



## Diversity and cultural policy: cultural citizenship as a tool for inclusion

Ricard Zapata-Barrero

To cite this article: Ricard Zapata-Barrero (2016) Diversity and cultural policy: cultural citizenship as a tool for inclusion, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 22:4, 534-552, DOI: [10.1080/10286632.2015.1015533](https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1015533)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1015533>



Published online: 09 Mar 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1821



View related articles [↗](#)




View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 3 View citing articles [↗](#)

## **Diversity and cultural policy: cultural citizenship as a tool for inclusion**

Ricard Zapata-Barrero\* 

*Social and Political Science Department, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Ramon Trias Fargas,  
25-27, 08005 Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain*

*(Received 7 November 2014; accepted 29 January 2015)*

At the crossroads of citizenship, cultural and diversity studies, I enter in the emerging debate on cultural citizenship. Culture is seen as a channel for diversity inclusion, and cultural policy carries the function of enhancing citizenship. My reasoning will follow two steps. First, in overviewing the recent literature, I identify two main drivers making cultural citizenship: the democratic/equality and the identity/national drivers. However, I will note that the debate is concentrated in the plurality of meanings of ‘culture’, and not, as I will argue as a second step, in the plurality of citizenship traditions: a liberal, a communitarian and a republican one. This view is at the basis of different approaches of cultural policies when we focus on them as enhancing cultural citizenship in diversity contexts. At the end, I will also contend that this can ground an interpretative framework capable of distinguishing current social practices and policies.

**Keywords:** citizenship; diversity; immigration; culture

### **Introduction**

Culture is perhaps one of the communication channels among citizens that has been less explored within citizenship and immigration studies, despite being a fundamental policy for accommodating diversity.<sup>1</sup> In times of financial crisis and growing economic differences among people, there can be diminished policy interest in socializing immigrant-related diversity into public culture. This context can even be an argument for justifying the need to promote culture economically, basically seen as a public expense after years of economic crisis. In this article, I would like to examine culture as a public investment in enhancing citizenship, especially when social circumstances increase the risk of losing social rights, of fostering social exclusion of immigrants and, in a nutshell, of devaluating citizenship.

The interest in studying cultural citizenship within diversity contexts arises from the emergent debate regarding the best policy strategy to accommodate diversity (following a critical diagnosis of the multicultural strategy). It also derives from the perennial concern of insuring the principle of equality in a society that tends to have a growing population (such as immigrants and citizens with immigrant backgrounds) with a differentiated set of rights and/or cultural identities (religion, language, cultural practices) and/or markers of difference in relation to the national

---

\*Email: [ricard.zapata@upf.edu](mailto:ricard.zapata@upf.edu)

majority (accent, skin colour, for instance).<sup>2</sup> In this framework of discussion, cultural citizenship becomes also a working category.

At the crossroads of scholarship on citizenship, culture and diversity, I seek then to argue within the emerging debate on cultural citizenship. When examining this link, culture is initially seen as a channel for citizens' interactions and diversity inclusion, and cultural policy as carrying the function of enhancing citizenship.

In Part I, I will follow a conceptual analysis approach in overviewing the recent literature with the main purpose to identify the main building blocks of cultural citizenship. I will argue that two main drivers of cultural policy play a prominent role in making cultural citizenship in diversity contexts: the democratic/equality driver and the identity/national driver. However, I will also note that in spite of evidencing an effort to make analytical distinctions in linking culture and citizenship, this always results from the plurality of meanings of 'culture'. Instead, I will concentrate on the plurality of meanings of the concept of 'citizenship' in framing cultural citizenship as a tool for inclusion. Here, I will first highlight the strategic use of cultural citizenship; then I will point out the plurality of meanings of the concept of culture ('culture is not a billiard ball'), in order, finally, to articulate the basic focus of cultural citizenship as a tool for diversity inclusion.

Having framed the main premises of my focus in Part II, I will defend that there is not one way to understand the role of cultural citizenship as a means for diversity inclusion, but three based on the three democratic traditions: a liberal, a communitarian and a republican one. This distinction is analytically important, since it is at the basis of different approaches of cultural policies when we focus on them as functioning to enhance cultural citizens in diversity contexts. At the end, I will also argue that this three-strand perspective of cultural citizenship can be the basis of a workable interpretative framework, which is capable of being applied to distinguish current social practices and policies.

### **Part I: Conceptual overview: building blocks of cultural citizenship**

To overview the recent literature on cultural citizenship, I will follow a conceptual analysis approach. In the *first section*, I will examine how the notion of citizenship becomes a strategic concept within the diversity/cultural policy nexus; then I will propose a workable category of 'cultural citizenship', understood in a broad sense as a tool for inclusion in diversity contexts. In the *second section*, I will concentrate on the notion of culture, which is treated, as I will argue, as a 'billiard ball' in most of the literature. Here, I will defend that there are essentially two main drivers of culture that can play a prominent role to conceptualize cultural citizenship: a democratic/equality driver and an identity/national driver. Finally, linking both analyses, in the *third section* I will map the particular focus of cultural citizenship as implying that culture can become a way of increasing participation of immigrants and interactions with the whole super-diverse society (Vertovec 2014).

#### ***Cultural citizenship as a strategic concept within the diversity/cultural policy nexus***

In spite of the existence of a large debate on cultural policies on the one hand, and on immigration-related diversity policies on the other, there are still few references that deal with the nexus. By introducing the focus on citizenship into the cultural

policy/diversity nexus, I assume, then, that cultural policy programmes foster a notion of citizenship that deserves to be explored, both theoretically and empirically. This emerging literature discusses the basic ways to develop the function of culture within diversity contexts, in order to enhance citizenship. We may say that the democratization and national identity building roles of culture both trace their genesis to cultural studies, and they have been related as the latest period of the incorporation of diversity within cultural studies (Pyykkönen 2012). The first debate tries to discuss culture as a distributive good that has to meet the equality principle as a public good, while the second debate makes visible the tension between national identity maintenance and building with complex identities in contexts of diversity.<sup>3</sup>

Considerations of cultural citizenship often revolve around the relationship between citizens and the institutions that give access to culture. This is why the trend of the debate focusing on governance is growing, both theoretically and as a framework in need of assessment.<sup>4</sup> The basic premise orienting these emerging discussions is that, behind cultural policy programmes, there is always an assumed conception of citizenship (or several, as I will argue in Part II). The production of citizenship has appeared on the agenda of cultural policy only recently, with the seminal work of Rosaldo (1999), who used it to describe citizens' initiatives of promoting cultural spaces in areas of poverty and alienation, and in a very fundamental way by others highlighting both the democratic and the identity debate it entails.<sup>5</sup>

From a theoretical background, this research programme is produced at the intersection of three ways of approaching cultural policies. First, from citizenship studies, cultural policy means basically a policy of national identity and citizenship acquisition (naturalization). Second, from cultural studies, cultural policy essentially means the promotion and planning of artistic and creative activities. Finally, from diversity studies, cultural policy designates the cultural integration of immigrants (with democratic values, common language, intercultural relations and civic norms). In this case, cultural citizenship may be seen as an effective mechanism to strengthen democratic values and national foundations. Here, we see how cultural citizenship transcends the sphere of traditional cultural rights, as we enter into the realm of what we could call 'cultural competencies', in which states grant specific cultural rights based on collective history and contemporary policy (Karim 2005, p. 149).

