

Developing a Local Cultural Indicator Framework in Australia: A Case Study of the City of Whittlesea

Audrey Yue, Rimi Khan et Scott Brook

Volume 3, numéro 1-2, 2011

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1108058ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.18192/clg-cgl.v3i1.191>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Centre d'étude en gouvernance, Université d'Ottawa

ISSN

1911-7469 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Yue, A., Khan, R. & Brook, S. (2011). Developing a Local Cultural Indicator Framework in Australia: A Case Study of the City of Whittlesea. *Culture and Local Governance / Culture et gouvernance locale*, 3(1-2), 133-149. <https://doi.org/10.18192/clg-cgl.v3i1.191>

Résumé de l'article

Cet article examine les pratiques de planning culturel de la ville de Whittlesea, une localité Australienne, et considère l'impact de cette planification sur le tissu social multiculturel de la région. Située en marge d'une région métropolitaine, la ville compte parmi les localités les plus vastes et les plus diversifiées du grand Melbourne, avec plus de la moitié de ses résidents issus de communautés d'origines culturelles autres qu'anglo-celtique.

Premièrement, cet article illustre comment le développement durable est rendu possible par une structure de collaboration interdépartementale ainsi que par un focus de planification orienté vers la culture et le développement durable. Ensuite, cet article aborde les enjeux de la mise en oeuvre du développement durable à travers ces politiques et programmes, notamment ceux de citoyenneté culturelle. Enfin, cet article a pour objectif d'évaluer deux événements communautaires afin de mesurer la portée de la participation culturelle. En combinant les données empiriques et une analyse théorique de la littérature, cet article vise à produire un modèle de développement culturel local basé sur des indicateurs afin de mesurer le niveau de participation des communautés d'origines culturelles autres, qu'anglo-celtique. En particulier, cet article tente d'établir des indicateurs culturels ayant une forte valeur pour la planification culturelle locale. Il s'agit par ailleurs de fournir un gabarit qui permettrait de développer des indicateurs utiles pour les administrateurs locaux. Un cadre d'analyse et des indicateurs locaux nous permettront de développer des outils robustes afin de mesurer et de saisir les différents aspects de la citoyenneté culturelle locale dans un contexte multiculturel.

© Audrey Yue, Rimi Khan, Scott Brook, 2011



Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

<https://www.erudit.org/fr/>

Developing a Local Cultural Indicator Framework in Australia: A Case Study of the City of Whittlesea

Audrey Yue

Rimi Khan

University of Melbourne, Australia

Scott Brook

University of Canberra, Australia

Abstract: This paper critically examines the cultural planning agenda of the City of Whittlesea, a local government municipality in Australia, and considers its impact on the region's multicultural communities. Located on the metropolitan fringe, the City is geographically one of the largest and most diverse municipalities in greater Melbourne, with more than half of the residents from non-Anglo-Celtic backgrounds. First, the paper shows how sustainability is achieved through a structure of inter-departmental collaboration as well as in a cultural planning focus on community cultural development. Next, it examines how sustainability is implemented in its policies and programs through the development of cultural citizenship. Finally, it evaluates two community events to consider the extent of cultural participation. Combining empirical data and theoretical research, this paper aims to produce a working model for developing local cultural indicators to measure the cultural participation of non-Anglo Celtic communities. Specifically, this paper hopes to establish cultural indicators with direct policy relevance for local government, and incorporate a detailed consideration of the 'use-context' of the cultural indicators in the City in order to provide a template for best practice at municipal program levels. A localized cultural indicator framework will enable robust tools of measurement to account for thick narratives of multicultural participation that can continue to enhance well-being, place making, and belonging.

Keywords: integrated cultural planning, multiculturalism, cultural indicators, growth corridor suburbs, cultural policy

Résumé : Cet article examine les pratiques de planning culturel de la ville de Whittlesea, une localité Australienne, et considère l'impact de cette planification sur le tissu social multiculturel de la région. Située en marge d'une région métropolitaine, la ville compte parmi les localités les plus vastes et les plus diversifiées du grand Melbourne, avec plus de la moitié de ses résidents issus de communautés d'origines culturelles autres qu'anglo-celtique. Premièrement, cet article illustre comment le développement durable est rendu possible par une structure de collaboration interdépartementale ainsi que par un focus de planification orienté vers la culture et le

Audrey Yue is Senior Lecturer in Cultural Studies at the University of Melbourne, Australia. Rimi Khan is a doctoral candidate and Sessional Tutor at the University of Melbourne. Scott Brook is Assistant Professor of Writing at the University of Canberra, Australia. E-mail: aisy@unimelb.edu.au.

développement durable. Ensuite, cet article aborde les enjeux de la mise en œuvre du développement durable à travers ces politiques et programmes, notamment ceux de citoyenneté culturelle. Enfin, cet article a pour objectif d'évaluer deux événements communautaires afin de mesurer la portée de la participation culturelle. En combinant les données empiriques et une analyse théorique de la littérature, cet article vise à produire un modèle de développement culturel local basé sur des indicateurs afin de mesurer le niveau de participation des communautés d'origines culturelles autres, qu'anglo-celtique. En particulier, cet article tente d'établir des indicateurs culturels ayant une forte valeur pour la planification culturelle locale. Il s'agit par ailleurs de fournir un gabarit qui permettrait de développer des indicateurs utiles pour les administrateurs locaux. Un cadre d'analyse et des indicateurs locaux nous permettront de développer des outils robustes afin de mesurer et de saisir les différents aspects de la citoyenneté culturelle locale dans un contexte multiculturel.

