



UNCHARTED

Understanding, Capturing and Fostering the Societal Value of Culture



The UNCHARTED project received funding under the Horizon 2020 Programme of the European Union

Grant Agreement number: 870793

Deliverable number	D2.6
Title	Synthetic summary of the debates at the first workshop

Due date	Month 21
Actual date of delivery to EC	31 st October, 2021

Included (indicate as appropriate)	Executive Summary	<input type="checkbox"/>	Abstract	<input type="checkbox"/>	Table of Contents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------

Project Coordinator:

Prof. Arturo Rodriguez Morató
 Universitat de Barcelona
 Email: rodriguez.morato@ub.edu

Technical Coordinator:

Antonella Fresa
 Promoter S.r.l.
 Email: fresa@promoter.it

Project WEB site address:

<http://www.Uncharted-culture.eu>

Context:

Partner responsible for deliverable	University of Porto
Deliverable author(s)	João Teixeira Lopes (Coordinator); Sónia Apolinário; Lígia Ferro; Natália Azevedo; Catarina Figueiredo
Deliverable version number	1
Dissemination Level	Public

Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

1. TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Workshop Rationale 4
2. Participants 5
3. Worksoop Sessions 7
4. Concluding Remarks 45

1. WORKSHOP RATIONALE

The first UNCHARTED workshop, titled *Cultural values in the cultural sphere: a European perspective*, presented the results from the two initial work packages:

WP 1 carried out an initial analysis about how the values of culture in Europe are constructed, aiming with the central goal, to examine the influence of a series of circumstances and key factors in shaping these values in five areas: Gender and rising diversity; Urbanisation, spatial and social segregation; Globalization and digitization; Neo-liberalism; and the European historical and political experience in relation with the promotion of cultural values.

WP2 was aimed at analysing the emergence of values linked to culture in practical contexts and in the field of cultural policy and cultural administrations. Its specific objectives are:

- to identify the plurality of values of culture in cultural participation in live arts and culture
- to identify the plurality of values of culture in cultural participation through media
- to identify the plurality of values of culture in cultural production and heritage management
- to identify the plurality of values of culture in cultural administration
- to identify tensions, conflicts, and public controversies in these four domains.
- in the beginning of the WP2, and faced with the pandemic context, the Consortium agreed to include Covid-19 context and effects as an additional dimension of analysis in the domains of research.

Through an extended dialogue between the whole consortium, some members of the project advisory board and other invited stakeholders, this workshop developed an examination of the factors shaping the value of culture in Europe and carried out a systematic comparison between perspectives on different areas of cultural practice where these values emerge.

The programme included **sessions devoted to present and discuss the results of WP1 (Sessions 1 and 2)**; the **case studies carried out in WP2** were presented in several sessions focused on the three main areas in our project (cultural participation, cultural production and cultural administration), with Advisory Board members as discussants (**Sessions 3, 4 and 5**).

Another kind of session **confronted the synthetic representations of the configuration of values** in the different areas of cultural practice that had been elaborated along WP2, with practical reflections by selected stakeholders (**Sessions 6, 7 and 8**).

Two Special Sessions were important moments of debate. **Special Session I** had two invited keynote speakers on **the challenge of representing cultural value**. In the **final session (Special Session II)** partners and stakeholders debated the **Covid-19 impact** on the values of culture in cultural participation in view of generating policy recommendations for cultural institutions at a time of recovery of normality. This was a policy-oriented session confronting UNCHARTED findings in this respect in the two focused areas of cultural participation, in a discussion with some stakeholders (this activity will inform the production of an extra policy brief later on).

The Workshop happened in a hybrid format, in co-presence and remotely, for two days (16th and 17th September, 2021) at the Faculty of Arts and Humanities of the University of Porto.

2. PARTICIPANTS

The participants included the totality or the representatives of all the Consortium teams, some members of the Scientific Advisory Board, invited stakeholders and keynote speakers:

Consortium
Partners come from 7 European Countries: Spain, Hungary, Portugal, Italy, Norway, France, UK
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Universitat de Barcelona (Coordination) Arturo Rodríguez Morató, Matías Zarlenga, Mariano Martín Zamorano, Victoria Sánchez Belando, Uxío Novo Rey, Ariadna Peralta, Alain Quemín, Arianni Batista Rodríguez [remotely] 2. Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Gábor Sonkoly, Gábor Ólah, Eszter György 3. University of Coimbra Nancy Duxbury, Sílvia Silva, Cláudia Pato Carvalho, Paula Abreu 4. University of Bologna Cristina Boari, Simone Napolitano, Paolo Ferri, Luca Zan [remotely], Rebecca Levy Orelli [remotely] 5. Telemark Research Institute Ole Marius Hylland, Ola K. Berge, Åsne Dahl Haugsevje 6. CNRS Félix Dupin-Meynard, Emmanuel Négrier 7. University of Porto João Teixeira Lopes, Natália Azevedo, Sónia Apolinário, Lúcia Ferro 8. Goldsmiths, University of London Victoria D. Alexander, Oliver Peterson Gilbert 9. Promoter S.r.l. Antonella Fresa
Advisory Board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ulrike Meinhof – School of Humanities, University of Southampton ▪ Michael Hutter – WZB Berlin Social Science Center ▪ Kate Oakley – School of Culture and Creative Arts, Centre for Cultural Policy Research, University of Glasgow ▪ Helmut Anheier - Centre for Cultural Policy, Hertie School, Berlin
Invited stakeholders

As Discussants

- Mark O'Neill – Former Head of Glasgow Museums, University of Glasgow
- José Soares Neves – Iscte-University Institute of Lisbon/ OPAC – Portuguese Observatory on Cultural Activities [remotely]
- Roberto Grandi – Bologna Business School [remotely]
- Dea Vidović – Director of Kultura Nova Foundation [remotely]
- Antonio Volpone – Cultural Observatory of the Emilia Romagna Region; Director of ALTE Fondazione [remotely]
- Peter Inkei – Director of Budapest Regional Observatory on Financing Culture in East-Central Europe

As Chairs of some sessions

- Paulo Pires do Vale – Commissioner of the National Plan for the Arts, Portugal (couldn't attend, substituted by Isabel Mendes - GEPAC. Office for strategy, planning and evaluation for culture (Portugal))
- Marcin Poprawski – University of Applied Sciences (Finland) and AMU University in Poznan (Poland)

From institutions, enterprises and political field

- Rebecca Thonander – NEMO Association [remotely]
- Joost Heinsius – IDEA Consult
- Tone Østerdal – Association of Norwegian Concert Organizers
- Richárd Barabás – Hungarian politician, deputy of a district of Budapest (District 1), responsible for culture and international relations since 2019, member and spokesperson of the Dialogue for Hungary party (Párbeszéd Magyarországért)
- Susana Sousa – GEPAC. Office for strategy, planning and evaluation for culture, Portugal
- Isabel Mendes – GEPAC. Office for strategy, planning and evaluation for culture, Portugal

Keynote speakers

- Patrycja Kaszynska – University of the Arts London
- Valentina Montalto – Joint Research Centre [remotely]
- Ben Walmsley – University of Leeds [remotely]

3. WORKSHOP SESSIONS

Opening session

Chair Antonella Fresa, Promoter S.r.l.

Welcome Message (by Fernanda Ribeiro, Director of Arts Faculty – Porto University, João Teixeira Lopes, Institute of Sociology of Porto University, and Arturo Rodríguez Morató, University of Barcelona)

The opening session began with a welcome message from Fernanda Ribeiro, Director of Arts Faculty – Porto University, and an introduction to the workshop by João Teixeira Lopes and Arturo Rodríguez Morató (coordinator of the project).

Their speeches highlighted the importance of the Workshop and the enthusiasm it brings to its participants. In a current pandemic context, the Workshop was described as a sign of hope and the project as a symbol of unity and diversity.

The place and the role of the Workshop in the Project were the main topics addressed. It was explained that it emerges as a collective reflection about the Project and its theme – the values of culture in Europe. It was emphasized the importance of adopting a pragmatic view of values (not an essentialist one), that understands the values of culture as social constructions of different types of contexts. Also, a broad approach, considering macro and micro perspectives are taken in account.

The Workshop stands in the intersection of the two first stages of the Project and focuses on its three main areas – cultural participation, cultural production and cultural administration. It followed an explanation about its organization and its sessions. At the end, it was also mentioned the importance of the presence of the stakeholders in the Workshop, allowing UNCHARTED to see how its results resonate with stakeholders' view; and the Round Table that will, hopefully, points to a contribution to policies.

Keynote Speech. “Valuation as meaning making” by Patrycja Kaszynska, University of the Arts London

The keynote speech of Patrycja Kaszynska focused on the valuation as meaning making. Based on the AHRC Cultural Value Project, Patrycja reflected comprehensively about the cultural value and valuation. From a pragmatic perspective, Patrycja assumes that values are a product of collective agreements, which are influenced by several factors related to the local constraints in which they appear.

However, the actual framework of the value and valuation of culture seems not to

evidence this feature. The public discourse has been dominated by economic and metric expressions of value which lack transparency, and people don't understand where value comes from and why it is measured the way it is. Thus, Patrycja criticizes the way cultural value has been defined and the way the valuation of culture has been developed. She affirmed that instrumental calculations command the valuations of culture and that economy and markets are defining every single stand of value – the value of everything has been determined by the neoliberal instruments. Therefore, cultural policies and public management related to culture continue to be highly defined by this economical perspective, where statistics and quantitative instruments are the main form of valuating.

In this sense, an alternative valuation framework is proposed. Assuming that valuation is too important to leave to economic yardsticks and that there is a need to shake the cultural policy framework, Patrycja proposed a humanities-grounded and design-informed new approach with the purpose of improving the understanding of the value of culture. The proposal builds on the traditions of critical theory and pragmatism as well as the more recent work in inventive sociology and design; integrating the contributes of humanities and design. Humanities bring a normative component to that understanding of values and design can bring action, activating concepts. So, a normative, pragmatic, hermeneutic approach is suggested, based on 3Ds: Discursive, Deliberative, Designing approaches to understanding and fostering cultural values.

The central principle is that valuation should be approached as a meaning-making endeavor and studied as a form of deliberation and interpretation which is collectively justified. Comprising the way people collectively understand and interpret culture should be the center of the valuation.

Thereby, at the very end one question is raised: How can we create a new approach of valuating culture, contradicting the fact that policies and public management of culture are frequently controlled by the political elite and social aristocracy and turning it into something more collectively constructed?

Session 1 Factors shaping the value of culture: social and technological transformations

Chair Alain Quemin, Université Paris 8

Topic 1: “Analysis of the influence of gender and rising diversity in the configuration of the values of culture” (by Matías Zarlenga, University of Barcelona)

In the first topic of Session 1, Matías reflected about the influence of gender and rising diversity in the values of culture. This reflection aimed to identify the factors that contribute to the growth of diversity and gender equality in Europe; analyze how these factors impact on the shaping of values of culture; and explore the influence of ethnic

diversity on the change of values of culture by contrasting the cultural policy in UK, France, Germany, Spain and Bulgaria.