Most use the cultural capital approach when conceptualizing cultural citizenship, not only from the point of view of consumption of culture, but also to explain the participation of artists of foreign origin in the production of culture. The social capital literature is already known and extensive, but perhaps less so is that based on cultural capital (Bennett 2001a, Murray 2005). There are, in fact, some studies pointing at the role that cultural capital may play in the construction of cultural citizenship, and some that even examine the relation between social and cultural capital, premised on the hypothesis that cultural capital can influence social capital. In a broad sense, this debate revolves around the consumption of cultural goods and services. Cultural capital is linked to Bourdieu's (1984) conception of *habitus*, namely 'the provisioning of taste' or 'consumption of specific cultural forms that mark people as members of specific classes'. Sharon Jeannotte (2005, pp. 125–126), for instance, employs Bourdieu's categorization of cultural capital to distinguish three basic elements: (i) *embodied capital* (or *habitus*), the system of lasting dispositions

that form an individual's character and guides his or her actions and tastes; (ii) *objectified capital*, the means of cultural expression, such as painting, writing and dance, that are symbolically transmissible to others, and (iii) *institutionalized capital*, the academic qualifications that establish the value of the holder of a given qualification.

We can maintain from this cultural capital field of research that there is a real need to build a *grammar of cultural citizenship* when culture meets citizenship and citizenship meets culture, but also when diversity meets culture and citizenship. I will try to clarify myself within this literature, and to highlight analytically the semantic space where we can build this grammar. This research programme is at the intersection of these three studies, and it interrelates their components in a particular way. *Citizenship* is the end to reach, and yet we will speak about framing, approaching, promoting citizenship (see part II). *Culture* is the means to reach citizenship, and with this will be considered as a channel for enhancing citizenship. Finally, *diversity* will be considered as a framework of interaction among people from different origins. In such an interdependent system, I would also like to combine a bottom-up (cultural social practices) and a top-down (cultural policies and programmes) approach of culture. This basically means, from a theoretical point of view, that I am interested in analysing the ways policy administrations and civil society manages interactions between citizenship, culture and diversity. It is from this background that I approach the concept of 'cultural citizenship' and I see it as becoming a strategic concept.

What this ultimately means is that 'cultural citizenship' is used politically for particular purposes and one that also functions as a means to reach these purposes. Following Stanley's views, culture is a strategic good, in that it increases the capacity of citizens to manage change and therefore to govern themselves. It is this strategic role that justifies governmental investment in culture (Stanley 2005a). We are basically stressing the importance of cultural promotion and planning in the making of citizenship (Karaca 2009); or even, following Delanty's (2002) two conceptions of cultural citizenship, we are seeking to bridge citizenship with diversity, while stressing the centrality of culture for an adequate understanding of citizenship. When we link citizenship with culture, we want to pay attention to the appropriate means to develop citizenship. 'Cultural citizenship', then, refers to the use of appropriate cultural resources to foster citizenship.

### ***Culture is not a 'billiard ball': the democratic and identity drivers of culture***

The literature of cultural citizenship is also based on the concept of culture it entails. Primarily, the debate focuses on distinguishing political/economical/social citizenship from cultural citizenship, or on trying to argue on how each dimension is interrelated (Miller 2002). In mapping this literature, the first diagnosis is regarding the way 'culture' is understood, which is even more essential when this is done in a diversity framework.

The conceptual problem of freezing the meaning of culture is consubstantial to the cultural policy debate (Williams 1976), with 'culture' used most of the time as a 'billiard ball' in drawing perspectives and arguments. Everyone entering into this concept recognizes at the end that it is essentially contested, and confusions surrounding its meaning can be the basis of greater theoretical misunderstandings. It is important, then, to articulate a workable concept of culture. Turner (2001) for

instance, in his ‘outline of a theory of cultural citizenship’ uses ‘culture’ in a very broad sense, as ‘cultural rights’. He then outlines that ‘the relationship between citizenship and culture cannot be properly delineated without some definitive idea as to what “culture” refers’ (2001, p. 18). Cultural studies has obviously produced an appropriate framework, arising from the seminal chapter of Williams (1976, p. 90), in which he rightly distinguishes three concepts of ‘culture’: (i) *culture as personal development*: the independent and abstract noun which describes a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development; (ii) *culture as a way of life*: the independent noun, whether used generally or specifically, which indicates a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period, a group or of humanity in general, (iii) *culture as artistic activity*: the independent and abstract noun which describes the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity. These three dimensions of culture are really too broad, since in each of them we can find many different understandings. In general, however, they are analytically useful, firstly, to frame a conceptual use, given the strategic understanding of citizenship we want to monitor. When linked to the governance of citizenship, these three conceptions of culture first emphasize the need for the appropriate means to develop citizenship. Broadly, when we speak about ‘cultural citizenship’, these three general meanings of culture could play a meaningful role. Cultural citizenship can be the appropriate means for personal development (according to intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic choices); the means for following a way of life that one can share with others in society, giving meaning to personal development; and last, but not least, cultural citizenship can also be understood as insuring the appropriate means for developing artistic and creative capacities of citizens. In all three cases, cultural policy is a channel towards fostering citizenship.

Within this conceptual mapping of ‘culture’, there is also a renewed classification of three meanings coming from Stanley (2005a), which is, in my view, more appropriate for our purposes. Stanley distinguishes between Culture H (Heritage): the repository of past meanings, symbols and cultural traditions; Culture C (Creativity): the making of new meanings and symbols through discovery and creative activity in the arts; and, finally, Culture S (Symbols): the set of symbolic tools from which individuals construct their ways of living. Considering these distinctions, we are concerned with analysing how cultural policies can enhance citizenship fostering Heritage, Creativity and Symbols through citizenship building.

