A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies: A Study of Three Croatian Candidates for the European Capital of Culture

Desirée Campagna [*]
Daniela Angelina Jelinčić [**]

The implications of multiculturalism and interculturalism for local cultural policies have been poorly studied and vaguely addressed by European policy instruments such as the Intercultural Cities Index, promoted by the Council of Europe. In the light of this gap, this paper proposes a set of 12 indicators which can be used to evaluate how two approaches to cultural diversity (multicultural and intercultural) are embedded in three dimensions of local cultural poli-

[*] Desirée Campagna, PhD Candidate in "Human Rights, Society and Multi-Level Governance", University of Padua, Italy (doktorski kandidat studija "Ljudska prava, društvo i višestupanjska uprava", Sveučiliša u Padovi, Italija, e-mail: desiree.campagna@phd.unipd.it).

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6841-4707

[**] Daniela Angelina Jelinčić, PhD, Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Development and International Relations, Zagreb, Croatia (znanstveni savjetnik, Institut za razvoj i međunarodne odnose, Zagreb, Hrvatska, e-mail: daniela@irmo.hr).

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9140-8498

48

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

cies (*discourse*, *governance*, and *cultural contents*). Because the European Capital of Culture Programme (ECoC) is considered promising ground for the analysis of city policies, these indicators are employed to compare three Croatian cities (Rijeka, Osijek, and Pula) as they undergo the process of candidature to become European Capitals of Culture. The results emphasize the interrelation of different dimensions of local cultural policies in the promotion of interculturalism, and the recurrence of gastronomy as a sector for experimentation with multicultural and intercultural approaches.

Keywords: multiculturalism, interculturalism, cultural policies, indicators, European Capitals of Culture, Croatia

1. Introduction

Over the past twenty years, increased attention has been paid to the concepts of cultural diversity, multiculturalism, and interculturalism in academic and political discourse. Dramatic social changes related to recent migration flows and the demand for recognition formulated in different contexts by ethnic minorities have fostered the necessity of managing diversity in a way that allows different communities to live together (Bonet & Negrier, 2011; Saukkonen & Pyykkönen, 2008). Against this background, various scholars (Barrett, 2013; Jelinčić, 2012; Landry & Wood, 2008) and several international and European policy documents and initiatives (UNESCO, 2005; Council of Europe, 2008) have stressed the opportunity to pursue an intercultural approach (based on interaction between cultural communities and their mutual enrichment), rather than a multicultural one (centred on the mere coexistence of various and fragmented cultures). Cities, considered to be laboratories of diversity (Ponzini, 2009) and spaces of "everyday negotiations of differences within the local micro-public" (Amin, 2002, p. 2), have been at the centre of this debate around multiculturalism and interculturalism.

The Intercultural Cities Index (ICC Index) promoted by the Council of Europe could be considered the first policy response to the necessity of defining and evaluating the dimensions and implications of the intercultural approach at city level. Designed in order to make cities express their "diversity advantage" (Council of Europe, 2013, p. 26) and to constantly evaluate their progress towards interculturalism according to an interna-

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

49

tionally tested and validated methodology, this index – now adopted in 115 cities around Europe and the world (Council of Europe, 2016) – does not allow for cities to be ranked but rather to engage in "self-reflection, mutual learning and improvement" (Council of Europe, 2007a, p. 1). The ICC Index, composed of 66 indicators grouped in ten dimensions, aims to highlight the "acupuncture" points of interculturalism by facts and phenomena and to capture the uniqueness of the cultural environment of every participating city (Council of Europe, 2013, p. 30). It takes into consideration (1) the city council's commitment to interculturalism; (2) the evaluation of various policies (education, public services, the labour market, culture, public space) through an "intercultural lens"; (3) mediation and conflict resolution; (4) languages; (5) relations with the local media; (6) international outlook; (7) intercultural intelligence; (8) intercultural competence within the administration; (9) welcoming new arrivals; and (10) governance, leadership, and citizenship.

Culture is included in the "intercultural lens" dimension of the ICC Index, but only a few aspects of local cultural policies are taken into consideration, such as the allocation of grants, cultural events, and cultural productions encouraging cultural encounters and the organisation of debates and campaigns on the issue of diversity. Because cultural policy is a fundamental aspect of the political organisation of ethnic and cultural diversity (Saukkonen & Pyykkönen, 2008), its scant consideration may prevent a proper understanding of the legitimisation of forms of cultural expression, of their inclusion or exclusion from the public sphere, and of the possible formation of hierarchies among cultures.

In light of the above, this paper proposes a more comprehensive set of indicators to evaluate interculturalism in local cultural policies. The indicators are designed according to an analytical scheme that considers (a) how two possible approaches to cultural diversity (multicultural and intercultural) are embedded in (b) three dimensions of local cultural policies (*discourse*, *governance*, and *cultural contents*).

The proposed set of indicators has been used to conduct a comparative analysis of the intercultural approach to cultural policies pursued by three Croatian cities (Rijeka, Osijek, and Pula) in the process of running for European Capitals of Culture. The reason for this choice is twofold. First, European Capitals of Culture, as moments of emergence of new forms of cultural governance and interactions between different communities (Németh, 2016), are considered to be interesting cases for the observation of the development of multicultural or intercultural dynamics. The candidature process initiated by each city within this European programme

CROATIAN AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

50

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

serves as comparative ground to study the changes of local cultural policies under the same conditions and pressures.

Secondly, the analysis of Croatian cities is seen as an opportunity to address the broader concept of cultural diversity. Indeed, in these cities the management of diversity due to migration flows is combined with a historical presence of national minorities.

The first chapter presents the theoretical framework, providing both the definitions of cultural diversity, multiculturalism, and interculturalism, as well as an explanation for a three-dimensional analysis of local cultural policies. The second chapter illustrates the set of indicators of interculturalism, clarifying the theoretical assumptions that have guided their identification in the three dimensions concerned (discourse, governance, and cultural contents). The third chapter presents the results of the empirical analysis conducted in the three Croatian cities. The last chapter provides conclusions, further insights, and future research paths.

2. Theoretical Framework

The proposed interculturalism indicators in local cultural policies are grounded in a theoretical framework that adopts a specific approach to (a) the definitions of cultural diversity, multiculturalism, and interculturalism and (b) the analysis of local cultural policies.