Starting with what led the rising diversity and increasing gender equality in European societies, Matías identified several factors. For the rising diversity, he mentioned the socio-demographic changes (much related to the increasing mobility of migrants); the changes in the composition of migratory flows in the European context; and the movements linked to the so-called ethnic minorities, feminist and LGBT groups. For the greater gender equality, Matías mentioned the feminization of employment in the three fundamental sectors; and the three lines of political and social action in pursuit of the principle of gender equality in Europe (equal treatment, positive affirmative action, gender mainstreaming process).

All these transformations brought changes to the values of society and, therefore, to the cultural field too. In society, we have seen a growth in tolerance and respect towards ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious and sexual orientation differences; a high level of tolerance and respect for differences that translates into new public policies for the integration of minority ethno-cultural groups; a recognition of sexual difference that translates into policies regarding gender equality; and even an integration of the value of difference in economy.

In the cultural field the main changes identified were: connection between ethno-cultural and gender diversity and processes of artistic and cultural creativity; platforms, projects, exhibitions and creative groups that promote the recognition of sexual and gender diversity; substitution of policies inspired on the idea of cultural democratization by policies based on the ideals of cultural democracy; and changes in the criteria established by cultural institutions for evaluation, promotion and exhibition.

Finally, he analyzed the influence of ethnic diversity on the change of values of culture by contrasting the cultural policy developments in the five European countries mentioned before. In this comparison three common patterns were found.

Firstly, a change in the criteria for artistic-cultural assessment in the orientation of cultural policies (moving from a universal liberal-humanist assessment criteria to a relative assessment criteria). Secondly, more respect to diversity in cultural programs and public actions through actions that understand culture as a means for social, educational and cultural inclusion and integration of different ethnic and religious groups (Spain, Bulgaria and France) and actions that seek recognition and equity in the participation of ethnic groups within the artistic-cultural sector (UK and France). And finally, more presence of the state in cultural policies related to diversity in the countries of historical migration (Germany, France and UK) that in those of recent migration, where there is a greater presence of civil society organizations and networks (Spain).

Topic 2: “Analysis of the influence of urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities in the configuration of the values of culture” (by Gábor Oláh, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem and Sónia Apolinário, University of Porto)

In Topic 2 of the session, Sónia and Gábor reflected about the way how urban configurations can influence the values of culture, focusing particularly on the phenomena of gentrification, touristification and spatial segregation; since they assume these phenomena and its consequences on urban heritage preservation are the factors that most determinate some major paradigm changes in recent urban development.

According to the speakers, urban regeneration has been most permeable to neoliberal logics and mostly characterized by gentrification, which has become a global and multi-scale territorial phenomenon. Urban spaces are major hubs of human mobility, both of migrations and of tourism; becoming multicultural places, where heritage, cultural industries and multi-ethnic neighborhoods are economic assets of tourism industry.

Regarding heritage, the number of urban sites is growing considerably, while due to the integration of the conceptual novelties of cultural heritage preservation the range of values to be preserved is expanding as well. Regardless the recent heritage discourses stress on the role of the local community and on the importance of participation to avoid such undesirable outcomes like gentrification, a great number of studies show that instead of the development of urban space, inequalities and segregation dynamics are reinforced. Local communities are severely affected by gentrification and touristification, that led them to a loss of space and of livability. Thus, there has been also a rise of resistance movements in many European cities upon this phenomenon.

So, gentrification and touristification have become main characteristics of urban reconfiguration, creating socio-spatial segregation and overtourism as major concerning outcomes. When it comes to the analysis of interrelations between urban heritage preservation and gentrification or socio-spatial segregation, it seems that heritage can not only act as an enabler on transformation of cultural spheres but with its increasingly important position in contemporary political and professional discourse on urban development, has major impacts on the urban configurations. Therefore, the speakers praised the importance of integrating social policy to respond to this new configuration.

Topic 3: “The influence of digitization in the configuration of the values of culture” (by Ole Marius Hylland, Telemark Research Institute)

In the third topic of the session, Ole Marius reflected about the influence of what is allegedly one of the most fundamental drivers of societal change for the past couple of decades – digitization – in the values of culture. Digitization was assumed by the speaker as the process of transition from analogue to digital modes of information, documentation, communication, production and distribution.

The research presented by Ole Marius aimed to look at how digitization and the digital turn affects the configuration of the values of culture; and it was developed through a systematic review to investigate results from different strands of research on the relations between digitization and on the configuration of values of culture.

Through the literature review, it was found that the identified values belong to three different broad categories – production, access and participation. The review conducted shows that digitization has affected the configuration of the values of culture in different ways. It has brought an increased complexity to the valuation of culture, and the views and attributed values of digitized culture have also developed during two decades of cultural digitization. In general, it was also found increasingly more critical views on the potential values of digitization in more contemporary research.

The values of production refer to how digitization affects the possibilities, work and results from cultural production. A central value in this category is creativity, in the sense that digital tools and digitized processes democratize creativity, enabling more people to take part in creative endeavors. At the same time, a growing number of works have pointed to the limitations of this creative democracy, perhaps mostly visible through the massive influence of the large platforms and tech companies.

The values of access are fundamental to promote and legitimate the public benefits of digitizing within the arts and culture sector. As a fundamental value of digitization, access has been seen as leading to subsequent, derived values, like democratization of culture, inclusion and general education. As analysis of digital access to culture has developed, the focus has shifted from mere access and availability to the way digitized culture is used and experienced by people.

And finally, the values related to participation are attributed to the actual use and experience of digital culture. A widely recognized value in this category is the potential for a more diverse audience, made possible through lower thresholds for participation. However, the results are ambiguous. Digital tools do not lead themselves to a more diverse audience and increased participation. There is nevertheless a potential value in diverse identification and heritage processes using digital and digitized cultural heritage. Regarding participation, it was also found within the studies a critical strand of analysis.

Session 2. Policy developments framing the value of culture

Chair Nancy Duxbury, Centre for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra

Topic 1: “Cultural values in policy discourse” (by Emmanuel Négrier, CNRS)

In the first topic of Session 2, Emmanuel made a reflection about the values attributed to culture by cultural policies in Europe. The speaker started his presentation by raising

some fundamental questions to solve some policy problems: Why question the social value of culture? How are cultural goods, services or practices essential? How to solve the paradox “priceless,” a common way to state a high value?

First, it is necessary to reflect about the concept of values. To define this concept, it is important to cross the contributions of different disciplines in order to arrive at a convergent meaning of value that only refers in relation to itself. Value is the principle from which acts, ideas, tangible and intangible goods can be measured. Valuation means the contingent nature of cultural value according to a certain context (of time, space or social condition). So, for analyzing the policy discourse of cultural value, the contingent approach is very relevant.

Concerning culture, there are a very large number of notions which claim to be of value. This brings a fundamental dilemma – How can we reduce those notions but in an integrative way? How can we classify them without simplifying too much? After having drawn up the “catalogue” of these “values” through an in-depth study of the literature on cultural policies, he identified five central values of culture as seen in cultural policies in Europe, which are intended to bring together the “levers of valuation” that are the norms, objectives and algorithms. These five values are: aesthetics, economy, democracy, identity, and well-being.

In this sense, Emmanuel referred to the necessity to pass from an absolute view of culture to a relative one. Thus, there is a dichotomy between the intrinsic and the extrinsic value of culture. This dichotomy continues nowadays, because in the cultural policies field one paradigm does not replace another. There is a permanent conflict between policy paradigms – cultural paradigms coexist.

The values stream in the cultural field is not a progressive substitution of one value for another. It can be defined through a double phenomenon: the accumulation of values, with, depending on the configuration, one value more or less dominating the others; and controversy, in the sense that the identification of values always generates a debate on their meaning, and on their appropriation within professional sectors, political territories, and historical periods.

At the end, Emmanuel launched a final challenge. He stated that these findings are perhaps related too much to the institutional domain of cultural policies and practices and too little to the non-institutional sides of the cultural life. So, he stressed the importance of studying empirically these contrasting practices to understand how distinct configurations may affect cultural valuation.

Topic 2: “Policy developments framing the value of culture: Neoliberalism” (by Oliver Peterson Gilbert, Goldsmiths, University of London)

In the second topic of the session, Oliver reflected about Neoliberalism and cultural

values, presenting a case study that developed a comparative typology of cultural policy in thirty European nation-states in order to understand different approaches to the value of culture. The typology is based on the relative centrality of neoliberal market-based values within each country's subsidized cultural fields. To produce this typology, European cultural policy assemblages were studied, that is, the networked systems that comprise cultural policies, cultural policymaking bodies, the performative reactions of cultural organizations, and cultural intermediaries.

Assuming that all nation-states are, in some senses, neoliberal in nowadays, but that cultural policy assemblages manifest a heterogeneous range of marketized practices and justifications across Europe, the methodology of this study consisted in the development of eight indicators of market orientation which allowed for comparison across the thirty European nation-states. Through these indicators, it is possible to describe differences in market-orientation through a classification of nation-states into four categories, Resistant, Emergent, Established, and Dominant (REED). The REED typology supports a comparative cultural policy analysis centered on six clusters of civic and politico-economic values. The relationship between the REED categories and these civic and politico-economic values enabled us to examine the association between market-orientated justifications and the presence of instrumental objectives across European cultural policy. These instrumental objectives show how culture has been seen, in a neoliberal context, by its extrinsic side.

Oliver mentioned that, although the instrumental cultural values are present in every European nation-state cultural policy, there are some differences among them. The nation-states that have a greater emphasis on neoliberal values also evidence an increase orientation to instrumental cultural values; and the ones that have a lower emphasis on neoliberal values have a lesser orientation to instrumental cultural values. Of the all nation-states analyzed the one that presented the most influence of the neoliberalism in cultural policies was the UK. The talk concluded that, cultural public strategy in Europe has been defined by neoliberal thought and that there is a link between market-orientated values and instrumental cultural values.

Discussion

One of the topics discussed at the end of the presentation of topic 1 and topic 2 of the session had to do with the difference between extrinsic values (referred by Emmanuel) and instrumental values (referred by Oliver). Although these are two similar concepts, they are not necessarily synonyms. The concept of extrinsic values focuses more on the idea of society, while the concept of instrumental values concentrates more on the idea of utility. This last concept has more to do with the fact that culture must serve some purpose (generally a neoliberal purpose), and the idea of extrinsic refers more to the influence that society exercises in the definition of values.

Another relevant topic discussed was the universality (or not) of values. Is a typology possible? Emmanuel considers that when we are talking about universality, we need to combine intrinsic and extrinsic values and that combination is always a certain form of universality. However, there are always regional variances that have to be considered – these differences need to be combined (when in some countries the definitions are made regionally, they are combined with the national orientations, in what can be called a “fighting arena”). The changes that are taking place in cultural policies were also discussed. About this, Emmanuel identified as the main change the fact that there has been an increasing complexification of the justification of cultural policies.

Regarding Oliver Peterson’s presentation, Patrycja K. highlighted that neoliberalism is a “statist” practice.

Session 3 The emergence of values of culture in cultural participation

Chair Isabel Mendes, GEPAC, Portugal

Discussant Ulrike Meinhof

Case Study 1: “Values of autonomous culture: Illegal musical events in the times of COVID-19” (by Félix Dupin-Meynard, CNRS)

Restrictions due to the COVID-19 crises led to the emergence of illegal and self-organized musical events, such as clandestine concerts and rave parties. Some of these events were already taking place before these restrictions – notably for aesthetics and practices that are not recognized by cultural institutions and policies, or that claim autonomy or political contestation. Others have emerged during the COVID-19 crisis, from the expressed “need” to experience musical events in collective presence, despite the health and legal risks – and faced an increased repression, as well as public moral judgements about their supposed responsibility for the pandemic dissemination.

The research presented by Félix focuses on the values advocated and/or experienced by organizers and spectators of rave parties and underground concerts in the south of France during the COVID-19 crisis. The research aimed to understand if these events, organized without any link to cultural policies and institutions, carry the same social values as institutional events and “legitimate culture”; and if not, to understand what specific values and valuations emerge from this autonomy and informality.

The methodology of the study was based in observations. Following an initial attempt to apply surveys, it was decided to consider only observations and in-person interviews, since they didn’t seem to add anything new. The values present within these musical events were analyzed through three specific categories of values: individual/personal

values, collective/social values and political/territorial values.

The main values identified by the research in the context of these illegal self-organized musical events are: the value of freedom (in opposition to control, security), the value of responsibility (individual and collective), the value of generosity (associated with the idea of volunteering and disinterested gifts), the value of hedonism (associated with physical and mental pleasure), and the value of artistic content.

At the end, Félix highlighted that these values are different from those that emerge from institutional musical events and reinforced the importance of studying these non-institutional cultural contexts.

Case Studies 2 and 3: “The emergence of values of culture in cultural participation through digital media: two case studies of remote delivery during Covid-19, a museum makerspace initiative (reimagine, remake, replay) and London choirs” (by Victoria D. Alexander and Oliver Peterson Gilbert, Goldsmiths, University of London)

Victoria and Oliver presented a two contrasting case studies, developed by Goldsmiths, to investigate values attributed to cultural participation via digital media during the Covid-19 pandemic. The social distancing regulations implemented in response to the Covid-19 pandemic forced UK cultural and creative organizations to migrate to modes of remote delivery in order to continue operation during lockdowns. The case studies explored two different spaces of cultural participation which migrated online: amateur choirs in London and Reimagine, Remake, Replay, a sequence of museum makerspaces in Northern Ireland for participants aged 16-25.

The research centered on what participant valued from online participation and tried to answer the question: what cultural values emerge through digital participation in the age of covid-19? For the first case study, interviews were conducted with members and organizers from a variety of choirs and choral societies to explore the values ascribed to online activity. For the second case study, focus groups were held with participants to understand why they chose to participate in the programmer’s online interactions. Despite the difference in cultural participation across the two case studies, both allowed the identification of clear value commonalities in six distinct value clusters.

These value clusters include: emotion regulation (participation was valued for focusing attention away from the threat to life, loved ones and livelihoods resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic); sociality and *comunitas* (social values were the most clearly and emphatically articulated justification for participating in online activities); identity consolidation (the continuation of choir activities in the digital realm was valued for consolidating identity during a period when many identity forming activities were outlawed); spatial-temporal structuring (a cluster of values centered on the spatial and temporal affordances of online participation, ranging from the structuring of time during

lockdown to increasing the reach of activities beyond the immediate locale); aesthetic, creative and socio-epistemic capabilities (a “creative boost” to overcome the generalized lockdown lethargy and a consolidation of skills and techniques).

Victoria and Oliver concluded that these value clusters didn’t appear to operate in conflict or tension with each other but rather existed in an overlapping and mutually sustaining plurality, which contributes to what they could call a “socio-emotional toolkit” to counteract the negative impact of COVID-19.

Study Case 4: “Culture-based creative tourism: Loulé Criativo” (by Sílvia Silva, Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra)

The study case presented by Sílvia is about Loulé Criativo [Creative Loulé], a creative tourism-based project established by the Municipality of Loulé, in the Algarve region of Portugal, that aims to preserve the local heritage, enhance its territory, and reinforce local identity. The project offers a range of activities, provided through a local network of artisans and artists. The fieldwork involved document and data compilation and analysis (for contextualization), semi-structured interviews, and observation in three “oficinas” (participatory workshops).

Loulé Criativo illustrates the importance of the arts, crafts and traditional-based practices today, revitalized within a context of creative tourism. This importance is reflected at different levels of values: internal/personal values, external/social values and contextual/political values.

The *internal/personal values* identified were: to understand the process of making, learning, curiosity, aesthetics, technique, creativity, sensorial connection to materials, emotional connection, creating memories that last, revitalizing memories and connection to the past, pride, recognition, empowerment, healing, well-being, being active, joy/pleasure, slowing down, relaxing, escape from everyday life, self-development, and to challenge oneself.

The *external/social values* identified were: social interaction, relationships, conviviality, creating partnerships, passing on knowledge, influencing others, preserving traditions, revitalize lost know-how, reinforce collective identity, integration, kindness, and gratitude.

The *contextual/political values* identified were: territorial development – economic and socio-cultural, strengthen territorial identity, help overcome seasonality of tourism economy, attract more visitors, city vitality, contribute to a decrease of local unemployment, provide space to younger artists/artisans, and promote responsible and sustainable practices using natural materials and handmade products.

Besides this, Sílvia also identified some values related specifically with participating in craft and “making activities”. Those values are: knowing and understanding the process

of making; receiving and giving/sharing knowledge; enabling creativity; importance of making with one's own hands; and empowerment.

Some tensions between these values were also mentioned. These tensions are: the technique vs. economic return; and the economic value attributed from the outside (visitors) vs. the economic value attributed from the artists/artisans. At the end of the presentation, Sílvia identified some changes that occurred due to COVID-19 and its restrictions. The changes are: missing of social relations; fewer people in the group activities, less interaction, less sharing; and in-person preference rather than online (higher connection, joy/good mood and creative atmosphere).

Case Study 5: “Community-engaged artistic projects: De Portas Abertas (O Teatrão) (by Sílvia Silva, Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra)

The second study case presented by Sílvia was De Portas Abertas [Doors wide open], a community arts intervention project coordinated by a professional theatre company, O Teatrão, developed in Vale da Arregaça, an urban area of Coimbra, Portugal. This area includes a social housing neighbourhood and other residences, an abandoned green valley, and a ruined industrial facility. The project designs and implements collaborative, multidisciplinary performances with the community with a strong collective mobilization of local partners. It links social and artistic dimensions, reflecting on the locale's past and present and activating thinking about its future.

Data collection involved document and data compilation and analysis, an online questionnaire, and semi-structured interviews conducted with different types of participants. Through this work, some main values were identified, which were organized in three main clusters: individual/personal, external/social, and contextual/political.

The *internal/personal values* identified were: memory; affectivity and emotional attachment; healing through sharing of life stories; well-being, happiness, individual valorization; break from routine, fun and leisure; individual and artistic learning; innovative perspectives; and openness to new ideas.

The *external/social values* identified were: identity – recovering the community “ways of life” and history; community valorization (internal and external); nurturing and ongoing community relations; intergenerational connection and continuity; active collaboration; knowledge production; informal cultural training; audience development; and institutional self-learning.

Finally, the *contextual/political values* identified, all of them related with visibility and integration into the broader territory, were: connection to outdoor urban space; sense of belonging; giving voice, civic mobilization; political intervention through individual consciousness; and collective empowerment.

Case Study 6: “The emergence of values in television and new media. A case study on digital concerts” (by Ole Marius Hylland, Telemark Research Institute)

The case study presented by Ole Marius is about digital concerts in the context of COVID-19 pandemic. Live, digitally streamed concerts became the new norm of concert production in mid-March 2020. In a short while, the numbers and importance of this kind of digital cultural distribution increased exponentially. Although the digital distribution technology did not represent an innovation in itself, it was uncharted territory for both producers and consumers. After the first initial phase of digital concerts, the interest in these concerts seem to decrease somewhat. This development coincided with the first attempts to re-open society. Nevertheless, even if the number of digital concerts and number of artists streaming their performances have decreased, these kind of concerts are still relevant more than a year after the first Covid concerts.

This case study asks the following questions: What kind of systems of valuation are at play in live-streamed concerts? To what degree does a set of values usually related to analogue concerts become relevant in a live-streamed concert? Are there differences in audience involvement related to musical genres? To answer these questions, the study was based on a combination of data from pilot study in March 2020, survey data, fieldwork and fieldwork notes, as well as social media data.

The results of the study show that valuations of digital concerts tend to be comparative (values are relational and relative). A physical concert represents a totality of values that is difficult to recreate in a digital format; and digital concerts hence also function as reminders of the values of the non-digital, traditional. The social values showed a decreasing importance compared to physical concerts. There is a greater difficulty in socializing (although social media offers some substitutes) and a very different level of communication and digital socializing. There are also different signals of actual “liveness” creating the feeling that people actually experience something together with other people, that is now, real, live, that is possible to comment and show appreciation for.

Another possible tension that is evident in the data, can be read as differences of genre. Although the selection of concert events is limited, they seem to represent or reproduce the traditional traits of different genres.

Case Study 7: “The emergence of values in television and new media. A case study on The Cultural Rucksack and Culture Schools” (by Ola K. Berge and Åsne D. Haugsevje, Telemark Research Institute)

The case study presented by Ola and Åsne is about the cultural values present in two core public policy programmes in the distribution of professional, high quality art experiences and cultural education to children and youth in Norway. The two included

programmes are Cultural Schools (Kulturskolen), that are extracurricular schools of music and performing arts obligatory in all municipalities; and the Cultural Rucksack, that is a national programme distributing professional art and culture to all Norwegian pupils from 6 to 19 years old.

Both programmes have operated, from the start, in a predominantly analogue format, either in the form of productions adapted to school classes, or in the form of master-apprentice lectures. However, during COVID-19 they both migrated to online platforms like Zoom or Teams, where they rearticulated themselves both aesthetically and socially.

The case study is based on qualitative online interviews and surveys covering a variety of stakeholders, such as artists producing digital performances for the Cultural Rucksack, the young school audience and their teachers, and art teachers in Kulturskolen, their pupils and the parents, as well as administrative stakeholders.

The analysis indicates that the digital versions of these two programmes are distinguished by a certain flexibility contributing to educational values, although the close face-to-face encounter between artist and child still is highly valued and hard to substitute. The digital formats challenge the sense of presence and togetherness, but at the same time they might reduce other barriers for participation and, also, make it possible to bring pupils together across schools, countries and time zones.