Mots clé : planification culturelle intégrée, multiculturalisme, indicateurs culturels, les banlieues des corridors de croissance, politique culturelle

Introduction

The City of Whittlesea (COW) is located on the metropolitan fringe approximately 20 kilometers to the north of the Melbourne Central Business District in Australia.¹ Covering an area of approximately 487 square kilometers, the City is geographically one of the largest and most diverse municipalities in greater Melbourne, with more than half of the residents from Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) backgrounds.² It incorporates 17 suburbs, 13 postal districts, and houses 130,000 people, with 40 new residents arriving every week. It has one of the country's most innovative cultural planning agendas characterized by the integration of sustainability. In 2007 and 2008, the City organized 67 cultural events that attracted at least 50,000 participants. By critically examining its cultural planning agenda against state and national cultural policy developments, and considering its impact on the region's CALD communities, this paper develops a localized framework for cultural indicators in Australia's growth corridor suburbs.³

Local government cultural planning: Cultural citizenship, social capital, and sustainability

Theorizations of cultural planning and sustainability highlight culture as the fourth pillar of sustainability, alongside of social, economic and environmental aims, and integration as a new framework for combining these four pillars. While some countries in Asia advocate an approach to

¹ In this paper, the acronym COW has two usages, referring both to the geographical region and the local government.

² 'Culturally and Linguistically Diverse' is an Australian census term used to classify the country's non-English speaking population. We use this term in this paper as an umbrella category.

³ This paper comes out of a project, 'Negotiating Cultural Insecurity: Multiculturalism, Arts Policy, Cultural Indicators and Cultural Citizenship', funded by the University of Melbourne Research Collaboration Grant (2009). The growth corridor suburbs, also known as interface cities, are newly emerging semi-rural-urban precincts outside of Australia's metropolitan hubs.

adaptive reuse in terms of urban regeneration, heritage conservation, and green ecology (Lau 2009), others call for a polycentric and defragmented approach to global cities (Jenks, Kozak & Takkanon 2008) and recommend a sustainable approach to new urbanism in the wake of urban decline and the spread of the suburban sprawl (Haas 2008). In Australia, these strategies are also advocated at national, state, and local government levels. *Cultural vitality* has been promoted as essential to a healthy and sustainable society as it contributes to social equity, environmental responsibility, and economic viability. Cultural vitality is taken as referring to the 'wellbeing', 'creativity', 'diversity', and 'innovation' that are the product of everyday forms of community interaction and involvement, which for Jon Hawkes (2001) are evident in a range of citizenly attributes: "robust diversity, tolerant cohesiveness, multi-dimensional egalitarianism, compassionate inclusivity, energetic creativity, open minded curiosity, independent confidence, rude health" (p. 23). Key to the innovative cultural planning agenda at the COW is its approach to integration.

COW's cultural programs are particularly significant given recent shifts that have taken place in Australian arts and cultural policy. Questions of social equity in relation to the CALD population are being increasingly discussed in terms of 'social cohesion' and 'social inclusion' rather than 'multiculturalism' (Jupp et al. 2007; Hage 2003), while cultural policy is increasingly promoted as a vehicle for overcoming the effects of social exclusion for a range of social groups (Mills 2006; Arts Victoria 2006).

The community cultural development (CCD) sector emerged in Australia in the 1970s following the introduction of community development rationales for public arts funding by government bodies. Traditionally oriented towards using cultural and artistic expression as a means to address issues of cultural and social disadvantage within the community, the sector was based on a vision for "stronger, more self-directed and culturally vibrant communities in Australia" (Dunn 2004, p. 1; Hawkins 1993). This was accompanied by an increasing number of studies into the social impact of the arts, linking community-based art with social outcomes such as social capital and community well-being (Belifore & Bennett 2008; Evans 2003; Krempf 2002; Matarasso 1997; Mills & Brown 2004; Moynihan & Norton 2002; Pitts 2004).

The recent move to the rhetoric of building creative capacity has resulted in a move away from the language of cultural development, and towards rationales of economic growth and renewal (Dunn 2004, p. 5; Jose 2006). In Australia, this has led to concerns that the economic benefits of culture are being prioritized over its social outcomes (Hawkes 2001; Stevenson 2000). Against such a backdrop, COW's sustainable cultural planning rationale is unique; its CCD framework has enabled its constituency to cultivate a range of non-economic outcomes, particularly social capital.

Much has been written on the contribution of community-based arts and cultural activities to the formation of 'social capital' (Moriarty 2004; Onyx & Bullen 2000; Williams 1996). The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) defines social capital as the "networks, together with shared norms, values and understandings which facilitate cooperation within or among groups" (Biddle et al. 2009, p. 2). These networks also encompass "the resources embodied in membership of social networks" (Ferres & Adair 2005, p. 7). The qualities of these networks are said to include norms "such as trust, reciprocity and inclusiveness, and common purposes such as social, civic and economic participation" (Edwards 2004, p. 5). Following the work of Robert Putnam, a number of commentators distinguish between *bonding capital* ("relationships between similar kinds of people