Although cultural diversity is not a new phenomenon, there is no easy way to define it. It is "embodied in the uniqueness and plurality of the identities of the groups and societies making up humankind" (UNESCO, 2002, p. 13). Because there is no unique approach to this concept, different terms are often used to describe aspects of cultural diversity such as multiculturalism, cultural pluralism, interculturalism, melting of cultures, transculturalism, and the like.

Monoculturalism represents the hard stance on a compact and monolithic national culture firmly grounded in *Volksgeist*, the national spirit, which must be clearly outlined and protected from the negative influences of other cultures so as not to become *entartet* – degenerate. Multiculturalism is not too far from this explanation because it sees cultural groups as closed units and the most important difference lies in the fact that it represents the belief in the possibility of a peaceful coexistence and the equal treatment of different cultures within a single society, e.g. within the territory of a single country. Interculturalism goes a step further, seeking common features in different

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

51

cultures, which in addition to a peaceful coexistence and tolerance enables dialogue and cooperation. Transculturalism represents the other extreme of culturalism, when compared to monoculturalism, because it involves the fusion (hybridisation, syncretism) of two cultures into one new transculture (Jelinčić, Gulišija & Bekić, 2010, p. 18-19; Jelinčić, 2010, p. 63).

The multiculturalist approach that was adopted from the late 1980s to the early 2000s has now been compromised because it is considered to have contributed to the cultural segregation and ghettoisation of European immigration societies. Interculturalism is seen as an alternative, and on the scheme of interaction between two cultural groups it is much closer to the extreme of fusion, while multiculturalism remains trapped in the half closer to the extreme of conflict. Politicians and experts across Europe are moving away from the attitude whereby cultural diversity is treated as an absolute value and gradually adopting the attitude that emphasizes the need to find common points of different cultures within the framework of liberal democracy and secularism (Jelinčić, 2012).

Regarding the approach adopted to analyse cultural policies, the indicators are meant to address certain specific dimensions of activities that governments undertake in the administration and organisation of cultural programmes and initiatives (Gray, 2010; Moon, 2001). The extent of multiculturalism or interculturalism will be evaluated mainly with reference to explicit cultural policies: namely, to deliberate public interventions that deal with "consciously crafted symbolic works" and "consecrated forms of artistic expressions" (Ahearne, 2009, p. 144). However, in recognition of the strict interrelation between the *explicit* and *implicit* dimension of cultural policies, the indicators should be considered as extendable to the analysis of culture intended as a "way of life", including belief systems, customs, and traditions (Williams, 1976).

Following on from earlier works dealing with the analysis of policy learning (Hall, 1993) and policy change (Graziano, 2011) in other policy areas, the set of indicators has been designed according to a "policy structure approach" in which cultural policy-making is unpacked and various subcomponents examined. These are analysed according to the different dimensions through which collective binding decisions on culture are formulated and implemented. The subcomponents usually include the goals and principles that guide policymakers in a particular field, the procedures and the actors involved, and the instruments used to attain the goal. In this paper, multiculturalism and interculturalism in local cultural policies are analysed according to a tripartite level of analysis that includes the dimensions of (a) discourse, (b) governance, and (c) cultural contents.

52

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

The discourse dimension refers to the underlying vision formulated by the city in developing its branding strategy based on culture. Branding strategies, introduced as a response to urban growth and the urban globalisation phenomena that make cities compete in order to be different and attract new markets, are increasingly focusing on culture. Starting in the 1990s, "culture has become a much more explicit part of urban politics and policies. Multiculturalism has become a code word for social inclusion or exclusion […]. The atmosphere of tolerance that city people historically claim has been charged with the lightning rods of social and cultural 'diversity'. Accepting diversity implies sharing public spaces […] with people who visibly, and quite possibly vehemently, live lives you do not approve of" (Zukin, 1995, p. viii).

Branding strategies often individuate the main features of a product to achieve visibility in a larger market. Because a city is often a blend of the differences it represents, either in physical terms (such as buildings, public spaces, its green areas, etc.) or intangible ones (such as its cultural expressions, social customs, or simply way of life), cultural diversity has become a key theme in stressing each city's uniqueness. The discourse dimension focuses on the analysis of the construction and communication of this cultural image, used to soften the motivation of pure economic branding. Indeed, although the creative city concept[1] was deemed to stimulate economic competitiveness, it also had other benefits with a more human face, focusing on enhancing the citizens' quality of life. Because it includes the system of ideas and standards followed by cultural policymakers, the discourse dimension is embedded in the "very terminology through which actors communicate" (Hall, 1993, p. 279) their initiatives in the cultural domain.

The governance dimension could be conceptualised as the steering mechanism of the cultural policy system, including both the norms and the actors that govern it. On the one hand, it embraces the jointly defined rules and norms that guide the decision-making processes (Schmitter, 2002) aimed at the provision of services and realisation of public initiatives in the realm of culture. On the other hand, it refers to the broader typology of actors that could be involved in cultural policy design and implementa-

---

[1] As emphasized by Anttiroiko (2014), the concept of the creative city is based on the assumption that creative industries and creativity as a generic attribute of social life provide the opportunities to generate business and jobs, and to increase the attractiveness of the local community.

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies …
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

53

tion, as well as to the increasing forms of horizontal interaction that have blurred the boundaries between public and private sectors (Stoker, 1998).

The cultural contents dimension refers to the promotion and realisation of activities, goods, and services that convey identities, values, and meanings (UNESCO, 2005) and define the realm of action of "explicit" cultural policies (Ahearne, 2009). Specifically, it is embedded in the symbolic meanings and artistic and creative aspects of tangible and intangible cultural expressions and of different forms of cultural heritage, whose diversity and continuity is considered intrinsically important (Throsby, 2011). The creation of cultural contents and the promotion of access to these across the population can be considered instruments whereby cultural policies are meant to produce cultural value, increasing "the capability and the potential of culture to affect us" (Holden, 2006, p. 15).

3. The Interculturalism Indicator Set in Local Cultural Policies

This chapter addresses in greater detail the modalities whereby it is possible to evaluate the extent of multiculturalism and interculturalism in the three dimensions of cultural policies, clarifying the theoretical assumptions that have guided the construction of the indicator set.

3.1 The Discourse Dimension

Owing to the work of Charles Landry and Phil Wood (2008), both theoretical indicators and practical toolkits for the development of intercultural cities have been neatly captured; still, there have been few cases dealing with interculturalism indicators in branding strategies. The farthest these two researchers go in this matter is in the area of interculturalism indicators in international relations, such as measuring trade and policy links with partner cities, as well as links with key countries of origin of the migrant population (Landry & Wood, 2008, p. 326).

When it comes to practice, "gentrification, historic preservation and other cultural strategies to enhance the visual appeal of urban spaces" (Zukin, 1995, p. 39) were trendy in the 1960s and 1970s, but have shown serious failures, creating what Zukin calls "urban fear". New solutions had to be found, particularly because today there are few examples of ethnically

CROATIAN AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

monocultural cities. Good practice examples of dealing with multiculturalism in cities are often found in the gastronomy sector. As early as 1995, Zukin wrote about New York restaurants as meeting places for artists and immigrants, whereas the more contemporary example of Toronto followed the same strategy in branding its multicultural diversity through "the language of food", as Wood and Landry named it (2008). Also, festivals proved to be fertile ground for intercultural branding strategies because they naturally attract diverse people and are thus easily packaged for global branding. Moreover, the intercultural aspect is enhanced if the festival is themed around immigration and/or minorities, as in the case of the Trieste event "Spaesati" (Kavoura & Bitsani, 2014). There are, however, few cases of city branding strategies that reflect the diversity of the city as a whole. The often quoted case of the "I amsterdam" branding strategy represents a rare but exceptional example of racial, gender, sexual orientation, cultural, as well as generational diversity present in the fabric of the city. The city of Melbourne also grounds its branding strategy on the historical diversity of cultures. The narrative of "Melbourne, not an ordinary city", focuses on diversities that, while mixing, create a totally new culture (City of Melbourne, 2013).

Therefore, while interculturalism does not occur often in the discourse dimension in the academic sense, examples show that it has been used in practice.

"To allow a multicultural society become intercultural, two conditions must be satisfied: the first is not to engage in the hierarchy of cultures […]. The second considers that it is not sufficient that all values coexist because the acting persons need to learn to negotiate in a democratic way to accept each other's representations and values […]" (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; cited in Kavoura & Bitsani, 2014).

In this article, we base the development of intercultural branding strategies founded on these conditions.

The multicultural approach to city branding strategies focuses on communicating elements of cultural pluralism and the coexistence of different cultures in a city, but without their active collaboration and exchange. This is why multicultural narratives individuate the diversity of cultures by naming these diversities along with the dominant majority, whereas intercultural strategies focus on the city as a whole, including all existing cultures equally. Thus, multicultural cities communicate the existing diversity of rather closed communities, as opposed to the open character of intercultural cities. Multicultural cities recognise tolerance towards others

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

55

in their narratives but do not attribute values to them. They tend to use fixed representations of cultures, predominantly using traditional or ethnic, religious, and autochthonous symbols, while intercultural cities avoid such attributions of belonging, stressing the presence of a cosmopolitan environment.

Kavaratzis has detected a change of focus from the rational character of marketing interventions to creating emotional, mental, and psychological associations with a city (cited in Braun, 2012, p. 258). In light of this, if we perceive a city as having its own personality, multicultural cities would tend to be dissociative and introvert, while intercultural ones use vibrant messages from the mouth of an extrovert personality. The discourse dimension in Table 1 summarises the list of interculturalism indicators considered when evaluating this aspect of a city's policies.

3.2 The Governance Dimension

The governance dimension aims to analyse the extent of multiculturalism and interculturalism in local cultural policies, focusing on the degree of participation of migrants and minorities in the cultural decision-making processes.

The necessity of creating opportunities for migrants and minorities to be involved in local and regional democracy has been debated at European level since the adoption of the European Convention on the Participation of Foreigners in Public Life at Local Level (1992) and of Resolution 92 (2000) of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe on the same issue. Focusing on the recognition of civic and political rights, these instruments have been judged essential but insufficient to promote a "real process of interaction between migrants and host community" (Council of Europe, 2007b, p. 2).

Following Fung (2006), we understand participation as a complex, multidimensional concept that characterises cultural decision-making processes with regard to three fundamental aspects, including (a) the degree of representation of minorities and migrants, (b) the intensity of communication – namely dialogue and deliberation – among them, and (c) the extent of power delegated to them over the formulation and implementation of the cultural programme.

The key assumption guiding the identification of indicators for the governance dimension is that the extent of multiculturalism and intercultur-

56

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

alism in cultural decision-making processes depends on the intensity of their participatory nature with regard to the three aspects above (representation, communication, and empowerment).

Regarding representation, both multicultural and intercultural approaches are considered to be oriented towards ensuring the largest possible involvement of all foreign groups. The openness of cultural decision-making processes – i.e., accessibility to all who wish to attend – is a means to take into consideration all relevant and significant cultural interests affected by cultural policies and to include a variety of competences, resources, and insights otherwise not available to cultural policymakers (Fung, 2006; Innes & Booher, 1999). To be truly representative, the openness of the process should be accompanied by measures of "selective recruitment" of participants (Fung, 2006, p. 67). Both minorities and migrants, because of social conditions and possible economic and linguistic barriers, risk being less prone to taking part in public decision-making processes and may require specific measures and incentives in order to be involved (Lencucha, Kothari & Hamel, 2010).

Unlike representation, the communication aspect allows for a clear distinction between multicultural and intercultural approaches. In multicultural governance settings, "communities are defined by ethnicity and consulted in isolation" (Council of Europe, 2007b, p. 5). Communication is based on negotiation, aimed at eliciting views community by community and at finding the best available alternative to advance their own preferences. On the contrary, intercultural approaches are based on deliberation: participants exchange perspectives, experiences, and reasons in order to develop a mutual understanding and to formulate decisions oriented towards the common good (Miller, 1992). By doing so, cultural groups are more likely to "think beyond the needs of their co-ethnics" (Council of Europe, 2007b, p. 5) and to create opportunities for mutual enrichment.

Regarding the delegation of power, multicultural and intercultural settings differentiate between the extent to which "the decisions that participants make become policies" (Fung, 2006, p. 59). In multicultural processes, minorities and migrants are involved in providing advice and consultation to public officials, who preserve their authority over cultural initiatives. On the contrary, intercultural approaches encompass the establishment of co-governing partnerships between public authorities, locals, minorities, and newcomers. There is a continuous "flow of engagement" (Council of Europe, 2007b, p. 6) because minorities and migrants have the economic and financial resources to realise autonomous initiatives. The governance

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

57

dimension in Table 1 summarises the list of interculturalism indicators considered when evaluating this aspect of local cultural policies.

3.3 The Cultural Contents Dimension

The cultural contents dimension analyses the degree of multiculturalism and interculturalism embedded in cultural activities promoted at city level. The main assumption is that both the concept of culture adopted and the methods employed make it possible to distinguish between static, knowledge-based multicultural activities and dynamic, relational and intercultural ones.

Building on the reflections of various authors (Bodo, 2013; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2009; Matarasso, 2006), it is assumed that cultural expressions – intended as the historical, artistic, material, and immaterial resources a community has inherited – may be the source of both exclusion and inclusion of different cultural groups. Culture strengthens differences when it is intended as the product of a past that cannot be changed (Matarasso, 2006). With this connotation, cultural expressions create a permanent distinction between "those who were born […] in the framework of certain social and religious traditions" and "those who choose to conduct their lives in these contexts" (Matarasso, 2006, p. 54) – the newcomers. On the contrary, when cultural expressions are considered to be "societal relationships, an attribution of meaning and value" (Dolff-Bonekämper, 2009, p. 70), the semantic field is open to all the possible reinterpretations. A joint process of heritage-building is activated, creating veritable spaces for discussion between locals and newcomers about the past and its influences on the present.

In terms of methodology, multicultural activities are considered to be knowledge-oriented, focusing on the acquisition of skills necessary to both understand other cultures and express one's own culture without questioning it. The classification introduced by Bodo (2013) provides useful examples of knowledge-based multicultural approaches pursued by museums and cultural organisations. The *showcasing difference* approach encompasses educational activities aimed at promoting a better understanding of other cultures in autochthonous audiences; the *heritage literacy* approach makes new citizens more familiar with a country's history, language, values, and traditions in order to for them to integrate into the mainstream culture; and finally, *cultural specific programming* focuses on improving the cultural self-awareness of migrant communities. All these

58

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

approaches are concerned with the realisation of specific cultural outputs (e.g. compensatory or celebratory exhibitions and events).

In intercultural approaches, the focus is on the process rather than on the contents. As underlined by Isar (2006), intercultural projects pursue a change of people's attitudes, encouraging them to question the basic assumptions of their respective cultures. The objective is a critical deconstruction of cultural identity as a consequence of contact with other cultures. Indeed, interculturalism "has to do more with the development of relational skills and dialogic identities than with the teaching of specific topics" (Bodo, 2008, p. 4).

As a consequence of the methods adopted, multicultural spaces enhance the rhetoric of diversity as richness and keep majority and minority communities apart, while intercultural ones look like "third spaces" where individuals cross the boundaries of belonging to generate new and shared narratives (Campaign for Learning Through Museums and Galleries, 2006; cited in Bodo, 2008, p. 6). The cultural contents dimension in Table 1 summarises the list of interculturalism indicators considered when evaluating this aspect of city policies.

4. Interculturalism in Three Croatian ECoC Candidates

The following chapter analyses the extent of multiculturalism and interculturalism achieved by three Croatian cities in the process of preparing their candidature in order to become European Capitals of Culture, according to the proposed set of indicators. The unit of analysis of this empirical investigation is the bidding process, intended to include both the decision-making process activated in each city for the preparation of the bid book, as well as the bid book itself.

For analytical purposes and following previous works dealing with the governance processes of European Capitals of Culture (Németh, 2016), the bidding process is intended as a sample of local cultural policies, able to summarise and reflect the key characteristics concerning the discourse, governance, and cultural contents dimensions.

The research methodology includes content analysis and the evaluation method. The content analysis concerns the frequency of the occurrence of keywords indicating either multiculturalism or interculturalism. Because some words may be used to indicate both terms, a qualitative evaluation

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

59

method has been applied in order to detect fine but important differences. Regarding the governance dimension, data have been collected by means of semi-structured interviews with those responsible for the bid book in each city.

4.1 Rijeka

By a cultural programme whose slogan is "Port of Diversity: Water–Work–Migrations", the candidature of Rijeka reflects an attempt to transform a multi-ethnic scenario into an occasion for enrichment and positive change.

Regarding the discourse dimension, this can be defined as being more intercultural than multicultural. Terms referring to the ideas of coexistence and tolerance appear in the text nine times and are employed to describe a condition that the city of Rijeka wishes to overcome to reach a "mutual cultural influencing" (*Rijeka 2020: Port of Diversity – Water, Work, Migrations* – Rijeka Bid Book, 2015, p. 2). Not only is interculturalism mentioned several times in the text (eight in total), it is also employed to describe lifestyles which should be acquired to activate an "intercultural acupressure" (ibidem, p. 6). The metaphor of the port, seen as "a place of welcome, a point of encounter, an opening, a prologue" (ibidem, p. 21), is representative of the value attributed to the Other and of the city's vibrant and extrovert personality. Terms connected with ideas of encounter, exchange, and interconnection, used 12 times in the text, clearly convey both the willingness to "[explore] the advantages […] of intercultural societies" (ibidem, p. 17) and the need for new eyes to foster solidarity and curiosity. Concepts related to the past and tradition (17 words) are employed to stress the city's capacity to reinterpret these and to open paths to "artistic, creative and innovative products from all over the world, shipped to and from Rijeka" (ibidem, p. 7). Symbols are barely mentioned in the cultural programme, whereas cosmopolitanism is deemed to be "a functioning antidote to nationalism and populism" (ibidem, p. 96). A multicultural attitude emerges in the description of the sense of belonging, still focused on the idea of a public space which, rather than promoting intercultural encounters, focuses on "the status as a zero human position" for the construction of a new micro-society.

Regarding the governance dimension, Rijeka's bidding process was designed and implemented as an open and participatory effort to involve "everyone that was willing to contribute" (Interview – Author of the Rije-

60

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

ka Bid Book). The cultural programme was conceived in three different participatory steps: consultations to formulate the vision of Rijeka 2020, activation of an international public call for ideas, and the evaluation and selection of projects. A special effort was made to engage minorities and migrants by follow-up communication regarding the opportunities to participate, and face-to-face and online interaction with the management team. Thanks to this "selective recruitment", the actors involved may be considered representative of the cultural diversity of Rijeka. In terms of communication and power delegation, the process presents elements of both a multicultural and an intercultural setting. While some projects, such as the Rijeka Carnival, reflected the effort to formulate decisions oriented towards the common good, some other initiatives were the result of a process of mediation between the ideas and the needs of the different cultural groups. Some autonomous initiatives of migrants and minorities, such as gastronomy exchanges (Bakanalije) and music festivals (Etno festival), were supported but represented just a small part of the bid book.

The evaluation of the degree of interculturalism in the cultural contents dimension of Rijeka's bidding process focuses on two parts of the cultural programme: the "Kitchen" flagship initiative and the "27 Neighbourhood" programme. While "Kitchen" presents both multicultural and intercultural traits, "27 Neighbourhood" pursues an intercultural process of cultural identity deconstruction. Collaborating with European centres for refugee reception, "Kitchen" is imagined as a "centre for creative migrations" (*Rijeka 2020: Port of Diversity – Water, Work, Migrations* – Rijeka Bid Book, 2015, p. 17), in which people can exchange their experiences concerning travel and daily habits, with a focus on the creation of intercultural menus in which different cultures mix and overlap. However, this initiative also presents some multicultural, knowledge-based objectives. It aims to provide "opportunities for people to showcase their culture, celebrate their history and share their stories" (ibidem, p. 72), contributing to the acquisition of skills, but not to the critical reflection on cultural identity. On the contrary, the "27 Neighbourhoods" project pursues a truly intercultural approach. Proposing a system of exchanges between twenty-seven selected neighbourhoods in Rijeka and the Primorje–Gorski Kotar County and twenty-seven other neighbourhoods in different EU countries, the project generates an "eye-to-eye meeting between widely different realities" in order to awaken self-reflection and curiosity and to deconstruct cultural identities by means of an "intercultural competence" laboratory (ibidem, p. 80).

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

61

4.2 Osijek

Cultural diversity was placed at the centre of the "Bridges Over Water" initiative in Osijek's candidature, linked with the concept of culture as oxygen and a "facilitator of positive change" (Mavrin, 2015, p. 5). "Bridges Over Water" was conceived to foster connections between different cultures both internally, within Croatia, and externally, across Europe. The objective was to promote a "Wireless World", where the fortification of state borders is replaced by an affirmation of the freedom of movement.

The discourse dimension linked with this vision is a mix of multicultural and intercultural elements. While multiculturalism is more evident in the description of the sense of belonging, interculturalism is strongly present in the city's orientation towards the future. Words connected with a multicultural and multiethnic setting are used 18 times in the text. This is part of a narrative in which the concepts of tolerance and coexistence are evoked more often (12 times) than those connected with enrichment, sharing, and commonality (eight times).

However, a more intercultural attitude emerges in the illustration of the city's personality. Verbs related to the ideas of connection, exchange and encounter are employed in the text with great frequency (38 times) and contribute to conveying the state of *openness*, mentioned 15 times, which makes Osijek an advanced city and a ground for cultural experimentation. This is confirmed by the recurrence of the words *future* (37 seven times) and *innovation* (17 times), indicating the willingness to move "from the past to the future and from conflict to peaceful solution" (ibidem, p. 95).

The analysis of the governance dimension is evidence of considerable effort undertaken by the management team to include interculturalism in the representation and communication modes of the bidding process. Owing to the Oskultura digital platform, it was possible "to integrate most of the ideas and cultural groups […] in all programme pillars and in most of the key projects" (Interview – Author of the Osijek Bid Book). Moreover, the team was successful at promoting deliberation. According to the interview, the idea behind programmes such as the Peace and Reconciliation Centre was "to benefit all parties involved". However, Osijek's bidding process cannot be considered truly participative because of the lack of empowerment of minorities and migrants. Although they were represented and consulted, "there were no significant interactions between the different minority groups and migrants were not involved directly as projects creators" (Interview – Author of the Osijek Bid Book).

62

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

The lack of opportunities for different cultural groups to collaborate could explain the prevailing multiculturalism of the cultural contents dimension. The majority of the activities proposed are knowledge- and goal-oriented and aim to promote cultural self-awareness. To name but a few, the key purpose of the "Meal of Tolerance" is to give people an opportunity to learn more about their food tradition and that of other cultures, "Language of Minority" focuses on teaching a minority language with special attention paid to Romani and Vlach, while the idea of "Horseland" is to give the Roma minority a "chance to display and demystify their rich culture linked with horse breeding" (Mavrin, 2015, p. 57).

However, intercultural objectives linked with a reflective deconstruction of cultural identity are present in other initiatives such as "Where the Streets Have Two Names" and "Language Labyrinth". The former temporarily changes street names, thus underlining how these need not be a matter of ideology and administration any longer, but rather a matter of culture and intercultural encounters. The latter stresses the importance of communication skills to promote linguistic integration, underlining how languages are also products of social interactions.

4.3 Pula

In Pula's bid book, intercultural dialogue is considered crucial for demilitarisation and the transformation of the city "from fortress to forum" (*Demilitarise! From fortress to forum* – Pula Bid Book, 2015, p. 10). Interculturalism is in this case strongly in the mainstream of a large part of the discourse, governance, and cultural contents dimensions.

Regarding discourse, the term *interculturalism* (used 10 times) is more frequent than words connected with multiculturalism, such as *coexistence* (used twice) or *tolerance* (three times) and mentioned only to indicate a historical feature of the city that should be changed by adopting a more proactive attitude. The concept of *otherness*, recurring eight times in the text, is strongly linked to *openness*, the most frequent word in the text (appearing 21 times), and *democracy*, intended to mean something that "makes us care about each other and the world we live in" (*Demilitarise! From fortress to forum* – Pula Bid Book, 2015, p. 47). Pula is portrayed as a vibrant city whose mission is that of fighting against "tapija", social passivity that fosters fear and intolerance, with "the transformative possibilities of participation and inclusion" (ibidem, p. 89). The direct involvement of citizens by organising outdoor games is linked with the idea of the *future*

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

63

(a word used 13 times) and with support for *innovation* (mentioned nine times), stressing the necessity of "transforming military spaces that are closed to citizens and filling them with cultural activities" (ibidem, p. 21).

The governance dimension reflects this participatory intercultural approach coherently. Not only was the process "completely open […] involving more than three hundred citizens of different professions and backgrounds", but there was also a strong attempt to "[avoid] the relation of majority-minority and its implicit inequalities" (Interview – Author of the Pula Bid Book). Instead of adopting the strategies of "selective recruitment", the most diverse representation possible was ensured "by trying to touch all important points of life in the city […] and choosing common themes" (ibidem). During the interview, it was underlined that "since groups were heterogeneous, the modality of decision-making encompassed searching for common good". As far as empowerment is concerned, the Author of Pula's Bid Book confirmed that "a great percentage of the programme has been developed following citizens' input", in combination with the idea of promoting demilitarisation by citizen participation.

It is only in the cultural contents dimension that both multicultural and intercultural traits are present. The "Open Fortress" initiative is mainly multicultural because various cultural communities "are invited to occupy the fortresses with the best of their contemporary art and cultural heritage" (*Demilitarise! From fortress to forum* – Pula Bid Book, 2015, p. 23), creating programmes that represent their own cultures. On the contrary, both "Open Sauces" and "Pilgrimage of Sounds" reflect an intercultural approach. The former aims to present the crossover character of European culture through food considered as a means of cultural diffusion. The latter promotes the transformation of churches, cathedrals, and chapels across Istria and Europe in places of interreligious encounters through traditional music and dance.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

The comparison between Rijeka, Osijek, and Pula regarding the degree of interculturalism in the three identified dimensions of cultural policies – discourse, governance, and cultural contents – offers interesting insights for the analysis of these cities' responses to cultural diversity and to further develop the theoretical basis of the proposed indicators.

CROATIAN AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...

HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

64

All three Croatian ECoC candidates have given considerable space to the issues of cultural diversity, multiculturalism, and interculturalism in their application. Regarding the discourse dimension, the shift from the coexistence of different cultural groups to the promotion of their mutual enrichment is supported in all three cities, but developed to varying degrees in the bid books. It is strongly in the mainstream in Pula, initiated but still not fully attained in Rijeka, and poorly expressed in Osijek. In Pula, the image of an intercultural city is made manifest by the fight against "tapija" and the promotion of inclusion and participation, detached from any majority-minority relationship. In Rijeka, the metaphor of the "Port of Diversity" underlines the necessity of replacing tolerance with an attitude of welcoming and openness, without questioning the sense of belonging to separate cultural groups. In Osijek, the city's vibrant, extrovert, and future-oriented image is still attached to concepts such as tolerance and coexistence among different communities, who are connected by a bridge but not united in a shared space.

This difference is reflected also in the governance dimension. While all three cities are open and inclusive, true participation – intended as the sharing of power among different cultural groups and the activation of partnerships between migrants, minorities, and the management team – has only been achieved in one city: Pula. Rijeka and Osijek were successful at promoting a broad representation of the cultural groups living in the city. In Rijeka, the management team made an extra effort to engage minorities and migrants. In Osijek, thanks to the activation of the Oskultura digital platform, it was possible to integrate most of the ideas proposed by the different cultural groups in various programme pillars. However, no significant interactions were initiated in either case, and the autonomous initiatives of migrants and minorities represented just a small part of the bid books. On the contrary, Pula was successful at overcoming, by means of governance arrangements, the majority-minority relationship and its implicit inequalities, promoting a reflection on transversal themes regarding the cultural life of the city.

Regarding the cultural content dimension, none of the three cities devised a cultural programme that was completely intercultural. While in both Rijeka and Pula the effort of creating new shared narratives was present in various programme pillars, in Osijek the majority reflected a showcasing approach, giving different groups the possibility of expressing themselves without questioning their identity.

Taken together, the 12 proposed interculturalism indicators and their empirical application also inspire further theoretical developments regard-

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

65

ing the relationship between cultural diversity and local cultural policies. First, it emerges that the different dimensions need not be coherent but can still be interrelated. A strong accent on interculturalism in the discourse dimension, which is not reflected in the governance and cultural contents dimensions gives rise to a rhetoric–reality gap, evidencing how, while present in the vision and narrative of the city's image, mutual enrichment among different cultural communities is not implemented in the decision-making processes and in cultural production. At the same time, the empirical analysis shows that without an intercultural governance dimension, in which the empowerment of minorities and migrants is promoted, the cultural contents dimension lacks shared cultural expressions based on the reflective deconstruction of cultural identity. According to this, consultative governance processes are much likely to be connected with showcasing difference or heritage literacy approaches to cultural production as defined by Bodo (2013), while participatory governance is supposed to lead to more intercultural, method- and process-oriented cultural experiences.

On top of that, the empirical analysis emphasizes that cities consider food and gastronomy to be crucial grounds for multicultural and intercultural experimentation, regarding not only the discourse but also the cultural contents dimension. Gastronomy has already been identified as a key sector for interculturalism by studies on city branding strategies by Zukin (1995) and Landry and Wood (2008), and it is present in all three cultural programmes as part of multicultural and intercultural initiatives such as "Kitchen" in Rijeka, "Meal of Tolerance" in Osijek, and "Open Sauces" in Pula. The opportunity to blend different food traditions, their ingredients and flavours, also conceptually clarifies the challenge of creating intercultural spaces in which identities mix and overlap. The emergence of gastronomy as a key sector underlines the necessity of complementing the explicit dimension of cultural policies by the implicit one when studying multiculturalism and interculturalism, collecting evidence not only regarding cultural heritage and cultural production, but including the analysis of a broader spectrum of ways of life, traditions, and customs as well.

The efforts undertaken by cities as part of the bidding process to become European Capitals of Culture provide solid ground for studying interculturalism in local cultural policies. Although the analysis showed some imperfections, the bid books are not only rich in concrete policy measures and actions which can be implemented, but are an invaluable result of the process undergone by a wide variety of cultural (and other) actors. This may eventually lead to an increase in self-consciousness and openness,

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

66

especially towards other cultures, as well as provide a firm foundation for future innovative cultural (and other public) policies.

Further comparative studies of other European Capitals of Culture, of cities involved in the Intercultural City Programme promoted by the Council of Europe, and of other programmes focusing on local cultural policies constitute interesting future paths of research for advancing the development and validation of the proposed set of interculturalism indicators, individuating both best practices and critical aspects for each of the dimensions concerned.

References

Ahearne, J. (2009). Cultural policy explicit and implicit: A distinction and some uses. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 15*(2), 141–153. doi: 10.1080/10286630902746245

Amin, A. (2002). Ethnicity and the multicultural city: Living with diversity. *Environment and Planning, 34*(6), 959–980. doi: 10.1068/a3537

Anttiroiko, A. (2014). Creative city policy in the context of urban asymmetry. *Local Economy*, *29*(8), 854–867. doi: 10.1177/0269094214557926

Barrett, M. (2013). *Interculturalism and Multiculturalism: Similarities and Differences.* Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.