The analysis also shows that the digital formats offer alternative ways of communication, such as chat functions, which enables new audiences to participate – democracy values. Finally, the digital formats seem to contribute to an enhanced communication between lecturers and pupils, lecturers and parents, and artists and pupils. Even though it was a challenge to keep up the spirit during lockdown, online sessions also had certain positive social impacts on these relations – social values.

Case Study 8: “Contemporary circus in Montpellier” (by Félix Dupin-Meynard, CNRS)

The second case study presented by Félix has to do with the values expressed by practitioners of contemporary circus. The case study focuses on an amateur collective that decided to organize informal and spontaneous events in private gardens before launching a circus festival in the French city of Montpellier. The methodology of the research consisted of six semi-structured interviews.

What comes up in all the interviews is the circus as a way to escape from everyday life, to have fun, to enjoy and to motivate oneself. The informal nature of the circus events studied brings a lightness, a naivety that opposes both the values of competition and of career and money (found in the institutionalized and subsidized circus). The autonomy and informality enable the deployment of values that are less common in more institutionalized events. For instance, professionalized members of the informal group claimed “experimentation” as a value, to counterbalance a professional world where

circus performers have to spend most of their time on formalized production, touring and educational activities. Experimentation and creation, whatever their aesthetic quality and whether or not they are fully achieved, have their place in this context.

Institutionalization, through the creation of a circus festival, provides the opportunity to address other values, such as the value of democratization. The festival is then a way to take over the public space to offer a free circus event for all. There is the idea of offering pleasure to people, of offering an opportunity for them to feel good, to break free, not to look at the world in a pragmatic way. But in this process of institutionalization, the organizers lose some freedom: the choice of venue is no longer up to them and experimentation, while still present, must make room for the presentation of accomplished circus acts to satisfy a heterogeneous and less familiar audience.

Discussion

The comment of Ulrike Meinhof suggested that EU should do a follow-up on these findings: these are extraordinary experiences (e.g., emotionally, for instance). Her comments highlighted the importance of the contextualization of the values that emerged from the cases, and of the affirmations done by the participants of those cases. It can be observed that values are totally contextual. In a personal example of participation in a choir, Ulrike states a conversion of experience in the pre- and in the pandemic contexts: in the pandemic context, with the recordings of the choir sessions it was possible to catch-up with professionals and learn better, differently of the previous experience in co-presence, when the gap between professionals and amateurs remained deeper. Ulrike also mentioned the relevance of studying not just the cultural participation, but also the non-participation that, especially, in the actual pandemic context, has a link with inequalities. Ulrike questions if a follow-up of the participants who stopped coming to choirs that moved to digital delivering would be done.

Regarding the French cases, it was highlighted the importance of studying the so-called non-institutional forms of art, to analyse its transgressive characteristics.

In the audience it was pointed that, in the context of Covid-19, it was clearer the importance of what is absent (the co-presence factors); Ulrike also pointed that due to the pandemic, there may have been a shift in the hierarchy of values, and not, as may appear, a change of values.

Session 4: The emergence of values of culture in cultural production

Chair Cristina Boari, University of Bologna

Discussant Michael Hutter, WZB Berlin Social Science Center

Case Study 1: “Three Barcelona Publishing Houses” (by Ariadna Peralta, University of Barcelona)

The first case presented in Session 4 was about the values and value tensions in Publishing Houses in Barcelona. Barcelona is a leading publishing center where the traditional cleavages and values tensions of the publishing world, between commercial and cultural values and between the different roles in the publishing production chain, are well present. Moreover, in recent years, the Spanish publishing world has experienced an important phase of concentration which may increase and transform these tensions.

The study presented by Ariadna approaches the complexity of this case to capture a good representation of these existing diversity of values and value tensions by selecting three publishing houses that are interrelated as part of one of the largest publishing conglomerates operating in the city. Before their integration into the conglomerate, these three sub-cases selected were reputed independent houses working in three different areas of the literary publishing subsector: two of them were publishing firms in Spanish, the first one specialized in adult non-fiction and the second one in adult fiction, while the third sub-case was a quite big publishing house in Catalan language that in turn integrates several specialized firms.

Previous studies on the publishers’ world were considered to identify dimensions, structures and dynamics where values emerged and are negotiated. But attention was also paid to the potential plurality of values embedded in the synchronic and diachronic logics of the cases selected by considering, for instance, the historical and contemporary specificity of each editorial firm, their incorporation and relation within a big publishing group, their structure and organization of tasks or their orientation and objectives.

In this way, it was identified a certain repertoire of values and value tensions that arise in the contemporary publishing world: commercial values expressed in different economic restrictions, publishing policy goals and management practices, and in front of them a variety of cultural values, like content quality or cultural sustainability in relation with specific cultural contexts.

Case Study 2: “Valuative and evaluative practices in Barcelona Architectural projects” (by Matías Zarlenga, University of Barcelona)

The second case study presented was about architectural projects in the city of Barcelona and focused on three specific projects: Barcelona Social Housing Complex, Nature Museum and Middle East Cultural Space.

The study case aimed to explore the evaluation and valuation contexts (situations, actors and actions), the evaluation and valuation practices and value conflict and

tensions that guided the different phases of development of the architectural projects selected. Semi-structure interviews and content analysis were developed.

In terms of valuative and evaluative practices they were identified three types of main values through the three cases. In the case of Barcelona Social Housing Complex project, social environment had been given the highest importance during the different stages of the project development. During the development of the Nature Museum project, the natural environment was given central importance as a guiding principle in all phases of the project development. And during the development of the Middle East Cultural Space, the aesthetic language adopted to the local culture of the proposal has been given a central value as a guiding principle that prevails in most of the decisions taken during the project.

Some value conflicts and tensions were also observed. The three main tensions identified were: tension between comfort and social participation (conflicts detected in the case of Barcelona Social House Complex project are manifested through this tension); tension between comfort and environmental sustainability (in the case of the Nature Museum, a tension was detected at the beginning of the project between the rules of the competition and the proposal that was finally approved); and tension between the initial aesthetic proposal, the constructive development and production costs (in the case of the Middle East Cultural Space, tensions are detected between the initial aesthetic proposal and its adequacy in terms of construction development and production costs).

At the end, Matías made a characterisation of the value dynamics found in the study case. Firstly, it was observed different set of valuations emerging in the contexts of ideation-design and construction of the projects analysed; and, secondly, it was observed a set of major tensions between economic, technical requirement and comfort valuations and the valuations that emerge in the contexts of ideation and design, especially those centered on aesthetic, social and sustainability principles.

Case Study 3: “Roma Art Exhibition” (by Eszter György and Gábor Oláh, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem)

The third case study analyses the preparation work and the collaborative establishment of a unique fine-art exhibition where cultural participation, the representation of minority heritage and the questions and tensions around cultural democratization appear together. The exhibition entitled Collectively Carried Out came to be as a collaboration between OFF-Biennale Association and the Budapest History Museum. The painting presents imagined-invented Roma creation myth surrounded by episodes recounted through symbolic figures of Hungarian Roma history and by figures of a new genesis – the emerging Hungarian Roma Intelligentsia.

The case study results were collected by observation and interviews with the actors involved. These actors are: independent curators; Off Biennale Association; Budapest History Museum; National Heritage Protection and Development Non-profit Ltd.; Jóna András Museum; European Roma Institute for Arts and Culture; Roma and non-Roma experts and NGOs.

The exhibition emerged as a space of values, where different values and value tensions were identified. The social value of art was very present, it was possible to see: accessibility and visibility after 10 years/for the first time, representation of Roma art and cultural heritage in a mainstream cultural institution, and writing back of Roma art in the national canon (political emancipation).

In terms of value tensions or conflicts, three were identified by the speakers: the tension between the Hungarian cultural policy and the bottom-up initiatives; the tension emerged from different protocols and approaches of institutional and non-institutional stakeholders; and the tension emerged from the reappropriation of Roma heritage.

The speakers also mentioned that the value dynamics that were found were around the value of cultural democratization, which appears related to identity values and to the empowerment of marginalized groups.

Case Study 4: “The case of Buda Castle Area” (by Gábor Sonkoly, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem)

The case study presented by Gábor focused on the reconstruction of the Buda Castle Area, entitled as “National Hauszmann Programme”, in Hungary. In the European context, the reconstruction of symbolic places, which were destroyed decades ago, generate several debates not only among professionals and politicians, but also in the general public, who feel concerned by the use and re-use of these memory places. Hence, the examination of the reconstruction can reveal intrinsic characteristics of contemporary European cultural production.

The main values that appear in relation with the programme reconstruction of the Buda Castle that were identified were: democracy (the programme is an extremely costly urban rehabilitation project, which consequently generates debates among professionals); authenticity (initiators, developers and supporters of the programme interpret authenticity as the unity of urban atmosphere, style as well as emotional categories such as faith, nostalgia or illusion); well-being (Buda Castle as a cultural neighbourhood attracting national then international tourism); and aesthetic (the aesthetic value of buildings reveals the clashes between professional and public taste for modern architecture).

In terms of value tensions, Gábor identified three specific tensions that are crystalized around the complex value of authenticity. The first is the tension between the political

instrumentalization and the professional/academic freedom. The different interpretations of authenticity are considered as indicators of the political practices of the actors, i.e., how they use the society as a reference – is the reconstruction of the Buda Castle achieved for or with the society? This debate defines a series of conflicts rooted in the lack of democratic decision making and in the variety of the interpretations of authenticity as a fundamental value.

The second is the tension between entertainment/free-time and historical significance. The interpretations of the authentic Buda Castle are based on two divergent understandings of the past: one regards it as a continuous entity, in which ruptures can be repaired and the built environment can be embellished in order to create an appropriate decoration for contemporary events reuniting with the glorious past; on the other hand, the critical interpretation of the past, which is guided by the determination of ruptures and by the demystification of illusions and it intends to prepare a present, in which ecological perspective of constructions and the critical processing of dark heritage are taken into consideration.

The third tension is between “good” and “bad” architecture. The notions of “good” and “bad” architecture are intellectual constructions to justify one’s position in debates about the preservation of modern architecture in the context of monument preservation and public acceptance and taste. These notions alter from one social actor to the other as much as from one period to the other.

Case Study 5: “Ferrara Buskers Festival” (by Simone Napolitano, University of Bologna)

The fifth case study presented focused on the Ferrara Buskers Festival, the oldest European festival devoted to busking and, currently, the biggest and most famous of this kind. This is a festival that shows variety of interesting elements for research on valuation practices of specific actors involved in cultural life.

The festival offers a unique research context to investigate the, often, conflicting values associated to culture: from its peculiar artistic offer, made of street performances endowed with a high level of interaction between artists and the audience, to its complex organizational framework, and finally to the intersectionality of different stakeholders in performance measurement and decision-making practices.

