

Concepts in Practice

Intercultural Dialogue

As an Objective in the EU Culture Programme (2007-2013)

**Research and recommendations for the next framework
programme**



The research for this report was carried out by Romanian cultural policy expert, Bianca Floarea, with the help of Culture Action Europe Project Officer Ewa Majczak. Their draft report and the reactions of consultant Chrissie Tiller and Yvette Vaughan-Jones from Visiting Arts, UK, were discussed at a seminar on 8th March 2010 together with members of the Platform's steering group as well as Culture Action Europe representatives. The summary, the concluding remarks and the recommendations were subsequently drafted by Sabine Frank, Secretary General of the Platform, with input from the two researchers, and steering group members Eli Borchgrevink and Niels Righolt. This report was finalised in July 2010.

© Platform for Intercultural Europe & Culture Action Europe, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	4
I. CONTEXT, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH	9
II. METHODOLOGY	13
III. MAIN FINDINGS	18
What does intercultural dialogue mean in practice?	18
Why is intercultural dialogue an objective of projects and work programmes? ..	21
Activities which pursue intercultural dialogue	24
Results of activities	27
Evidence of intercultural dialogue	28
Lessons learnt about promoting intercultural dialogue	30
IV. CORRELATION WITH SIMILAR RESEARCH	33
V. CONCLUDING REMARKS	36
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT CULTURE PROGRAMME	37
VII. REFERENCES	42
VIII. ANNEXES	44
Annex 1: questionnaire models & interview questions	44
Annex 2: list of grant beneficiaries participating in the research	49

SUMMARY

“There are a thousand ways of understanding intercultural dialogue.”

(project manager of a cooperation project)

Intercultural dialogue is one of three specific objectives of the Culture (2007-2013) Programme of the European Union. How has this objective been translated into the practice of funded projects and organisations? This is the question which the Platform for Intercultural Europe and Culture Action Europe, both organisations with a key interest in the topic and a track record of advocacy work at EU level, have investigated with a view to contributing to the European Commission’s review of the Programme and the preparation of its next phase beginning in 2014. Preliminary results were informally discussed with the EC Culture Programme Unit in April 2010. This concluded study is for submission to the public consultation on the Culture Programme in second half of 2010.

The scope and methodology of the research

Intercultural dialogue is an objective in 209 cooperation projects and work programmes funded under the EU Culture Programme in 2008 and 2009 according to information made available by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)¹. These amount to approximately 70% of all selected beneficiaries for the mentioned budget years.

The analysis was carried out with questionnaires and additional selective telephone interviews with project managers of lead organisations. Out of the 209 beneficiaries, 60 completed the questionnaires (representing a response rate of approximately 30%). 24 out of the 60 respondents were then asked to take part in phone interviews – 13 interviews were eventually carried out.

¹ The Executive Agency could not provide any information on the intercultural dialogue-related grants offered in 2007 or on the operational grants offered in 2008.

Research questions

Respondents were asked to explain in writing with regard to their project or work programme:

- why intercultural dialogue is an aim
- what intercultural dialogue means practically
- who the dialoguing partners are
- what activities reflect the pursuit of intercultural dialogue
- what positive or negative results these activities have
- what learning the activities offer
- if or how intercultural dialogue has been documented.

The aim of the additional interviews was twofold:

1. To gain further insight into

- Ways in which the understanding of intercultural dialogue changed during the implementation process
- Evidence of or reflections on difficulties in achieving intercultural dialogue.

2. To solicit reflection on

- How arts and culture organisations can best engage in intercultural dialogue
- Challenges and best practice in this field
- Whether more specific criteria for intercultural dialogue would be welcome in the Programme Guide.

Key findings

(1) A myriad of meanings and a weak delineation from related concepts

The study confirmed that intercultural dialogue has a myriad of meanings. Respondents evoked dialogue between:

- individuals or organisations from different countries and diverse backgrounds (ethnic, social, professional, artistic etc)
- art disciplines and other professional domains
- men and women, and different generations

- migrants and local populations
- rural and urban populations
- “centres” and “peripheries” of Europe
- the public and the private sectors.

Moreover, the responses showed that actual dialogue between people is not always at the heart of projects or programmes, but that they are deemed to be about intercultural dialogue when they are about cultural diversity. Commonly, projects are concerned with diversity in one of two ways:

- (1) Showcasing diversity: expressing and presenting different cultural identities (national, social, ethnic, community-related, artistic) in order to promote mutual understanding and respect or to embrace a common heritage.
- (2) Co-creation out of diversity: exploring and creating something new out of the interaction of people with different backgrounds.

Finally, intercultural dialogue is simply seen as an aspect of transnational cultural cooperation. An intercultural, i.e. international way of working is widely believed to favour the high quality and success of cultural activities and to stimulate innovation.

(2) Not an equal Programme objective: intercultural dialogue as an effect of transnational mobility

The EU Culture Programme currently offers neither guidance on what it intends with the promotion of intercultural dialogue, nor any indication of ways in which projects and work programmes might demonstrate that they will/have promoted intercultural dialogue. As a result, the field is left wide open to the interpretation of Programme beneficiaries who claim to be contributing to it, and the objective of intercultural dialogue does not emerge as a distinctive purpose or a conscious intention, but rather as a by-product of working transnationally, in other words as an effect of the other two objectives of the Programme: Projects and work programmes claim to be about intercultural dialogue by virtue of entailing the mobility of artist/cultural operators or transnational circulation of artistic and cultural works and products. The international collaboration which is the corner stone of

projects under the Programme is considered intercultural dialogue. *"The promotion of intercultural dialogue appears to be accepted as a probable adjunct of cross-border cultural activity"* (Ch. Tiller). This actually renders intercultural dialogue superfluous as an objective of the Programme. It is just an 'additional box' which gets ticked. *"The Culture Programme might be accused of abjuring its responsibility in this context"* (Ch. Tiller). Given that *"the reality of [the implementation of the objective is] left to applicants' individual reading, there are no winners and no losers."* (Ch. Tiller). What this means is that the EU fails to create an effective policy for intercultural dialogue with the Programme.

In fact, the 30% percent of projects under the examined period which did not declare that they had intercultural dialogue as an objective, might well have done so. It could be interesting to extend the research to this group and investigate why they did not select intercultural dialogue as an objective – might they have a more discriminate understanding of the term? Might they be considered less opportunistic in not laying claim to a 'fashionable' EU objective?

(3) A better definition: understanding the need but lack of interest

Such diversity of meaning inevitably dilutes the practical value of the term. Many respondents therefore called for a definition of intercultural dialogue under the Programme. Beneficiaries put forward that activities of arts and culture organisations should be more interculturally aware and not just involve exchanges for the sake of them or mobility as an end in itself. Some have suggested that international exchanges should stimulate genuine dialogue between many different stakeholders and with a larger public. However, on further probing during the follow-up interviews, all respondents displayed a reluctance to embrace a narrowing down of the term for fear that this might affect the success of applications.

(4) Assumptions only about the achievement of intercultural dialogue

Whilst most respondents seem to agree that creating opportunities for direct meetings and interactions around a common topic between people with different cultural backgrounds is the best way of achieving intercultural dialogue, nobody has any measures or firm

assessment of having achieved intercultural dialogue. The results of intercultural dialogue activities are largely deemed to become apparent only over longer periods of time. The tangible project or programme results (e.g. a theatre performance, an audio-visual material, the setting up of networks of artists or culture professionals etc.) are referred to as evidence of intercultural dialogue by virtue of the participation of people with different cultural backgrounds, but with no regard to quality, depth and sustainability of any dialogue.

Correlation with other research

The study confirms the findings of other recent research on the topic, such as the report of the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA) "*Achieving Intercultural Dialogue through the Arts and Culture? Concepts, Policies, Programmes, Practices*". Even if the IFACCA study has a worldwide scope and touches upon intercultural dialogue both within and between countries, it also revealed how broadly intercultural dialogue is understood: That intercultural dialogue is a process nurtured and continuously changed by the interaction between people with different cultural backgrounds; that it is stimulated by artists from different countries while engaging with audiences from across Europe and beyond; that it is a result of initiatives allowing exchange between people with different national traditions etc.

Another study with similar conclusions is the *Diversity Mapping Exercise* carried out by the European Forum for the Arts and Heritage (EFAH) in 2007 amongst the members of the organisation (now called Culture Action Europe). It also showed that understandings of intercultural dialogue abound, that the concept is widely equated with international cooperation and seen as implicit in contemporary cultural initiatives which entail transnational mobility. EFAH's study also pinpointed the difficulty of evaluating intercultural dialogue: indicators of change in individuals or collectives are scarce and impacts are expected only in the very long term.

I. CONTEXT, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

Context

Intercultural dialogue is currently a wide-ranging transversal objective in several funding programmes of the European Union, including the *Culture (2007-2013) Programme*. The promotion of intercultural dialogue was identified in the European Commission's *Agenda for Culture in a Globalizing World*² (2007) as a tool contributing to the governance of cultural diversity within European societies, transnationally across European countries and internationally with other parts of the world. Moreover, to enhance its commitment, the EU designated 2008 the *European Year of Intercultural Dialogue* "to contribute to giving expression and a high profile to a sustained process of intercultural dialogue which will continue beyond that year."³

In the context of intercultural dialogue being placed ever higher on political agendas in Europe, a closer look at how this concept has been reflected in practice can be highly useful for its future development direction.

Objectives and scope

INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE IN EU PROGRAMMES

Programmes of DG Education and Culture: **Culture (2007-2013), Youth in Action, Europe for Citizens, Lifelong Learning, Comenius, Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus, Grundtvig, Leonardo da Vinci, Tempus, FP7, Jean Monnet**

Programmes of DG Information Society and Media: **Media 2007-2013**

Programmes of DG Communication: **EuroGlobe**

Programmes of DG Employment: **Progress**

Programmes of DG Regional Policy: **European Territorial Cooperation**

Programmes of DG External Relations and Development: **European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, EuroMed**

Programmes of DG Justice, Freedom and Security: **European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals**

For the **Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance** several DGs are responsible: Enlargement, Regional Development, Agriculture and Rural Development and Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities.

According to Decision no 1855/2006⁴, the Culture Programme was established to "enhance the cultural area shared by Europeans and based on a common cultural heritage through the development of cultural cooperation between the creators, cultural players and cultural institutions of the countries taking part in the Programme, with a view to encouraging the

² http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-policy-development/doc399_en.htm

³ Decision 1983/2006/EC of the EP and of the Council concerning the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue http://www.interculturaldialogue2008.eu/fileadmin/downloads/documents/240-officialdocuments/legal_basis/legal_basis_EN.pdf

⁴ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:372:0001:0011:EN:PDF>

emergence of European citizenship". The European Commission's Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG EAC) is in charge of the Programme and directly manages some of its component parts. Responsibility for most Programme strands, however, is delegated to the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA).