Bodo, S. (2008). *From 'heritage education with intercultural goals' to 'intercultural heritage education': Conceptual framework and policy approaches in museums across Europe.* Retrieved from www.interculturaldialogue.eu

Bodo, S. (2013). New paradigms for intercultural work in museums: Or intercultural work as a new paradigm for museum practice? In I. Z. Simansone (Ed.). *Museums and Intercultural Dialogue: The Learning Museum Network Project* (Report No. 4). Retrieved from http://online.ibc.regione.emilia-romagna.it/I/libri/pdf/LEM4rd-report-museums-and-intercultural-dialogue.pdf

Bonet, L., & Négrier, E. (2011). The end(s) of national cultures: Cultural policy in the face of diversity. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 17*(5), 574–589. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2010.550681

Braun, E. (2012). Putting city branding into practice. *The Journal of Brand Management, 19*(4), 257–267. doi: 10.1057/bm.2011.55

City of Melbourne (2013). *Melbourne city marketing strategy 2013–16* [Brochure]. Retrieved from: https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/SiteCollectionDocuments/melbourne-city-marketing-strategy.pdf

Council of Europe (2007a). *Intercultural city index: A methodological overview* [Paper]. Retrieved from http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/files/178/en/methodological_overview.pdf

Council of Europe (2007b). *Citizenship and participation in the intercultural city* [Paper]. Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/16803009c7

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

67

Council of Europe (2008). *Intercultural dialogue: "Living together as equals in dignity"* [White Paper]. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.

Council of Europe (2013). *The intercultural city step by step: Practical guide for applying the urban model of intercultural integration* [Guide]. Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168048da42

Council of Europe (2016). *Intercultural cities: Sharing our cities, sharing the future* (Annual report). Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806c9674

Demilitarise! From fortress to forum [Pula Bid Book] (2015). Retrieved from http://www.min-kulture.hr/userdocsimages/NAJNOVIJE%20NOVOSTI/EPK%20proglasenje%2024.3.2016/Pula2020_ECoC_bidbook.pdf

Dolff-Bonekämper, G. (2009). The social and spatial frameworks of heritage: What is new in the Faro Convention? In Council of Europe (Eds.). *Heritage and Beyond* (pp. 69–74). Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.

Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review, 66*(s1), 66–75. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x

Gray, C. (2010). Analysing cultural policy: Incorrigibly plural or ontologically incompatible? *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 16*(2), 215–230. doi: 10.1080/10286630902935160

Graziano, P. R. (2011). Europeanization and domestic employment policy change: Conceptual and methodological background. *Governance, 24*(3), 583–605. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0491.2011.01533.x

Hall, P. A. (1993). Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: The case of economic policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics, 25*(3), 275–296. Retrieved from http://jcp.gc.cuny.edu/

Holden, J. (2006). *Cultural value and the crisis of legitimacy: Why culture needs a democratic mandate.* London, United Kingdom: Demos.

Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (1999). Consensus building and complex adaptive systems: A framework for evaluating collaborative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 65*(4), 412–423. doi: 10.1080/01944369908976071

Isar, R. (2006). Una deontologia interculturale: utopia o realismo utopico? [An intercultural code of conduct: utopia or utopian realism?] In S. Bodo & M. Cifarelli (Eds.). *Quando la cultura fa la differenza* [*When the culture makes the difference*] (pp. 60–70). Rome, Italy: Meltemi.

Jelinčić, D. A. (2010). Celebrating diversity through different-isms. In Ű. Z. Kutlu & C. Smithuijsen (Eds.). *Cultural policy and management (KPY): Yearbook 2010* (pp. 68–75). Istanbul, Turkey: Istanbul Bilgi University Press/Boekmanstudies.

Jelinčić, D. A., Gulišija, D., & Bekić, J. (2010). *Culture, tourism, interculturalism.* Zagreb, Croatia: Meandarmedia.

Jelinčić, D. (2012). *Cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and digital culture: Summary of project results.* Zagreb, Croatia: Institute for International Relations.

Kavoura, A., & Bitsani, E. (2014). Investing in culture and intercultural relations for advertising and sustainable development of the contemporary European

CROATIAN AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

68

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

city within the framework of international city branding and marketing: The case study of the intercultural festival of Trieste, Italy. In L. Barreau (Ed.). *Advertising: media, marketing and consumer demands* (pp. 35–66). New York, USA: Nova Science Publishers.

Landry, C., & Wood, P. (2008). *The intercultural city.* London, United Kingdom: Earthscan.

Lencucha, R., Kothari, A., & Hamel, N. (2010). Extending collaborations for knowledge translation: Lessons from the community-based participatory research literature. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice, 6*(1), 61–75. doi: 10.1332/174426410X483006

Matarasso, F. (2006). La storia sfigurata: la creazione del patrimonio culturale nell'Europa contemporanea. [The disfigured history : the creation of cultural heritage in contemporary Europe] In S. Bodo & M. Cifarelli (Eds.). *La cultura fa la differenza – Patrimonio, arti e media nella societã multiculturale* (pp. 50-62). Roma, Italy: Meltemi.

Mavrin, I. (Ed.) (2015). *Oxygen* [Osijek Bid Book]. Retrieved from http://www.min-kulture.hr/userdocsimages/NAJNOVIJE%20NOVOSTI/EPK%20proglasenje%2024.3.2016/Osijek2020-ECoC_bid_book-single_page_A4_for_print.pdf

Miller, D. (1992). Deliberative democracy and social choice. *Political Studies, 40*(1), 54–67. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.1992.tb01812.x

Moon, M. J. (2001). Cultural governance: A comparative study of three cultural districts. *Administration & Society, 33*(4), 432–454.

Németh, A. (2016). European Capitals of Culture: Digging deeper into the governance of the mega-event. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 4(1), 52–74. doi: 10.1080/21622671.2014.992804

Ponzini, D. (2009). *Governing urban diversity?* Milan, Italy: Riksbankens Jubileumsfond.

Rijeka 2020: Port of Diversity – Water, Work, Migrations [Rijeka Bid book] (2015). Retrieved from http://rijeka2020.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ri2020-eng-web.pdf

Saukkonen, P., & Pyykkönen, M. (2008). Cultural policy and cultural diversity in Finland. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 14*(1), 49–63. doi: 10.1080/10286630701856518

Schmitter, P. (2002). Participation in governance arrangements: Is there any reason to expect it will achieve sustainable and innovative policies in a multilevel context? In J. Grote & B. Gbikpi (Eds.), *Participatory governance: Political and societal implications* (pp. 409–507). Opladen, Germany: Leske & Budrich.

Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal, 50*(155), 17–28. doi: 10.1111/1468-2451.00106

Throsby, D. (2011). Cultural capital. In R. Towse (Ed.). *A handbook of cultural economics* (pp. 142–147). Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2002). *Universal declaration on cultural diversity* [Declaration]. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127162e.pdf

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

69

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2005). *Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions.* Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001429/142919e.pdf

Williams, R. (1976). *A vocabulary of culture and society.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Zukin, S. (1995). *The cultures of cities.* Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell

Table 1: *Set of interculturalism indicators in local cultural policies*

Dimension	N.	Multiculturalism	Interculturalism
Discourse	1	Focus on coexistence and tolerance of diversity	Attribution of value to the Other
	2	Sense of belonging to a separate community	Sense of belonging to the city as a whole
	3	Dissociative and introvert city personality (closure)	City with an extrovert and vibrant personality (openness)
	4	Presence of traditional, autochthonous and ethnic symbols	Presence of contemporary, cosmopolitan or mixed symbols
	5	Past oriented narrative	Present or future oriented narrative
Governance	6	Negotiation and aggregation of interests community by community	Deliberation aimed at mutual understanding and common good
	7	Involvement of minorities and migrants in consultation processes	Involvement of minorities and migrants in co-creation processes
	8	Exclusive authority of some groups over the implementation	Promotion of autonomous initiatives of minorities and migrants
Cultural contents	9	Static and exclusive conception of cultural expressions	Dynamic and controversial conception of cultural expressions
	10	Knowledge- and goal-oriented cultural activities	Method- and process-oriented cultural activities
	11	Promotion of cultural self-awareness in the various cultural groups	Reflective deconstruction of cultural identity
	12	Distinct spaces based on the separation between dominant majority and minorities	Creation of a shared cross-cultural space beyond the boundaries of belonging

Source: Authors

CROATIAN AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

70

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

A SET OF INDICATORS OF INTERCULTURALISM IN LOCAL CULTURAL POLICIES: A STUDY OF THREE CROATIAN CANDIDATES FOR THE EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF CULTURE

Summary

While they have been increasingly debated, the differences and implications of multiculturalism and interculturalism for cultural policies at city level have been poorly studied. The Intercultural Cities Index, promoted by the Council of Europe, includes just a few aspects of cultural policies in the intercultural lens dimension. In the light of this gap, this paper proposes a more comprehensive set of indicators to evaluate interculturalism in local cultural policies. The indicators are designed according to an analytical scheme that considers how two possible approaches to cultural diversity (multicultural and intercultural) are embedded in three dimensions of local cultural policies (discourse, governance and cultural contents). Because they focus more on the explicit dimension of cultural policies, dealing with cultural heritage and consecrated forms of artistic expression, the proposed indicators could also be extendable to the implicit definition of culture intended as a way of life. The 12 proposed indicators are applied to conduct a comparative analysis of the degree of interculturalism attained in three Croatian cities (Rijeka, Osijek, and Pula) as they underwent the process of candidature to become European Capitals of Culture. This European programme serves as comparative ground to study the changes of a city's cultural policies under the same conditions and pressures. First, the study of these cities emphasizes the strict interrelation between the different dimensions of local cultural policies. Even if it is strongly present in the discourse dimension, interculturalism has not been fully attained without a governance aspect that promotes the creation of shared cultural contents. Second, the results evidence the recurrence of gastronomy as a sector for experimentation with multicultural and intercultural approaches. The crucial role of food in promoting cultural encounters stresses the necessity of taking into consideration a broader spectrum of the ways of life, traditions, and customs when studying multiculturalism and interculturalism in local cultural policies.

Keywords: *multiculturalism, interculturalism, cultural policies, indicators, European Capitals of Culture, Croatia*

Campagna, D., Jelinčić, D. A. (2018). A Set of Indicators of Interculturalism in Local Cultural Policies ...
HKJU-CCPA, 18(1), 47–71

71

INDIKATORI INTERKULTURIZMA U LOKALNIM KULTURNIM POLITIKAMA: TRI HRVATSKA GRADA KANDIDATA ZA EUROPSKU PRIJESTOLNICU KULTURE

Sažetak

Iako se o utjecaju multikulturalnosti i interkulturizmu sve više raspravlja, razlike između tih dvaju pojmova te njihov utjecaj na gradske kulturne politike ne istražuju se dovoljno. Vijeće Europe nastoji promicati Intercultural Cities Index (Interkulturni indeks gradova), no taj instrument sagledava samo neke aspekte kulturnih politika iz interkulturne perspektive. S obzirom na to, u radu se predlažu sveobuhvatniji indikatori koji bi mogli procijeniti razinu interkulturizma u lokalnim kulturnim politikama. Indikatori slijede analitičku shemu kojom se nastoji utvrditi kako su dva moguća pristupa kulturnoj raznolikosti (multikulturalnost i interkulturizam) ugrađena u tri dimenzije lokalnih kulturnih politika (dimenzije diskursa, upravljanja i kulturnih sadržaja). Indikatori se odnose na eksplicitniju dimenziju kulturnih politika koja se bavi kulturnim nasljeđem i oblicima umjetničkog izražaja, no mogu se također primijeniti na implicitnu definiciju kulture kao načina života. Predlaže se dvanaest indikatora pomoću kojih su autori usporedili razine interkulturizma u tri hrvatska grada (Rijeci, Osijeku i Puli) tijekom razdoblja njihova statusa grada kandidata za Europsku prijestolnicu kulture. Ovaj europski program nudi uvjete za usporedbu promjena gradskih kulturnih politika pod istim uvjetima i pritiscima. Kao prvo, pregled tih triju gradova naglašava snažnu međusobnu povezanost različitih dimenzija lokalnih kulturnih politika. Čak i kada je nedvojbeno prisutan u dimenziji diskursa, interkulturizam se ne može u potpunosti postići bez upravljačke dimenzije koja potiče stvaranje zajedničkih kulturnih sadržaja. Kao drugo, podaci govore o povratku gastronomije kao sektora koji eksperimentira s multikulturnim i interkulturnim pristupima. Ključna uloga hrane u promicanju kulturnih susreta ističe potrebu za razmatranjem šireg spektra načina života, tradicija i običaja prilikom proučavanja multikulturalnosti i interkulturizma u lokalnim kulturnim politikama.

Ključne riječi: *multikulturalnost, interkulturizam, kulturne politike, indikatori, Europske prijestolnice kulture, Hrvatska*

CROATIAN AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION