# CULTURAL CITIZENSHIP AND COMMUNITY INDICATOR PROJECTS
# APPROACHES AND CHALLENGES IN THE LOCAL/MUNICIPAL CONTEXT[1]

## NANCY DUXBURY

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

nancy@cultureandcommunities.ca

## KEYWORDS

*Cultural Citizenship, Community Indicators, Cultural Diversity, Cultural Indicators, Community Wellbeing, Community Sustainability*

## ABSTRACT

*This paper explores how the concept of cultural citizenship may inform the evolving practice of community indicator projects and address some of the challenges faced in developing and incorporating meaningful cultural indicators into these projects. Part 1 presents a brief overview of community indicator projects in the United States and Canada, and the status of cultural indicators in this field. Part 2 describes the approaches undertaken by two leading organisations to introduce cultural citizenship issues into their work and knowledge base. Part 3 presents some key factors influencing the development of cultural indicators within community indicator projects, and assesses opportunities for aligning and linking cultural citizenship issues more closely with those of the community indicator projects.*

Some of them were born here and some were born in Vietnam, but they all want to be fully-fledged members of the civic community in Santa Clara County that is now their home. And they want to be part of a democracy that does not require them to erase their cultural identity and traditions. How could they dance without them? As they dance the dragon, they are enacting a new model of citizenship that is identifiably cultural as well as intercultural, and not assimilated to any single, supposedly 'neutral' civic standard. – *Pia Moriarty (2004:7)*

This paper is situated between two domains: the evolving concept of cultural citizenship and the evolving practice of community indicator projects. *Cultural citizenship* examines the formative role of culture in constructing and understanding citizenship practices such as identity formation and the altruistic behaviours that contribute to a collective's ability to "live together." Cultural citizenship focuses on cultural expression, production, and participation as key avenues through which citizenship develops and "lives."[2] The field of community indicators, contextualised in conceptions of community wellbeing, sustainability, and grassroots democracy, forms both an evolving practice and a conceptual frame for considering cultural citizenship at the local level.[3]

The paper is divided into three parts. Part 1 presents a brief overview of community indicator projects in the United States and Canada, and the status of cultural indicators in this field. Part 2 describes the approaches undertaken by two leading organisations to introduce cultural citizenship issues into their work and knowledge base. Part 3 presents some factors influencing the development of cultural indicators within community indicator projects, and assesses opportunities for aligning and linking cultural citizenship issues more closely with those of the community indicator projects.

**PART 1: THE EVOLVING FIELD OF COMMUNITY INDICATOR PROJECTS**

The field of community indicator projects is continuously and dynamically evolving as conceptual and practical issues are negotiated, lessons are learned and shared, and projects adapt and realign themselves. The projects are

generally driven by motivations arising from two directions. On the one hand, it is a movement driven by "grassroots leaders seeking better ways to measure progress, to engage community members in a dialogue about the future, and to change community outcomes" (John S. and James L. Knight Foundation et al. 2001: 13). On the other hand, it is also informed or influenced by general efforts to improve "social" indicators, often developed in response to government and social scientists' widespread aspirations "to develop better measures of progress and to meet the demands for greater accountability in government policies and programs" (Madden 2004: 4).

In general, indicators are defined as "bits of information that summarise the characteristics of systems or highlight what is happening in a system," information bits that can "simplify complex phenomena" and enable a community to "gauge the general status of a system to inform action" (P. Berry, cited in City of Ottawa 2003a: 3). They may be quantitative or qualitative in nature, and a balance between the two is typically sought, and they need to "rest on a robust knowledge base ... which is constantly refreshed by research, both pure and applied" (Mercer 2005: 11). There is also a growing awareness of the need to balance the use of indicators with other types of information and the importance of analysis in the process of producing meaning from them.

The projects usually act as information clearinghouses, organisers, analysts, and communicators, and do not collect the raw data themselves. Their key functions are: to develop overarching conceptual frameworks; to identify, select, and link data sources with these conceptual frameworks; to analyse and make the findings meaningful; and to present all this to the community. They also act as a civic engagement agent, as an important point of connection for a diverse populace and a means to become involved in defining and shaping the community. Thus, infused in all their work is the desire for change and improvement in the community.

When indicator projects are initially under development, key concerns are the development of a meaningful set of indicators within a coherent conceptual framework, and the identification and acquisition of reliable and relatable data. Once the projects are established, indicator projects take on additional issues and often "reside in a state of suspended tension between the mandate to provide objective measures of change and the critique that they do not sufficiently drive change" (Sustainable Seattle 2005a). Consequently, projects are very interested in identifying "leverage points," that is, opportunities to initiate large change with relatively less investment. The Boston Indicators Project has attempted to resolve this tension through the use of systems thinking to identify "high-leverage points" through systematic analysis and through dialogue at large and small-scale convenings. The Boston project now operates on a dual track – the data portal track and the civic agenda track – and since 2005 has released an

"emerging civic agenda." This agenda is explicitly presented within a "taking action" context, with links to ways to get involved and examples of current initiatives in each agenda area.

Another intersection exists between government performance measures and community indicators. Indicators are often incorporated into evaluation frameworks, as tools to evaluate governance/investment success and/or to assess investment impacts. Administrative systems and controls may incorporate indicators on internal processes as well as outside community impacts, and these systems may link indicators to budgetary processes and funding decisions. As Sustainable Seattle (2005a) notes, "Government performance measures, intended to quantify the outcomes of government programmes, and community indicators, meant to quantify the health and wellbeing of a community, are not the same. Although they may overlap, they derive from different perspectives and serve different purposes." A key issue is how these two kinds of measures could be made more compatible and mutually reinforcing, and how this might be done.

The choice and development of indicators in each project is informed by a wide range of factors, including the overarching goals and guiding framework of the project, the values and aspirations of the project participants in the community, and developments in the larger field(s) of indicators and related research areas.[4] The primary focus for each project is its immediate geographical territory, and they are typically very locally focused. However, indicators are also used to evaluate one's (competitive) position vis-à-vis other jurisdictions, and there is a growing desire to be aware of what is being done elsewhere and to know "how we compare." Related to this concern for comparable benchmarks is the desire to know whether an observed change is a local issue or more widespread trend.

**THE EMERGENCE OF ARTS AND CULTURE AS AN INDICATOR AREA**

Within this broader context, cultural and arts considerations have gained increasing prominence, especially in neighbourhood-based models. This is due, in some measure, to the Arts and Culture Indicators in Community Building Project within the Urban Institute's National Neighbourhood Indicators Partnership in the United States. The Arts and Culture Indicators project brought research on cultural indicators into the broader discussion of "neighborhood indicators" that the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership promoted (see Jackson & Herranz Jr. 2002).

Including indicators related to arts and culture in individual projects is now generally widespread, although it varies from very prominent (Boston Foundation) to slight or not at all. Organisations specialising in community indicators

generally include at least a few culture-related indicators in their lists but, in general, contributions to this field are dispersed, diverse, and largely disconnected. Only rarely are projects (such as that of Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley 2003) entirely focused on cultural indicators. In Canada, efforts to include cultural indicators in community indicator projects to date are generally less developed, although some have emerged out of community and cultural planning situations and, frequently, administrative/governance needs for measurable indicators of progress. The recent emergence of a national network of researchers interested in cultural and quality-of-life indicators in small cities in Canada[5] and the informal network of researchers and practitioners brought together for a full-day workshop on developing cultural indicators at the local level in late 2006 (see Duxbury 2007) are promising.

To date, in general, "comprehensive indicators of the cultural vitality of a community" have been difficult to find (Rettig 2002), and a comprehensive, integrating framework has yet to form. Typically what also has been missing is the issue of "how arts and culture contributes to social health" (Chris Dwyer, cited in AtKisson 1999: 3). The existing cultural indicators in community indicator projects generally fall into two categories: *what we do* (actions, investments) and *outside conditions* (progress toward our goals). The linking (and evaluative) question of "What impact have we made?" lies between these two measurement areas, but many projects do not adequately address this question.

## PART 2: TWO RECENT APPROACHES TO INTRODUCING CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES ON CITIZENSHIP INTO THE KNOWLEDGE BASE

Two recent exploratory initiatives undertaken by leaders in developing cultural indicators within the community indicator field are of interest for their different approaches to what can be defined as cultural indicators of citizenship. It should be noted that these initiatives exist either as a complementary study (Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley) or as a specific module of a larger community indicators project (The Boston Foundation), and were not fully integrated into the organisations' other cultural indicators work.