The Programme mainly finances cultural projects, operational work programmes of European cultural organisations and studies and analysis activities in cultural cooperation (these Programme strands are implemented by EACEA). Additionally, the Programme supports the European Capitals of Culture, the awarding of European prizes in culture, cooperation with international organisations, Cultural Contact Points in all countries taking part in the Programme and valorisation and dissemination activities for maximising the impact of cooperation projects (with the exception of the Cultural Contact Points, these other strands are directly managed by DG EAC).

The Culture Programme acknowledges the promotion of intercultural dialogue as one of its three specific objectives. The award criteria that applicants must fulfil to obtain financing include the extent to which the proposed activities can support one or more specific objectives of the Programme i.e.:

- promotion of the transnational mobility of people working in the cultural sector;
- support for the transnational circulation of cultural and artistic works and products;
- promotion of intercultural dialogue.

The main objective of this research was to investigate how intercultural dialogue has been understood and translated into practice in the initiatives funded by the Programme (until 2009, following the 2008 calls of proposals). Other objectives were to identify how grant beneficiaries have achieved intercultural dialogue and what evidence of its achievement exists, to collect the lessons learnt on intercultural dialogue from the practice of cultural organisations and their further reflections on intercultural dialogue in arts and culture.

The research covers only the strands implemented by EACEA and described in the Programme Guide⁵, which require transnational cooperation between organisations and individuals:

- multi-annual cooperation projects (strand 1.1);
- cooperation projects of maximum 24 months (strand 1.2.1);
- cooperation projects with third countries (strand 1.3);
- operational grants for organisations active at European level in the field of culture (strand 2)

The research focused on the following strands of the Programme:

- **strand 1 - cooperation projects;**
 - strand 1.1. Multi-annual cooperation projects (3-5 years; involve minimum 6 operators from 6 different countries);
 - strand 1.2.1: Cooperation projects (last up to 24 months; involve minimum 3 operators from 3 different countries);
 - strand 1.3: Cooperation projects with third countries (last up to 24 months; involve minimum 4 operators from 4 different countries).
- **strand 2 - annual or 3-year work programmes of 4 types of European cultural organisations:**
 - Ambassador (activities in minimum 7 countries);
 - Advocacy network (members in minimum 15 countries);
 - Festival (works and/or artists from minimum 7 countries);
 - Policy support structure for the Agenda for Culture, with its sub-categories:
 - ✓ Platform (members in minimum 15 countries);
 - ✓ Policy-analysis grouping (involve minimum 3 countries).
 - ✓

** The funding structure has remained almost unchanged since the beginning of the Programme, with few changes in strand numbers and the introduction of the Policy support structures strand for the 2007 call.*

The research does not include:

- the Literary translations strand (1.2.2.),
- the support for analyses, the collection and the dissemination of information and for maximising the impact of projects in the field of cultural cooperation (strand 3),
- any of the strands directly managed by the Commission's DG EAC, i.e. the European Capitals of Culture, the awarding of European prizes in culture, special actions, cooperation with international organisations.

⁵ The version of the Programme Guide available for this research was the November 2009 one:
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/programme/documents/programme_guide_culture_11_2009_en.pdf

Strands 1.2.2 and 3 were not dealt with since cooperation is not required in their cases (even if consortia are encouraged for strand 3) and, as previously explained, the focus of the research is on cooperation strands. The strands managed by DG EAC were not covered either because they are not part of the Programme Guide and they follow different specific guidelines. A future extended study could look into more or all strands of the Programme, but, for this first analysis, a more homogenous cooperation-based corpus of funding strands was chosen.

II. METHODOLOGY

The research was based on the official data available from EACEA in November 2009 and provided upon the request of the Platform for Intercultural Europe and Culture Action Europe: the list of grant beneficiaries of strands 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3 and 2 who quoted intercultural dialogue as one of their objectives in application forms.

The official list of EACEA did not include any information about:

- grants offered in 2007, following the 2006 call of proposals;
- strand 2 operational grants offered in 2008, following the 2007 call of proposals (neither the annual grants nor the 3-year Framework Partnership Agreements),

and consequently the research could not cover the beneficiaries of these grants.

On the Executive Agency's website, **the total number of beneficiaries of the strands in focus in 2008 and 2009⁶ is 301**. According to EACEA's list provided for this research, **intercultural dialogue is an objective in 209 of the cooperation projects and work programmes supported in the same years**. However, one should bear in mind that **this number** (meaning approximately 70% of the total strand beneficiaries in 2008 and 2009) **could be higher in reality, if some of the unavailable 2008 operational grants also related to intercultural dialogue in the application forms**.

The **research** was carried out **on the basis of written questionnaires and of telephone interviews** with the grant beneficiaries. Respondents could provide answers in English or in French.

Neither the questionnaires nor the interviews put forward any given definition of intercultural dialogue or implied any specific desirable approach to the concept.

To eliminate any potential influence on answers and encourage genuine reflection on what intercultural dialogue really means in practice, respondents were not given any reference

⁶ The beneficiaries of 2008 and 2009 were selected following the calls of proposals of 2007, respectively of 2008: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/results_compendia/results_en.php (see "Funding 2007" and "Funding 2008").

point or multiple choice answers to choose from, but the possibility to answer freely to open questions.

In January 2010, **all⁷ organisations which coordinate(d) cooperation projects or work programmes with an intercultural dimension were contacted** by e-mail and asked to fill in the questionnaires. **60 beneficiaries replied (a response rate of almost 30%)**: 54 about their cooperation projects and 6 about their operational work programmes (see detailed comparative statistics about beneficiaries in 2008 and 2009 on page 16).

The questionnaires (see models in Annex 1) asked respondents to explain what intercultural dialogue practically means in their projects or work programmes, between whom the dialogue is, while also gathering information about their activities reflecting the pursuit of intercultural dialogue, about possible positive and negative results of these activities, and about any lessons they may have learnt. Not all 60 respondents replied entirely to the questionnaire; some entries were sometimes left blank.

In the case of cooperation projects, only the coordinating organisations were contacted and not all the co-organisers. Coordinating organisations are in charge of preparing and submitting the applications and of signing the grant agreements – as such they could easily provide all relevant information on intercultural dialogue in their actions. In some cases, coordinators explicitly stated that they had contacted the project's co-organisers to contribute to the answers of the questionnaires.

The research took into account that the cooperation projects under analysis were at different stages of their implementation: some had already finished, some were at the peak of their development, while others had just started. This impacted on the comparability of some findings of the research, such as the results of beneficiaries' activities, the lessons learnt about intercultural dialogue or the evidence claimed to support the occurrence of

⁷ The total number is 209. However, to avoid any autoreferential remarks throughout the research, the Platform for Intercultural Europe, also a grant beneficiary who quoted intercultural dialogue in the application form, did not provide answers to the questionnaire or the interview.

intercultural dialogue. For ongoing projects, the analysis was based on beneficiaries' projections for the future, e.g. expected evidence, and estimated results.

Out of the 60 respondents to the questionnaires, 13 participated in further phone interviews (initially, 24 respondents were asked to take part in the round of selective interviews, but 11 of them were eventually unavailable).

The **aim of the interviews** was twofold: to get more insight into the particular initiative financed by the EU (changes in the understanding of intercultural dialogue along the implementation process; evidence of intercultural dialogue being achieved, potential barriers that arose), and to extend the discussion to how arts and culture organisations can best engage in intercultural dialogue and what challenges they face; what best practice is in the field of arts and culture; whether EC-designed criteria for guiding how intercultural dialogue might be implemented would be welcome in the Programme Guide. The interviews fed into the analysis of the questionnaire, taking its points one step further, from particular to more general considerations.

The **selection of the interviewees** was **based on a purposive sampling procedure**, which considered the balanced representation of Programme strands, the fields of activity and the geographical coverage of the project of programme partnership.

Last but not least, it is important to underline that since the main objective of the study was to identify what intercultural dialogue actually means in the funded cultural initiatives, **the dimension of the analysis was mostly a qualitative one**. The great diversity of answers to the open questions of the questionnaires and the telephone interviews is an additional argument for the predominance of the qualitative over the quantitative analysis.

Grant beneficiaries in the financial years 2008 & 2009

STRAND OF THE PROGRAMME	BENEFICIARIES 2008			BENEFICIARIES 2009			TOTAL BENEFICIARIES 2008 & 2009		
	All	ICD-related	ICD-related part of research	All	ICD-related	ICD-related part of research	All	ICD-related	ICD-related part of research
1.1. Multiannual projects	11	9	1	9	8	2	20	17	3
1.2.1. Cooperation measures	92	77	27	87	77	20	179	154	47
1.3. Third countries projects	13	5	1	14	10	3	27	15	4
2. Ambassador	10 (2 AG & 8 FPA)	? <i>unavailable</i>	0	4 (AG)	4 (AG)	2	14 (6 AG & 8 FPA)	* 4 (AG)	2
2. Festival	20 (14 AG & 6 FPA)	? <i>unavailable</i>	0	8 (AG)	8 (AG)	3	28 (22 AG & 6 FPA)	* 8 (AG)	3
2. Network	29 (6 AG & 23 FPA)	? <i>unavailable</i>	0	4 (AG)	4 (AG)	1	33 (10 AG & 23 FPA)	* 4 (AG)	1
2. Platform	0	0	0	2 (AG)	2 (AG)	0	2 (AG)	2 (AG)	0
2. Grouping	0	0	0	5 (AG)	5 (AG)	0	5 (AG)	5 (AG)	0
TOTAL STRANDS / YEAR	175	* 91	29	133	118	31	308	* 209	60

AG = Annual Grants

FPA = Framework Partnership Agreements (3-year grants)

The statistics about all beneficiaries in 2008 and 2009 were extracted from the official information available on EACEA's website: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/results_compendia/results_en.php. The statistics about the beneficiaries in 2008 and 2009 who quoted intercultural dialogue in their applications were provided by EACEA upon request for the purpose of this research.

IMPORTANT! The figures marked with * are incomplete since there was no information available on the strand 2 beneficiaries (Ambassador, Festival, Network) in 2008 who ticked the objective of intercultural dialogue in their application forms.

III. MAIN FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH

What does intercultural dialogue mean in practice?

In the absence of a clarification in the Programme Guide and in application forms, intercultural dialogue acquires **very diverse interpretations** among the grant beneficiaries: from dialogue between individuals or organisations from different countries and with diverse backgrounds (ethnic, social, professional, artistic etc.) to dialogue between art disciplines, and art disciplines and other professional domains; men and women, and different generations; migrants and local populations; rural and urban populations; the public and the private sectors, „centres” and „peripheries” of Europe (where “periphery” is defined as “*non-location, removed from the world of art and cultural industries, which eludes public attention due to its apparent insignificance*”). While the first understanding is the common thread in respondents’ answers, the others are also referred to as important layers of intercultural dialogue in many initiatives.

Intercultural dialogue takes on an obvious cultural-artistic perspective in the analysed projects and work programmes – a fact which stresses the challenges and opportunities of encounters between artists, other culture professionals and audiences of different cultural backgrounds but touches only marginally the general social, ethnic, economic or historical context of these encounters.