Next, there are also some specific focuses that deserve attention.<sup>6</sup> Bennett (2001a) has a competency-based approach. This refers to a specific set of cultural competencies that governments should guarantee to its citizens. Rosaldo (1999) essentially takes a rights-based approach, focusing on cultural citizenship as a set of rights guaranteed to minorities. It is a way to describe citizens’ initiatives in promoting cultural spaces in special areas, in relation to poverty and alienation. From the driver of identity, Kymlicka (1995) has offered a specific perspective of cultural citizenship, seeking to reconcile collective minority cultures and the individual majority.<sup>7</sup> As we have already mentioned, Turner, who defends a cultural empowerment, rights-based approach, exemplifies this identity driver of culture as having a national-based perspective of cultural citizenship. This is to be understood as the capacity to participate effectively, creatively and successfully within the national culture. This involves, for him, having access to basic educational institutions, the possession of a ‘living’ language, the ownership of cultural identity through national citizenship and the capacity to hand on to future generations the

richness of a national cultural heritage (Turner 2001, p. 12). Coming also from citizenship studies, Stevenson (2010, p. 289) introduces the idea that cultural citizenship is a struggle for a democratic society, one which enables a diversity of citizens to lead meaningful lives, which respects the formation of complex identities and which grants access to critical education. From this democratic/equality driver of culture, Wang (2013, p. 95) defends the idea that the concept of cultural citizenship allows us to examine the challenges of cultural inequality. In the same vein, Isin and Wood (1999, p. 123) highlight that 'cultural citizenship is a field in which the rights to access to production, distribution and consumption of culture become a field of struggle and conflict'.

Taking these two meaningful drivers of culture, my understanding also follows Miller when he says that 'culture' is connected to policy in two registers: artistic and everyday life (2002, p. 239). Following Marshall's well-known classification of civic, political and social citizenship, Miller asserts cultural citizenship and seeks to reconcile all forms of citizenship 'as interlocking zones, interdependent and equally important – not just in terms of individual access, but as measured by political participation, economic development, cultural norms, and tastes' (2002, p. 240). Miller's (2002) effort seeks to differentiate cultural citizenship from political, social and civic ones, following Marshall's classical division (1950). Marshall's basis for conceptualizing cultural citizenship is shared by most of the literature. Cultural rights means, first and foremost, the rights of culture for citizens, in the most literal understanding, and this is also reflected in many international reports (for instance, Agenda 21 for Culture, UNESCO, 1996, 1997, 2001, 2002, 2005). Marshall implicitly recognizes this when he refers to education and self-improvement (Bloomfield and Bianchini 2001, p. 101). Culture has to be treated, then, with the same democratic parameters as social, political and civic rights, insuring its distribution through the population, following equality of treatment and opportunity. This also means that we are breaking with elitist and professional views of culture, and entering into the democratization debate, which considers culture as a factor of social cohesion and collective identity. We enter, here, into understanding culture through subculture, popular culture and even micro-culture,<sup>8</sup> going beyond the view of culture as an industry and a commodity, but treating it rather as a capital (as cultural capital) and as a good (a cultural good) that needs to be ensured and distributed by public institutions and enhanced through social practices.

Following the Miller's simple analytical distinction, we can also differentiate between a narrower and a broader sense of cultural citizenship, depending on what meaning we give to culture when linked to citizenship. The broader sense considers culture as personal identity in everyday life, but also as national identity and the sense of belonging to a collective identity. The narrower definition considers culture in the artistic and creative senses. These two meanings sometimes overlap in the current literature of cultural citizenship and need to be clearly distinguished. The first one has been criticized rightly, when it is used in a conservative manner, as an attempt to align culture with genetics, as though it were hereditary like skin colour (Bloomfield and Bianchini 2001, p. 104), or even with the presumption that culture is rooted in territory, in the sense also already signalled by the liberal Kymlicka (1995, p. 84) in his seminal book when he criticized that, according to the communitarian view, 'one cannot choose to belong'.

Having overviewed this first literature, what is the initial conclusion we can reach? That there is no consensus of what 'cultural citizenship' should mean or

how to operationalize it to interpret current policies and social practices. There are, however, some driving forces from the mapping exercise we have done. When culture meets citizenship, or the other way round, the democratic and the identity drivers of culture are interconnected. Both, in some sense, are in interplay in most arguments and perspectives. The notion of culture is considered as a channel for citizenship that needs to be approached with standards of democracy and identity. Democracy/equality and Identity/nationality are, then, keys to the construction of cultural citizenship. They invite us to look at the ‘democratization of culture’, as well as at the identity formation of cultural policy, with both becoming solid foundations for the development of cultural citizenship.

Each case frames a driving concern of the current literature. The *identity driver* tries to reconcile the initial tension between the majority national identity and a minority of population with differentiated backgrounds (of culture, nationality, religion or language), and then falls within the national tradition and diversity nexus. The *democratic driver* exemplifies the concern of how to link culture and equality, while maintaining a minimum of social cohesion in a growing context of diversity.

Let me see now how these two notions – citizenship and culture – can also shape the focus of cultural citizenship as a tool for inclusion in diversity contexts.

### ***Mapping cultural citizenship as a tool for inclusion***

Following the overview of the literature, we can articulate a concept of cultural citizenship as implying that culture can become a way of increasing participation of immigrants and interactions with the whole society. And it may even become a way of changing citizenship regimes. However, we must say that cultural citizenship should not become a means of pretending inclusion in a community when in fact immigrants and their descendants are excluded from political and social citizenship. Cultural citizenship may be regarded as a means of reaching the aim of acquiring other citizenship statuses, and it is in this way we want to draw our focus ‘as a tool for inclusion’.