### CULTURAL INITIATIVES SILICON VALLEY – IMMIGRANT PARTICIPATORY ARTS

In 2002, Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley[6] commissioned cultural anthropologist Dr. Pia Moriarty to observe, document, and assess the rich domain of participatory performing arts groups operating within the immigrant populations that constitute the majority of Silicon Valley's population. Moriarty's qualitative, exploratory study,

*Immigrant Participatory Arts: An Insight into Community-building in Silicon Valley,* published in 2004, focuses on publicly accessible community celebrations and festivals over a six-month period.[7]

The study found that the dominant reason for the existence of amateur arts groups in immigrant communities derived from a strong desire of parents to maintain the structure, values, language, and traditions of their families:

> Immigrant adults put energy into culture-based arts to provide a protected space for children and young people to grow and stay connected to their resettling communities. This is art for the sake of the family, and it is more often about teaching and culture transmission than about individual expressiveness and artistic freedom. (Moriarty 2004: 25)

The study concluded that the participatory arts serve essential functions for Silicon Valley's immigrants and refugees in their ability to help them assimilate (to become civically and socially engaged) as well as maintain their cultural identity. The study notes:

> Official government agencies count and admit immigrants as individuals, but the immigrants realize that they must reconstitute themselves as families. Immigrants survive not as individuals, but as members of large and expanding social molecules. Newcomer parents know that if their children are to prosper ... they will have to embody their bonded cultural traditions, and in addition, know how to bridge beyond them. (p. 24)

The majority of cultural practices examined in this study combined both bridging and bonding social capital in the practices, presenting an important contribution to the either/or debate launched by Robert Putnum. Moriarty writes:

> Participatory community arts are one of the strongest channels that immigrants have for self-assertion as authoritative adults, teachers of their children, and allies to their new friends and neighbours. This study documents a pattern of artistic adaptation that affirms the living heritages of immigrant and refugee communities, and at the same time solidifies their new connections to mainstream civic life in Silicon Valley.
>
> The pattern is both/and, not either/or. ... Artistic production in this context is bonded, or affirming of the original in-group culture. At the same time, participatory ethnic arts serve as a powerful vehicle for bridging – connecting with other cultural groups and civic allies. (p. 11)

The study's findings are meant to be indicative rather than exhaustive; and are meant to identify cultural patterns as well as lay groundwork for additional studies of trends in art making.

An appendix that compares the study with a similar one in Chicago looking at informal arts practices (Wali, Severson, & Longoni 2002) shows significant variations between the situations, emphasising the dangers of uncritically generalising from either study. Nonetheless, it does introduce important observations and analysis of the real-life cultural practices of immigrants to the region, and the ways in which these cultural practices play a key role in developing and establishing connections and citizenship in their new home. The study suggests that "immigrant participatory arts offer a new community arts paradigm for our mobile world, a vibrant source of social energy, and a ready means of proceeding in the larger task of community-building amidst diversity" (p. 8). It also provides a good example of the type of grounded, qualitative baseline understanding that is so needed in order to even begin to develop meaningful indicators of changes and social impacts, and the practices of cultural citizenship.

**THE BOSTON FOUNDATION – VIBRANT EXPRESSIONS OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY**

The Boston region is one of the most ethnically diverse cities in the United States, with "residents whose origins reflect 50 nationalities and ethnicities and who speak more than 100 distinct languages and dialects" (Boston Indicators Project website). Thus, the Boston Foundation's Boston Indicators Project includes "vibrant expressions of cultural diversity" as a goal within the Cultural Life and the Arts section. Documenting this goal began with the addition of the Greater Boston Cultural Resources Survey in March 2005, followed by the addition of measurements regarding demographically representative cultural institution leadership in Greater Boston, and public festivals and celebrations. These three components provide complementary observations on: (a) a breadth of culturally diverse community resources, (b) the racial and gender diversity of boards of cultural institutions[8], and (c) public festivities and celebrations, "opportunities to experience and share new cultural traditions."[9]

The Greater Boston Cultural Resources Survey was designed "to assess movement along a continuum of cultural expression, as groups develop resources to transact their own businesses, move toward reflecting themselves to the larger community, and grow in ways that begin to reshape the cultural landscape of the city" (Boston Indicators Project website 2008). A "cultural continuum" model provided the underlying structure for the survey's design:

History shows that there is a similar path that new groups often take. Newcomers often first develop resources to *celebrate their culture* and transact business internally, such as informal gathering places or places of worship. They then often *formalize these resources* and also develop ways to *share their presence to the broader community* through murals, restaurants, shops or festivals. Ultimately, diverse groups *reshape the social and cultural environment* of the community and region. (Survey website 2005)

By mid-2008, the survey (streamlined from its initial format) contained 13 questions over two web pages. The questions are in forms such as "Are there social or cultural clubs specific to this ethnic or cultural community? If yes, please list." and 'Are there restaurants, grocery stores or specialty stores that serve or sell products from this ethnic or cultural community? If yes, please list." With each such question, respondents are given two fields in which to type in examples.[10]

The results of the survey are not located on the Boston Indicators Project website, but links to the websites of *Kaleidoscope*, Greater Boston's Multicultural Network, and *The Ethnic Media Project*, a project of the Center on Media and Society at the University of Massachusetts Boston, imply that the findings are integrated into the extensive online directories maintained by these two organisations.

The Boston Indicators Project provides an example of indicator evolution within a project over time.[11] As a part of the Arts and Culture section, the Cultural Resources Survey provides a reference point to documenting broadly defined cultural resources and practices in the region, and serves as a point of engagement for citizens. It began with a simple conceptual model of a process of attachment, a means to categorise aspects of this process, and a range of possible items to consider as cultural resources in this context. Its findings feed into publicly accessible resource directories maintained by outside organisations with ongoing complementary interests and audiences.

The later addition of measurements regarding the diversity of the leadership of cultural institutions in Greater Boston greatly strengthens the documentation of "vibrant expressions of cultural diversity," reflecting the openness of cultural institutions to embrace the diversity of the region within their leadership structures. The third component, the existence of public festivals and celebrations rooted in the cultural diversity of Boston neighbourhoods, documents opportunities for the "general" public to experience the cultures in their region, and an observation of the extent to which culturally diverse communities have been able to foster and grow these (neighbourhood-based) events into

larger public festivities and celebrations.

Through these three components, the Boston Foundation and partner organisations have built a more robust perspective on the topic of "vibrant expressions of cultural diversity." The area incorporates cultural community/grassroots resources, opportunities for exploring and sharing cultures with others outside the core cultural group, and the extent to which diversity is embedded within the leadership of the region's major cultural institutions.

**PART 3: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES IN LINKING AND ALIGNING CULTURAL CITIZENSHIP WITH COMMUNITY INDICATOR PROJECTS**

**INFLUENCES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL INDICATORS**

The choice and development of cultural indicators in community indicator projects is generally influenced from three directions: (1) the indicators actually being used in various projects; (2) the conceptual and theoretical grounding of concepts and frameworks guiding the selection of indicators; and (3) the use-contexts and pressures of practice. These three areas provide avenues for possible alignment or embedding of cultural citizenship considerations within community indicator initiatives.

*1. Cultural indicators in use: Legacies and influences of practice*
In the development of indicators, the leading edge practice has a significant influence on new and emerging projects and initiatives. As particular indicators are chosen, developed, and used, they become examples or even models for other projects. Similarly, omitting particular types of indicators in projects also sends a signal, establishing a pattern that others may adopt. The "thinness" of cultural indicators within community indicator projects has meant that the cultural indicators that do exist have played very important roles in providing both knowledge and assurance to others. This suggests that a significant pilot demonstration or integrated project/module specifically addressing cultural indicators of citizenship may go far as a model for other projects.

*2. Conceptual influences: Grounding concepts and determining frameworks*
One of the key deficiencies limiting the advancement of cultural indicators has been the lack of a conceptual research base underlying the choice of art and culture indicators (Duxbury 2001). This conceptual deficiency has two components: the need to develop indicators meaningful to understanding and guiding cultural development, and the

need to relate cultural indicators to concepts of quality of life and sustainability. Evolving concepts related to cultural citizenship may help inform both of these areas.

*2.1. Indicators of cultural development.* Christopher Madden argues that although indicators are not in widespread use in cultural policy, thinking on cultural indicators is now well developed. Even so, his review of the cultural indicator literature revealed a number of common analytical and coordination issues: confusion about what indicators are and how they should be used, a lack of quality data, unwieldy frameworks (consisting in many cases of "large matrices of indicator 'wish lists' ") and vague policy objectives (Madden 2004: 6). Madden also notes that "Analysts rarely devote sufficient time to exploring indicator theory or articulating clearly the interrelationships between indicators, data, and statistics, and between indicators, policy evaluation and cultural analysis" (p. 6). Further research attention to these matters is needed to inform and guide the development and implementation of meaningful cultural indicators in practice.