Most respondents acknowledge **intercultural dialogue as an essential ingredient in today’s arts and culture practice**, highlighting the benefits it brings when working transnationally. The further in-depth interviews revealed that intercultural dialogue is seen as going beyond arts and culture and being “*a political and social issue that is really important in order to overcome nationalism, the fear for minorities and foreigners*”. On the other hand, there were also a couple of respondents who believe that intercultural dialogue, because it is so much used as a political accessory nowadays, has started to “*functionalize the arts*”, which become “*constantly instrumentalised*” to promote it.

In practical terms, cooperation projects and work programmes relate to intercultural dialogue as:

- **Showcasing diversity:** expressing and presenting different cultural identities (national, social, ethnic, community-related, artistic), in order to promote mutual understanding and respect and embrace the common European heritage. This understanding of intercultural dialogue does not lead to the creation of something new together; it only showcases different cultures and cultural expressions, introduces them to one another, reveals the differences and the similarities and underlines the uniqueness of cultures, the importance of keeping one's identity and of placing it in a common European context. **The focus here is on knowledge of the Other**, which contributes to tolerance, mutual understanding and respect. "Intercultural dialogue" is used interchangeably with "multiculturalism" or "cultural diversity" by respondents in this category.

Examples:

- ✓ projects which bring together writers from different countries who present their works in their native languages during public reading sessions;
 - ✓ festivals during which each project partner has a national day with specific gastronomy, literature, music etc.
- **Co-creation out of diversity:** exploring and creating something new out of the interaction of people with different cultural backgrounds. Something new refers, for instance, to a theatre co-production with artists from different countries and with different cultural backgrounds, or to the joint elaboration of common strategies and policy recommendations for a certain professional field at European level. This interpretation of intercultural dialogue goes beyond the mere mutual presentation of diversities (in any its forms) and proposes a new joint answer to common interests and concerns. **The focus here is on action with the Other:** working together to produce new outputs.

The proportion of respondents who understand intercultural dialogue as *showcasing diversity* and those who read it as *co-creation out of diversity* is fairly equal.

Intercultural dialogue is about transnational mobility and direct interactions between individuals with diverse cultural backgrounds. There is a general belief that intercultural dialogue is automatically *"achieved simply by bringing people together and hoping that there will be some kind of positive intercultural osmosis"* (Yvette Vaughan-Jones). However, respondents to the questionnaires and the interviews very rarely considered the quality, depth and impact of these encounters, which are assumed to be intercultural.

What emerged clearly from the study is that **projects and organisations do not have an active purpose and an intentional focus on intercultural dialogue, which becomes an effect, a simple expected by-product of the first two highly measurable specific objectives of the Programme**, i.e. supporting the transnational mobility of people and the transnational circulation of cultural works. These first two objectives are clear, straightforward and easily quantifiable. On the other hand, **intercultural dialogue is not seen as a distinctive Programme objective, but "as an inevitable result of projects meeting one or both other (objectives)".** *If people and / or objects move from one country to another across national boundaries then intercultural dialogue is an unavoidable outcome* (Ch. Tiller). Establishing if a project will support or has supported the movement of artists and other culture professionals and /or artistic works and products is rather easy. As the research reveals, however, *"verifying and evaluating the promotion of intercultural dialogue is more complex and applicants are offered little, if any guidance"* (Ch. Tiller) in this sense. It is clear from the research that, in the absence of any such landmark reference, many cultural projects have reached the conclusion that **intercultural dialogue is a simple aspect of transnational cultural cooperation.** Projects are deemed to be about intercultural dialogue because they are about cooperation between several countries, which, in the case of the Culture Programme, requires transnational mobility of people working in culture and transnational circulation of culture works and products.

As the "Culture Programme offers no clear definition of what is intended by promoting intercultural dialogue, there is no danger of applicants misunderstanding or misinterpreting its aims" (Ch Tiller). **The translation into practice of intercultural dialogue is thus**

left to applicants' individual interpretation, even if the policy commitment to intercultural dialogue is clearly stated in the Programme Guide and in the Agenda for Culture in a Globalizing World.

Many respondents found it useful to ask what the research itself meant by intercultural dialogue and to clarify their own understanding of the concept. On the other hand, most beneficiaries responding to the questionnaires and to the interviews seem to have been content to work with their own definitions and to record their individual intercultural dialogue outputs. **None of the interviewees agreed to introduce any sort of criteria for intercultural dialogue in the Culture Programme that might affect applications and the selection process.** One respondent stated that: *"It is believed that, since intercultural dialogue has so many different meanings depending on people and on contexts, designing a more precise definition, or trying to set criteria for it, would not be beneficial at all for culture projects, which are about creativity and complete openness above all."* Other participants in the research said that intercultural dialogue does not have a long enough history in Europe when it comes to funding for cooperation projects to exactly define all its aspects and to enclose criteria: *"For the moment, it is too early to define what intercultural dialogue is, we are still in the phase where we are surprised that it appears in certain places and situations, that it often takes such unexpected forms. I think it is still an experiment and should not be given restrictive criteria."* **While these perspectives underline the importance of embracing the multiplicity of perspectives on intercultural dialogue, they also "condemn" the term to vagueness and lack of substance and create situations in which "there are no winners and no losers" (Ch. Tiller) and no clear development directions of intercultural dialogue.**

Why is intercultural dialogue an objective of projects and work programmes?

More than 70% of the cooperation projects and operational work programmes supported in 2008 and 2009 have intercultural dialogue as one of their objectives. The questionnaires investigated what the reasons for selecting intercultural dialogue in these initiatives were

and tried to infer what might differentiate them from the ones that did not include this objective.

As concluded at the previous point, **the objective of intercultural dialogue does not emerge as a stand-alone Culture Programme objective**, with a distinctive purpose or a conscious intention, but rather as a by-product of working transnationally, in other words as an effect of the other two objectives of the Programme. One questionnaire respondent even explicitly stated that intercultural dialogue was not an aim (even if the submitted application did quote intercultural dialogue as an aim), but *“occurred as some sort of natural by-product of the project.”* **Projects and work programmes claim to be about intercultural dialogue by virtue of entailing the mobility of artists / cultural workers or the transnational circulation of artistic and cultural works and products.** The European and international cooperation, which is the corner stone of projects and work programmes under the Programme, is automatically considered intercultural dialogue. This actually renders intercultural dialogue superfluous as an objective of the Programme: it is just an ‘additional box’ which gets ticked, but brings no added value.

The statement that intercultural dialogue is a by-product of working transnationally could also mean that the rest of projects and work programmes under the examined period which did not declare to have intercultural dialogue as an objective, might as well have done so. It could be interesting to extend the research to this group and investigate what their understanding of intercultural dialogue is and why they did not select it as an objective.

The answers to why intercultural dialogue is an aim are generally answers to why organisations chose cooperation at European level to frame their actions, rather than designing projects at national or local level: because it is on this wider level that mutually beneficial action and results can be achieved, contemporary cultural and artistic trends be developed, substantial awareness on certain issues be raised, knowledge and respect of the Other be enhanced or, in few respondents’ cases, socio-political conflicts be mediated. Thinking in intercultural terms and working transnationally is described as

enriching for all target groups involved, setting new ways of connecting to audiences across Europe, and generally being “*the only way of creating and producing high standard cultural activities*”. Intercultural dialogue and the ability to bring together a diversity of perspectives, voices, and experiences are called for as a way to stimulate innovation and thus ensure a project’s success.

Again, in all these answers, there is the **assumption that intercultural dialogue is a natural effect of cooperation at European level**. Intercultural dialogue does not emerge as a specific type of dialogue within this cooperation framework.

One special mention can be made with regard to the beneficiaries who answered about their international cooperation projects with third countries (strand 1.3. of the Programme)⁸. In their cases, intercultural dialogue appears as a more distinct aim within the general aims of activities: *to combat all sorts of exclusion (social, gender, age, handicap, geographic or other)*”, especially in disadvantaged areas and in connection to immigrants, to help “*overpass frontiers and separations*”. One concrete example is a project involving the occupied Palestinian Territory: “*The condition of permanent conflict in occupied Palestinian Territories makes it very important to promote activities where culture plays an active role against the isolation created by frontiers, in a process that sees culture as a factor of social integration. It is important to produce an alternative vision to the one produced by violence, so to denounce the misery of war and to promote a practice of peace among equals.*”

Intercultural dialogue: between whom?

The answers to this question, too, reflect the multitude of understandings of intercultural dialogue amongst grant beneficiaries and the fact that everything is intercultural within the framework of transnational cultural cooperation. **The actors involved in dialogue are generally deemed identical with the partner organisations and the target groups**

⁸ Brazil was selected by the EC as an eligible third country for 2008. For 2009, the selected countries were: Armenia, Belarus, Egypt, Georgia, Jordan, Moldova, the occupied Palestinian Territory and Tunisia.

of each project or work programme, but dialogue is also said to take place between different artistic disciplines and fields of activity, between “centres” and “peripheries” of Europe or between the public and the private sectors.

A general listing of the target groups mentioned by beneficiaries includes: artists; culture specialists/experts; youth; general public; educational institutions, minority/immigrants; disadvantaged people. These are also the choices of target groups provided in the Culture Programme application forms. Out of these categories, **artists, culture specialists / experts and the general public are the common denominators who engage in intercultural dialogue. Artists, in particular, are considered to be the most important facilitators of intercultural dialogue.** However *“artists, because they work internationally should not automatically be assumed to be good at working interculturally.”* (Yvette Vaughan Jones)

Out of the 60 initiatives analysed, 4 refer to disadvantaged people (mentally and / or physically disadvantaged, economically disadvantaged, one-parent families, ethnic groups etc.) and 2 to minority / immigrants as one of their target groups participating in intercultural dialogue.

Activities which pursue intercultural dialogue

The research highlights that **activities said to lead to intercultural dialogue are the usual activities of projects and work programmes;** there are actually no particular project activities, which reflect the intercultural dialogue objective. **Intercultural dialogue is not underlined at any specific stage of these initiatives. This allows the conclusion that activities are not conducted with the explicit intention to conduct intercultural dialogue, but rather simply touch upon it while in the framework of transnational cooperation.** The broadness of what respondents call intercultural activities is again a consequence of the broad understanding of the term “intercultural dialogue” and of the fact that transnational cooperation in itself is said to make intercultural dialogue happen.

Activities are generally intercultural by the participation they involve (people from different countries and with different cultural backgrounds) and by their itinerant character at European or international level, but there is little regard to the impact and sustainability of the dialogue triggered by these activities, as the majority of answers reveals.

The type of activities mentioned by respondents fall into the general categories put forward by the application forms of the Culture Programme: performance; fair/exhibition; arts residency; festival; publication; research; training; conference/seminar/workshop/lecture; multimedia and new technologies.

Arts residencies are seen as the best examples of intercultural dialogue in contemporary arts, since participants can interact directly and work together on common topics: *"(...) Residences are more effective with respect to cultural interaction, mutual knowledge building and linking participants to the place where they occur (...). Multicultural and multidisciplinary artistic residencies are at the heart of our conception of intercultural dialogue applied to the artistic field."*

The entailed activities depend in the first instance on the particular topics and themes of the project or programme. However, the type of activities is also influenced by the requirements of the Culture Programme as set out in its Guide: *"The projects (...) must not consist fully and exclusively in the production and maintenance of websites, the production of magazines and newspapers, the organisation of conferences or meetings and the production of studies and reports. Projects of this type are not eligible."*⁹ As a result, the activities of cooperation projects have adapted to the requirements of the Programme, but often would not otherwise have been included: *"When we designed the project for funding, to fit not only our intentions, but also the criteria of the EU, we understood that the EU wants more than conferences and research – what we would have normally thought of as activities in our project – so we decided to include a photo-exhibition with children."* Having to diversify the activities seldom impacted on the way intercultural dialogue was understood by the end of a project: *"Our understanding of what intercultural dialogue is and how it can be achieved did change! (...) In the beginning, I had considered it to be*

⁹ Culture Programme Guide, November 2009 version, page 40.

taking place between nations, but as the project unfolded we discovered that this perspective might not be the most relevant one. (...) So (...) the issue of intercultural dialogue is not only a horizontal one, between nations, but also one to be discussed on a vertical axis, concerning direct exchange of people with different social backgrounds”.

The interviews took the description of activities in the questionnaires one step further, asking beneficiaries what good practice in connection to intercultural dialogue in general is. Answers show that **good practice is transparent in activities which protect and promote cultural differences, bring to the fore what is unique and then work beyond it to create something new with another; activities which are inclusive with everyone, respectful, address larger audiences and not only a specialised narrow public, and add a social dimension to the arts and cultural one.**

The **concrete good practice examples** given by grant beneficiaries range from projects that include artists’ residencies, the creation of transnational artistic networks, to having focus groups for intercultural dialogue that would work on assessing the changes brought about by an activity or to doing theatre in conflict zones to help the mediation process.

The interviews also gathered project managers’ opinions on what **the best way for arts and culture organizations to promote intercultural dialogue** would be. Although *“there is no easy recipe for (encouraging) intercultural dialogue”*, there is a **unanimous acknowledgement that intercultural dialogue has to be integrated not only in organisations’ mission statements and vague approaches, but in practice, in concrete activities which imply direct interaction between people with different cultural backgrounds and which have special moderators to consciously coagulate this dialogue around a common topic.** Organisations interested in encouraging intercultural dialogue *“should not necessarily find instruments to do so or models, but should rather ask the right questions through the activities they propose to the public”*.

There is also a strong belief among interviewees that the topics of **activities** brought to the fore by these organisations **should be more intercultural dialogue-aware**; they should not just imply exchanges for the sake of exchanges or mobility as an end in itself, but

should rather wrap them up in relevant content that encourages genuine dialogue between many different stakeholders and with a large public.

All interviewees mentioned that their **organisations will continue to carry out activities with an intercultural dialogue dimension in future projects**, because sustainability through concrete actions is important for enhancing intercultural dialogue.

Results of activities

"Bear in mind that you sometimes have to wait for the results for a long time..." is a unanimously shared belief amongst participants in the research.

The questionnaires asked project managers to mention some of the positive and, if any, the negative results of their activities. It should be underlined that a significant number of the projects analysed were still in their implementation phase, therefore the listing of results also includes beneficiaries' estimated results.

The positive results of finalised projects fall into two main categories: tangible and intangible. The examples of tangible results range from the creation of a theatre performance, the elaboration of joint strategies in urban policies, the launching of an audio-visual material (CD, DVD etc.) presenting the project, to the setting up of a website which continues to promote the completed activities or of a new platform of culture workers (artists, cultural managers, researchers etc). **The positive results are usually the proposed activities themselves being implemented as planned.** Examples of intangible results range from *"increased knowledge of the Other"*, *"becoming familiar with other cultures"*, *"strengthened social solidarity"*, *"reduced discrimination"*, to having raised awareness on the multiplicity of perspectives on a certain topic, and wide media and general public attention being attracted etc.

Respondents provided no negative results of activities as such. What they referred to as results here are rather considerations on the cooperation process with organisations and individuals from different countries: language barriers;

differences in the organizational and management cultures of the partners involved; high travel costs; short duration of initiatives due to funds limitations.

As a general remark, it can be said that **just like the intercultural dialogue-related activities of projects and work programmes are their general activities, the intercultural dialogue-related results are the general results of these initiatives.** This complete overlapping is the direct consequence of intercultural dialogue being perceived as a natural effect of transnational cooperation, in which all activities and results are by default intercultural.

Evidence of intercultural dialogue

The documentary evidence provided by participants in the research is the evidence of the actual implementation of projects and work programmes, as reflected in: projects' webpages or blogs, official implementation reports, video and audio recordings, documentaries, publications and promotional materials, written reports of participants in different activities, general media coverage, photo archives etc.

The interviews tried to capture a more in-depth perspective on what beneficiaries consider evidence that their projects or work programmes serve or lead to intercultural dialogue.

There are **two types of evidence provided: concrete/quantifiable and abstract.** Examples of concrete evidence range from positive feedback reports which artists were asked to write about their transnational cooperation experience, to the fact that artists learned new particular techniques by means of knowledge transfer from artists in another country and to co-produced performances with artists of diverse cultural backgrounds which actually take place. Examples of less easily quantifiable evidence are: *"enhanced partnership between the organisations involved in the project"*, which is thought to create opportunities for future joint projects, *"increased knowledge and understanding of other cultures and of how organisations across Europe work"*, *"no more prejudices against the Other"*, or *"having questioned one's own perspectives and values to allow for more flexible and open approaches in the professional field or in life in general"* etc.

A general belief was that the very fact of bringing people with different cultural and professional backgrounds together in a real life face-to-face situation and enabling them to interact, discuss and compare views on a common issue, design joint activities/solutions is evidence enough that intercultural dialogue occurs. Also, having organisations work in European/international cooperation projects is referred to as already concrete proof of intercultural dialogue happening. However, the deepness of such direct encounters is a subject that respondents do not touch upon (i.e. how effective they actually were). The direct interaction is considered to be enough to trigger intercultural dialogue or to be defined as intercultural dialogue. Several answers emphasized that this interaction should benefit from the “*conscious effort of a moderator*” who could give it a direction and stimulate people to engage with each other more effectively.

What was widely noticed is the belief that **intercultural dialogue is “self-evident” in contemporary arts and culture**, which are said to speak an international language and to be, by definition, open to interferences and to constantly embrace change and a multiplicity of perspectives. Tendencies in contemporary arts and culture are thought to travel from country to country more easily and to define a space of synchronicity and similarities (especially within Europe) rather than one of differences.

A concluding remark is that **it is highly difficult to evaluate the effects and the evidence of intercultural dialogue in the analysed projects and work programmes. Indicators of such individual or collective patterns of change are scarce and the impact is in general apparent only in the very long term, according to the participants in the research. This makes it essential for the Culture Programme to design evaluation methods for intercultural dialogue, including quality criteria and indicators to assess its impact, taking account of the dynamics at the heart of cultural projects.** „*Whether a project has contributed to intercultural dialogue is currently put down either to the tangible outcomes of a project or is a matter of claiming to have achieved it. Methods need to be proposed which can capture the learning which has taken place in the course of projects. Since there are few objective criteria to judge them,*

virtually all projects would be safe in assuming they will bring about this dialogue and like "motherhood and apple pie" the assumption is that dialogue will inevitably be a good thing." (Yvette Vaughan Jones)

Lessons learnt about promoting intercultural dialogue

The lessons learnt were extracted from both the questionnaire and the interviews. Generally, **respondents refer to the experiences of having been involved in a cooperation initiative at European or international level**, which is again in line with all the other consequences of intercultural dialogue being understood as a simple effect of transnational cooperation.

There is a great diversity of answers received here, as every lesson is specific to each initiative. However, **the most common answers are that: arts and culture are a fertile ground for developing intercultural dialogue; cultural differences are an enriching, creative aspect of a project; creating opportunities for direct interaction between people with different cultural backgrounds is the best way to achieve intercultural dialogue; the involvement of young people is essential to the sustainability of intercultural dialogue.** There were also respondents who said that cooperation among partners from more countries is sometimes difficult due to the differences in the management, institutional and administrative cultures and that, as a lesson, one should look into these differences more carefully before embarking on a European cooperation project that wants to be successful. However, **there is unanimous agreement among all participants in the research that "if you want to collaborate, there can be no barriers."**

Some of the particular lessons respondents mentioned:

- ❑ *"In intercultural dialogue projects much more work has to be done than in usual cultural projects (...) because they are complicated and sensitive and they engage a lot of different people that usually do not work together."*
- ❑ Intercultural dialogue should happen more with the non-European space (e.g. Africa, South America). According to the majority of the interviewees, in Europe, the

differences between countries do exist, but they are not that great anymore and intercultural dialogue should be more present in places where there are still significant gaps to be bridged. The Culture Programme funding is considered too specific in this sense, having only one strand open to cooperation with third countries, which are different every year / two years, thus not supporting sustainable partnerships outside Europe¹⁰.

- ❑ *"Promoting intercultural dialogue is a long term process, which cultural institutions should constantly consider in their daily activities".*
- ❑ *"Intercultural dialogue is not mainly linked to arts, but to societies. Intercultural dialogue is actually a political and social issue, one that is really important in order to overcome nationalism, the fear for minorities and foreigners."*
- ❑ *"Intercultural dialogue is an essential dimension of contemporary artistic creation".*
- ❑ *"Reality goes beyond whatever we can imagine. We expected to be able to launch some joint activities and performances, as we did. But we could not anticipate long lasting results, as the establishment of a new stable network of archaeology based in Portugal, Brazil (...and) other Southern American countries".*
- ❑ *"The promotion of the intercultural dialogue depends on a number of social, cultural and economical characteristics of the participants. In order to successfully promote intercultural dialogue, it is important to determine the main specific points of intersection (...). Our main lesson is that different kinds of artistic expressions represent a strong unifying force in the dialogue between cultures, where the obstacles often effortlessly disappear".*
- ❑ *"One always needs to be aware of the local communities' mentality in order to achieve the desired maximum effect with an activity".*
- ❑ Working at European level in cooperation projects contributes to better evaluations of national cultural policies and to the design of new ones.
- ❑ The main challenge in intercultural dialogue is to keep quality high, even when one tries to make information accessible: *"In intercultural dialogue projects there is always the risk that, because you want to make yourself easily understood, you resort to trivial information. But the obvious is not trivial and one should strive to*

10 The current rule of the third countries cooperation projects strand is that the EC selects, each year, different countries with which cooperation projects can be made.

communicate substantial information, not give in to the social, cultural and other challenges that arise in the communication process."

- ❑ *"Intercultural dialogue is about quality and not quantity, so the challenge is to think about the quality and not the quantity outcomes".*
- ❑ *"In order to promote intercultural dialogue it is important to find simple and linear communication strategies and instruments which are able to foster dialogue and exchange and to reduce the risks of misunderstanding."*
- ❑ *„Intercultural dialogue is really a criterion in today's approach to art and culture"*
- ❑ *"There is still much work to do in order to increase the awareness on and the consciousness about intercultural dialogue. In general, people know little about their neighbours speaking a different language, about ethnic minorities in their own countries, about social and economic problems in peripheral regions in Europe".*
- ❑ *„Travelling gives one of the most obvious results – when people step outside their daily location and jobs, they are much more open for any new experience and ideas".*
- ❑ *"Often simply allowing the exchange of ideas and giving different individuals a voice in certain discussions is already enough to catalyze significant dialogue and to increase the understanding and collaborative potential within groups of very different actors".*
- ❑ Sustainability is an important aim, cooperation should be continued after a project's end to ensure that intercultural dialogue is genuinely achieved.

IV. CORRELATION WITH SIMILAR RESEARCH

The study confirms some of the findings of other recent research on the topic, such as **IFACCA's Report "Achieving Intercultural Dialogue through the Arts and Culture? Concepts, Policies, Programmes, Practices"**¹¹. Even if the IFACCA study has a worldwide scope and touches upon intercultural dialogue both within and between countries, it also reveals how broadly intercultural dialogue is understood: that intercultural dialogue is a process nurtured and continuously changed by the interaction between people with different cultural backgrounds; that it is stimulated by artists from different countries while engaging with audiences from across Europe and beyond; that it is a result of initiatives allowing exchange between people with different national traditions etc. Intercultural dialogue has multiple meanings and there is no single approach to it employed across Europe: from linguistic diversity to gender and generational diversity or cultural cooperation in general. A recurrent dimension that is much more emphasized by respondents to the Culture Programme research is the artistic one, pointing out the contribution of artists and of interdisciplinary activities to encouraging intercultural dialogue across borders.

In our research, the transnational mobility of cultural workers is one of the most important ways of triggering, encouraging and promoting intercultural dialogue. This conclusion can also be sustained by the fact that, for almost all respondents, intercultural dialogue is a process or an effect rather than something concrete. A similar remark is found in IFACCA's Report, where intercultural dialogue is *"less an activity or tool with fixed ends and more an interactive communication process, whose parameters are constantly evolving and will sometimes produce interim or hybrid results"*.

EFAH's Diversity Mapping Exercise of 2007¹², carried out among the member organisations of the now Culture Action Europe network (ex-EFAH), also outlines some similar conclusions. The very diverse understandings of intercultural dialogue abound there,

¹¹ <http://www.ifacca.org/topic/intercultural-dialogue-cultural-diversity/>

¹² EFAH Mapping Exercise: The experience of Cultural Diversity in EFAH Membership. How EFAH Members Perceive and Respond to the Concept of Cultural Diversity (2007), <http://www.cultureactioneurope.org/think/intercultural-dialogue?p=resources-and-links>

too. Intercultural dialogue is also equated with cooperation in general and seen as an obvious implicit element in contemporary cultural initiatives, especially when they are about transnational mobility. EFAH's study also revealed that it is highly difficult to evaluate the evidence of intercultural dialogue: indicators of such individual or collective patterns of change are scarce and the impact is in general apparent only in the very long term.

The EFAH Mapping also highlighted that cultural operators were reluctant to define their work in socio-political terms, like many interviewees participating in the current research were: *"Even if they did increasingly recognize that social trends have an impact on their audiences and staff, they did not want to see their activities reduced to a form of socio-civic instrumentalism."*

What is widely noticed in the Culture Programme research is the belief that intercultural dialogue is *"self-evident"* in contemporary arts, which are said to be, by definition, open to interferences and to constantly embrace change and a multiplicity of perspectives. Tendencies in contemporary arts are said to travel from country to country more easily and to define a space of synchronicity and similarities (especially within Europe) rather than one of differences. The same conclusion became obvious in the IFACCA report and in EFAH's study. In the latter one, intercultural dialogue simply equalled cultural cooperation in general: *"The interviewees (...) considered cultural diversity a "natural, obvious element" of their work, something, which "is simply there", "implicit" in their "daily activity". They deal with diversity through, for example "musical diversity", "representing the entire music sector", "spreading repertoires" and "playing different kinds of music"; they "spread European literature abroad" or "support different forms of non-traditional and non-conventional arts".*

The current research on the Culture Programme identified, above all, the need to clarify the term "intercultural dialogue". The same conclusion can be found among the recommendations of **EricArts' "Sharing Diversity"**¹³ study in 2008, where it is essential

13 Sharing Diversity: National Approaches to Intercultural Dialogue in Europe, <http://www.interculturaldialogue.eu/web/index.php>

to "establish a clear concept / definition of intercultural dialogue (...) for the future development of European, national, regional / local policies, strategies and funding programmes to promote intercultural dialogue and for helping to avoid potential misinterpretations of their objectives and make it easier to evaluate their success."

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In order to make the EU Culture Programme more effective in terms of intercultural dialogue, reflection on the nature of 'objectives' might be useful: The Culture Programme might need to be clearer that 'funding programme objectives' do not need to be the same as 'project objectives' or 'organisational work programme objectives'. It could be made clear that the EU wishes to promote mobility or intercultural dialogue as working tools because of the many benefits they bring to projects, organisations and societies at large, rather than prescribing mobility or intercultural dialogue as a subject matter.

Intercultural dialogue could be promoted as a methodology that ensures that all aspects of the inclusion of 'the other' are thought about in any given project from planning to implementation, and that new perspectives on how to perform, how to create, how to entertain and inspire may emerge as a result. Ultimately, the EU would be promoting intercultural dialogue as a democratic process for all members of our diverse societies. This approach could also begin to resolve the problem of measuring long-term impact. Once guidelines on possible methodologies for encouraging intercultural dialogue are set out, it will also be possible to evaluate whether these methodologies have been employed successfully or not.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT CULTURE PROGRAMME

The premise of the following recommendations is that intercultural dialogue remains an objective of the EU Culture Programme. While excellence in the production and promotion of art and heritage should be a concern of the Programme, the EU supports art and heritage primarily for their contribution to the overarching purposes of the economic, social and political well-being of European society. The recognition in this context that the diversity of people in Europe poses a challenge which needs to be addressed across policy areas, has lead the EU to make intercultural dialogue a 'transversal' policy aim. The reasons remain strong to continue with this endeavour and also to keep the EU Culture Programme in the service of intercultural dialogue. However, far from 'instrumentalising' the arts and heritage, a well-defined 'intercultural dialogue' goal will allow those practitioners who already work in this field to find support and those who seek to grow into it, to find a unique developmental opportunity.

(1) Define intercultural dialogue explicitly for the purposes of the EU Culture Programme

Intercultural dialogue must become a distinctive objective in order to achieve congruity in the aims of the projects under it. According to our Rainbow Paper¹⁴, intercultural dialogue is *"a series of specific encounters, anchored in real space and time between individuals and/or groups with different ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds and heritage, with the aim of exploring, testing and increasing understanding, awareness, empathy, and respect"*. We also defined that intercultural dialogue has the ultimate purpose *"to create a cooperative and willing environment for overcoming political and social tensions"*.

Given the Culture Programme's focus on artistic and cultural activity, this definition could be adapted to *"European exchange and collaboration on arts & heritage to help ensure that people of all backgrounds and identities participate fully and equally in society"*.

14.The Rainbow Paper „Intercultural Dialogue: From Practice to Policy and Back"
<http://rainbowpaper.labforculture.org/signup/public/read>

The subject of such exchange and collaboration could be the following principal ways in which the arts and heritage can contribute to intercultural dialogue¹⁵:

- Making marginalised groups visible, legitimising their presence and perspectives and improving the social attitudes towards them of dominant majority groups
- Highlighting similarities rather than differences between people by showing historic and current connections between different cultures and human experiences
- Providing a different language where things can be understood by people who do not share a single language and where challenging ideas and experiences can be expressed safely
- Providing safe meeting spaces with the possibility of encounter with other cultures without a commitment to further engagement
- Providing a source of affirmation and confidence building (focusing on people's creativity and achievements, providing enjoyment)
- Breaking down perceived or real barriers between people and removing negative stereotypes.

Intercultural issues must not be seen only as those arising between people of different nationality or ethnicity, but must also encompass issues such as class, gender, place, faith and socio-economic realities. Cultural identity must be regarded as an individual as well as a group or national concept.

The EU Culture Programme should also explicitly support exchange and collaboration on increasing the intercultural competence of cultural organisations to be able to fulfil the above objective. In fact, the Programme should become an attractive development option for cultural organisations and should reward experimentation and relationship building.

15. See report on the Platform for Intercultural Europe's 2009 European Forum "*The Distinctive Contribution of the Arts to Intercultural Dialogue. A View from and on the Arts*", <http://www.intercultural-europe.org/template.php?page=pa-european-forum>.

(2) Withstand resistance to reinforcing the objective on intercultural dialogue with a definition

The funding under the Programme is precious and it is clear that it is in the interest of current beneficiaries to maintain the status quo with regard to the intercultural dialogue objective rather than create hurdles for eligibility. However, if the Programme is to serve wider EU policy and the greater public good, then intercultural dialogue needs to become a more effective objective. By enhancing the intercultural dialogue objective, the Programme will increase its potential to affect change and to be seen to do so, thereby being in a position to claim a greater percentage of the overall EU budget and, ultimately, to offer more substantial grants under the Programme.

(3) Establish selection criteria

It must be made possible *“to identify effective (intercultural) practice and provide direction for evidencing when and how it had happened”* (Ch. Tiller). To this end, applicants under the intercultural dialogue objective should be asked questions such as¹⁶:

“If you have ticked the box intercultural dialogue as an aim, please tell us more about the ways in which intercultural dialogue will take place within your project. e.g.

- Who will the intercultural dialogue take place between? Why do you feel intercultural dialogue is important between these groups? Are all the groups who will be involved in the dialogue present as co-creators in your project? If not, how will you involve them?
- Where will the intercultural activities take place? Will it be in traditional spaces such as theatres and art galleries or in community spaces, found spaces, marketplaces, etc?
- How will you guarantee equal access for the groups you wish to encourage to take part in the dialogue?
- When will intercultural dialogue happen in your project? Is it a theme running through all the activities or will it be highlighted at particular stages?

¹⁶ Examples provided by Chrissie Tiller.

- What particular project activities will feed into the intercultural dialogue objectives of your project? Why do you expect these activities might effectively encourage intercultural dialogue?
- How will intercultural dialogue be actively encouraged or facilitated? Will it be mostly through the activities or will there be organised forums for intercultural dialogue to take place? How will you set up these possibilities?"