The meaning of inclusion here points at the promotion of immigrant’s participation in cultural practices – whether directly, through specific cultural mediators or through existent networks in civil society (e.g. through neighbourhood associations, retailers, sports, etc.). It is broadly defined as a set of activities for making and using cultural products, goods and processes that enhance citizenship. This argument that participation enhances citizenship and promotes inclusion in diversity contexts is not new and belongs indeed to one of the starting premises in immigration studies (Zapata-Barrero *et al.* 2013). What is innovative is the line of research that tries to link *cultural* participation and citizenship. Initially begun as a quantitative concern for measuring citizenship participation in cultural activities, there has been very little qualitative research conducted on the topic. The recent special issue in *Identities*, edited by Martiniello (2014), offers a promising line of research, in which the channel of culture as political participation gets explored through several case studies. Murray (2005), for instance, wonders if cultural participation is a basic building block of cultural citizenship or if it is a way to measure it. Participation is, then, considered as a means towards citizenship. Other scholars explore artists’ interests in engaging with the cultures of their community, thereby shaping and contributing to the cultures in which they live.<sup>9</sup> Most consider that this participation



is a recognized right in Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, when it establishes ‘a right to participate in the cultural life of the community as a basic human right’. Here, problems arise within the debate regarding how to map cultural participation, in terms of measuring access to cultural activities. Initially, participation was thought about in terms of modes of consumption and the use of cultural goods and activities (Mercer 2002). Some scholars suggest there are three categories of participation: creators, audiences and managers (Moore 2003). Participation thus involves the creative and the productive, access and audience, and processes of management and decision-making. Martiniello (2014) would also add that culture could offer a link between political participation and the claims of immigrants. Finally, we can mention the seminal work linking diversity and cultural policy of Bennett (2001a, pp. 62–63) when he states that

four principles are of paramount importance in developing such a revised vocabulary of citizenship. i. The first consists in the entitlement to equal opportunity to participate in the full range of activities that constitute the field of culture in the society in question; ii. The second consists in the entitlement of all members of society to be provided with the cultural means of functioning effectively within that society without being required to change their cultural allegiances, affiliations or identities; iii. The third consists in the obligation of governments and other authorities to nurture the sources of diversity through imaginative mechanisms, arrived at through consultation, for sustaining and developing the different cultures that are active within the populations for which they are responsible; iv. The fourth concerns the obligation for the promotion of diversity to aim at establishing ongoing interactions between differentiated cultures, rather than their development as separated enclaves, as the best means of transforming the ground on which cultural identities are formed in ways that will favour a continuing dynamic for diversity.

## **Part II: An interpretative framework: a pluralistic view of cultural citizenship**

I will articulate this second part in two main sections: a *first section* where I overview the three main traditions of citizenship, using three primary standards of interpretation (framing citizenship, approaching citizenship and promoting citizenship). However, the different constructions to citizenship in different political traditions are well known; my purpose is to link them with the different discussions on culture already developed in Part I. Then, in the *second section*, I will try to apply these distinctions from three perspectives of cultural citizenship.

### ***Three main traditions of democratic citizenship***

Scholars of citizenship tend to designate at least three main conceptions of democratic citizenship<sup>10</sup>: a liberal one, a communitarian one and a republican one. My purpose is to take these three views as a basis for drawing an interpretative framework. Theoretically, I argue that we have to think about not one, but three conceptions of cultural citizenship. Let me proceed, step by step.

The differences between the three traditions are employed here analytically, since these three strands together define what citizenship is today. I will use three basic standards, covering one distinctive dimension of the concept, to define each tradition.<sup>11</sup> In Table 1, I have described each standard (in Table 2, I will apply them to distinguish different traditions of citizenship, and in Table 3, I will differentiate, accordingly, three types of cultural citizenship):

Table 1. Standards to define citizenship.

Standard	Key question	Description
Framing citizenship	How does each tradition frame citizenship?	Identifies the main forces with the authority to frame the concept
Approaching citizenship	How does each tradition approach citizenship?	Identifies the main pillar for approaching the concept
Promoting citizenship	How does each tradition promote citizenship?	Identifies the main objective for promoting citizenship

### *Framing citizenship*

- In the *liberal tradition*, the state frames citizenship. This basically means that we need a state to organize citizenship. A national without a state, despite claiming a certain national identity, could not claim citizenship. From this liberal view, the state has complete sovereignty regarding how to delimit citizenship conceptually, through a naturalization process if non-citizens request citizenship.
- *Communitarianism* has a different view. It is not the state, but the nationality that frames citizenship. From this point of view, even if there is not a state behind it, nationality functions to keep people together, as it is strengthened as a common project towards the future. It means the sharing of a minimum of historical narrative and national construction, or a common inter-generational link, determined by descent and ethnicity. Whatever the criteria, what frames citizenship is a shared national identity. Through this framing of citizenship, the idea of community is reinforced. We are, here, very close to the concept of ‘community of citizens’, established some years ago by Schnapper (1994). Citizenship can only be framed if people share a minimum of national identity and if they feel that they can participate in this national identity-building process through their community inter-relations. It is through this joint action that a sense of community and identity can be built.
- For the *republican tradition*, it is neither the state nor the nationality that frames citizenship, but the public sphere. It is basically this public space that gives meaning to the actions of citizens. Without this sphere of public action, citizenship could not develop. We see that, in contrast with the other two traditions, framing is determined not by who has a ‘monopoly’ over the definition (the state), nor by a distinctive sense of community (the national identity), but rather by a sphere of everyday experience and action. This space is not private, but public. This is why we can say that, for the republican tradition, ‘citizen’ is the answer to the question of ‘Who am I?’ when it is posed in the public sphere.

### *Approaching citizenship*

- It is well known that the *liberal tradition* has a rights-based approach towards citizenship. Following Marshall’s distinctions, it defines citizenship as a set of

civic, political and social rights, with voting being one of the most distinctive. It is, of course, the state that has the responsibility to distribute these rights.

- The *communitarian tradition* has a national membership-based approach towards citizenship. This basically means that its primary concern is to ensure that the loyalty of citizens is channelled through a minimal common sharing of national membership.
- Finally, the *republican tradition* is also well known. It is an essentially civic-based approach towards citizenship. This implies that it seeks to involve citizens in public affairs and in the making of society. This civic involvement comes from an obligation of duty, which requests that people take responsibility and that they limit individual interests in favour of public ones.

### *Promoting citizenship*

- The *liberal tradition* promotes citizenship basically as a status and position in society. Those who hold this status are allowed to do certain things that non-citizens cannot do. Liberalism within democracy also means that this is an equal status for all. Without this status, one cannot enjoy all the rights and benefits of society.
- The *communitarian tradition* promotes citizenship as the feeling of belonging and as community membership. Belonging to the community can help you to orientate your expectations and to direct your life. Citizenship without this feeling of membership is difficult to promote.
- Finally, the *republican tradition* promotes citizenship through civic mindedness or civic responsibility. This means that citizens are only rendered such through action, not by status or by pre-social membership. It is through the promotion of this practice, based on civic duties (approaching citizenship) in the public sphere (framing citizenship), that republicans view citizens.