After the identification of actors, practices and valuations, it was analysed the value dynamics and conflicting tensions at work in the case of the Festival. It was found that the value of participation, while sustained by all actors, interacts and often clashes, with the professional legitimation pursued by the artists, with the use of city spaces as perceived by stakeholders, and with the economic benefits of all actors involved. These valuation dynamics have implications on three different levels: the artistic field, the use of public spaces, and the participation of citizens to events related to live music and

performing arts.

Case Study 6: “MUDEC (Museum of Cultures)” (by Paolo Ferri, University of Bologna)

The last case study presented was about MUDEC, a relatively new cultural institution, established in Milan, 2015. It formally aims to foster research, collection and protection of tangible and intangible cultural expressions of non-European populations. MUDEC is one of the few public-private partnerships operating in the Italian heritage sector, involving three entities: the municipality; 24Ore Cultura; and Città-Mondo Association. The municipality owns the building and the ethnographic collection, but to produce and run the museum it collaborates with the other two entities.

The different conceptions of culture expressed by the three actors incorporate a range of somehow conflicting values, which are intertwined in the different cultural programs. The study focuses on valuation practices implemented by the current configuration of MUDEC. Particularly, it reconstructs the cultural activities produced from 2015 to 2021, drawing on documental sources and qualitative interviews with some of the main museum’s actors. The findings highlight the complexity of and tensions between the different values pursued by the three main players.

The economic value creates tensions with the valuation practices connected to the historical significance of the collections; moreover, it creates tensions with the valuation connected to cultural diversity. The value of participation appears to be in friction, in different instances, with the value of self-representation. Currently, the data suggest, the economic driver appears to be the dominating one. With the private partner capable of imposing its interests over the other two players. However, MUDEC is increasingly anchoring its identity to the ethnographic and intercultural aspirations foreshadowing possible future rebalancing between the power of partners.

Discussion

At the end of the session, Michael Hutter discussed the emergence of value of culture in contemporary and historical cultural production, in order also to reflect about all the cases that were previously explored. Michael proposed a change in the title of the session to **“The emergence of values of culture in (contemporary and historical) cultural production”**.

He mapped two types of tensions related with the values of culture – tensions between goals and tensions between goals and constraints. The values that were referred by him were: Democratic, Economic, Aesthetic, Authentic, Communal, Technological, Natural. And for all of these he presented a goal and a constraint. For Democratic values, the goal is “participation” and the constraint is “rule of power”; for Economic values, the goal is “profit/gift” and the constraint is “solvency”; for Aesthetic values, the goal is “self-

representation” and the constraint is “design guardian”; for the value Authentic, the goal is “significance” and the constraint is “historical fact”; for Communal values, the goal is “plurality” and the constraint is “wellbeing/taste”; for Technological values, the goal is “innovation” and the constraint is “efficiency”; and for Nature, the goal is “unity” and the constraint is “sustainability”. This way, Michael showed how all these goals can be in tension with all of these constraints or with themselves.

After this, Michael mentioned the importance that diversity and plurality in cultural values have for the communities and stated that the centre value of UNCHARTED is, and should be, the value of participation. Recommendations for policy should focus on making participation more prevalent in community, regarding democratic involvement.

After Michael’s speech, a discussion between the participants of the Workshop took place. The main theme of that discussion had to do with the value and valuation tensions. From the audience, questions arose about how to deal with tensions that might not be able to be solved and about the purpose of talking so much about those tensions. Matías reminded the need of compromises. Other participants answer to those questions by saying that the purpose of talking about tensions is to reveal them, because they are fundamental elements in social relations and their complexity. Tensions make part of social life, and they should not be seen as pathology but as a fundamental element of social life. So not always tensions should be seen as something that needs to, or can be, be solved.

Session 5: The emergence of values of culture in cultural administration

Chair Marcin Poprawski, University of Applied Sciences (FI); AMU University in Poznan (PL)

Discussant Kate Oakley, University of Glasgow

Case Study 1: “The case of Barcelona city council cultural administration” (by Victoria Sánchez Belando, University of Barcelona)

The first case study presented in Session 5 consists in an analysis about the cultural policies of Barcelona. It aims to identify the diversity of values that shape and inform cultural administration decisions and practices, focusing on the tensions and conflicts between the involved actors and their rationalities that emerge in policy making processes. The analysis, which is mainly descriptive, is based on qualitative data collected from primary (semi-structured interviews and a focus group) and secondary sources (local administration documents).

A key point in the case of Barcelona is the reconfiguration of institutional discourses and practices in the field of cultural policy brought about the victory of the left-wing coalition

Barcelona en Común in the City Council. These emerging changes were examined from a socio-historical approach that allowed to capture the shifting mottos, debates and controversies around the economic, social, aesthetic and institutional values that underpin cultural policy design and cultural administration dynamics and actions.

As a result of the analysis, it was observed contested perspectives about cultural values and conflicting relations between social, market and state actors. These competing perspectives draw a scenario that tends towards fragmentation in institutional discourses and practices. These are mainly divided between interventions aimed at promoting cultural sectors policies, framed in market values (economic return and creative industries), and those aimed at promoting community cultural participation from a perspective that includes culture within the range of citizenship rights (social return and sociocultural action).

Case Study 2: “Culture values in Galicia cultural policies” (by Uxío Novo Rei, University of Barcelona)

Uxío presented the second study case of the session, that explored the cultural values in current Galicia cultural policies. The analysis aimed to identify and problematize these values through documentary analysis of cultural plans, reports, information and budgets, and fieldwork activities. Galicia is considered one of the three “historical” nationalities in Spain and the Constitution grants it broad powers and control over both administrative and normative dimensions of cultural policies. As a result of this decentralization process, the Galician government of the Xunta de Galicia through the Regional Ministry of Culture, Education and University is the leading actor with the competencies in this area.

Cultural policy orientation is based on the conservative vision of the government that is based on an intervention model that includes low planning and involves the implementation of a highly hierarchical structure with low density and diversification. Therefore, the Conception of regional public policies is centred on the idea of culture merged or subordinated to tourism and at the service of socio-economic development.

The central and transversal values identified in the discourse of cultural policies in Galicia revolve around socio-economic development. Thus, value is approached from a liberal perspective associated with digital innovation, cultural industries, heritage, tourism and, in general, a cultural offer with a high cost in investment and maintenance as well as the mass consumption of cultural products. This presentation examines the tensions between these dominant values in cultural policies and others, such as rural and local sociocultural development stressed by third cultural sector actors and other institutional stakeholders.

Case Study 3: “Values in Portuguese Ministry of Culture’s Policies” (by Sónia Apolinário, University of Porto)

The third study case presented by Sónia focused on the values in Portuguese Ministry of Culture’s Policies. Cultural policies in Portugal became consistent since 1995, with the structured ministry of Culture under a socialist government, which started important measures in 5 main areas: books and reading, heritage, creation in arts, decentralization, and internationalization. However, nowadays there are some recent other areas of cultural policy, like: media and cinema sectors, digitisation, and economic and innovation aims. In the context of the 2008 global financial crisis, from 2011 to 2015, culture was downsized to a Secretary of State of Culture, under a social democrat government. In 2015, the elected socialist government reestablished the Ministry of Culture.

Through the analysis of government’s programmes, cultural planning, recent legislation, cultural information available in official statistics, activity reports and cultural budgets, it was possible to identify some dominant values in the Portuguese Ministry of Culture’s Policy. The values identified were: heritage; democratization/participation; artistic creation; Portuguese language; cinema; decentralisation and networks; digitisation and innovation; media pluralism and access. Some recent measures concern special support regarding the pandemic situation. It was also observable that these dominant values have, in association, another level of valuation, directed to economic outcomes, internationalization, and an important social value too.

In terms of value tensions, it was identified: tensions within the Ministry, some lack of administrative autonomy of ministerial entities; tensions in the relationship with artists, the employment’s statute; and tensions in the relationship with other cultural agents, an alleged restricted ministerial definition of culture and cultural agency.

Case Study 4: “Values in Bragança Municipality’s Culture Policies” (by Lígia Ferro, University of Porto)

The case study presented by Lígia is about the values in Bragança Municipality’s Culture Policies. In a country with some territorial asymmetries, Bragança is a low-density, northeast, inland city, with a particularly rich cultural life. Decentralisation policies have been important in Portugal since the 1990’s, with a tendency for partnerships between central and local government to develop cultural facilities over the territory. Research demonstrates that municipalities have been valuing heritage protection, diversification of cultural offer and audiences’ development; lately, a redefinition of the cultural sphere as a local economy, and the articulation of cultural policy with other public policies, have been observable.

To identify the values present in Bragança municipality’s culture policies, interviews and

online focus group were developed. The dominant values identified through the research were: preservation and promotion of heritage; cultural participation and cultural literacy; support to the arts; networking in the culture domain; and economic value. These values emerged linked with some specific measures, like: support the traditional music, masks tradition, history; creation of new museums; support to local associations, programming with schools; support to contemporary art, theatre, literature; cultural programming nets in the municipality, and at inter-municipal, regional, national and abroad levels; municipal events gathering heritage and traditional crafts and gastronomy; territory branding and tourism.

It was also possible to identify some value tensions. The tensions appeared to be most visible through an unbalanced governance and a claimed devalorisation of local artists and associations when compared to foreign artists, regardless a consensual recognition of support to associations and programming's quality.

Lígia concluded that there is a continuity in political lines for culture across the two mandates and also some agreement on the Municipality's availability to receive requests from the associations and sometimes support them. There is a gap between cultural work from associations, the Municipality and the learning local activities in the field of arts; and also a need for professionalization and valorisation of the work developed by the local associations. Lígia added that exists a strong relationship between local development and cultural and touristic investment and a more balance between the valorisation of cultural traditions and heritage and the investment in some local artistic projects.

8 Documentary Cases: one block of contrasting cases of France, Norway, United Kingdom and Hungary) (by João Teixeira Lopes, University of Porto)

João presented eight case studies, intended to picture the European scenario regarding predominant values and value tensions in order to complement the four Iberian deep research cases presented before. These eight cases are relative to four countries - France, Norway, United Kingdom and Hungary -, so they were considered two cases per country (one central government and one regional or local administration). The analysis of these cases, based on extensive documental research, aimed to identify the plurality of values of culture in European Union cultural administrations and to picture the European scenario in cultural policy administrations – main values and tensions.

For each case the main internal tensions were found. In the French Ministry of Culture, the main tension is between the intrinsic cultural value and the economic performance; in Montpellier Council, it is between creative and cultural orientations of cultural democracy; in Norway's Ministry of Culture it is between economic performance and social return of culture; in Bergen Council, between sectoral development and internationalization; in Arts Council of England, it is between economic and social values;

in Creative Scotland it is between local cultural values and economic performance, and also between public support to arts innovation and institutional reputation; in Hungary's Secretary of Culture, it is between national identity and diversity; and, finally, in Budapest Council, between institutional autonomy and illiberal intervention.

Besides these differences, there were also found some discursive consensus on values within the analysed cases. These discursive consensus were around the values of artistic excellence, cultural diversity, national identity, culture as citizenship rights, and heritage. However, these values have unequal positioning and differential importance depending on the value regimes, cultural policy models and political scenarios.

Adding to this, it was also possible to identify some main values that are present on all cases. In the case of national and regional cultural administrations, the main common values referred were: economic, identity and aesthetic. In the case of local cultural administrations, the main common value referred was sustainability.

Discussion

At the end of the session, Kate Oakley made some comments about all the cases presented to synthesize the main ideas exposed previously. About cultural administration, Kate highlighted the importance of making choices by mentioning some different examples that can illustrate that importance. Kate also mentioned the importance of think about cultural policy in contemporary society. She said that cultural political discourses are antiquated and that there is an urgent need to understand the reality of contemporaneity and to reflect about what should be the bases of cultural policy nowadays. Kate stated that there is a big difference between the official documents and the reality, giving the example of multiculturalism. She mentioned that we have seen an increasing of discourses of multiculturalism, and at the same time we also see that ethnic inequalities are also increasing; using a metaphor "All cultural political discourses are zombies!", also applicable to the issue of access. João Teixeira Lopes agrees, pointing to the example of how multiculturalism is so often handled in municipalities' level as an excuse for gentrification (e.g., street art and festivals). Kate highlighted the need to look at the new conflicts in Europe and adapt cultural policy to them.

Besides this, the discussion also developed around the concepts of nationalism and national identity. From the audience, Alain Quemini asks, when referring the values of national identity, why not to use the term "nationalism"? Some participants answered that nationalism has very different and plural configurations in several countries (e.g., Galicia or France), so it cannot be understood as a synonym of national identity.

Special session I. Keynote speeches: The challenge of representing cultural value

Chair Helmut Anheier, Hertie School, Berlin

Keynote Speech. “The challenges of representing cultural value” by Ben Walmsley, University of Leeds

In the first special session, Ben reflected about some of the challenges faced by research into cultural value, and he shared the history behind the UK’s Centre for Cultural Value and its current mission and activities, as well as the emerging principles that can support purposeful cultural evaluation.

The Centre for Cultural Value builds on the legacy of the AHRC Cultural Value Project, which foregrounded the first-hand individual experience of arts, culture and heritage. At the moment, the mission of the Centre for Cultural Value settles in building a shared understanding of the differences that arts, culture and heritage make to people’s lives and society in general. It aims cultural policy and practice to be based on rigorous research and evaluation on what works and what needs to change; and its policy goal is to place culture in local, regional and national policymaking.

Ben stated that everyone values culture in some way, shape or form. However, cultural value is also subjective and elusive and there’s no consensus about how to capture, measure or articulate it. The speaker mentioned that we have to recognize that there are diverse perspectives about culture and cultural values. Many questions of and about cultural value are ultimately irresolvable but, meanwhile, discussions around and about cultural value actually become more interesting and fruitful.

However, there’s a longstanding crisis in arts and cultural evaluation: many academics, funders and policymakers are suspicious of the advocacy focus of much of the sector’s evaluation; and in turn, many cultural practitioners complain that the painstaking evaluation reports they produce are often ignored or disregarded by funders and fail to capture the social or cultural value of their activities.

There are, indeed, a lot of challenges around evaluation, of which can be mentioned the challenges related to the methods (since we can question what constitutes “evidence”); to the disconnections that exist between the cultural sector, the academy and policy; to the different policy perspectives existent; to the acknowledges and embracing failures; to the broken knowledge management system; and to the getting funder buy-in.

In co-developing a set of principles to support the evaluation of culture, one of the key questions we have been asking ourselves is: Who is evaluation actually for? There is a strong tendency to consider evaluation as a necessary evil demanded by funders. But what we’ve heard over the course of our scoping events is a strong desire to develop a culture or reflective practice and to share learning in a more honest and transparent

way across the arts, cultural and heritage sectors.

In this sense, the Centre for Cultural Value considers that evaluation should follow some principles in order to develop a learning-based approach to evaluation that can resolve some of the structural challenges that have been existing within it. Ben mentioned that evaluation should be beneficial, robust, people-centred and connected. These principles can be adopted across the cultural sector. At the end, the speaker stated that it is necessary to create a movement around evaluation that people get excited by evaluation.

Discussion

The main topics of the discussion that took place at the end of the keynote speech were mainly related to the relevance of considering the plurality and diversity that exists in terms of cultural values' concepts and perspectives. It was mentioned that is important to have a plural notion of culture and to hold that notion in evaluation. It was said that the notion that measure culture nowadays is not "fair", so when we talk about cultural value, we always have to take in consideration the diversity and pluralism existent. Adding to this, it was also discussed the importance of the qualitative methods.

Keynote speech. "Making culture counts: an open and accessible evidence base tool highlighting the importance of culture and creativity in cities" by Valentina Montalto, Joint Research Centre

Valentina Montalto reflected about the role that culture and creativity plays in European cities. She presented the work that was developed by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre to build up an open and accessible evidence base highlighting the importance of culture and creativity. This work was developed through the construction of the Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor (CCCM).

The CCCM is a new measuring tool that was released in 2017 and had its second edition in the year of 2019. This tool inspired local governments across Europe – several cities have been using the Monitor to tailor their policies to better respond to local needs and ambitions.

Valentina explained that there were selected 190 cultural and creative European cities, using three main criteria. The selected cities are European Capitals of Culture, UNESCO Creative Cities or cities hosting at least two international cultural festivals. This tool tries to measure the values of culture and creativity in cities, and for that, it was built a total of 29 relevant indicators that constitute 9 different dimensions, which are grouped in 3 main sub-indices: cultural vibrancy, creative economy, and enabling environment.

All these indicators allowed the creation of an index that ranks the cities in terms of

culture and creativity. However, cities are not ranked in the same foot – cities are grouped according to population similarities. This allows a more realistic comparison between the several European cities included. Adding to this ranking, other important indicators are included to understand, for example, the physical accessibility of cultural facilities. At the end, Valentina left a suggestion for the participants: research the position which their cities occupy in this ranking.

Session 6. Panel discussion.

The conflictual plurality of values in cultural participation

Chair Ulrike Meinhof, Southampton University

Institutional stakeholders

Mark O’Neill, University of Glasgow

José Soares Neves, Iscte-University Institute of Lisbon; OPAC

“Emergent values of cultural participation in live arts and culture: plurality and tensions” (by Nancy Duxbury, Centre for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra)

Based on five of the eight case studies that were explored in Session 3, Nancy reflected about the values of cultural participation in live arts and culture, considering their plurality and main tensions. In order to organize a profusion of expressed values emerging from the five cases, Nancy used three frames: the internal/personal (for oneself), the external/social (by/for the group involved), and the contextual/political (for the society, at a larger scale). These frames enable an articulation of the cases without losing their specificity and highlight how the frames are often dynamically articulated and interconnected.

Across the five cases, cross-cutting themes of what was valued in live cultural participation included: emotions, imagination and social representations; the gift/counter-gift; the “practice” of values and social/political change; sharing knowledge and know-how; and empowerment.

Variations in valuation were identified within the cases. Valuation was viewed as plural, multilayered, and continuous negotiating process. The main differences that were found in valuation processes were aligned with: individuals’ different roles or types of participation, personal characteristics and social trajectories, and the degrees of institutionalization of the activity itself.

The individuals’ different roles or types of participation refers to the fact that the specific role assumed by a participant and the responsibilities of that role shapes what types of value are attributed to the cultural activity. The personal characteristics and social

trajectories have to do with the fact that personal perspectives are shaped by one's life circumstances, experiences, demographics, and other personal characteristics. And, finally, the degrees of institutionalization of the activity itself refer to the fact that degree of institutionalization of projects may influence the values among organizers.

Beyond this, Nancy also identified some tensions between values. She affirms that were noticed several "internal" tensions between values within the same case study and "external" tensions between values promoted in the case studies and values promoted by external fields of cultural activity. Three sets of tensions stood out: aesthetic values in question; hedonism and entertainment vs. politicization and emancipation; and Independence, freedom and autonomy vs. political and market influences.

Starting with the first tension identified, it can be said that the place of aesthetics as a value in participating in live arts and culture emerged as a subject of controversy among participants, with other principles used to judge the artistic contents. In many cases, it seems that collective cultural activity could be seen as a social pretext. The non-centrality of aesthetics does not detract from the specificity of the values of cultural experience and the artistic content but, invites to re-evaluate the place of artistic aesthetics in the hierarchy or plurality of experienced values. About the second tension mentioned, Nancy said that the research found a tension between an art that must be "useful" and emancipating and an art that is viewed as a non-legitimate leisure activity within the analysed case studies. About the third tension identified, it was said that in the case of autonomous events, many values (like freedom, empowerment, responsibility, Independence, etc.) are claimed in opposition to the values of the institutional and market fields; and in more institutionalized and market-oriented activities, these kinds of values exist in the same space as market demands.

"Conflictual values within online cultural participation" (by Ola K. Berge, Telemark Research Institute)

Ola reflected about the conflicts in values of online cultural participation through the analysis of four of the eight case studies that were explored in Session 3. Through the analysis of the cases, the speaker identified some important key value clusters. Those are: identity, capability, democracy, education, emotions and emotion regulation, social values, spatial-temporal values, and value for money.

Through these, some conflicts were also identified. At an individual cultural participation level, there is no immediately apparent conflicts or tensions. However, at a general level, some conflicts were identified. Ola mentioned that the COVID-19 pandemic driven digital participation to be viewed as the counterpart to "normality", and also, to physical participation, however some conflicts have emerged from traditional, vested values being viewed as challenged or threatened.

The speaker mentioned some more specific value tensions that were found. The first was the tension between aesthetic and non-aesthetic values. Some people value digital cultural participation for the creative, cultural and aesthetic content of the participation. While others emphasize the non-aesthetic values of participation – across all cases, social aspects are frequently mentioned. In this sense, we can see that in online shows, traditional aesthetic hierarchies are challenged.

Beyond this, some other tensions emerge. In cultural educational practice, there is a tension between a ludic and an educational perspective. And a similar tension exists in online choirs and makerspaces. Here, “success” is often defined in terms of the technical aspects of a show, rehearsal, or creator session with less focus on the quality of the aesthetic materials.

Ola concluded that online cultural participation opens for plenty of innovation possibilities due to new technology and new mediation and education practices; and that participants tend to initially embrace such innovations. However, conflicts tend to arise when downsides of the innovation outnumber the benefits. The main reason for conflicts is that physical presence is an enduring value in the cultural field, including arenas of multi-level participation. Yet, the speaker stated that COVID-19 also made audiences more willing to try new platforms.

Discussion

The stakeholder Mark O’Neill reflected about the cultural policies in European Union. He started his speech by making some considerations about the definition of values. For him, the idea of “intrinsic value” is socially and ideologically constructed, because all funded culture is instrumental. Instrumental culture only works if the intended audience is socialized into experiencing into its intrinsic value. Many cultural experiences are rituals of belonging, of which exclusion is an intrinsic value.