(4) Design measures which can prove that intercultural dialogue has taken place

A further consequence of the lack of a definition is that no measures can be applied to the achievement of the objective. Whether a project has contributed to intercultural dialogue is currently put down either to the tangible outcomes of a project or is a matter of claiming to have achieved it. Methods need to be proposed which can capture the learning which has taken place in the course of projects. This will be particularly important where a project might have a principal objective – for example, to create a project that addresses climate change – but a strong intercultural element and an intercultural secondary objective. A qualitative approach to evaluation is needed. Based on questions to applicants, such as those suggested above, a methodology for interpreting answers and evaluating follow up statements made in final reports needs to be designed. Peer assessments by clusters of related projects could be made a condition of the Programme so as to ensure that learning from projects is maximised.

(5) Make transnational cooperation that does not necessarily involve mobility eligible under the Programme

The Programme might additionally promote virtual *"trans-national exchange of effective models of good practice [of promoting intercultural dialogue that happens within partner countries]"* (Ch. Tiller). Although the quality of interchange that takes place in live communication can often be more powerful and effective than virtual discourse it should be possible for the Culture Programme to provide national projects that promote dialogue within countries, between say *"first and third generations of immigrant communities, the*

dominant aesthetic and working class cultures, between 21st century 'hybrid' identity and historical ethnicity" (Ch. Tiller) to apply for an added element of trans-national exchange.

(6) Fund preparatory actions

At the same time the Programme might also consider supporting the partner search as part of the development of real intercultural dialogue. In the Culture Programme as in many other programmes ("*the real work is finding the partners*"), money for preparatory actions (Grundtvig model) should be made available.

(7) Ensure coherence between the achievements of intercultural dialogue under the EU Culture Programme with those under the other EU Programmes and actions with this objective.

To this end, studies similar to this one should be conducted on intercultural dialogue as an objective in the Youth, Citizenship, Multilingualism, Life-long Learning, and Media Programmes as well as relevant instruments of research, social, regional, neighbourhood and integration policies.

VII. REFERENCES

Decision no 1855/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 establishing the Culture Programme (2007 to 2013)

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:372:0001:0011:EN:PDF>

The Culture (2007-2013) Programme Guide (version of November 2009 and the current version) http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/programme/programme_guide_en.php

Website of the European Commission, Directorate General Education and Culture (DG EAC)
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/index_en.htm

Website of the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/index_en.php

The Agenda for Culture in a Globalizing World
http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-policy-development/doc399_en.htm

Draft Resolution of the Council on a European Agenda for Culture
<http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/07/st14/st14485.en07.pdf>

Decision no 1983/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (2008)
http://www.interculturaldialogue2008.eu/fileadmin/downloads/documents/240-officialdocuments/legal_basis/legal_basis_EN.pdf

Official website of EYID 2008
www.dialogue2008.eu

Intercultural Dialogue — Support through EU Programmes (DG EAC publication, 2008)
http://www.interculturaldialogue2008.eu/fileadmin/downloads/resources/EN_Broschuere_A_5_EYID_vt.pdf

EFAH Mapping Exercise: The experience of Cultural Diversity in EFAH Membership. How EFAH Members Perceive and Respond to the Concept of Cultural Diversity (2007)

<http://www.cultureactioneurope.org/think/intercultural-dialogue?p=resources-and-links>

Sharing Diversity - National Approaches to Intercultural Dialogue in Europe (EricArts Study, 2008);

<http://www.ifacca.org/publications/2008/03/28/sharing-diversity-national-approaches-intercultural/>

IFACCA Report no 39: Intercultural Dialogue through the Arts and Culture (2009)

<http://www.ifacca.org/topic/intercultural-dialogue-cultural-diversity/>

The Rainbow Paper „Intercultural Dialogue: From Practice to Policy and Back” (Platform for Intercultural Dialogue)

<http://rainbowpaper.labforculture.org/signup/public/read>

Report on the Platform for Intercultural Europe’s 2009 European Forum *“The Distinctive Contribution of the Arts to Intercultural dialogue A View from and on the Arts”*

<http://www.intercultural-europe.org/template.php?page=pa-european-forum>.

VIII. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: questionnaire models & interview questions

Questionnaire model for strand 1



Platform for Intercultural Europe & Culture Action Europe Intercultural Dialogue as an Objective in the EU Culture (2007-2013) Programme

Questionnaire on how intercultural dialogue is interpreted and implemented in the funded projects (strands 1.1; 1.2.1; 1.3)

PART I - BRIEF INFORMATION ABOUT THE FUNDED PROJECT

1. Title of the *Culture (2007-2013)* project:

2. Timeframe of the project:

3. Field of the project:

- ☐ Cultural heritage
- ☐ Visual Arts
- ☐ Performing Arts
- ☐ Literature, Books and Reading
- ☐ Architecture
- ☐ Design, Applied Arts
- ☐ Interdisciplinary (*please detail*):

4. Brief description of the project (5-15 lines):

5. Coordinating organisation:

6. Person answering this questionnaire on behalf of the project *(please also mention your role in the project and your contact details)*

PART II – please answer the following questions about the funded project

1. What does / did intercultural dialogue mean in your project in practical terms?

2. Please explain why intercultural dialogue is / was an aim of your project

Who are / were the actual actors engaging in intercultural dialogue in your project?

3. Please give examples of your project activities reflecting the pursuit of intercultural dialogue.

4. Please name some of the most important positive results (if any) of these activities. If your project is not finished yet, please name some of the most important estimated positive results of these activities.

5. Please name some of the most important negative results (if any) of these activities.

6. Please mention the lessons (if any) about promoting intercultural dialogue that you learnt from the activities of this project.

7. Do you have documentary evidence and / or media coverage about the intercultural aspects of your project? If so, please provide the respective internet links below and / or attach relevant documents by e-mail when replying to this questionnaire.

8. Other remarks you would like to add

Questionnaire model for strand 2



Platform for Intercultural Europe & Culture Action Europe Intercultural Dialogue as an Objective in the EU Culture 2007-2013 Programme

Questionnaire on how intercultural dialogue is interpreted and implemented by the selected organisations (strand 2)

PART I - BRIEF INFORMATION ABOUT THE ORGANISATION AND ITS WORK PROGRAMME FINANCED THROUGH THE CULTURE 2007-2013 PROGRAMME

1. Name of the organisation:

2. Strand 2 category for which the grant was awarded :

- ☐ Ambassador
- ☐ Festival
- ☐ Advocacy network
- ☐ Policy support structures for the Culture Agenda
- ☐ Platform;
- ☐ Policy-analysis grouping.

3. Year(s) for which the grant was awarded:

4. Field of activity of the organisation:

- ☐ Cultural heritage
- ☐ Visual Arts
- ☐ Performing Arts
- ☐ Literature, Books and Reading
- ☐ Architecture
- ☐ Design, Applied Arts
- ☐ Interdisciplinary (*please detail*):

5. Brief description of the proposed work programme for which the grant was awarded (5-15 lines):

6. Person answering this questionnaire on behalf of the organisation (*please mention your role in the work programme and also leave your contact details*):

PART II – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR ORGANISATION’S WORK PROGRAMME FINANCED THROUGH THE CULTURE 2007-2013 PROGRAMME

9. Is intercultural dialogue embedded in your organisation’s mission statement and long-term objectives? If so, please state how.

10. What does / did intercultural dialogue mean in your work programme in practical terms?

11. Please explain why intercultural dialogue is / was an aim of your work programme.

12. Who are / were the actual actors engaging in intercultural dialogue in your work programme?

13. Please give examples of activities in your work programme reflecting the pursuit of intercultural dialogue.

14. Please name some of the most important positive results (if any) of these activities.

15. Please name some of the most important negative results (if any) of these activities.

16. Please mention the lessons (if any) about promoting intercultural dialogue that you learnt from carrying out this work programme.

17. Do you have documentary evidence and / or media coverage about the intercultural aspects of your work programme? If so, can you please provide the respective internet links below and / or attach relevant documents by e-mail when replying to this questionnaire?

18. Other remarks you would like to add.

Interview questions

1. Has your understanding of what intercultural dialogue is and how it can be achieved changed in the course of your project / work programme? If so, how?
2. How do you know that your project / work programme is serving intercultural dialogue? What do you consider as evidence that your project / work programme leads to intercultural dialogue?
3. Do you intend to promote intercultural dialogue with any of your future projects? Why (not)?
4. What are the main challenges in creating intercultural dialogue through the arts and culture?
5. What do you think is the best way for arts and culture organizations to promote intercultural dialogue?
6. Would you find it useful if applicants had a set of criteria for evaluating the promotion of intercultural dialogue introduced in the Culture Programme?
7. What do you think is good practice when it comes to intercultural dialogue in arts and culture?

ANNEX 2: list of grant beneficiaries participating in the research

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
grants in 2008				
1	1.1.	JARDIN D'EUROPE	DANCEWEB - VEREIN ZUR FORDERUNG DES INTERNATIONALEN KULTURAUSTAUSCHES IM BEREICH DER DARSTELLENDE KUNSTE (AT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ULTIMA VEZ, BE • BIMER A.S., TR • DE HEXE CENTRE CHOREGRAPHIQUE NATIONAL DE MONTPELLIER LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON, FR • WORKSHOP FOUNDATION (MUHELY ALAPITVANY), HU • NGO LOKOMOTIVA - CENTER FOR NEW INITIATIVES IN ARTS AND CULTURE, MK • SOUTHBANK CENTRE, UK • STATION SERVICE FOR CONTEMPORARY DANCE IN BELGRADE, RS • CULLBERG BALLET, SE • ASOCIATIA ARTLINK, RO
2	1.2.1.	MASQUES ET MASCARADES - FACES MULTIPLES D'EUROPE	ASSOCIATION NATIONALE CULTURES ET TRADITIONS (FR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASSOCIACAO PROGESTUR, PT • THE MUMMERS FOUNDATION, IE • CENTRO INTERNAZIONALE ETHNOSTUDI, IT • FOUNDATION INTERNATIONAL FOLKLORE FESTIVALS FOUNDATION, BG
3	1.2.1.	AGAINST NATURE: THE HYBRID FORMS OF EUROPEAN MODERN SCULPTURE	STICHTING MUSEUM BEELDEN AAN ZEE (NL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GERHARD-MARCKS-HAUS, DE • THE HENRY MOORE FOUNDATION, UK
4	1.2.1.	BALKAN MODERNISMS	BASIL & MARINA THEOCHARAKIS FOUNDATION FOR THE FINE ARTS & MUSIC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NATIONAL MUSEUM OF ART OF ROMANIA, RO