In relation to community-level cultural indicators, community goals for cultural development and cultural planning objectives also come into play. Conceptual research informs not only the development of selected indicators, but also the development of conceptual frameworks to *guide and frame* an entire project, and the choice of related indicators within these frames. (A good example of this is articulated in Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley's *Creative Community Index*.)

Through these conceptual rationales and frameworks, distinctive community values and approaches are articulated. For instance, in the United States, the Silicon Valley project focused on building a creative community, rooted in interactions among cultural activity, business innovation, and civic vitality. In contrast, the Urban Institute's cultural indicator efforts are focused on community building in neighbourhoods. Can such diverse efforts be rationalised and drawn together, or would the particular purposes of each project be undermined in the process?

Two Canadian examples are also instructive here. The City of Ottawa and the City of Toronto each proposed a set of cultural indicators to measure progress on the cities' cultural plans (City of Ottawa 2003b; City of Toronto 2003). The differing priorities, contexts, and approaches to cultural development in these municipalities are evident in their choices of cultural indicators: Toronto's indicators relate largely to economic development and activity levels while Ottawa proposed measures that generally focus on opportunity levels and citizen participation, activities and partnerships (Duxbury 2004). These official plans and associated indicators exist alongside more broadly based

community indicator projects. They do not replace arts and culture in these community projects but most likely inform them. These examples illustrate the tension between the importance of community relevance and the challenges of consistency and comparability across communities (see also Duxbury 2007).

*2.2. Culture's roles in quality of life and sustainability.* Concepts of quality of life or sustainability guide, frame, and determine the categories and measures within most community indicator projects. However, definitions of quality of life and sustainability articulated in these projects seldom refer to arts and culture explicitly. Furthermore, while the use of arts and culture indicators is generally widespread in community indicator projects, they are not yet universal practice nor are they widely understood. A beginning point for including arts and culture in more quality of life or sustainability projects is thus to integrate cultural considerations into, or build onto, the prevailing frameworks in place.

In many prevailing sustainability frameworks, if culture is included, it usually appears within a concept of social sustainability. However, culture is also being explored as a fourth pillar of sustainability, the others being the environmental, economic, and social pillars. Thinking about culture as the fourth pillar of sustainability has been most actively discussed in Australia through the activities of the Cultural Development Network[12] and has also emerged in Canadian policy circles and practices. It is also a foundation of the *Agenda 21 for Culture* (approved at the IV Forum of Local Authorities of Porto Alegre, May 2004) and UNESCO's *Decade of Education for Sustainable Development* (2005-14). The four-pillar model of sustainability promises to be a useful platform and framework for integrating cultural considerations into the broader sustainability context.

In Canada, the federal government has taken a leading role in adopting this model of sustainability as the conceptual framework for the development of municipal Integrated Community Sustainability Plans. These ICSP plans are, in turn, linked to gas tax revenues for municipalities.[13] The Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities has been conducting some research to advance thinking in this area (see, for example, Duxbury & Gillette 2007). Some applied developments in this area can also be found. For example, the first official plans of the newly amalgamated City of Ottawa (Ottawa 20/20, officially adopted in 2003) were based on a goal of sustainable development, where social, environmental, cultural, and economic issues would be kept in balance. One of the overarching 20/20 principles is that Ottawa is a "creative city, rich in heritage, unique in identity," and arts and heritage were positioned as a pillar of the new City of Ottawa and core to its future development. The *Ottawa 20/20 Arts and Heritage Plan* was developed within this framework.

In both official planning and more general community contexts, our collective understanding of culture-based roles, dynamics, and relationships in a community would be strengthened by further conceptual grounding to link and integrate arts and culture more soundly into the prevailing concepts of quality of life, sustainability, and social sustainability that frame various projects. The complexity of this work should not be understated. As Jackson & Herranz Jr. (2002) note, "researchers should not confuse searching for clarity with expecting to find simplicity" (p. 34).[14]

Cultural citizenship scholarship is poised to address many of these challenges through providing better understanding of culture-based and culture-infused relationships; identifying what these activities, participation rates, expenditure patterns, etc. actually mean to the stakeholder communities; and considering "how they might contribute, for example, to human, social, and cultural capital and capacity building, to identity and sense of place, to 'social impacts.' To citizenship in its fullest sense..." (Mercer 2005: 12).