According to Mark, the UNCHARTED project presents some gaps. These gaps have to do with cultural values and expressions that are based on: traditions of faith (christianities, secularisms, islams, sectarianisms, marxisms, markets) and traditions of belonging (races, nations, ethnicities, supranational, western, modern). Also, pointing to the question of diversity, Mark reminded participants of a larger territory that appears to be not included (Russia, Turkey, the ancient European overseas colonies, and finally, a map of anti-Semitism).

In this sense, Mark stated that “progressive” cultural policy isn’t working in European Union, highlighting the importance that socio-economic inequalities continue to have. According to him, traditional concepts of audience development do not lead to sustainable changes in the social structure of the audience and, besides that, there is no

significant indication that EU countries with different cultural policies are able to attenuate the effect of education and income on cultural participation.

These have some implications: museums and cultural institutions are not educational (they super-serve the already educated), museums with larger attendance gaps than average are actively increasing inequality, and audience development projects that don't link to macro cannot be evaluated meaningfully. Thus, Mark launched the question: will more research make a difference? The speaker consider that academically rigorous pilot/demonstration projects are not scalable and that no research on individual experiences, organisations, and projects can answer the question of how much is enough to make a difference at a population level.

Mark leaves some questions that should guide the research scales in cultural policies: Can we devise a conceptual framework that links micro (individuals' cultural experience), meso (group experiences of culture) and macro (large scale population level data on attendance/participation/values)? Can the framework incorporate traditional and progressive cultural value? What can we learn from "positive deviants" (people with low educational attainment/low income who attend cultural institutions)? How does cultural autonomy from socioeconomic forces differ for different social groups, for different cultural institutions or at different life-stages?

The stakeholder José Soares Neves also reflected about the many existing challenges for culture in Europe, but he focused more on the challenges that are linked with technology and its relationship with the cultural sphere. José stated that not everyone has the access (or the same kind of access) to technology, so it is crucial to think about that issue when we are carrying out research on culture. Related to this, he also reflected about the future of technology, launching the question: Which technologies will remain, and which ones will not?

Besides this, José also spoke about the great importance that social values have for the understanding of culture and exposed some relevant tensions that exist within the cultural sphere and between cultural values. One of the tensions mentioned had to do with the values for money or with the institutionalization of culture.

At the end of the session, a small discussion took place among the participants of the Workshop. An important remark is that physical presence is an enduring value in the cultural field (namely, the importance of the physical proximity of the artists); Nancy Duxbury states that the research showed the interest of people in "belonging" (in a community sense). But the main themes approached in the discussion had to do with the comments that both stakeholders made. Participants discussed the several gaps that were identified by Mark in UNCHARTED; the importance of considering the inequalities in the access to technologies; and the difficult that lower class people have in systematically integrating the cultural sphere (that is deepened by the cultural

institutions that don't facilitate their integration and only do non-systematic initiatives when there are funds for them); in this regard, João Teixeira Lopes stated that UNCHARTED can make a map of "positive" practices, linking the micro, meso and macro levels.

Session 7. Panel Discussion.

The conflictual plurality of values in cultural production and heritage

Chair Michael Hutter, WZB Berlin Social Science Center

Institutional stakeholders

Roberto Grandi, Bologna Business School

Dea Vidović, Director of Kultura Nova Foundation

"Synthetic view on the plurality of values in cultural production and heritage" (by Matías Zarlenga, University of Barcelona)

In order to synthesize the cases that were discussed in Session 4 about cultural production, Matías presented his synthesis proposal. With this proposal, Matías aimed to identify valuation affinities among cases which refer to certain common value principles; compare the profiles of the cases in terms of the relationship between actors and practices in order to put these valuations into their context of emergence; elaborate a synthetic representation of the valuations, and the axiological tensions present in the different cases showing affinities between valuations, as well as homologies between the logics linking actors, practices, and valuations.

Among the six cases presented in Session 4, the speaker identified some common value principles. They are: aesthetic (mainly associated with formal aspects in terms of language and artistic quality), democratic (associated with participation, accessibility and horizontality), cultural diversity (linked to the positive valuation and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions), authenticity (associated with the correct representation of different ethno-cultural groups and their expressions), sustainability (based on the positive valuation of the natural and cultural environment, its preservation and care), economic (focused on the importance of the costs and profits of an activity, product and artistic-cultural proposal), technical efficiency (associated with the centrality given to the technical requirements that make the development of a certain project or cultural proposal possible), well-being (linked to the positive valuations of comfort, quality of life, etc.), and cultural visibility (based on the positive valuation given to the visibility of some artistic-cultural expression or proposal).

In terms of repertoire of actors involved, Matías identified three different types. The core team that are usually dedicated to the central tasks, such as the creation and development of a cultural proposal or project, or the preservation, organisation, and management of an exhibition; the support teams that dedicate themselves to tasks of development and materialisation of the actions proposed by the core teams; and the external actors that assist, pay and, in some cases, regulate the creative and organisational processes developed by the core and support teams.

In terms of repertoire of valuation, the speaker identified two types of contexts. The context of creation and design, in which aesthetic, democratic, cultural diversity, authenticity, sustainability values dominate. And the contexts linked to the development, support and regulation, in which economic, technical efficiency, well-being, cultural visibility values dominate.

At the end, Matías mentioned the existence of two main tensions. The tensions between the valuations emerging in the contexts of creation and design of the proposals, projects and productions analysed and those valuations that arise in the contexts linked to their development, support and regulation. And tensions between economic valuations and the valuations that emerge in the contexts of creation and design, especially those centred on aesthetic principles, cultural diversity and democracy.

“Disentangling valuation practices in cultural production and heritage management: a multi-level proposal” (by Paolo Ferri, University of Bologna)

Like Matías, Paolo also presented a synthesis proposal about the six cases explored in Session 4. He identified the main valuation practices there are present in these cases and categorized them according three domains – product, organization and society. These domains correspond to different levels of valuation and actors. Product refers to authors, curators, artists, users, the editor and the audience; organization refers to stakeholders, organizers, architects, marketing and institutional actors; and society refers to NGOs, municipality and consultants.

In this sense, the valuation practices identified in each case can be analysed according to these categories. In terms of valuation practices, we have for Ferrara Buskers Festival: performances – quality entertainment (product); set of activities – participation (organization); part of the city – economic impact, civic society (society). For Barcelona Architectural Projects: place to live – Comfort (product); project – cost control (organization); part on the world – environment (society). For MUDEC: collections – historical significance, hedonism (product); organization – participation, financial sustainability (organization); part of the city – urban regeneration, cultural diversity (society). For the Barcelona Publishing Houses: reading experience – excellence,

newness (product); part of an editorial plan– commercial success (organization); part of the cultural field – cultural sustainability (society). For Buda Castle: area – authenticity, well-being, beauty (product); consultation – participation, authoritarianism (organization); idea of the country – democracy, national identity (society). And, finally, for Roma Exhibition: painting – historical relevance (product); initiative – inclusiveness (organisation); Roma culture – self-representation (society).

After this, Paolo explored the value tensions that were identified through these six cases. The speaker distinguished two types of conflicts – the conflicts within levels and the conflicts between levels. The conflicts within levels can be observed, particularly, in the cases of MUDEC and of Buda Castle; and the conflicts between levels can be observed, particularly, in the cases of Barcelona Architectural Projects and of Barcelona Publishing Houses. Beyond these two types of conflicts, Paolo added the importance of exploring the value dynamics over time. According to the speaker, values are added over time, their meaning can change and actors can be associated to different values over time. In relation to this last question, the two cases that most illustrate it are the case of Ferrara Buskers Festival and of Roma Exhibition.

Discussion

The stakeholder Roberto Grandi highlighted the different levels of conflict that exist within museums. He mentioned that there are tensions in terms of values, visible through the fact that new values emerge among the traditional ones, these new values are – promotion of knowledge, critical thinking, sustainability and democracy. He also mentioned the tensions within the professionals that work in the museums, especially between the old and the new professionals. Roberto stated that we can see a growth in the tensions in museums due to the fact they have less Money than in the past. At the end, he said that nowadays we have to decide between the values of democracy and the values of market.

The stakeholder Dea Vidović started by reflecting about the notion of culture and its oppositions, referring that different notions of culture lead to different values of culture. According to her, one of the main challenges in contemporary society is to combine the variety of values that exist around culture. Dea also reflected about the inequalities in culture and focused on the individual artists and their economic conditions.

At the end, the discussion that took place among all the participants of the Workshop had, as main theme, the existing tensions in culture. The centre of the discussion had to do with how should we deal with tensions and conflicts. Should we try to solve the tensions? Or should we just manage them? Several participants take part in this discussion, with different perspectives, although it seemed that the majority of them think that we should be more worried about managing the tensions than about solving

them. It was said that tensions have the capacity to point to what we may pay attention to, like a lens does.

Session 8. Panel Discussion.

The conflictual plurality of values in cultural administration

Chair Kate Oakley, University of Glasgow

Institutional stakeholders

Antonio Volpone, Cultural Observatory of the Emilia Romagna Region; ALTE Fondazione Peter Inkei, Budapest regional Observatory on Financing Culture in East-Central Europe Richárd Barabás, Hungarian politician, deputy of a district of Budapest, member and spokesperson of the Dialogue for Hungary party

“Synthetic view on the plurality of values in cultural administrations” (by Mariano Martín Zamorano, University of Barcelona)

In Session 8, Mariano reflected about the multiplicity of values that serve as the rationale of cultural policies, assuming that, conceived as intrinsic or instrumental, values are embedded into discourses, valuation processes and philosophies for action for cultural policies. The speaker presented the UNCHARTED analysis of values in European cultural administration from a comparative perspective.

The analysis addressed 12 case studies corresponding to national, regional and local administrations, and allowed to identify predominant values and value tensions in cultural policy administrations, and axiological affinities among the cases which refer to certain common value principles. Two methodological strategies have been applied to develop the comparative examination. On the one hand, it was carried an extensive documentary research of 12 cultural administrations in Spain, Portugal, France, Norway, UK and Hungary; on the other hand, it was used fieldwork research to collect additional data about the 4 Spanish and Portuguese cases – semi-structured interviews and focus groups were developed.

The research reveals the existence of a plurality of values under certain common trends. There were identified 8 predominant values principles: economic, identity, aesthetic, participation, diversity, equality, education, and well-being. Economic and identity presented a special intensity and generalization. At the local administrations, were identified almost the same value principles, however one of them is absent – diversity – and one new emerged – sustainability. Adding to this, the value of participation is highlighted at the local level.

In terms of tensions, some dominant trends were also identified. At the national and

regional level, the economic value comes into tension with well-being, identity or aesthetic values. At the local level, the participation value emerges in an opposition with the economic or aesthetics values. Beyond this, other tensions were identified, for example, between economic and identity, but those are more ambiguous.

Mariano concluded that we can see dominant tensions between social and economic values within various value configurations and policy trajectories. And he added that these tensions are often articulated as tensions between different types of actors (actors that embody opposing axiological perspectives) and also manifest contrasts between discourse and policy action.