or groups”) and *bridging capital* (“connections where members have less in common”) (Edwards 2004, p. 5). Putnam’s widely circulated model of social capital articulates well with the normative policy project of ‘social inclusion’ insofar that it enables a horizontal analysis of association networks and ultimately affirms the importance of social capital to individual and collective well-being. However, in operationalizing the notion of social capital in the current project we added to this model a slightly more critical account currently circulating in cultural policy, one that might capture hierarchical relationships and the differing capacities of social networks and relationships to engage with these operators of power. The concept of *linking capital*, defined as “vertical relationships with sources of influence or authority which assist with access to financial and other resources” (Edwards 2004, p. 5), recommended itself to the current project due to the way it enables a more differentiated analysis of social capital (not all social contacts and involvements have the same value) and a vertical analysis of social connections. More specifically, *linking capital* enabled the analysis of a particular kind of social capital that would be important for individuals seeking to act on the community through established agencies, such as the media, the committees of local organizations (e.g., trader’s associations and schools), and state and municipal government. Of course, such a focus approaches the account of social capital offered by Pierre Bourdieu (1986) where this concept enables an analysis of the reproduction of social elites who through their accumulated monopoly on social recognition within group-specific settings (and the associated capitals into which such social capital can be ‘converted’) appropriate the power to represent the group to others. Although the notion of linking capital overlaps with Bourdieu’s notion of social capital as the basis of specific forms of social power, our operationalization of this idea is far more normative in its purposes and falls short of an account of the role of social capital in actively reproducing an unequal distribution of social resources.

The research team conducted a policy discourse analysis of the two main cultural planning documents: (1) the *COW Integrated Community Cultural Development Plan 2008-2012* (the *Plan*) (COW 2008a); and (2) the *COW Integrated Cultural Plan 2006-2010* (the *Cultural Plan*) (COW 2006).⁴ These plans make up the cultural policy of COW and fall under the auspice of the Community Cultural Development Department (CCDD). Established in 2008, the CCDD comprises five portfolios: Festival and Event Management, Cultural Identity, Community Development through Performing Arts, Multicultural Services, and Aboriginal Services. This new structure (from its previous Arts Unit) highlights a new focus on community cultural development (CCD).

These plans are framed by a vision of sustainability through its approach to integration. Cultural planning is integrated with other planning streams through collaboration and information-sharing with other departments and the community, as exemplified in Table 1.

⁴ The *Plan* is a working document and not publicly available. It outlines the history and structure of the Community Cultural Development Department, highlighting the specific responsibilities of each portfolio. A short version of this, the *Cultural Plan*, is available online (COW 2010). The research team is not involved in drafting these plans.

Table 1. Examples of ways in which local government aims to integrate cultural planning with other planning streams

Cultural	Social	Environmental	Economic
Identify, reflect, strengthen, utilize, and support our community's cultural values, creative capacity, and potential.	Community building in new development areas using an arts project as a means to bring new residents together.	Projects that preserve, protect, and promote local heritage sites and artefacts.	Cultural projects that invigorate the city and enhance its vitality, thereby encouraging people to shop, visit, invest, or move there.
	History and heritage projects to assist long-term residents preserve and protect their community identity.	Public art and interpretive projects that improve the streetscape, parks, and community buildings.	Long-term cultural projects with community groups to assist them to become more entrepreneurial and resourceful.
	Arts projects that connect long-term residents with new arrivals through shared interests in an art-form.	Cultural projects that inform and educate the community about environmental values in the local area.	Cultural projects with particular groups (e.g., youth) to assist them gain confidence, contacts, skills, and experience.

COW's integrated approach to sustainability has enabled local government to meet the needs of new migrants and established communities through the provision of cultural resources and services in a rapidly growing region that lacks public infrastructure and amenities. Its policy frameworks are useful for considering the development of local cultural indicators as they relate to the broader aims of state and federal cultural planning.

Cultural indicators are statistics that can be used to make sense of cultural phenomena (e.g., arts, programs, activities) to monitor the success of cultural planning for cultural rights (Madden 2005). While some early theoretical work on cultural indicators was undertaken in the 1970s and 1980s (Melischek et al. 1984), it was not until the 1990s that a substantive policy-orientation began to emerge, particularly with a number of papers commissioned by UNESCO (Gouiedo 1993; Pattanaik 1997; McKinley 1997). More recent studies include generalized accounts of international overviews that attempt to develop cultural indicators (Ferres & Adair 2005) or focus on techniques of measurement (Allaire 2006; Australia Council 2004). While some previous research on cultural indicators in the state of Victoria has been undertaken, this has tended to be subsumed under a broader concern with social and economic indicators and the framework of community 'well-being' and 'quality of life' (Wiseman et al. 2006). The approach of this study is thus very specific within this broad field. Following Duxbury (2007, 2008), this paper develops a framework of cultural indicators at local level that overcomes the common problems with existing studies, such as lack of local specificity, lack of quality data, and vague policy objectives (IFACCA 2002; Galloway 2009; Jackson et al. 2003). Here the cultural indicator framework is used to measure the effectiveness of

municipal-level policies and cultural programs, with particular attention to development of cultural citizenship amongst CALD communities. The research team approached this in two ways: through policy discourse analysis and program evaluation. Integrating the results from the close reading of cultural planning documents with the evaluation of two events, a localized cultural indicator framework for a growth corridor suburb with a high multicultural constituency was developed.

Policy discourse analysis

Statements in COW's two cultural plans were closely examined and classified into key themes or categories. This analysis identified seven program-wide policy objectives, which fall under the broader goal of 'cultural citizenship': community capacity; social capital; culturally rich and vibrant communities; cultural identity; access and participation; council responsiveness; and place and environment (see Table 2).

The policy documents ascribed varying levels of priority to each objective. The level of priority given to each objective was derived from a content analysis of the policy documents – that is, the number of times each statement appears was counted. These priority levels are highlighted in the diagram below according to the 'tier' in which each objective is situated, with Tier 1 considered the most important objective, and Tiers 2 and 3 containing objectives of slightly lesser importance. Each objective is defined with reference to specific examples of how these objectives appear in COW documents. The objectives should be regarded as interacting and overlapping with each other, highlighting the way in which the separate portfolio areas of the CCDD fall under a set of distinct, yet closely related, goals.