Research that provided conceptual grounding and better understanding of the roles, benefits, and impacts of culture in a community or society could address a range of research needs, such as:

- Providing conceptual and empirical roots to underpin arguments to include arts and culture in broader frameworks of quality of life or sustainability indicators;
- Helping link inputs and outputs to outcomes;
- Informing the development of selected indicator(s) that illustrate particular connections, benefits, or impacts; and
- Suggesting how best to integrate and present these topics and issues within the prevailing quality of life and sustainability analyses and reporting frameworks.

Consideration of the four-pillar model of sustainability as a possible point of connection between the two fields and as an organising framework would be a promising step in the development of shared body of knowledge and understanding.

*3. Contextual influences: Use-contexts and pressures of practice*

As described at the beginning of this paper, community indicator projects develop their own dynamics, occupy particular roles, and respond to competing pressures and environmental dynamics in a range of ways. The contextual influences at work in instigating, developing, and implementing cultural indicators (and influencing the sustainability of cultural indicator projects) should not be underestimated. The environment in which indicators are developed and used is complex and dynamic. Indicators are used in many processes – coordination, planning, evaluation, analysis, education, enlightenment, and decision-making – across contexts such as governance, philanthropy, and advocacy.

Community indicator projects are developed and exist as an important component of communities' leadership and governance systems and structures. The frameworks and indicators that are developed, maintained, evolved, and explained through these projects serve as tools and inputs into governance systems. As such, they also serve as policy catalysts and tools for mobilising change. As Mercer (2005) notes, the strategic and political significance of culture lies in its formative roles in "constructing, understanding – and sometimes contesting – versions of citizenship and enhancing our definitions and practices of citizenship beyond the formal and legal definitions" (p. 18). Community indicator projects present an opportunity for highlighting these relationships and dynamics, and integrating cultural citizenship considerations in local knowledge and governance systems.

**KEY CHALLENGES, POTENTIAL POINTS OF CONNECTION**

Significant advances in the development of cultural indicators for community-level indicator projects require attention to all three areas discussed above. In this context, greater attention to the following five key gaps in cultural indicator development is needed:

- The indicators in use and in development;
- Conceptual and empirical research both in the development of indicators meaningful to understanding and guiding cultural development, and in relating cultural indicators to quality of life and/or sustainability contexts;
- The development of relevant sources of reliable data;
- Methodologies and practices of interpreting and presenting indicators; and
- Coordination issues (Duxbury 2005).

Although this scope may seem daunting, the field evolves by many small steps in both conceptual and practical ways. Towards this end, and to further point out potential "points of connection," the following list may serve to highlight some (interrelated) challenges that could be addressed from the perspective of cultural citizenship:

*Re: Conceptual understanding*

- Clarifying what markers best capture meaningful cultural vitality in cities and communities
- Clarifying cultural citizenship concepts and issues, and translating them into community-digestible vocabulary and indicators
- Integrating cultural considerations into prevailing conceptual frameworks defining and guiding the community indicator (and related) projects

*Re: Use-context understanding and appreciation*

Indicators are developed in large part in real-life situations, contextualised by a wide range of competing dynamics and influences – full engagement and partnership with those immersed within and knowledgeable about these contexts is essential to help ensure real applicability and meaningfulness to real-life situations and practices.

- What are the key contextual and influencing factors at play in particular projects and community situations? How can these factors be addressed?
- Related to this, greater attention to the contextualised uses for indicators is needed: How are the indicators used (and, perhaps, misused)? How are they made meaningful to the general community, and in policy and planning contexts?

*Re: Bridging disconnects*

- Integrating cultural diversity and cultural citizenship issues meaningfully into existing and new projects' development and evolution
- Developing connections between different areas of research and activity to begin to develop an "integrating net" and network(s), and also to clarify differences in approaches which cannot be integrated but stand as alternate perspectives

**NOTES**

1. This paper was initially prepared for a workshop on "Cities and Shared Citizenship: Developing Indicators of Cultural Diversity" at the 10th International Metropolis conference, Our Diverse Cities: Migration, Diversity and Change, Toronto, Canada, 18 October 2005. The paper has been revised and updated for this journal.

2. For an overview of the emergence and contemporary uses of the term cultural citizenship, see Stone et al. 2008.

3. This scope of this paper does not incorporate the numerous action-oriented ethno-cultural inclusivity initiatives that address human resource situations and municipal services to communities across Canada. An approach that would bridge these initiatives with the community indicator projects, perhaps under an integrating *community governance* perspective would be valuable. See Icart, Labelle, & Antonius 2005, which would valuably inform this approach.

4. For a review of current literature on cultural indicators, including discussions on what are cultural indicators and relationships between data, indicators, and analysis/evaluation, see Madden 2004, Appendix 2.

5. This network is currently anchored by a project entitled "Mapping Quality of Life and the Culture of Small Cities," which is funded through the Community-University Research Alliance program of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. The project secretariat is located at Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops, BC. For more information, see: http://www.smallcities.ca.

6. After 10 years, Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley closed its doors on 31 December 2006. Its resources are accessible here: http://www.ci-sv.org/index_old.shtml

7. Interestingly, in a pilot project to contact practicing artists, the amateur artists participating in a county-wide Open Studios network "uniformly rejected notions that their art-making came out of, or fed into, ongoing community frameworks. Indeed, this question was received as almost hostile, interpreted as another instance of stereotyping free individual artists who are working to break out of received categories for their artwork" (Moriarty 2004: 9-10).

8. The importance of this indicator area is described on the Project website: "Measuring demographically representative leadership in Boston's major cultural institutions enables us to assess their openness to new leadership and ideas; their responsiveness to new populations and audiences; avenues for the expression of Boston's increasingly rich cultural heritage; and the capacity of diverse constituencies to influence the cultural landscape of the city. Leaders recruited from diverse sectors of Boston can help to grow and attract new audiences, enrich Boston's cultural menu with both traditional expressions of culture and new hybrid forms of expression, and broaden participation in the arts. Representative leadership also ensures that dynamic and talented young people, such as those who attend the city's visual and performing arts colleges, will not be lost to other, more welcoming cities."
(http://www.bostonindicators.org/indicatorsproject/culturallife/indicator.aspx?id=1146).

9.  Boston Indicators Project – '2.4.3 Public festivals and celebrations' website.

    http://www.bostonindicators.org/indicatorsproject/culturallife/indicator.aspx?id=1154

10. In the initial 2005 survey, the question format was fixed choice (yes/no/I don't know), implying that the primary goal was to begin documenting the existence or lack of these types of resources. By 2008, the survey was framed as an opportunity for respondents "to share your special knowledge of the heritage, commercial establishments, and traditions of various communities that others might like to explore as well". The questions had evolved into open fields in which respondents were asked to list examples.

11. An update of the Boston Foundation indicators is due to be released in 2008 but was not available at the time of writing.

12. In *The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability*, Jon Hawkes develops an initial framework on which to explore this concept, rooted in Australia's community cultural development as well as UNESCO's cultural diversity and policy traditions. In *Understanding Culture,* Hawkes further explores this terrain, pointing out, for instance, the debates embodied in the more well known social, economic and environmental pillars of the sustainability model. Much conceptual work remains to be done to more fully flesh out thinking about culture as a pillar of sustainability so that these ideas are more fully grounded within sustainability theory and are also readily understandable to a general citizenry and on-the-ground practices.

13. In order to access gas tax funds, municipalities are required to have an Integrated Community Sustainability Plan, which is defined as: "A long-term plan, developed in consultation with community members that provides direction for the community to realize sustainability objectives it has for the environmental, cultural, social and economic dimensions of its identity'

    (The Natural Step website: http://www.naturalstep.ca/scp/sustainablecommunities.html).

14. Jackson & Herranz Jr. (2002) identify two main theoretical and methodological challenges to documenting arts/culture/creativity impacts: "having definitions that are either too narrow to capture what we are looking for or too broad for policy use" and "trying to establish simple causal relationships in an area that is inherently complex – with many interacting forces and about which not enough is yet known to justify efforts to build formal causal models, even complex ones' (pp. 34-5).

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*Agenda 21 for Culture.* (2004).

English: http://www.agenda21cultura.net/en/ag_cultura_en.pdf

French: http://www.agenda21cultura.net/fr/ag_cultura_fr.pdf

Atkisson, A. (1999, Winter). Rethinking cultural indicators. *Urban Quality Indicators*, no. 12, 3-4.

Boston Indicators Project. (2008). Cultural life and the arts. Webpage.

http://www.bostonindicators.org/indicatorsproject/culturallife/Default.aspx

Boston Indicators Project. (2004). The Greater Boston Cultural Resources Survey. Web-based survey.

http://www.tbf.org/SelectSurvey/TakeSurvey.asp?SurveyID=8KK6o4KLln94M

City of Ottawa. (2003a). *Indicator workbook. Tracking our progress: Exploring Ottawa's quality of life indicators.*

Unpublished internal document.

