seen that this brokering role can be important during the problem definition stage of the policy cycle (encompassing issue identification and policy objectives and boundary definition in Figure 5). As Hoppe (2002, 2007) describes, different actors involved in policy problem definition will likely seek to undertake this definition challenge in different ways, depending on their cultural biases. For example, actors following hierarchical belief systems may seek to structure any problem and deny that ‘unstructured’ problems exist; those with an egalitarian (or enclavist) bias may see every policy problem through the frame of fairness; individualists may seek to attempt to make every problem better or search for improvements in the current situation through the use of useable knowledge; and fatalists (or isolates) are more likely to see all policy problems as unstructured and that surviving them will require strategies of flexibility and resilience. This potential for extreme differences in perspectives on
policy problem definition and what should be focussed on for resolving them highlights the need for more effective ‘problem structuring’-focussed actors that are able to appreciate and work across the four culturally-biased approaches. Following Thompson et al.’s (1990) definition of the fifth cultural type, the hermit (outlined in Figure 3), Schmutzer (1994) (cited in Hoppe, 2007) considers that this type can also be ‘Hermes’, a messenger and translator, named after the Greek god of commerce and traffic.

Here it can be seen, as with the previous waste policy example, that if certain actors are able to understand the prevailing strength of different cultural biases exhibited by other policy actors—also referred to as ‘democracy audits’ by Thompson (2002)—and they themselves have an interest in developing workable policy solutions, then they can use this knowledge to work across cultural boundaries constructing arenas for productive engagement and helping to ‘broker’ solutions between seemingly incompatible positions. Likewise, such brokers might be able to develop culturally appropriate policy development processes to bring followers of the different cultural biases together, or at the very least understand the likely cultural reactions to a particular policy definition or decision and act to develop mitigation strategies to deal with predicted fall-out (such as social protests, lawsuits or stakeholder withdrawal from policy engagement). For future research, here it could be hypothesised that the brokered solutions may migrate towards the more dominant ‘national’ cultural characteristics (based on the relevant strength of different biases in society), or potentially seek to redirect them towards the more dominant political pole of the time to ensure their safe passage into legislation. Undertaking such cultural analyses of minority governments, and how brokered solutions with parliamentarians holding the balance of power are made, could be particularly valuable. It could equally be useful for understanding the underlying cause of party-constituent backlash and potentially how to better manage this by showing the target populations what of their cultural value system has been maintained.
5 CONCLUSIONS AND AN AGENDA FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND POLICY PRACTICE

Cultural factors influence economic behaviour, political participation, social solidarity and value formation and evolution (Sen, 2002), which are closely linked to how and why public policies are developed in different ways in different countries. It is for this reason that there are many authors who emphasise the importance of taking a ‘cultural turn’ in the understanding of governance and public policy (e.g. Foucault, 1991; Lemke, 2002; Stubbs, 2005), in other words to use cultural analysis to enrich knowledge of politics, policies and practices (Clarke, 2004, p.47).

Although this review has sought to highlight the substantial literature that exists on characterisations of national cultures or their underlying attributes or biases, and how they may be used to understand and shape public policy, it is also important to heed cautions of some authors like Sen (2002, p.44) who emphasises that ‘cultures interact with each other and cannot be seen as insulated structures’, a lesson that forms the basis of Cultural Theory that has been discussed in both Sections 2.3 and 4.2. He also cautions that: ‘rapid-fire cultural generalisations can not only undermine a deeper understanding of the role of culture, but also serve as a tool of sectarian prejudices, social discrimination, and even political tyranny’ (Sen, 2002, p.44). This implies that care needs to be taken with the labelling and use of cultural dimensions or orientations discussed in Section 2.3 with applications carefully constructed for specific purposes, as shown in Section 4.1.