While the term *cultural citizenship* is not used in the policy documents, it is a useful term for linking these various objectives together, and demonstrating how these objectives are actually encompassed by one broad policy goal. Over the last decade, the term *cultural citizenship* has been increasingly promoted as a means of conceptualizing the new field of research opened up by the notion of *cultural rights* (Andrew et al. 2005; Mercer 2002). At its broadest, it refers to the 'cultural' dimensions that attend membership of a national population, such as the forms of social participation and specific knowledges regarded as important for citizens to engage in and possess. It can refer to both rights and obligations, and has also been described in terms of 'cultures of citizenship' (Couldry 2006). It can be analyzed more specifically as a set of capacities that provide the necessary practical support for civic participation and the activation of other citizenship rights (such as the right to education and employment). Accordingly, cultural citizenship refers to active capacities that are differentially distributed throughout the population (Turner 2002; Rosaldo 1997; Stevenson 2003). It is a field of contest in which the recognition of cultural difference is understood as central to the equitable distribution of those capacities that underpin effective civic participation. Given the shifting priorities and rhetoric of the CCD sector outlined earlier, *cultural citizenship* offers a useful rubric with which to consider the intersection between community engagement in cultural activities, cultural diversity, and strategies of community capacity-building.

Table 2. Policy analysis of COW's cultural plans

Cultural Citizenship	Objectives	Examples from COW Plans
Tier 1	Community capacity	Civic engagement/Participation; Skills/Education; Community capacity for initiative, self-organizing communities; Cosmopolitan/liberal capacities.
Tier 2	Social capital	Linking social capital: capacities to engage social agencies that hold power (COW, media, etc.); Community cohesion; Belonging; Confidence; Networks; Ownership.
	Culturally rich and vibrant communities	Diversity for its own sake, cultural abundance; Liveliness, vitality; Celebration; Enhanced quality of life.
	Cultural identity	Community heritage; Community recognition/respect for cultures; COW recognition/respect for cultures; Cultural maintenance.
Tier 3	Access and participation	Pertains to all physical and symbolic aspects of access; Cultural relevance of COW programs/activities; Community interests in programs/activities; Availability of culture to all members of the community.
	COW responsiveness	Service delivery; Community satisfaction; CCDD embodies/reflects communities; CCDD to be within reach of the community.
	Place and environment	Place-making; Beautification; Sense of place; Site heritage.

Between November 2009 and February 2010 the research team evaluated two cultural activities at COW using a multi-modal approach consisting of stakeholder interviews with CCDD staff and questionnaire surveys (for a sample of these questionnaires, see Yue et al. 2010, pp. 97-125). The selection of these two events was guided by a concern to evaluate two distinct event 'types' in cultural planning in relation to two distinct modes of CALD community participation. (It should be noted that the timeframe available for fieldwork also substantially reduced the number of possible events that could be included.) The first event, a CALD community forum, is an example of a community-specific event, one that seeks to build on specific links between COW and CALD communities resident in the municipality: it is hence a strong example of the exercise of targeted community development within a CCD program. The second event, a local 'carols by candlelight' concert, is an example of a general community event; despite its basis in the Christian calendar, the event seeks to be broadly accessible to local residents through gestures (typical of Australian Christmas events co-supported by municipal government and local businesses) towards a 'secularization' of proceedings and public space though the inclusion of family distractions, such as children's rides and food stalls, and the incorporation of more popular and multiethnic cultural content in formal proceedings, such as songs in languages other than English and pop music performances by young people. While the first event sought to make good on policy agendas

specific to the relation between COW and CALD communities, the second pursued the more historically routine cultural planning project of sustaining a non-discriminatory and festive public 'event' in which a diverse resident population might come together and experience this diversity.

Case study 1: Valuing Cultural Diversity Forum

Held on 4 November 2009, this community forum was aimed at facilitating a discussion about issues of concern to the multicultural community, in order to ensure better COW responsiveness to these issues. A member of the research team attended this event as an observer. A survey was also conducted with participants at the event examining how successful the event was in mobilizing and building social capital among CALD participants, and facilitating the participation of CALD communities in local government. The questionnaire sought to address the policy framework outlined above, and examined the degree to which the programs met these stated objectives. Of the 39 community participants who attended the forum, 28 completed questionnaires (72%) were returned. Because of the small sample size, comparisons to the broader COW population are indicative only, although many of the key findings were substantiated through more detailed follow-up interviews with four community participants and five staff members from COW's CCDD.

Our research findings revealed that the forum was successful in attracting participants from a broad range of cultural backgrounds (e.g., Egypt, Sudan, Malaysia, Cameroon, Samoa), particularly a number of people from smaller, emerging communities who may be in greater need of COW services. Forum participants tended to be better educated than the COW average⁵; however, only 61% were in paid employment. Overall, the representativeness of the forum reflects well the CCDD's objectives of access and participation, and it is clear that the program works to enable better COW responsiveness and service delivery. It primarily attracted people who have high existing levels of civic engagement – most had prior involvement with COW, are involved with other community organizations, or otherwise have an existing capacity to influence other community members. By engaging with local residents who are strategically positioned within their own community networks, the forum has the potential to effect broader community change. In this way, the forum clearly works to increase community capacity among participants and in the wider community. It also facilitated new connections among participants at the forum itself, increasing the social capital (including linking social capital) of these people: 61% exchanged contact details with others at the forum, and most stated that they intended to contact those with whom they had shared their contact details.

Participants' perceptions of the forum were overwhelmingly positive and there was a strong belief that the discussion addressed important issues. This was accompanied by a more general positive perception of COW and its support of CALD communities. The forum evidently works to foster and maintain a positive relationship between COW and CALD communities – particularly with those who are most actively involved within the community, strengthening links that work to improve community capacity. A specific challenge for the forum in the future might be to better engage with those with low levels of social capital; that is, more isolated community members who

⁵ Over two-thirds (68%) of forum participants were university educated, including approximately one-third (32%) who had a postgraduate degree. This represents a very high proportion of forum attendees who are university educated, compared with 22% of residents in COW who have a similar level of education.

are not already involved with COW, or do not regularly attend meetings with other community groups or associations. This is an important step in building the civic capacities of the broader CALD community, and generating a stronger sense of cultural citizenship among the more marginal population segments of COW.

Case study 2: Carols by Candlelight community event

This community-based event was held on 11 December 2009. An audience survey was conducted in order to develop a profile of event attendees and to assess the representation of CALD communities resident in the municipality. This profile is compared to the general demographic profile for COW. Research findings assessed how successful the event was in mobilizing and building social capital, and the types of interest CALD participants had in the event. Approximately 1,500 people attended the event as audience members, and 161 returned completed questionnaires. While this low response rate means that the survey findings are indicative only, the data collected enabled a broad evaluation of the achievements of the program and form a useful basis from which to continue further investigation into cultural activity in COW.

As the majority of the event's attendees were from Anglo-Celtic backgrounds, people from CALD backgrounds were somewhat underrepresented in the event's audience profile. However, given that the nature of the event means that it will be difficult to attract community members from non-Christian backgrounds, the proportion of people from CALD backgrounds (22%) who attended the event is impressive and reflects well on COW's objective of access and participation. The education and employment status of participants were broadly comparable to COW population (32% with a university degree), and the audience was also comprised of a wide range of age groups (with 47% in the 35-50 age group). While people from suburbs across the municipality were represented at the event, about half of all respondents lived in Mill Park, the suburb where the event was held.

Most participants became aware of the event through a combination of official COW promotion of the event and word of mouth. The substantial word of mouth component (21%) indicates the significance of existing social networks in raising awareness of a large-scale community event such as this. The event attracted an equal mix of regular attendees and those who had never attended before. This is a promising result for COW; repeat attendances indicate the ongoing success of the event in meeting community needs and expectations, while new attendances highlight the capacity of the event to grow in profile in future years. The fact that many audience members attended in groups, and/or met people they were not expecting to, demonstrates that the event had a substantial role in strengthening social capital. However, the event was primarily regarded as a family occasion (55%), rather than an opportunity to strengthen ties with broader networks of friends and neighbours. The overwhelming majority of audience members responded positively to the event in general. It is thus clear that the event was widely perceived as meeting community needs. It contributed to the cultural richness and vitality of the municipality, and was also generally perceived to reflect the cultural diversity of COW. Overall, there was a significant acknowledgement of the event's role in creating a sense of community belonging and cohesion (or social capital) with 61% of the respondents meeting someone at the event they were not planning to meet. However, while the event inspired this sense of belonging, the survey suggested it did not

motivate attendees to entertain the possibility of greater involvement, such as an aspiration to perform in the event, or civic engagement, such as an intention to become more involved with community or COW activities. This latter point is significant given that it is these sorts of community capacity that are a key objective in COW's policy agenda, and can be read as key components of building effective cultural citizenship.

Developing a framework for local cultural indicators

The process for developing the local cultural indicator framework used both the policy review and the case studies to determine issues and priorities for COW as they relate to cultural citizenship. This, in turn, enabled the research team to: (1) clarify *why* the indicators were being developed; (2) consider *how* the indicators will be interpreted and used within this municipal context; (3) distill each indicator into key dimensions; and (4) consider the level of information that "can usefully and sustainably be collected" for each of these indicator areas (IFACCA 2002, p. 11). This approach, adapted from IFACCA, provided an integrated process for developing cultural indicators relevant to COW. The indicator areas detailed in Table 3 are derived from the key objectives contained in the *Plan*. Each indicator area is broken down into 'key dimensions', 'measures', and 'data sources'. Unless otherwise stated, the questions suggested under 'data sources' were all used in evaluation instruments in the second section.

It should also be noted that the implementation of the indicator framework is at a preliminary stage, and the suggested data sources are thus not an exhaustive list but a framework that should be regularly revisited and revised as more consistent and reliable data sources become available to COW. For instance, while it would be useful to have statistical data on a range of modes of community 'engagement with cultural objects and activities', including the consumption of public cultural objects and events, the measure for 'participation in arts and cultural activities' currently available from Community Indicators Victoria is limited to six areas of creative arts practice: painting and drawing; art/craft activities; playing a musical instrument; singing; acting, dancing and other forms of performing; and creative writing (Community Indicators Victoria 2010). While such an instrument is clearly useful and to be welcomed, there are a host of other activities we might define as 'cultural', including, crucially, the consumption of local cultural objects and events (such as attending performances and exhibitions) that would be useful in measuring the impact of municipal cultural planning.

Table 3. A local cultural indicator framework that combines stakeholder interviews, policy review, and cultural evaluation

Note: Numbered headings refer to key indicator areas

1. Community Capacity	
Key dimensions:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic engagement/participation • Skills/education • Community capacity for initiative/self-organizing communities • Cosmopolitan/liberal capacities • ‘Linking’ social capital (institutional networks) 	
Measures:	Data source:
Data on community participation	Existing data from COW (2008b) annual household survey.
Data on education levels	Existing data from COW (2008b) annual household survey.
Data on participation in cultural events	Existing data from COW (2008b) annual household survey.
Networks with institutions, organizational affiliations	<p>Q. In the last year have you contacted any of the following organizations in order to discuss an issue of concern? [Insert list of relevant local community agencies, such as municipal council, local media, or local member for parliament]</p> <p>Q. Have you ever been a member of a group that has taken local action in relation to an issue?</p> <p>Q. Are you a member of committees with decision-making power?</p>
Data on community involvement/volunteerism	<p>Q. Are you a member of any community groups, societies, associations or clubs in the COW? (e.g., musical group, school committee, sports team, ethnic club, church group, etc.)</p> <p>Q. Do you perform any voluntary work for a community organization? (This might be at a community centre, nursing home, school, etc.)</p>
2. Social Capital	
Key dimensions:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community cohesion • Belonging • Confidence • ‘Linking’ social capital (institutional networks) • Ownership 	
Measures:	Data source:
Level of community cohesion	<p>Q. To what extent do you agree with: ‘[Insert program/event] makes me feel part of a community.’?</p> <p>Q. To what extent do you agree with: ‘[Insert program/event] gives me a sense of belonging to this area.’?</p>
Data on ‘cognitive capital’ (i.e., trust, reciprocity, belonging)	<p>Q. Participation in social activities [recreation group/cultural group].⁶</p> <p>Q. Do you think most people can be trusted in the neighborhood/at work/at school/of different cultural backgrounds?</p> <p>Q. Are you a member of any community groups, societies, associations or clubs in the COW? (e.g., musical group, school committee, sports team, ethnic club, church group, etc.)</p> <p>Q. Do you perform any voluntary work for a community organization? (This might be at a community centre, nursing home, school, etc.)</p>

⁶ This question was taken from Edwards (2004).

Measures: Data on networks with institutions, organizational affiliations	Data source: Q. In the last year have you contacted any of the following organizations in order to discuss an issue of concern? [list] Q. Have you ever been a member of a group that has taken local action in relation to an issue? Q. Are you a member or committees with decision-making power?
3. Culturally Rich and Vibrant Communities	
Key dimensions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural diversity for its own sake • Liveliness/cultural vitality • Celebration • Enhanced quality of life through engagement with cultural objects and activities 	
Measures: Data on involvement with cultural activities and cultural backgrounds of participants	Data source: Existing Community Indicators Victoria (2010) data on involvement in cultural activities. Existing ABS (2006) data on cultural background.
Variety of cultural experiences available	Undertake cultural mapping project of COW.
Funding/support for new or emerging artists	Existing organizational data on funding for relevant programs.
Funding for cultural activities	Existing organizational data on funding for relevant programs.
4. Cultural Identity	
Key dimensions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community heritage • Community recognition/respect for different cultures • COW recognition/respect for different cultures • Cultural maintenance 	
Measures: Data on involvement with cultural activities and cultural backgrounds of participants	Data source: Existing Community Indicators Victoria (2010) data on involvement in cultural activities. Existing ABS (2006) data on cultural background.
Opportunities for cultural expression	Q. To what extent do you agree with: 'In the COW there are opportunities for people from different cultural backgrounds to have their voices heard.'? Q. To what extent do you agree with: 'In the COW there are opportunities for people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds to present their arts and culture to the general public/to their own communities.'?
Perceptions of COW respect for cultural identity	Q. To what extent do you agree with: 'COW is committed to supporting culturally and linguistically diverse communities.'?
Perceptions of community respect for cultural identity	Q. To what extent do you agree with: 'Residents in the COW recognize and respect the different cultures within the municipality.'?
Attitudes towards cultural diversity	Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree that it is a good thing for a society to be made up of people from different cultures? ⁷
5. Access and Participation	
Key dimensions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both physical and symbolic aspects of 'access'. • Cultural relevance of COW programs/activities. • Community interest in programs/activities. • Availability of culture to all members of the community. 	

⁷ This question appeared in the Community Indicators Victoria (2010) project.

Measures: Data on involvement with cultural activities and cultural backgrounds of participants	Data source: Existing Community Indicators Victoria (2010) data on involvement in cultural activities. Existing ABS (2006) data on cultural background.
Adequacy/accessibility of arts/culture facilities	Collate profile of CCDD event/program participants. Source qualitative data from ethnic community members regarding barriers to participation. Q. To what extent do you agree with: 'In the COW there are opportunities for people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds to present their arts and culture to the general public/to their own communities.'?
Perceptions of community respect for cultural identity	Q. To what extent do you agree with: 'Residents in the COW recognize and respect the different cultures within the municipality.'?
6. COW Responsiveness	
Key dimensions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service delivery. • Community satisfaction. • CCDD embodies and reflects community priorities and aspirations. • CCDD to be within reach of community. 	
Measures: Satisfaction with service delivery for CALD communities	Data source: Q. To what extent do you agree with: 'COW is committed to supporting culturally and linguistically diverse communities.'? Q. To what extent do you agree with: '[Insert program/event] is an important event for local communities.'?
CCDD reflects community priorities and aspirations	The <i>Plan</i> to be revised regularly and adapted to incorporate concerns reflected in community consultations.
Adequacy/accessibility of arts/culture facilities	Collate profile of CCDD event/program participants. Source qualitative data from ethnic community members regarding barriers to participation. Q. To what extent do you agree with: 'In the COW there are opportunities for people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds to present their arts and culture to the general public/to their own communities.'?
7. Place and Environment ⁸	
Key dimensions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place making • Beautification • Sense of place • Site heritage 	
Measures: Sense of place	Data source: Q. To what extent do you agree with: '[Insert program/event] gives me a sense of belonging to this area.'?
Attitudes towards environment	Existing data from COW annual household survey. ⁹

⁸ Because 'place and environment' was not a specific priority of the two programs evaluated for this project, it was not within the scope of this paper to examine this indicator in depth.