Discussion

Stakeholder Peter Inkei highlighted what he thinks it is the importance that UNCHARTED can have, by giving people some instruments for assessing cultural policies. Peter asks how can cultural policy be evaluated? (remembering, por example, the presented case studies of Bragança and Galicia): how can be the involvement of the stakeholders? Should they be the citizens? The professional circles and artists? Or professional experts/analysts? It should not be forgotten that there are hidden motivations to be considered, which affects the priorities of political action; they are secondary factors, such as personal interests in municipalities, the elections, and lobbies (e.g., Europa Nostra in the field of heritage). But, this subjective analysis must be accompanied by the records (such as statistics, as Oliver Gilbert presented before on neoliberalism), showing patterns in cultural policies, even if they tend to simplify the reality. Finally, it was mentioned the importance of identifying the nature and trends of cultural policies in order to make choices about them more consciously, being also necessary to know exactly what the big problems in these policies and work are based on that.

The stakeholder Antonio Volpone reflected about the values in cultural administration and their plurality through his experience in the Cultural Observatory of the Emilia-Romagna Region. Antonio mentioned the importance of understanding the “key factors” that are shaping the values in this field. In this sense, the speaker analysed the “key factors” that shape the values in cultural administration in Emilia-Romagna Region.

The identified “key factors” for the main quantitative-qualitative analysis at institutional level (in the pre-pandemic context) were separated in two levels of analysis. In the first level of analysis, it was identified: cultural employment; cultural entrepreneurship; cultural participation; private and public funding; cultural spaces. In the second level of analysis, it was identified: best practices and innovative projects; education and training courses for professional skills; networks and eco-system; creative cities and local communities; social and economic impact.

In the post pandemic context, some main “values” considered by cultural administration for public grants were identified: value of “accountability” and “sustainability”; value of “education and training”; value of “digit(al)ization”; value of “innovative business models” and matching “start-up” proposals, “research centres”, “CCS companies” experimenting the role of new technologies; value of a cultural local/regional/national “eco-system” and “networking”; value of cultural promotion through “international projects”; value of “fundraising”.

Richárd Barabás asks how can values effectively permeate decision making. This politician gave examples of problematic municipal practices in culture according to his own professional experience (e.g., a process of funds distribution). Finally, Richárd, as a politician, asks help from scholars regarding some issues: How to implement strategic thinking in the grant decision-making? How to create cultural foundations “immune” to political switching (regarding the current Hungarian political context)?

Special Session II. Round Table.

Covid-19 impact on the values of culture in cultural participation

Chair Helmut Anheier, Hertie School, Berlin

Institutional stakeholders

Joost Heinsius, IDEA Consult

Tone Østerdal, Association of Norwegian Concert Organizers

The second special session consisted in a roundtable that seek to debate the implications of the pandemic in the cultural sector, whether in the most protected and institutionalized sectors, or in the most precarious and informal ones, from the perspective of the huge impact it has had on cultural participation.

Several researchers participated in this roundtable presenting the research developed by the Project and its results were commented by stakeholders, who added dimensions of their personal and professional experience in order to contribute to the formulation of public policies.

Victoria D. Alexander (Goldsmiths, University of London):

Victoria reflected about the digital participation in cultural spheres. She mentioned that the cultural participation revealed to be a “socio-emotional tool kit” in the pandemic context and that the main values identified, related to this participation, are the values of sociability and identity. Victoria added that there is maybe a potential increasing of cultural online participation, however it is also important to understand that co-

presence is still a fundamental value, either in attending artistic performances, or in the practice of artistic education. One thing is right, COVID-19 pandemic has had a major influence on cultural participation, but it is not yet clear how this may have *changed* cultural values.

Félix Dupin-Meynard (CNRS):

Félix discussed the different effects that COVID-19 had on cultural values, assuming that the pandemic is a variable that is capable of bringing change to these types of values. He identified 4 types of effects: the Normative Effect (regarding a political hierarchy of values – what was forbidden in some sectors led to a debate of essential/non-essential sectors/activities, with a sense of injustice in some sectors); the Feeling Effect (the importance of the lack of personal and collective co-presence shared experience); the Innovation Effect (the pandemic forced cultural actors to invent, to use the digital); and, finally, the Reflexivity Effect (the pandemic forced a break, a crisis of meaning).

Tone Østerdal

Tone discussed the impact of COVID-19 in the values of culture, presenting a mainly negative perspective of that impact. She focused especially on the impact of the pandemic in the music industry. Tone mentioned that this was one of the most affected sectors, showing worry about the long-term consequences of the COVID-19. An important fact that she mentioned is that 25% of the employment in the music sector was lost due to the pandemic.

Joost Heinsius (IDEA Consult):

Joost mentioned that COVID-19 had a hard impact in the majority of the cultural sectors and, therefore, he presented some important recommendations. He considers that it is necessary to develop a fairer working system and also to promote more digital access for people. Joost also reflected about the role of culture and of cultural sector in society. He mentioned that culture stays very low in the social hierarchy; it has to be constantly arguing itself, always justifying its necessity and its values. So, to solve this problem, Joost defends that it is important to combine the economic logic with the cultural logic. Adding to this, he also mentioned there is a lack of the artists perspective in the research about the values of culture.

Discussion:

In the discussion several themes were approached, unveiling different opinions and perspectives. One of the main themes had to do with the place and status of culture in society. Towards the less value that cultural sphere present in society comparing with

others, there were identified different postures regarding to it. On the one hand, there were those who think that culture is as much important as other sectors, emphasizing the fact that artists are workers as well, and pointing to its important role during the lockdowns, by fostering mental and emotional balance and joy to participants. On the other hand, were those who considerer that, inevitably, culture cannot have the same value as other areas, like hospitals or supermarkets (“it is luxury”), so, the priorities that were given by the governments due to COVID-19 are defensible.

Other important debate that took place in this session was about the innovation – did COVID-19 bring innovation? Once again, there were different perspectives about this. Some of the participants consider that, because of the pandemic, artists had to create new ways to reach their audiences and continue to be connected to people, readapting to this new situation and reinventing the form of making art. Other participants consider that the negative impacts on artists were so big, that their only worry at the moment is to “survive”, so we cannot talk about innovation in this context.

Relating these two questions, it was possible to identify a division among the participations about the way they see COVID-19 impact. While some favour the good things that the pandemic brought to culture (like the increase in innovation and the new forms of producing and participating in culture – “People are buying books, they are painting...!”), other favour the negative things that the pandemic brought (like the worsening of the condition of the cultural sphere and its workers and artists).

Adding to these debates, there were stated some important considerations that are worth mentioning. The first important comment had to do with the fact that the pandemic increased preexisting inequalities. About this, some participants considerer that the COVID-19 did not change anything, but instead it had only exacerbated previous problems. Another comment had to do with the relevance of studying the non-institutional contexts of culture, because frequently we take the institutional form of culture as the only way of culture – culture is not just cultural policies.

It was said that a follow-up of the case studies would be important to understand what will change after this pandemic context. Is Covid-19 an opportunity to move forward? It was reminded The New European Bauhaus as an important opening in the European Commission.

Another important final note to mention is the fact that the challenge of UNCHARTED is to identify something that is really important to everyone to articulate forces for, because the value of culture is low, and culture has to be always justified. One thing we know: there is change going on.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Concluding Remarks (by João Teixeira Lopes, Institute of Sociology of Porto University, and Arturo Rodríguez Morató, University of Barcelona)

In the closing session of the Workshop some important final considerations were shared with all the participants. Commenting the discussion and debate of the Round Table and the whole sessions of work, João recognized the challenge and the need of thinking differently, because this is how we learn scientifically and construct citizenship.

Arturo outlined the main important conclusions of the Workshop. This was a very successful exchange meeting, of intense work, enriched by the perspectives of the Advisory Board, invited speakers and the stakeholders.

Sessions 1 and 2 gave a glimpse of some connections between the influence exerted by different factors in shaping the valuation of culture in Europe: the rise of the diversity value in cultural policy motivated by important changes in European societies, but at the same time, also marked by digitization, spatial segregation and ethnic stigmatization in urban spaces, etc. These two sessions helped us to understand the discussion of the internal complexity of the notion of national cultural policies, that hides the diversity of paradigms, both sectorial and territorial (like Helmutt pointed out); helped us to understand the complementarity between the evidence gathered in WP1 (these macro-perspectives) and the evidence gathered in WP2 (the micro, that allowed to differentiate between cultural policy paradigms in different regions, territorial levels and also in different sectors of cultural production).

In sessions 3, 4 and 5, discussion of the cases was diverse. Félix showed some issues of axiology linked to cultural legitimacy in non-legitimate contexts of cultural practice; they were presented also the contexts that have been deinstitutionalised by the Covid-19 crisis – which Ulrike also discussed, and Nancy and Ola referred later. Oliver and Victoria showed that value tensions are absent in the individual level of cultural participation. Considering the cultural production cases, Michael has showed the analytical potential of taking into account the parameters defining actions, goals and constraints when accounting for tensions between values.

Arturo commented the absences that stakeholders identified in the Project, like the fields or the activities that were not clearly present or covered in our case studies, or, the amount of people that are not participating or included in these activities, even if we had made efforts to look into non-formal, marginal and very diverse kinds of cultural participation and activities. We can make an effort to connect and include these

traditions that Mark has indicated and that were outside our focus. Arturo reminds that it will be possible to achieve this integration in the WP3, when selecting the case studies; also, regarding the links between the several levels of analysis (micro, meso, macro), although they may be not exactly visible at this stage, they are part of the plan of the Project, namely, the meso level – namely, the WP4 analysis will focus on the dynamics of cultural policies makers and cultural administrations.

At the end, a suggestion is left to all partners: to maintain the values analysis more opened to the kind of work we have done in WP1 (about the construction of values and management of values in the cultural realm), revisiting it in different stages as a way to try to connect, or not to lose the connection, with the macro level.

Reflection post-Porto Workshop

Finally, an exercise of reflection in a Consortium meeting post-Workshop, enabled the partners to establish some considerations for the future work, in two dimensions.

1. Regarding the next Workshop to be held in London:
 - It was consensual the advantage of more time for discussion and informal exchanges - which suggests that the workshop could be prolonged for at least another half day.
 - It was agreed the need to think about activating more the co-creation concept for the central London event, in order to involve stakeholders in the proposals for public policy design.

2. Regarding the organization of following work:
 - It is useful to keep the recordings and the summaries of the presentations and discussion moments of the Porto Workshop, given their richness and complexity, in order to establish a solid basis for the preparation of WP3 and WP5.
 - To establish a better articulation between the macro, meso and micro levels of analysis, so as not to waste the information collected and analyzed in WP1, including power relations and inequalities.
 - To develop a reflective practice from within the cultural sector.
 - To broaden the focus of the analysis to cases to consider the range of arts and culture, ensuring that different forms, from the legitimated arts to art to creative forms from popular culture and disadvantaged groups are studied.