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
			(GR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NATIONAL MUSEUM FOR BULGARIAN VISUAL ARTS (NATIONAL GALLERY), BG
5	1.2.1.	CITY VISIONS EUROPE	BERLAGE INSTITUTE- CENTRE FOR ARCHITECTURAL RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT (NL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MMMECHELEN VZW, BE • ARC EN REVE CENTRE D'ARCHITECTURE, FR • VLAAMS ARCHITECTUUR INSTITUUT, BE
6	1.2.1.	DIFFERENZART – ART WITH A DIFFERENCE: A NEW APPROACH TO SOCIAL THEATRE	COMUNE DI LUMEZZANE (IT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BIRDS OF PARADISE THEATRE COMPANY, UK • NON-PROFIT ASSOCIATION "THEATRE TSVETE", BG • KAVA KULTURALIS MUHELY EGYESÜLET, HU • DIVALDO Z PASAZE, N.O., SK
7	1.2.1.	ECO UNION OF ROCK FESTIVAL	THE FRIENDS OF THE 1ST MAZURIAN ARTILLERY BRIGADE ASSOCIATION NAME (PL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "FOR THE YOUTH" PUBLIC BENEFIT ASSOCIATION, HU • PRVY LEVICKY UMELECKY SPOLOK O.Z., SK
8	1.2.1.	EUROPEAN FESTIVAL OF VISUAL ART IN HOSPITALS	ART DANS LA CITE (FR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRUSTVO STUDENTSKI KULTURNI CENTER, SI • CENTRE CULTUREL FRANÇAIS, RO • REGIONE VENETO, IT • COMUNIDAD DE MADRID - CONSEJERIA DE CULTURA Y TURISMO, ES
9	1.2.1.	EUROPEAN ROUTES FROM ORDER'S PATRIMONY AND HERITAGE (EUROPH)	MUNICIPIO DE AVIS (PT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COMUNE DI PIEVEPELAGO, IT • CENTRE DE CONSERVATION DU LIVRE - COOPERATION, FORMATION, PREVENTION, FR

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
10	1.2.1.	EUROPEAN TELEPLATEAUS TRANSNATIONALE RÄUNE DER KULTURELLEN BEGEGNUNG UND KÜNSTLERISCHEN KOPRODUKTION	TRANS-MEDIA-AKADEMIE HELLERAU E.V. (DE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR ART AND NEW TECHNOLOGIES, CZ • ASOCIACION TRANSDISCIPLINAR REVERSO, ES • BITNET PRODUCTIONS, SE
11	1.2.1.	IF I CAN'T DANCE...EUROPE	STICHTING DE APPEL (NL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STEDELIJK VAN ABBEMUSEUM, NL • PROJECT ARTS CENTRE, IE • SALA DE EXPOSICIONES REKALDE S.L., ES • OVERGADEN INSTITUT FOR SAMTIDSKUNST, DK
12	1.2.1.	INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE: SACRED ELEMENTS OF THE EUROPEAN NATIONAL ART	LATVIAN CHRISTIAN ACADEMY (LV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FACULTATEA DE TEOLOGIE ORTODOXA, RO • CNV - KUNSTENBOND, NL • MULLSJÖ FOLKHÖGSKOLA, SE
13	1.2.1.	JAZZ OHNE GRENZEN	INNTONE - VEREIN FÜR ZEITGEMASSE KUNST (AT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PASSAU JAZZFEST E.V., DE • JAZZ BEZ HRANIC, CZ
14	1.2.1.	MIGRANT WOMEN WOMENHOOD AND CULTURAL RADICATION IN EUROPE	ASSOCIAZIONE CULTURALE "II GRIFO E IL LEONE" (AT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZECORA URA THEATRE COMPAGNY, LIMITED BY GUARANTEE, UK • BOLLYWOOD PICTURES-PRODUTORA DE FILMES, LDA., PT • MOTUS ASSOCIAZIONE CULTURALE, IT
15	1.2.1.	MIGRATING ART ACADEMIES	ECOLE EUROPEENE SUPERIEURE DE L'IMAGE (FR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VILNIAUS DAIL S AKADEMIJA, LT • KUNSTHOCHSCHULE FÜR MEDIEN, DE
16	1.2.1.	PAN-BARENTZ	PIKENE PA BROEN AS (NO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANADOLU KULTUR, TR • KONCENTRAT, SE • UNIVERSITY OF LAPLAND, FI

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
17	1.2.1.	PERFORMING EUROPE -THE APAP VII PROJECT	SZENE SALZBURG (AT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SILESIAN DANCE THEATRE, PL • ASSOCIACIO CULTURAL LA MEKANICA, ES • BUDA KUNSTENCENTRUM VZW, BE • TRANSFORMA ASSOCIACAO CULTURAL, PT • TANZFABRIK BERLIN E.V., DE • ARMUNIA - FESTIVAL COSTA DEGLI ETRUSCHI, IT
18	1.2.1.	PRESERVING PLACES. MANAGING MASS TOURISM, URBAN CONSERVATION AND QUALITY OF LIFE IN HISTORIC CENTRES	CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE DELLE RICERCHE, ISTITUTO PER LA CONSERVAZIONE E LA VALORIZZAZIONE DEI BENI CULTURALI (IT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, TR • UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA DE MADRID, ES • ETUDES SUPÉRIEURES D'HÔTELLERIE ET DE TOURISME DE L'UNIVERSITÉ D'ANGERS, FR • LONDON METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY, UK • UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI ROMA "LA SAPIENZA", IT • ARISTOTELEIO PANEPISTIMIO THESSALONIKIS, GR • UNIVERSITE LIBRE DE BRUXELLES, BE
19	1.2.1.	QUARTET / VISIONS OF EUROPE	GARDONYI GEZA SZINHAZ (HU)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SERBIAN NATIONAL THEATRE, RS • THEATRE QUARTIER LIBRE, FR • ZAPADOCEŠKE DIVADLO V CHEBU, CZ
20	1.2.1.	STOCKHAUSEN CELEBRATION – MODERN ANTHEM OF EUROPE	POLISH COMPOSERS' UNION - INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL OF CONTEMPORARY MUSIC " WARSAW AUTUMN " (PL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEUTSCHER MUSIKRAT GEMEINNUTZIGE PROJEKTGESELLSCHAFT MBH, DE • MILANO MUSICA, ASSOCIATION FOR CONTEMPORARY MUSIC, IT • STICHTING ASKO ENSEMBLE, NL • STADT PFORZHEIM - CITY OF

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
				PFORZHEIM, DE • MUSIKFABRIK-LANDESENSEMBLE NORDRHEIN-WESTFALEN E.V., DE
21	1.2.1.	THALASSA OF MYTHS	CENTRE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THEATRE STUDIES (GR)	• PRO RODOPI FOUNDATION, BG • CENTRUL EUROPEAN DE EDUCATIE SI CULTURA ARTEMIS, RO • ASSOCIAZIONE CULTURALE TEATROINVERSO, IT
22	1.2.1.	THE 2020 NETWORK. THIN ICE: ARTS AND CLIMATE CHANGE	KAAITHEATER VZW (BE)	• BUNKER, LJUBLJANA, SI • ÉTABLISSEMENT PUBLIC DU CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA DANSE, FR • ARTSADMIN, UK • LONDON INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL OF THEATRE, UK • EPCC THEATRE LE QUAI, FR
23	1.2.1.	THE ART OF DIALOGUE - AN INTER- CULTURAL THEATRE RESEARCH PROJECT	AKT-ZENT E.V. INTERNATIONAL THEATRE CENTRE BERLIN (DE)	• CYPRUS CENTRE OF THE INTERNATIONAL THEATRE INSTITUTE, CY • DIVADELNI FAKULTA, AKADEMIE MUZICKYCH UMENI V PRAZE, CZ • LA CORTE OSPITALE, IT • SCHLOSS BROLLIN E.V., DE • CIVICA ACCADEMIA D'ARTE DRAMMATICA " NICO PEPE " DI UDINE, IT • PROTEI PROGETTI TEATRALI INTERNAZIONALI, IT • STADT MARBACH AM NECKAR, DE • ACADEMY OF MUSIC AND DRAMATIC ARTS, SK
24	1.2.1.	SEEING EUROPEAN CULTURE THROUGH A STRANGER'S EYES	COMUNE DI REGGIO EMILIA - ASSESSORATO CULTURA E SPORT - MUSEI	• UNIVERSIDAD POLITECNICA DE VALENCIA, ES • ACADEMY OF FINE ARTS IN POZNAN, PL

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
		(SETSE)	CIVICI (IT)	• UNIVERSITY OF JYVASKYLA, FI
25	1.2.1.	TRANSIENT SPACES – THE TOURIST SYNDROME	UQBAR-GESELLSCHAFT FUR REPRESENTATIONSFORSCHUNG E.V. (DE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BEZIRKSAMT FRIEDRICHSHAINKREUZBERG, KUNSTRAUM, DE • THE INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR CONTEMPORARY ART, RO • VIESOJI ISTAIGA MENO PARKAS, LT • EURO-MEDITERRANEAN ARTS O.N.L.U.S., IT
26	1.2.1.	TRIPTYCH: POETRY - TRIPTYCH: POETRY IDENTITY- COEXISTENCE	NH ATLANTIS PRODUCTIONS (CY)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALEKTON CULTURAL ORGANISATION, GR • TIDSKRIFTEN 00TAL (THE JOURNAL 00TAL), SE • BIENNALE INTERNATIONALE DES POÈTES EN VAL DE MARNE, FR
27	1.2.1.	U.N.I.T.E. - URBAN NATIVE INTEGRATED TRADITION OF EUROPE	TRANS-GLOBAL UNDERGROUND (UK)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.T. IVAN VALKOV - ART, BG • D SMACK U PROMOTION SPOL. S R.O., CZ
28	1.3.	SAFE HARBOUR: PERFORMING CULTURAL DIALOGUES ACROSS THE ATLANTIC	INSTITUTO POLITECNICO DE TOMAR (PT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DIFERRARA, FERRARA, IT • MUSEUM NATIONAL D'HISTOIRE NATURELLE, PARIS, FR • INSTITUTO DE ESTUDIOS PREHISTÓRICOS, MÉRIDA, ES • CÂMARA MUNICIPAL DE MAÇAO, PT • HERITY INTERNATIONAL-DRI, ROMA, IT
	grants in 2009			
29	1.1.	RED - RESTORING THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION OF THE ROMANI	KISEBBSEGI ES EMBERI JOGI LAPITVANY-MINORITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS	• NADACIA DOBRA ROMSKA VILA KESAJ, SK

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
		LANGUAGE & CULTURE	FOUNDATION (HU)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INSTITUTE OF SOCIOLOGY AT BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BG • ROMANI CRISS - ROMA CENTRE FOR SOCIAL INTERVENTION AND STUDIES, RO • REGIONAL MUSEUM IN TARNOW, PL • INSTITUT NATIONAL DES LANGUES ET CIVILISATIONS ORIENTALES, FR
30	1.1.	SMALL SIZE, BIG CITIZENS - WIDENING OF THE EUROPEAN NETWORK FOR THE DIFFUSION OF THE PERFORMING ARTS FOR EARLY YEARS	LA BARACCA S.R.L. (IT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VILLE DE LIMOGES, FR • ACCION EDUCATIVA, ES • CITY OF HELSINKI CULTURAL OFFICE – ANANTALO ARTS CENTRE, FI • BARBORÓ GALWAY INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S FESTIVAL LIMITED, IE • GLEDALISCE ZA OTROKE IN MLADE LJUBLJANA, SI • TOIHAUS - THEATER AM MIRABELLPLATZ, AT • KOLIBRI GYERMEK - ES LFJUSAGI SZINHAZ, HU • POLKA CHILDREN'S THEATRE LIMITED, UK • THEATRE DE LA GUIMBARDE, BE • TEATRUL ION CREANGA, RO • HELIOS 6 LIVE ART PRODUCTION E.V., DE
31	1.2.1	A TASTE OF EUROPE	STIFTELSEN ARBETETS MUSEUM (SE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARBEJDERMUSEET & ARBEJDERBEBÆGELSENS BIBLIOTEK OGERKIV, DK • TEHNISKI MUZEJ SLOVENIJE, SI • EESTI RAHVA MUUSEUM, EE • THE SCOTTISH FISHERIES MUSEUM TRUST LTD, UK • FINNISH LABOUR MUSEUM WERSTAS, FI

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MUSEUM OF HUNGARIAN AGRICULTURE, HU • MUSEU DE PORTIMAO : MINICIPIO DEPORTIMAO, PT • NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AGRICULTURE PRAGUE,CZ
32	1.2.1	KLOPFZEICHEN/COLPI/TRKA NJE - KUNST & BEGEGNUNG IN VERGESSENER LANDSCHAFT	UNIVERSITATSKULTUZENCENTRUM UNIKUM (AT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KULTURNO UMETNISKO DRUSTVO OPOKA, SI • ASSOCIAZIONE TOPOLO - TOPOLUOVE, IT
33	1.2.1.	ALTERNATIVES ROUTES	MOVEMENT ON SCREEN LTD (UK)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MODERN DEBRECENI MUVESEZETI KHT, HU • FABRICA DE MOVIMENTOS ASSOCIAÇAO CULTURAL MOVEMENT ON SCREEN LTD, PT • 700IS REINDEERLAND SF, IS
34	1.2.1.	PLATFORM 11+ ARTISTIC DISCOVERIES IN EUROPEAN SCHOOLYARDS	BRAGETEATRET AS (NO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELSINOR SOC. COOP. AR.L., IT • OULU KAUPUNGINTEATTERI, FI • KOLIBRI GYERMEK - ES IFJUSAGI SZINHAZ, HU • PILOT THEATRE LTD, UK • STICHTING DE CITADEL JEUGDTHEATER, NL • THEATER JUNGE GENERATION DRESDEN, DE • COOPERATIVA DE PRODUCAO ARTISTICA TEATRO ANIMACAO O BANDO CRL, PT • VAT TEATER MTU, EE • EMERGENCY EXIT ATS LTD, UK • THEATRE INSTITUTE BRATISLAVA, SK • DIVADLO ALFA PRISPEVKOVA

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
				ORGANIZACE, CZ
35	1.2.1.	ARTS AND PARKS	SMOLYAN MUNICIPALITY (BG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COMET-INTERNATIONAL SUMMER SCHOOL ON EUROPEAN PREHISTORY, IT • COMUNE DI PRECI - MUNICIPALITY OF PRECI, IT • MUNICIPALITY OF SAMOTHRACE, MK • EURO PERSPECTIVE FOUNDATION, BG • TURIZEM BOHINJ, SI • ASSOCIAZIONE MONTE CELANO - MONTECELANO ASSOCIATION, IT
36	1.2.1.	CONNECTING DANCE PRACTICES IN EUROPE (CIRCLE)	SPISANIE EDNO LTD (BG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZAVOD ZA PODPORO CIVILNODRUZBENIH INICIATIV IN MULTIKULTURNO SODELOVANJE PEKARNA - MAGDALENSKE MREZE, SI • GEGENWARTSTANZ, VEREIN ZUR FÖRDERUNG FÜR TANZ UND BEWEGUNG, AT
37	1.2.1.	CONTEMPORARY MUSEUM BREAKS THE BORDERS OF CULTURES	ESTONIAN STATE PUPPET THEATRE (EE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LATVIAN STATE PUPET THEATRE, LV • VILNIUS TEATRAS LELE, LT

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
38	1.2.1.	DIALOGUE MUSICALE SUR LA MEMOIRE DE L'EUROPE	GOOD AND BAD NEWS (BE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A38 CULTURAL PUBLIC BENEFIT ORGANISATION, HU • PALIMPSEST LTD, BG • ARTHOSTAL CULTURAL ASOCIATION, ES • ATR FEST LTD, BG • ELEN MUSIC, DE
39	1.2.1.	DISCOVERING EUROPEAN HERITAGE IN ROYAL RESIDENCES	ASSOCIATION DES RÉSIDENCES ROYALES EUROPÉENNES (FR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ETABLISSEMENT PUBLIC DU DOMAINE NATIONAL DE CHAMBORD, FR • SCHLOB SCHONBRUNN KULTUR – UND BETRIEBSGES M.B.H, AT • MUSEUM PALAC W WILANOWIE, PL • CONSEJO DE ADMINISTRACION DEL PATRIMONIO NACIONAL, ES • ETABLISSEMENT PUBLIC DU MUSEE ET DU DOMAINE NATIONAL DE VERSAILLES, FR • PALAIS DE CHARLES QUINT A.S.B.L, BE
40	1.2.1.	EUFONIA 2009 – STRINGED MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS	MUNICIPALITY OF SOFIA (BG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESPACE FORMATION PME, BE • FUNDATIA ART PRODUCTION, RO
41	1.2.1.	FORMER WEST	BASIS VOOR ACTUELE KUNST (NL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STEDELIJK VAN ABBEMUSEUM, NL • MUSEUM OF MODERN ART, WARSAW, PL • MUSEO NACIONAL CENTRO DE ARTE REINA SOFIA, ES
42	1.2.1.	INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE FESTIVAL – CULTURAL ENCOUNTER BETWEEN EAST AND WEST	MUNICIPALITY OF SANTA SEVERINA (IT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MUNICIPALITY OF CROTONE, IT • AYUNTAMIENTO DE PUERTA LUMBRERAS, ES • GEORAMA, GR

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
43	1.2.1.	OPEN LATITUDES - AUDÉPART DE LA DANSE, DES FORMES HYBRIDES ET DES LANGUAGES ARTISTIQUES EN ADÉQUATION AVEC NOTRE TEMPS	ASSOCIATION LOI 1901 LATITUDES CONTEMPORAINES (FR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LES HALLES DE SCHAEERBEEK ASBL, BE • LE MANEGE.MONS A.S.B.L, BE • FUNDATION CIALO/UMYSL, PL
44	1.2.1.	SUSPENDED SPACES	PIERIDES FOUNDATION (CY)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FOUNDATION OF THE HELLENIC WORLD, GR • UNIVERSITÉ DE PICARDIE JULES VERNE, FR • FONDAZZJONI TEMI ZAMMIT, MT
45	1.2.1.	TERRA (IN)COGNITA ARCHITECTURE DE TERRE EN EUROPE	ECOLE D'AVIGNON CENTRE DE FORMATION POUR LA RÉHABILITATION DU PATRIMOINE ARCHITECTURAL (FR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI FIRENZE - DIPARTIMENTO DI TECNOLOGIE, IT • ESCOLA SUPERIOR GALLAECIA DE ENSINO UNIVERSITARIO - FUNDACAO CONVENTO, PT • CONSEIL D'ARCHITECTURE, D'URBANISME ET DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT DE VAUCLUSE, FR • UNIVERSIDAD POLITECNICA DE VALENCIA, ES
46	1.2.1.	UNDERGROUND CITY XXI	LABIN ART EXPRESS XXI (HR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LABORATOIRE D'HYBRIDATION DES ARTS ET DES NOUVELLES TEHCNOLOGIES, FR • PRAGUE COLLEGE S.R.O, CZ • NOMAD THEATER, AT
47	1.2.1.	VRAI OU FAUX ?	FABRIQUE DES ILLUSSIONS (FR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EENMANSZAAK, NL • VEREIN, AT • MERINARODNI VYDAVATELSKA AGNETURA/MVA, CZ • FOTO AGENCIA COBERTURA SL., ES

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUPPORT AGENTUR, DE
48	1.2.1.	W-EST_WHERE	COMPAGNIE JASMINA (FR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TRAFO KORTARS MVESZETEK HAZA KHT, HU • CENTRO DE ARTES DO ESPECTACULO DE VISEU, PT • HRVATSKI INSTITUT ZA POKRET I PLES, HR
49	1.2.1.	WOMEN'S MUSEUM – A CULTURAL GENDER CONCEPT FOR EUROPE	FRAUENMUSEUM - KUNST, KULTUR, FORSCHUNG EV (DE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KVINDEMUSEET I DANMARK, DK • GESELLSCHAFT FUR KULTURANALYTIK, AT • FRAUENMUSEUM "EVELYN ORTNER"- DIE FRAU IM WANDEL DER ZEIT, IT
50	1.2.1	PRAS PRO TOTO	CRACOVITALIA FOUNDATION (PL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARPAAAD FILM THEATRE, IT • SECRETARIADO DE ACTIVIDADES CULTURALES DE LA UNIVERSIDAD DE LEON, ES
51	1.2.1	THE DRIFT WORKS	THE SHOWROOM GALLERY LTD (UK)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OBJECTIF EXHIBITIONS VZW, BE • STICHTING CASCO, NL
52	1.3	ROAD AND DESIRES - THEATRE OVERPASSES FRONTIERS	EUFONIA SOCIETÀ COOPERATIVA-ASTRAGALI TEATRO (IT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 8 - FR • NATIONAL AND CAPODISTRIAN UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS - GR • AL QANTARA - IT • UNIVERSITY OF SALENTO FACULTY OF SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND TERRITORIAL SCIENCES - IT • BABELMED CULTURAL ASSOCIATION - IT

No	Strand	Title of project / action	Coordinator	Co-organisers
				• MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY - UK
53	1.3.	TRANSKAUKAZJA 2011	FUNDACJA INNA PRZESTRZEN (PL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INTERKULTURELLEZS ZENTRUM - AT • EASTERN ALLIANCE - CZ • KULTUR AKTIV E.V - DE
54	1.3.	E-FEST	ASSOCIATION ECHOS ELECTRIQUES (FR)	• TRANSCULTURES ASBL - BE
55	2	ambassador	CAMERATA NUOVA E.V (DE)	N/A
56	2	ambassador	THE EUROPEAN THEATRE CONVENTION (FR)	N/A
57	2	festival	KUNST-WERKE BERLIN E.V. (DE)	N/A
58	2	festival	EU ART NETWORK ZIEL 1 KUNST - VEREIN ZUR EUROPAISCHEN UND INTERNATIONALEN KUNSTLERLNNENVERNETZUNG (AT)	N/A
59	2	festival	EXPERIMENTA - ASSOCIACAO PARA A PROMOCAO DO DESIGN E CULTURA DE PROJECTO (PT)	N/A
60	2	network	NETWORK OF EUROPEAN MUSEUM ORGANISATIONS (DE)	N/A