⁹ Community attitudes towards the environment are measured in the COW annual household survey through a number of questions relating to perception and level of concern with various environmental issues, as well as recycling, energy, and water saving practices (COW 2009, pp. 71-81).

Conclusion

COW's framework of integration has allowed its Cultural Plans to be sustainable and hailed as best practice for local government in Australia. Sustainability is achieved through the structure of inter-departmental collaboration as well as in the plans' focus on community cultural development. This approach, in turn, supports the development of cultural indicators that might assess the impact of these policies and programs for CALD communities.

Following a critical policy review and evaluation of two cultural events, this paper has combined empirical data and theoretical research to produce a working model for developing local cultural indicators to measure the participation of CALD communities in an outer urban, inner rural Australian municipality. CALD communities make up 41% of the Australian population; in COW, they comprise 53% of its constituency, yet multicultural arts spending does not reflect these demographics. In the state of Victoria, only 3.5% is allocated to CALD arts funding, and in COW, CCD activities make up 1.5% of the local government budget. As well as the significant social impact of multicultural arts, funding for this sector is miniscule compared to the economic worth of the creative sector. In 2007-8, the sector generated AU\$31.1 billion and employed 487,000 individuals in private and public creative institutions in mainstream Australia. Clearly, sustainable cultural planning in local municipality creates diversity, revitalizes place, and generates productivity.

A localized cultural indicator framework will enable robust tools of measurement to account for thick narratives of multicultural participation that can continue to enhance well-being, place making, and belonging. Thick narratives that combine policy discourses with stakeholder interviews address local specificity and provide quality data that respond directly to specific policy objectives. Through a close discourse analysis of the *Cultural Plan*, this paper hopes it has established cultural indicators with direct policy relevance for COW, and incorporated a detailed consideration of the 'use-context' of the cultural indicators in COW, in order to provide a template for best practice at municipal program levels. While the results from our pilot study (Yue et al. 2010) have yet to circulate in the public domain, it has been used by the CCD team at COW as a possible template for future implementation. The research team hopes to continue monitoring this project over the next five years with more sustained involvement from state and federal stakeholders (see Papastergiadis et al. 2010).

References

- Allaire, B. (2006). *Analysis of methodologies used by cultural observatories: Guidelines for trainers and researchers*. Presentation at 'Analysis of Methodologies Used by Cultural, Observatories and Statistical Centres – Guidelines for Trainers and Researchers' conference, Bologna, October 18-19, 2006. Quebec City: Institut de la statistique Quebec.
- Andrew, C., Gattinger, M., Jeannotte, M.S. & Straw, W. (eds.). (2005). *Accounting for culture: Thinking through cultural citizenship*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Arts Victoria & Department for Planning and Community Development. (2006). *Strengthening local communities arts in community settings*. www.arts.vic.gov.au/content/Public/Research_and_Resources/Evaluation_Projects/Strengthening_Local_Communities.aspx [25 October 2009].

- Australia Council for the Arts. (2004). *Making cross-country comparisons of cultural statistics: Problems and solutions*. Sydney: Australia Council for the Arts.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). (2006). *Whittlesea: Basic community profile*.
- Belifore, E., & Bennett, O. (2008). *The social impact of the arts: An intellectual history*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Biddle, N., Davis, E., Myers, J. & Dodhy, R.S. (2009). *Exploring measures of low social capital*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1986). The forms of capital. In J.G. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- City of Whittlesea (COW). (2006). *Integrated cultural plan 2006-2010*. Melbourne: City of Whittlesea.
- City of Whittlesea (COW). (2008a). *Integrated community cultural development plan 2008-2012*. Melbourne: City of Whittlesea.
- City of Whittlesea (COW). (2008b). *2007 Household survey: Highlights bulletin*. Sustainability Planning Department, City of Whittlesea. www.whittlesea.vic.gov.au [10 September 2009].
- City of Whittlesea (COW). (2009). *Annual household survey: Municipal report 2008*. Sustainability Planning Department, City of Whittlesea. www.whittlesea.vic.gov.au [15 November 2009].
- City of Whittlesea (COW). (2010). Website. www.whittlesea.vic.gov.au [3 February 2010].
- Community Indicators Victoria (2010). Website. www.communityindicators.net.au [10 January 2010].
- Couldry, N. (2006). Culture and citizenship: The missing link. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3): 321-339.
- Dunn, A. (2004). *The cultural journey*. In Fourth Pillar Conference. Melbourne Town Hall.
- Duxbury, N. (2007). *Cities and communities: Cultural indicators at the local level workshop report*. Vancouver: Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities, Creative City Network of Canada.
- Duxbury, N. (2008). Cultural citizenship and community indicator projects: Approaches and challenges in the local/municipal context. *Multi-Disciplinary Research in the Arts* (special issue on 'Creative Local Communities: Cultural Vitality and Human Rights'), 1(2): 48-66.
- Edwards, R.W. (2004). *Measuring social capital: An Australian framework and indicators*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- Evans, M. (2003). *Community cultural development – a policy for social change?* Masters' thesis, Department of Arts, School of Creative Arts, University of Melbourne, Melbourne.
- Ferres, K. & Adair, D. (2005). Social capital, communities and recent rationales for the performing arts. *Engaging communities 2005 Conference*, 14-17 August, Brisbane. www.engagingcommunities2005.org/abstracts/Ferres-Kay-final.pdf [10 September 2009]
- Galloway, S. (2009). Theory-based evaluation and the social impact of the arts. *Cultural Trends*, 18(2): 125-148.
- Gouiedo, L.H. (1993). Proposals for a set of cultural indicators. *Statistical Journal of the United Nations ECE*, 10: 227-289.
- Hage, G. (2003). *Against paranoid nationalism: Searching for hope in a shrinking society*. Annandale, Victoria: Pluto Press.
- Hawkes, J. (2001). *The fourth pillar of sustainability: Culture's essential role in public planning*. Melbourne: Common Ground.
- Hass, T. (ed.). (2008). *New urbanism and beyond: Designing cities for the future*. New York: Rizzoli.
- Hawkins, G. (1993). *From Nimbin to Mardi Gras: Constructing community arts*. St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin.
- International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA). (2002). International comparisons of arts participation data. *D'Art Topics in Arts Policy*, no. 2.