From these three standards, we can infer that each tradition invites different kinds of behaviours. The distinction between active vs. passive citizens is very common in citizenship studies. Here, we find that both the liberal and communitarian tradition share a passive view of citizenship. This means that people do not need to engage to be citizens, since they hold this status or membership by adscription. This lack of visible behaviour is unthinkable for the republican tradition, which only defines citizenship by its active participation and practices. This follows that both the liberal and communitarian traditions share, again, the view that citizenship is initially acquired by birth or later achieved through naturalization. In contrast, the republican tradition insists that ‘a person is not born a citizen, but becomes citizen’. Here, the education of citizens, and of civic virtues, plays a functional role for citizenship behaviour. We could remember the well-known republican sentence from Rousseau: ‘It is not enough to say to the citizens, *be good*; they must be taught to be so’.

Let me summarize the features of each tradition in Table 2 before proceeding to my next step of reasoning.

Table 2. Summary of citizenship standards by democratic tradition.

Tradition	Liberal	Communitarian	Republican
Framing citizenship	State	Nationality	Public sphere
Approaching citizenship	Rights	National identity	Public involvement
Promoting citizenship	Status Passive, by adscription. Citizenship by birth or naturalization	Belonging, membership	Civic-mindedness or public responsibility Active, by practices. A person is not born a citizen, but becomes citizen

Now we reach the pivotal question of this process of drawing an interpretative framework: *How do we translate these strands of citizenship traditions into our debate on the framework of cultural citizenship?* To explore an answer, I will try to link the first part with these democratic citizenship traditions. Let me first outline the focus of ‘cultural citizenship as a tool for inclusion’ within these three standards.

The basic descriptive definition of cultural citizenship depends upon considering ‘culture’ as a channel for framing, approaching and promoting citizenship. The argument I want to put forward, and that will help me to structure the interpretative framework, is that we consider not one, but three conceptions of cultural citizenship according to each democratic citizenship tradition.

To do this cultural citizenship reading of the three citizenship traditions, following the most relevant aspects we have highlighted, I will apply the democratic driver of culture (equality and participation). These key questions arise: What does cultural policy consider relevant for making cultural citizens? How does each tradition understand the democratization of culture? We can consider each tradition as an ideal type that somehow overlaps in reality (in the concluding remarks I will suggest its potential applicability to analyse case studies in the future). Each tradition will offer a different answer, according to the three citizenship standards. Of course, we can imagine each tradition as drawing a certain model of society, but we will consider them analytically, and not as independent bases of societies.

### *Framing cultural citizenship*

- A *liberal cultural policy* seeking to frame cultural citizenship will be carried out by the administration, but it will also consider cultural output in the market, which is free to be chosen by citizens. If we consider the three main areas of cultural policy according to cultural studies, cultural planning falls under the supervision of administrative authorities, while managing culture is a distributed public good. However, production and promotion follow market conditions. The basic purpose of authorities is to ensure the cultural rights of citizens, without taking into account the means necessary for citizens to put these rights into practice. This is why – apart from cultural planning – cultural production and promotion are left to market considerations, following the principle of supply and demand.
- A *communitarian cultural policy* serves the function of framing the national character of cultural citizenship. Culture is seen as heritage and national

tradition, and when linked to citizenship it tends to frame culture as looking at the past rather than towards the future. However, it will also consider national cultural elements of citizens from other national and religion backgrounds. In this case, some national festivities of other cultural groups would be incorporated into cultural planning, production and promotion. If we take national identity broadly, we can also say that the purpose of cultural policy is to frame the collective identity of citizenship and to frame multiple identities and cultures within citizenship, as Turner (2001) signals, following his cultural empowerment, rights-based approach.

- A *republican cultural policy* would consider that it is the local public sphere that frames cultural citizenship. Public space is perceived as a core element in creating cultural exchange and interaction among citizens. It is seen as an ally of diversity because it enables contact between different communities in a very natural way, almost incidentally. The city has always had multiple cultural policies embedded within its traditions, both with religious and cultural backgrounds. Public spaces are the areas where they take place. There is a vast literature showing how public spaces are places where people form new and deep relationships with people from other cultures, and that most of the time they are interclass and intergenerational. Cultural policies encourage the devotion of public space to promoting sociability, cohesion, co-operation and a sense of community.<sup>12</sup>

#### *Approaching cultural citizenship*

- Being rights-based, a liberal cultural policy seeking to make cultural citizenship will mainly focus on ensuring equality of access to all cultural goods distributed by authorities. Equality is thus understood in terms of distribution and access.
- Being identity-based, the communitarian cultural policy will focus on constructing a collective, shared public identity in making cultural citizens. It understands this collective public identity either in national terms or in terms of other public entities such as local or neighbourhood ones.
- Focused on seeking citizen involvement in the making of society, from a cultural point of view, a republican tradition will then develop participatory and creative capacities for making citizenship. A republican cultural citizenship will try to be involved in cultural planning and production.

#### *Promoting cultural citizenship*

- The liberal tradition will basically seek to promote the consumption of cultural citizenship. This means that a cultural citizen is a spectator of culture, and it is this consumption of cultural productions that need to be promoted. For instance, a liberal concern would include the lack of participation of nationals or immigrants in museums or theatres, and thus use of cultural offerings is considered an indicator of success. According to my understanding, what matters to a liberal are not only rights of access, but also the willingness of consumers and the types of choices offered. This is primarily

because we are treating culture as a public good that is distributed by the administration. A liberal cultural citizen is not simply one who does not break the rules, but one who moreover uses the public goods that are distributed. The use of cultural goods is performed, however, not through involvement in creative activity, but only through viewing and consumption. Balancing supply and demand of cultural productions is what drives the promotion of cultural citizenship.

- A cultural policy seeking to promote communitarian cultural citizenship will mainly focus on national identity and tradition, on cultural heritage, and on insuring citizens' feelings of collective belonging. It understands democratization of culture in terms of providing a shared, common identity through cultural rights. At this point, we can, of course, follow a strict communitarian understanding of culture, underlining the clash between national tradition and identity and requests for diversity, or we can take a broader view of culture, including local or neighbourhood identity building, as well. Whatever approach to collective identity building, citizens are not mere consumers, but also producers of shared public culture. Regarding their participation in culture, they are not seen merely as spectators, but as community producers.
- A cultural policy seeking to promote republican cultural citizenship will mainly focus on ensuring participatory channels for cultural production. It understands democratization of culture in terms of guaranteeing the participatory and creative capacity of citizens. Cultural citizens are basically seen as cultural producers. Creative citizenship supposes an appropriation by people of adequate resources for the creation, production, dissemination and consumption of their own culture. Therefore, we go from the citizen-as-consumer-of-culture to citizens valued for their creative cultural capacity. Citizen participation strengthens the participation of institutions directly or through specific cultural mediators, as well as through the network of existing civil society (e.g. neighbourhood associations, traders, sports, etc.).