From this literature review, it is considered that there is much potential for developing a more in-depth understanding of national cultures and the impacts that cultural orientations or biases have on the development of public policy within countries and policy transfer between countries. These applications could address a range of issues across almost all domains of policy and the questions presented at the beginning of Section 4 on investigating what aspects of national cultures are most: policy relevant; relevant to the processes of policy-making; useful for understanding national policy-making cultures; and critical for understanding or aiding policy transfer and learning between jurisdictions.

These questions aside, there are also some important areas of public policy that could likely benefit from a more in-depth consideration of national cultures and their underlying combinations of societal cultural orientations and biases. These areas have been identified through a lack of apparent discussion in the literature. They also link to research and practice interests discussed in the through the HC Coombs Policy Forum in 2013-2014 that share the aim of seeking to enhance Australia’s public policy.

5.1 Hypothesis testing of the impacts of cultural variables on public policy success/failure

In today’s currently fiscally constrained environment (at least in many western countries), one potentially useful future activity could be to investigate the potential for cultural variables to lead to policy failure, and hence to proactively work towards adapting policies in ways that could mitigate this risk. For example, a risk-based approach could be used for developing an analytic framework to test hypotheses related to the impact of cultural variables on public policy processes (or different phases of their development). Such a framework could then be used when developing public policy interventions, especially those based on policy interventions from other countries, in order to allow for policy adjustments to be made to mitigate the risks of policy failure and associated resource wastage. There are many examples of hypotheses found in the literature (see for example those in
Section 4.1. or one like an increase in individualism in a national culture can lead to deregulation/privatisation of public assets (Hofstede et al., 2010) or that formal property rights are more frequently developed in individualist cultures (North, 1990; Greif, 1994) and evidence in both the academic and grey literature (e.g. government reports and unpublished papers) that could be used for testing such hypotheses.

5.2 Investigation of national culture impacts on the development and use of different policy-making ideologies/methodologies

Values, evidence, preferences and other information make their way into policy-making processes and influence policy decisions in different ways in different countries and policy areas. At a time when many countries’ policy-makers and academics are debating the importance of ideologies such as ‘evidence-based policy-making’ (e.g. Solesbury, 2001; Latham, 2001; Parson, 2002; Davies, 2004; Banks, 2009; Kay, 2011), ‘participatory or deliberative democracy’ (Dryzek, 1990; 2000; Bachrach and Botwinick, 1992; Mutz, 2006) or alternatives such as ‘intelligence-based policy-making’ (Matthews, 2014a,b) or ‘policy analytics’ (Tsoukiàs et al., 2013; De Marchi et al., 2014) there appears to be the need for investigation on how national culture can affect the uptake and specificities of public policy processes in different countries. For example, how exactly are scientific advice, public opinion and preferences, local knowledge or political staffers’ views perceived and used by policy makers in different countries and to what extent do national cultural orientations affect the comparative importance of these information sources and how they are integrated into policy-making processes? Understanding the impact of normal cultural biases on these processes may allow conscious efforts to be made to do things differently or at least understand which kinds of new policy-making ideologies/methodologies from other countries could be imported or exported to other countries and what adaptations may be required.

5.3 The relationship between national cultures and preferences for different types of multi-level governance systems

Most of today’s policy issues and the impacts of decisions made about them transcend geographical or administrative levels and sectors of interest. This means that countries are required to develop, maintain and adapt multi-level governance systems (e.g. Hooghe and Marks, 2003; Bache and Flinders, 2005) for different policy issues, which may be more or less formally structured (e.g. clear federated system with clearly defined jurisdictions compared to transient groups of interest or specific purpose institutions developed at multiple levels). The question that seems to have received little attention in the literature, with perhaps the exception of the European Union, but is vital for successful public policy implementation is to what extent different multi-level governance systems are products of, or themselves shape, national cultures and lead to the relative success or failure of public policies? Such research could inform the future design of more successful and culturally-aware multi-level governance systems in different countries, including those linked to the effective local adaptation of international laws, directives and promoted policies.

---

4 For an example of a hypothesis testing methodology used for rapid policy evaluation that could be adapted for this purpose see Matthews and White (2013)
5.4 The role of individuals and groups in developing public policy that appears counter to dominant national culture characterisations but is still widely perceived as successful

National cultures are not static and are also complex and full of competing dimensions. The question here is to understand the role of individuals and groups in supporting the development of public policy that appears counter to the dominant characterisations of national culture but is still widely perceived as successful; in particular, to identify to what extent national culture plays an important shaping role in different policy domains and where there is room for policies based on alternative cultural bases to survive and thrive; and more specifically, to what extent is it possible to overcome deep seated ideas of difference and potential incompatibility and to what extent do the individuals and brokering individuals matter vs the prevailing cultural systems?

For example, it could be imagined that carefully crafted policies for minority groups by culturally-aware policy makers may seek to uphold cultural values of the receiving group rather than the dominant majority (national) culture, but exactly how such policy makers work to have this policy also legitimated by the dominant voting majority could be of particular interest for other policy makers or policy entrepreneurs/brokers seeking to develop policies or find niches for policy innovations based on alternative bases to the dominant national culture, including those they would like to import from other countries. This could imply that the ultimate shaping of public policy in different sectors may be more or less ‘national’ depending on the issue, the stakeholders and policy entrepreneurs involved.

5.5 Methods for understanding and supporting multi-cultural policy dialogue and development

International collaboration on policy issues and partnership projects often falter or misunderstandings develop depending on the cultural awareness of facilitators and participants. In fact, this is relevant for many multi-stakeholder collaboration attempts within countries or regions due to differing organisational and personal cultures, although here it is of particular interest to determine the potential acuteness of these issues in developing effective international policy dialogue, development and learning. Many of the meeting formats and facilitation structures used in international meetings stem from different (often western) countries and do not always have the ability to promote sincere and equal cross-country dialogue due to communication norms and preferences that stem in large part from national cultural orientations and biases (see Lewis (2006) for discussion on cultural communication patterns). More often than not, policy recommendations that stem from such meetings may not actually represent consensus or agreement due to differences in decision-making and communication practices in different countries, with real decisions later being made separately and politics continuing to play out to influence uptake or blocking of the original recommendations. The question then becomes: what methods can actually be developed for specific cross-country partnerships and international dialogues where real joint decision-making processes can be appreciated by the partners and lead to better mutual understanding and policy outcomes? And who can most effectively develop and broker these dialogues and partnerships, and what skills might they need to enhance this cross-cultural translation and practice?
5.6 The role of public policy in developing and particularly shifting national cultures

Early on in this review the importance of understanding culture as a constantly evolving phenomenon was emphasised. Most of this review has then focused on the role of national cultures in shaping public policy, but there is another related question that is of just as significant importance: which is to understand the role that public policy can play in developing and shifting national cultures. For example, there is evidence that many continued neo-liberal policies have led to increasing levels of individualism in many countries. However, just how these changes take place and what timeframes of specific policies are required to shift cultures significantly is of interest for those developing public policy and those voting for politicians and their policies. This then leads to the question of how policies can be designed in a culturally-aware way to either reinforce or slowly adapt national cultures to more ‘preferred’ settings; for example, the current (sometimes heated) debate about Australians perceiving themselves as egalitarian but the political, cultural and historical reality seeming not always to match (e.g. DFAT, 2014; Cater, 2013; Rundle, 2013). The trouble then to look for is when policies do not lead to the desired (national) cultural outcomes and how this can potentially be redressed.

This agenda does not seek to be exhaustive and there are likely to be many other questions of interest between national cultures and public policy that may be of interest to others or particular policy domains. It is hoped that this review has provided some ‘food for thought’ and inspiration for further discussion on the role of national culture in shaping public policy and the development of more culturally-aware public policy both in Australia and internationally.
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