- Jackson, M.R., Herranz, J. & Kabwasa-Green, F. (2003). *Art and culture in communities: Unpacking participation*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Jenks, M., Kozak, D. & Takkanon, P. (eds.). (2008). *World cities and urban form: Fragmented, polycentric, sustainable?* London: Routledge.
- Jose, J. (2006). *Community partnerships scoping study: Directions and opportunities discussion paper*. Sydney: Australia Council.
- Jupp, J., Nieuwenhuysen, J. & Dawson, E. (eds.). (2007). *Social cohesion in Australia*. Port Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Krempl, S. (2002). *The five dimensions of community*. Perth: Community Arts Network (WA).
- Lau, S. (ed.). (2009). *International sustainable and urban regeneration: Case studies and lessons Learned 2008. ICONUS Conference'08*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong College of Technology.
- Madden, C. (2005). Indicators for arts and cultural policy: A global perspective. *Cultural Trends*, 14(3): 217-247.
- Matarasso, F. (1997). *Use or ornament? The social impact of participation in the arts*. Stroud: Comedia.
- McKinley, T. (1997) *Cultural indicators of development*. Paris: UNESCO/UNRISD.
- Melischek, G., Rosengren, K.E. & Stappers, J. (eds.). (1984). *Cultural indicators: An international symposium*. Vienna, Austria: Verlag der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Mercer, C. (2002). *Towards cultural citizenship: Tools for cultural policy and development*. Hedemora: The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation & Gidlunds Forlag.
- Mills, D. (2006). *Cultural development and the arts in everyday life*. Discussion paper prepared for the Australia Council's Scoping Study Reference Group, Australia Council. www.australiacouncil.gov.au/research/community_arts/reports_and_publications/community_partnerships_scoping_study_information [27 October 2009].
- Mills, D. & Brown, P. (2004). *Art and wellbeing*. Sydney: Australia Council for the Arts.
- Moriarty, P. (2004). *Immigrant participatory arts: An insight into community-building in Silicon Valley*. San Jose, CA: Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley.
- Moynihan, S. & Horton, N. (2002). Protest or participate? Community cultural development and globalisation in Australia. In D. Adams & A. Goldbard (eds.), *Community, culture and globalisation*. New York: The Rockefeller Foundation.
- Onyx, J. & Bullen, P. (2000). Measuring social capital in five communities. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 36(1): 23-42.
- Papastergiadis, N., Yue, A., Harindranath, R., Hage, G., Panucci, F., Morton, J., Leonard, P. & Rinaudo, C. (2010). Multiculturalism and governance: Evaluating arts policies and engaging cultural citizenship. Australian Research Council Linkage Project Application Round 1, 2011 (LP110100039).
- Pattanaik, P.K. (1997). Cultural indicators of well-being: Some conceptual issues. *UNRISD/UNESCO occasional paper series on culture and development*, 2. Paris: UNESCO.
- Pitts, G. (2004). *Public art, public housing*. Melbourne: Cultural Development Network.
- Rosaldo, R. (1997). Cultural citizenship, inequality, and multiculturalism. In W. Flores & R. Benmayor (eds.), *Latino cultural citizenship: Claiming identity, space, and rights*. Boston: Beacon.
- Stevenson, D. (2000). *Art and organisation: Making Australian cultural policy*. St. Lucia, Qld.: University of Queensland Press.
- Stevenson, N. (2003). *Cultural citizenship: Cosmopolitan questions*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Turner, B. (2002). Outline of a general theory of cultural citizenship. In N. Stevenson (ed.), *Culture and citizenship*. London: Sage.
- Williams, D. (1996). *Creating social capital: A study of the long-term benefits from community-based arts funding*. Adelaide: Community Arts Network of South Australia.

- Wiseman, J., Heine, W., Langworthy, A., McLean, N., Pyke, J., Raysmith, H. & Salvaris, M. (2006). *Measuring wellbeing, engaging communities: Developing a community indicators framework for Victoria*. Melbourne: VicHealth & Department of Human Services.
- Yue, A., Harindranath, R., Khan, R. & Brook, S. (2010). *Negotiating cultural insecurity: Multiculturalism, arts policy, cultural indicators and cultural citizenship*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne and City of Whittlesea.