Let me summarize the three strands of cultural citizenship in Table 3.

Table 3. Cultural citizenship standards by democratic tradition.

Tradition	Liberal	Communitarian	Republican
Framing citizenship	Administration (planning), market (production and promotion) Culture is a distributed good	National culture (culture heritage)  Culture is heritage and national tradition is collective shared public identity	Territorial public space
Approaching citizenship	Equality of access to cultural goods	Shared collective identity (in the city, in neighbourhoods)	Insuring involvement of citizens in cultural planning and production
Promoting citizenship	As cultural consumer, as citizen-spectator	As cultural player, as community producer	As cultural producer, as creative and participatory citizen

This interpretative framework for analysing the concept of cultural citizenship is not only a theoretical proposal, but it moreover seeks to be empirically viable, conceived as an analytical resource helping to interpret different cultural policies and social practices. Let me go into this argument in the concluding remarks.

### **Concluding remarks: looking for a workable interpretative framework**

This article provides a theoretical contribution to the small, but growing literature of how to accommodate immigrants into culture, and how to use culture as a factor for diversity accommodation. To this purpose, I have drawn on theories of cultural citizenship that regard culture as a means to reach citizenship. However, while much of the literature on cultural citizenship has focused on culture, I have taken a slightly different approach to the issue by drawing from citizenship studies the perspective of the three democratic citizenship traditions: a liberal, a communitarian and a republican one. This allows me to move away from discussing the many possible understandings of culture towards different citizenship traditions and to answer the question of how culture is considered relevant in the making of citizens in these three traditions. In these short concluding remarks, I will therefore consider how the different approaches to culture in the different citizenship traditions are able to reach the aim of using culture as a means of including immigrants into their host societies.

Indeed, earlier discussions of multiculturalism reflected the different (and, at times, conflicting) conceptions of citizenship and its relationship to cultural diversity in diverse political traditions. I have been particularly interested in situating the concept of cultural citizenship in contexts of diversity (defined from the beginning as a framework of interaction among people from different origins), and in considering cultural policy as being also a potential diversity policy. Let me recall my arguments by illustrating some potential applications, necessarily generic, but that can help to assess the potential value of the proposed framework, and identify also some limits.

Within the emerging debate on cultural citizenship, so far I have defended two complementary arguments. First, in overviewing the recent literature I have shaped the focus of cultural citizenship as a tool for inclusion in diversity contexts, and identified within this focus, two main drivers making cultural citizenship: the democratic/equality and the identity/national drivers. However, I have highlighted that the debate is too narrowly concentrated in the plurality of meanings of 'culture', and not, as I have argued as a second argument, in the plurality of democratic citizenship traditions: a liberal, a communitarian and a republican one. This view is at the basis of different approaches of cultural policies as functioning to enhance cultural citizens. To summarize, the liberal tradition sees citizens as cultural consumer, as citizen-spectators (for instance, the liberal concern can be illustrated as 'how many immigrants go to the museums in comparison to national consumers?'); meanwhile, the communitarian tradition enhances citizenship as cultural player, as participatory citizen (for instance, the communitarian concern can be stated as 'how many immigrants participate in the organization of festivities and/or take part in the collective cultural events of their neighbourhood?', which promotes their sense of belonging to their community, and community cohesion); and the republican democratic tradition of citizenship promotes immigrants as cultural producer, as creative and participatory citizen (for instance, 'how immigrant artists are promoted?' or even 'how culture is channelling current ways of immigrant mobilisation of protest?' – Let's say through music, painting, etc.)

I want now to argue that this can ground an interpretative framework that seeks to be empirically viable. This three-strand perspective of cultural citizenship can be applied to distinguish current social practices and local policies, and may serve as a basis for working on potential indicators for analysing the various ways of enhancing cultural citizenship in different spaces. However, this framework needs still to be proven through case studies analysis. I say ‘policies and social practices’ because I understand that a cultural policy promoting cultural citizenship could be carried out within a particular program of the city council and its cultural policy strategy for instance, or, from the same society, as a neighbourhood initiative or as a particular cultural institution working with culture for social and identity promotion. In other words, there can be a top-down and a bottom-up approach of cultural citizenship, and both approaches can frame the application of this interpretative framework.

Here, we can also say that the relationship between two concepts of culture may have their place as analytical tools applying the framework. In the cultural citizenship debate, there is a tension between propagation and preservation (Cunningham *et al.* 2005, p. 104). One concept of culture is understood as propagation into the future, and thus linked to creative processes and innovation; another concept is oriented towards conserving the past, and is linked to tradition and seeking preservation. This tension is obviously present in the cultural citizenship concept as a tool for inclusion in diversity contexts, where tradition (or the preservation of national identity) and innovation and creativity can initially be at odds. Here, maybe the distinction between diversity as a constraint for the preservation of national identity and/or diversity as an asset and advantage for creativity could play also an analytical function when applying the interpretative framework.<sup>13</sup>

It is also true that a potential weakness of this interpretative framework is that it may be limited to be applied in Western-regions, with a long democratic tradition. The historical development of democracy in non-Western regions is greatly different from that of European societies; therefore, the distinction between the three democratic traditions may not be pertinent. There may be some contemporary practices and policies which on surface, seem to follow a certain Western democratic tradition. However, it may be too simplistic and far-fetching to claim that these practices and policies derive from one or another democratic citizenship tradition.

Although, I will conclude, this framework of cultural citizenship needs still to be proven, we should note that we see its application not for shaping potential models and approaches at the city level or other territorial levels, but to distinguish practices and policies within a same territory. For instance, this framework could be the main wall for working on potential indicators for analysing the way a city enhances cultural citizenship. This can effectively be the added value of the focus I have proposed, as a tool for inclusion in diversity contexts.

### **Acknowledgements**

This article has been previously presented at the 21st International Conference of Europeanists, Council for European Studies (Washington, DC, 14–16 March 2014) in the workshop *Immigration and Cultural Policy: Debating new research trends in post-migration studies*. I thank comments from the participants IMISCOE Standing Group. It was also a key-lecture at the 12th Assembly of Experts of the Council of Europe / ERICarts (Vienna, 13 December 2013). I also thank all the participants for their comments.