City of Ottawa. (2003b). *Ottawa 20/20 arts plan.* Ottawa: City of Ottawa. http://www.ottawa.ca/2020/arts/toc_en.shtml

City of Toronto, Culture Division. (2003). *Culture plan for the creative city.* Toronto: City of Toronto.

http://www.city.toronto.on.ca/culture/cultureplan.htm

Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley. (2003). *Creative community index: Measuring progress toward a vibrant Silicon*

*Valley.* Silicon Valley: CISV. http://www.ci-sv.org/cna.shtml

Duxbury, N. (2001). *Exploring the role of arts and culture in urban sustainable development: A journey in progress.*

Paper presented at Table d'Hôte on 'Building Sustainable Communities: Culture and Social Cohesion,' Hull, Quebec,

Canada, 5 December 2001.

Duxbury, N. (2004). *Creative cities: Principles and practices.* Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

http://cprn.org/en/doc.cfm?doc=1082

Duxbury, N. (2005). Cultural indicators and benchmarks in community indicator projects. In C. Andrew, M. Gattinger, M. S. Jeannotte, & W. Straw (Eds) *Accounting for culture: Thinking through cultural citizenship* (pp. 257-72). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Duxbury, N. (2007, April). *Cities and communities: Cultural indicators at the local level – Workshop report.* Vancouver: Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities, Simon Fraser University. http://www.cultureandcommunities.ca/downloads/indicators-2006/Report-Indicators.pdf

Duxbury, N., & Gillette, E. (2007). *Exploring the cultural dimensions of sustainability.* Creative City News: Special Edition 4. Vancouver: Creative City Network of Canada. http://www.creativecity.ca/news/special-edition 4/index.html

Hawkes, J. (2001). *The fourth pillar of sustainability: Culture's essential role in public planning.* Melbourne: Cultural Development Network; Common Ground Publishing.

Hawkes, J. (2003). *Understanding culture.* http://www.culturaldevelopment.net

Icart, J.-C., Labelle, M.. & Antonius, R. (2005). *Indicators for evaluating municipal policies aimed at fighting racism and discrimination.* Montreal: UNESCO and the Center for Research on Immigration, Ethnicity and Citizenship.

Jackson, M.-R., & Herranz Jr., J. (2002). *Culture counts in communities: A framework for measurement.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute. http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=310834

John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, Princeton Survey Research Associates, American Institutes for Research, & The Urban Institute. (2001, March). *Listening and learning: Community indicator profiles of Knight Foundation communities and the nation.* Miami: John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. http://www.knightfdn.org/publications/listeningandlearning/index.html

Madden, C. (2004, July). *Statistical indicators for arts policy: Discussion paper.* Sydney: International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies. http://www.ifacca.org/ifacca2/en/default.asp

Mercer, C. (2005). From indicators to governance to the mainstream: Tools for cultural policy and citizenship. In C. Andrew, M. Gattinger, M. S. Jeannotte, & W. Straw (Eds) *Accounting for culture: Thinking through cultural citizenship* (pp. 9-20)*.* Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Moriarty, P. (2004, April). *Immigrant participatory arts: An insight into community-building in Silicon Valley.* San José, CA: Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley. http://www.ci-sv.org/pdf/Immigrant_Arts_LR.pdf

Rettig, H. K. [John S. and James L. Knight Foundation]. (2002, Fall). *Measuring the impact of the arts in communities.* News article. http://www.knightfdn.org

Stone, M., Destrempes, H., Foote, J., & Jeannotte, M.S. (2008). Immigration and cultural citizenship: Responsibilities, rights, and indicators. In J. Biles, M. Burstein, & J. Frideres (Eds) *Immigration and integration in Canada in the twenty-first century*. Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Sustainable Seattle. (2005a). Conference agenda for "Driving change and getting results: Exploring approaches to performance measures and community indicators in the Cascadia Region," 13-14 September 2005. http://www.sustainableseattle.org/confagenda

Sustainable Seattle. (2005b). Toward a sustainable future: The King County/Seattle Indicator & Strategies for Action Project. http://www.sustainableseattle.org/Programs/RegionalIndicators/IndUpdate

UNESCO. Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005-14). Webpage. http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=27234&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

Wali, A., Severson, R., & Longoni, M. (2002, May). *Informal arts: Finding cohesion, capacity and other cultural benefits in unexpected places.* Chicago, IL: Center for Arts Policy at Columbia College Chicago. http://www2.colum.edu/center_for_arts_policy/published_research.htm