## Notes

1. The incorporation of diversity within the cultural planning and policies is relatively recent (see, among others, the seminal works of Cardinal (1998), Bennett (2001a, 2001b), D'Angelo and Vespérini (1998), D'Angelo (2001), Ghilardi (2001), Baeker (2002), Skot-Hansen (2002), Ellmeir and Rásky (2006)) and there are some trends that try to approach it from intercultural perspective. See among others, Bloomfield and Bianchini (2004), Khan (2006), and Brecknock (2006).
2. See some recent works: Vertovec and Wessendorf (2010), Candle (2012), Barrett (2013), Zapata-Barrero (2013, 2015a, 2015b), and Vertovec (2014).
3. See, among others, Stanley (2005b), Caune (2006), and Bonet and Négrier (2012).
4. See for instance Turner (2001), citizenship studies and the policy relevance of this concept and its measurement in Andrew *et al.* (2005).
5. See, among others, Miller (2002), Chaney (2002), Delanty (2002), Mercer (2002), Andrew *et al.* (2005), Couldry (2006), and Zapata-Barrero (2014).
6. I take discussions from Miller (2002) and Wang (2013).
7. With some variants we can also mention Carens (2000) and Parekh (2000), falling also within this broad identity perspective of culture, however also combining it with the democratic driver.
8. See the key-concept book of Neuliep (2012), and chapter 3. 'The microcultural context'.
9. Sherman (2005) or, recently, Sievers (2014).
10. I take my previous work on citizenship, Zapata-Barrero (2004), and obviously there is a big array of literature. I will concentrate myself mainly in those that I think outline the most important arguments and perspectives: Bloemraad (2000), Stevenson (2001, 2003), Isin (2002), Isin and Turner (2002), and Bosniak (2006).
11. Of course this task is risky since we are forced to summarize and highlight what we consider relevant for each tradition to draw each standard, aware that from the citizenship studies there are a full literature of each tradition.
12. See Carr *et al.* (1993), Dines *et al.* (2006), Bagwell *et al.* (2012), and Francis *et al.* (2012).
13. Following the seminal work of Florida's 'creative class' notion (2002), the basic idea is to connect diversity with its citizens' creative opportunities. In Europe, urban studies scholars, such as Landry and Bianchini (1995), and also Landry (2000) have examined this notion alongside the role of cultural activity in urban regeneration. The argument of cultural citizens – qua-creative citizens as a tool for cohesion and development in diversity contexts remains still underexplored in this area. See also the seminal work of Andersson *et al.* (2011). Specially the chapters of R. Florida and Ch. Landry.

## ORCID

Ricard Zapata-Barrero  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3478-1330>

## References

- Andersson, D.E., *et al.*, eds., 2011. *Handbook of creative cities*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Andrew, C., *et al.*, eds., 2005. *Accounting for culture: thinking through cultural citizenship*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Baeker, G., 2002. Sharpening the lens: Recent research on cultural policy, cultural diversity, and social cohesion. *Canadian journal of communication*, 27 (2), 179–196.
- Bagwell, S., *et al.*, 2012. *Public space management: report to the Intercultural Cities Research Programme*. London: City University.
- Barrett, M., ed., 2013. *Interculturalism and multiculturalism: similarities and differences*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Bennett, T., 2001a. *Cultural policy and cultural diversity: mapping the policy domain*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Bennett, T., 2001b. *Differing diversities: transversal study on the theme of cultural policy and cultural diversity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- Bloemraad, I., 2000. Citizenship and immigration: a current review. *Journal of international migration and integration*, 1, 9–37.
- Bloomfield, J. and Bianchini, F., 2001. Cultural citizenship and urban governance in Western Europe. In: N. Stevenson, ed., *Culture and citizenship*. London: Sage, chap. 7, 99–123.
- Bloomfield, J. and Bianchini, F., 2004. *Planning for the intercultural city*. Stroud: Comedia.
- Bonet, L. and Négrier, E., 2012. The nds(s) of national culture? Cultural policy in the face of diversity. *International journal of cultural policy*, 17 (5), 574–589.
- Bosniak, L., 2006. *The citizen and the alien: dilemmas in contemporary membership*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brecknock, R., 2006. *More than just a bridge: planning and designing culturally*. Bournes Green: Comedia.
- Cantle, T., 2012. *Interculturalism: the new era of cohesion and diversity*. London: Palgrave.
- Cardinal, D., 1998. *Changing purposes of municipal cultural policy*. Presentation at Cultural Policies and Cultural Practices: Exploring Links between Culture and Social Change conference Ottawa. Ottawa: Canadian Cultural Research Network.
- Carens, J., 2000. *Culture, citizenship, and community*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carr, S., et al., 1993. *Public space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caune, J., 2006. *La démocratisation culturelle* [The cultural democratization]. Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- Chaney, D., 2002. Cosmopolitan art and cultural citizenship theory. *Culture & society*, 19: 157–174.
- Couldry, N., 2006. Culture and citizenship: the missing link? *European journal of cultural studies*, 9 (3), 321–339.
- Cunningham, S., et al., 2005. From ‘culture’ to ‘knowledge’: an innovation systems approach to the content industries. In: C. Andrew, et al., eds. *Accounting for culture: thinking through cultural citizenship*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, chap. 8, 104–123.
- D’Angelo, M., 2001. *Cultural policies in Europe: local issues*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- D’Angelo, M. and Vespérini, P., 1998. *Cultural policies in Europe: a comparative approach*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Training series 1.
- Delanty, G., 2002. Two conceptions of cultural citizenship: a review of recent literature on culture and citizenship [online]. *Ethnopolitics*, 1 (3), 60–66. Available from: [www.ethnopolitics.org/archive/volume\\_1/issue\\_3/delanty.pdf](http://www.ethnopolitics.org/archive/volume_1/issue_3/delanty.pdf)
- Dines, N., et al., 2006. *Public spaces, social relations and well-being in east London*. London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Ellmeier, A. and Rásky, B., 2006. *Differing diversities: Eastern European perspectives: transversal study on the them of cultural policy and cultural diversity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Florida, R., 2002. *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.
- Francis, J., et al., 2012. Creating sense of community: the role of public space. *Journal of environmental psychology*, 32, 401–409.
- Ghilardi, L., 2001. Cultural planning and cultural diversity. In: T. Bennett, ed. *Differing diversities: cultural policy and cultural diversity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 123–135.
- Inis, E., 2002. *Being political: genealogies of citizenship*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Inis, E.F. and Turner, B.S., eds., 2002. *Handbook of citizenship studies*. London: Sage.
- Inis, E.F. and Wood, P.K., 1999. *Citizenship and identity*. London: Sage.
- Karaca, B., 2009. Governance of or through culture? Cultural policy and the politics of culture in Europe. *Focaal – European journal of anthropology*, 55, 27–40.
- Karim, H.K., 2005. The elusiveness of full citizenship: accounting for cultural capital, cultural competencies and cultural pluralism. In: C. Andrew, et al., eds. *Accounting for culture: thinking through cultural citizenship*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 146–158.

- Khan, N., 2006. *The road to interculturalism: tracking the arts in a changing world*. London: Comedia.
- Kymlicka, W., 1995. *Multiculturalism: a liberal view of minority rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Landry, C., 2000. *The creative city: a toolkit for urban innovators*. Sterling, VA: Comedia.
- Landry, C. and Bianchini, F., 1995. *The creative city*. London: Demos.
- Marshall, T.H., 1950. *Citizenship and social class: and other essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martiniello, M., 2014. Artistic separation versus artistic mixing in European multicultural cities. *Identities: global studies in culture and power* (Special Issue: Artistic separation versus artistic mixing in European multicultural cities), 21 (1). Re-edited by Routledge in 2015 with the title: Multiculturalism and the arts in European cities.
- Mercer, C., 2002. *Towards cultural citizenship: tools for cultural policy and development*. Stockholm: Gidlunds Forag.
- Miller, T., 2002. Cultural citizenship. In: E.F. Isin and B.S. Turner, eds. *Handbook of citizenship studies*. London: Sage, 231–244.
- Moore, M., 2003. *Rethinking participation: a framework for change*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.
- Murray, C., 2005. Cultural participation: a fuzzy cultural policy paradigm. In: C. Andrew, et al., eds. *Accounting for culture: thinking through cultural citizenship*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 32–54.
- Neuliep, J.W., 2012. *Intercultural communication: a contextual approach*. 5th ed. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Parekh, B., 2000. *Rethinking multiculturalism: cultural diversity and political theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pyykkönen, M., 2012. UNESCO and cultural diversity: democratisation, commodification or governmentalisation of culture? *International journal of cultural policy*, 18 (5), 545–562.
- Rosaldo, R., 1999. Cultural citizenship, inequality, and multiculturalism. In: R.D. Torres, L. Mirón, and J.X. Inda, eds. *Race, identity, and citizenship: a reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 253–261.
- Schnapper, D., 1994. *La communauté des citoyens* [The citizenship community]. Paris: Sur l'idée moderne de nation.
- Sharon Jeannotte, M., 2005. Just showing up: social and cultural capital in everyday life. In: C. Andrew, et al., eds. *Accounting for culture: thinking through cultural citizenship*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 124–145.
- Sherman, T., 2005. Artists' behaviour in the first decade. In: C. Andrew, et al., eds., *Accounting for culture: thinking through cultural citizenship*. Ottawa: The University of Ottawa Press, Governance Series, 82–88.
- Sievers, W., 2014. From others to artists? Immigrant and ethnic minority art. In: M. Martiniello and J. Rath, eds. *An introduction to immigrant incorporation studies: European perspectives*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Skot-Hansen, D., 2002. Danish cultural policy – from monoculture towards cultural diversity. *International journal of cultural policy*, 8 (2), 197–210.
- Stanley, D., 2005a. The three faces of culture: why culture is a strategic good requiring government policy attention. In: C. Andrew, et al., eds. *Accounting for culture: thinking through cultural citizenship*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 21–31.
- Stanley, D., 2005b. *Recondita armonia – a reflection on the function of culture in building citizenship capacity*, A study prepared for the Council of Europe in the framework of the European Year of Citizenship 2005, Policy Note No. 10.
- Stevenson, N., ed., 2001. *Culture and citizenship*. London: Sage.
- Stevenson, N., 2003. *Cultural citizenship: cosmopolitan questions*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Stevenson, N., 2010. Cultural citizenship, education and democracy: redefining the good society. *Citizenship studies*, 14 (3), 275–292.
- Turner, B., 2001. Outline of a general theory of citizenship. In: N. Stevenson, ed., *Culture and citizenship*. London: Sage, 11–32.
- Vertovec, S., ed., 2014. *Migration and diversity*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Vertovec, S. and Wessendorf, S., eds., 2010. *Backlash against multiculturalism in Europe: public discourse, policies and practices*. Londres: Routledge.
- Wang, L.-J., 2013. Towards cultural citizenship? Cultural rights and cultural policy in Taiwan. *Citizenship studies*, 17 (1), 92–110.
- Williams, R., 1976. *'Culture' in keywords a vocabulary of culture and society*. Nueva York: Oxford University Press, 87–93.
- Zapata-Barrero, R., 2004. *Multiculturalidad e inmigración* [Multiculturalism and immigration]. Madrid: Síntesis.
- Zapata-Barrero, R., 2014. The limits to shaping diversity as public culture: permanent festivities in Barcelona. *Cities: the international journal of urban policy and planning*, 37, 66–72.
- Zapata-Barrero, R., 2015a. Exploring the foundations of the intercultural policy paradigm: a comprehensive approach. *Identities: global studies in culture and power* [Online first]. doi:10.1080/1070289X.2015.1006523.
- Zapata-Barrero, R., ed., 2015b. *Interculturalism in cities: concept, policy and implementation*. Cheltenham: Edward-Elgar Publishing.
- Zapata-Barrero, R., et al., 2013. The political participation of immigrants in host countries: an interpretative framework from the perspective of origin countries and societies. INTERACT Research Report, 2013/07, 1–31.

### Reports and institutional documents

- Agenda 21 for Culture. Available from: <http://agenda21culture.net/index.php>
- Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development, entitled 'Our Creative Diversity', 1996. Available from: [http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=22431&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=22431&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)
- UNESCO, 1997. *Cultural citizenship in the 21st century: adult learning and indigenous peoples*. Follow-up to the Fifth International Conference on Adult Education. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/education/uie/confintea/pdf/1b.pdf>
- UNESCO, 2005. Protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/new/es/culture/themes/cultural-diversity/diversity-of-cultural-expressions/the-convention/convention-text/>
- UNESCO Declaration on Cultural Diversity, 2001. Available from: [http://portal.unesco.org/es/ev.php-URL\\_ID=13179&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/es/ev.php-URL_ID=13179&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)
- UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, 2002. Paris: UNESCO. Available from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf>