TANGO ROMANTICA OR LIAISONS DANGEREUSES? CULTURAL POLICIES AND SOCIAL COHESION: PERSPECTIVES FROM CANADIAN RESEARCH

Presented at the International Conference on Cultural Policy Research
Bergen, Norway
November 10-12, 1999

by
M. Sharon Jeannotte
International Comparative Research
Strategic Research and Analysis (SRA)
Strategic Planning and Policy Coordination
Department of Canadian Heritage

25 Eddy Street, 12th Floor
Hull, Québec
CANADA K1A 0M5

Reference: SRA-485

For copies of this report contact us at:
sradoc_docras@pch.gc.ca
or Fax: (819) 997-6765

** The opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Canadian Heritage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tango Romantica: A compulsory dance in World Championship figure skating. Skaters are scored on Technique and on Timing/Expression.

PRELUDE - CHOOSING THE DANCE

The title of this paper may be whimsical, but the topic is not. A major rethinking of the basis of cultural policy is taking place in many countries and multilateral organizations. This movement seeks to tie cultural policy and cultural policy research more closely to the cluster of public policy interests often subsumed within the term"social cohesion". Canadians are also engaged in this re-examination process, but there are lingering doubts in the minds of some. Is this a "dance with the devil" -- a "liaison dangereuse" that will drive us into the arms of those who do not have the best interests of culture at heart? Or is it a "tango romantica" a new and beautiful dance with a partner who understands and supports our artistic and creative impulses?

This paper will explore these questions, noting at the outset, if I may be permitted one more ice-based metaphor, that culture in Canada for the past few years has borne more resemblance to full contact ice hockey than to the graceful choreography of the ice dance. As Oliver Bennett noted in a perceptive article a couple of years ago, there have been three recurring themes in cultural policy discourse over the last fifty years: culture as a source of moral improvement, culture as an economic engine, and culture as an instrument for promoting national identity and prestige.[1] On all three fronts, Canada has seen its share of confrontation and dissent.

On the moral front, a Canadian cultural policy review committee characterized one of the central functions of culture as "... the critical scrutiny of all other spheres including the political. ... This critical function suggests an analogy with religion, as an autonomous source of moral judgement resting on its own authority."[2] Despite such sentiments, there has seldom been a time in Canadian history when cultural policy has *not* been used for instrumental purposes to promote the moral underpinnings of the dominant order. While Canada has not experienced the same degree of racial tension and income inequality as the United States, the increasing diversity of Canadian society has intensified pressure for a more inclusive and rights-based approach to cultural policy.[3] A formal response to this pressure has come in the form of legislative measures to promote multiculturalism, employment equity and repatriation of indigenous cultural artifacts. However, these measures have not prevented Aboriginal peoples, visible minorities, women, disabled people and other socio-cultural minorities from pointing out the continuing shortcomings of "cultural democracy" in a Canadian context.

1 Oliver Bennett, "Cultural Policy, Cultural Pessimism and Postmodernity", The International Journal of Cultural Policy, Vol. 4, No. 1 (1997), pp. 70-71.

2 Department of Communications, Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Committee, (Ottawa, 1982), p. 16.

3 In the United States, we are now beginning to see a moral backlash not only against political correctness and affirmative action, but also against the "culture of violence" that many legislators fear has contributed to several high profile high school shootings.

Anyone who is familiar with Canada's "magazine wars" with the United States will sense how well economic arguments have served our cultural policy objectives.[4] Canadian culture is a significant contributor to Canada's Gross Domestic Product, but the inexorable logic of the global entertainment industry means that (not unlike ice hockey) the biggest cultural industry players dominate the play and can command the highest compensation for their efforts. In culture, as in hockey, skill and finesse appear to count for less than a hard body check.

For much of its history, Canada has feared the juggernaut of American cultural domination, and most Canadian cultural policies over the past 60 years has been aimed at counteracting this threat. One of Canada's foremost writers, Margaret Atwood, has suggested that the central symbol of Canada is survival - la survivance - and for both English and French Canadians this idea has evolved from simply surviving the elements (all that Canadian ice and snow!) to cultural survival[5]. As Greg Baeker has pointed out, a "two-tier" cultural system has evolved, consisting of a national state-subsidized, predominantly Eurocentric "civilizing" or "high" arts system (usually linked to lofty goals of national identity and cultural sovereignty) and "popular culture", either operating within the marketplace (as do the commercial cultural industries) or at the community level (as do the folk or ethnic arts). The state-subsidized national culture has functioned mostly according to a "supply-side" logic, providing support for production of Canadian content, but somewhat less for distribution and next to nothing on the consumption side. Popular culture, on the other hand, has been expected to be demand-driven, although as can be discerned from the magazine example, cultural sovereignty has been used as well as a justification for various state measures in support of the commercial sector.[6] Overall, the promotion of national identity and unity by cultural means has had mixed success. While about 60% of the Canadian public consistently supports subsidies for Canadian culture, the domestic market shares of both "high" and "popular" Canadian content remain small, prompting neo-conservative critics to question the efficacy of such subsidies as nation-building instruments.[7]

The 1996 Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development (Our Creative Diversity) and the 1996 report of the European Task Force on Culture and Development (In from the Margins) added fuel to the debate in Canada about the aims of cultural policy. Building on the messages emerging from these reports, the 1998 Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development asserted that "The essential aims of cultural policy are to establish objectives, create structures and secure adequate resources in order to create an environment conducive to human fulfilment".[8] To accomplish this aim, the Conference's Action Plan stated that:

> Cultural policies should promote creativity in all its forms, facilitating access to cultural practices and experiences for all citizens regardless of nationality, race, sex, age, physical or mental disability, enrich the sense of cultural identity and belonging of every

---

4 The United States filed a protest with the World Trade Organization about Canadian subsidies and favourable tax treatment for Canadian magazines. In June 1997, the WTO ruled that these measures were inconsistent with national treatment clauses of various trade agreements. The U.S. threatened to retaliate against Canada's steel industry unless American magazines were given equal treatment, which they were under new Canadian legislation passed earlier this year.

5 Margaret Atwood, Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature, (Toronto, 1972), pp.32-33

6 Baeker, p. 8.

7 In the mid-1990s, Canadian content accounted for approximately 38 per cent of all TV programming in Canada, 13 per cent of total sound recording sales and only 5 per cent of movie theatre screen time (as reported in the Canadian Heritage publication, Culture & Heritage: Making Room for Canada's Voices.)

8 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Action Plan on Cultural Policies for Development , 8 April 1998, p. 2.

individual and community and sustain them in their search for a dignified and safe future.[8]

The role of culture in building cohesive and sustainable societies is a theme that fits well within the social cohesion research framework taking shape in Canada. In the following sections of this paper, I will first provide background information on the origins and objectives of social cohesion research in Canada. I will then summarize the ongoing debate about the definition of "social cohesion", and will describe the conceptual work that has been prompted by this debate. I will describe recent Canadian cultural policy research on the subject, then focus on its place within this framework. Finally, I will end with some thoughts on the merit of this position. Is this a *liaison dangereus*e or an exciting new dance?

CHOREOGRAPHY - BLOCKING OUT THE STEPS

In 1996, the Government of Canada launched the Policy Research Initiative, an interdepartmental collaboration intended to revitalize the federal government's capacity to carry out long-term research on longer-term, horizontal policy issues that do not fall within the mandate of any one government department, but have a significant impact on Canadians. Early in 1997, after much debate, four research networks were formed -- on economic growth, on human development, on global challenges and opportunities and on social cohesion. Each of these networks was charged with developing a workplan to address emerging issues within their area of concern.

The Social Cohesion Network was formed because of the Government of Canada's concern that the social fabric linking Canada's many overlapping communities may be unravelling. This social fabric has, to a large extent, been reinforced by an unspoken but deeply held conviction that Canada is a land of opportunity -- a society where Canadians can realize their aspirations and be treated with fairness and dignity. At the root of current unease is the perception that our communities may be eroding -- that various emerging fault-lines may be fragmenting social cohesion and destroying Canadians' faith in the future of their families, their communities and their country. The Social Cohesion Network was asked to develop a research framework to address this problem, but before that could happen, it became evident that the definition of social cohesion needed to be made clearer if "researchable questions" were to be posed.

It turned out to be easier to identify what social cohesion was not than what it was. Members of the Network agreed that the term "social cohesion" was **not** a code-name for social or cultural programs or Canadian identity. Nor was it identical with the term "social capital", defined by Robert Putnam as "features of social organization such as networks, norms and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit".[9]

The term "social cohesion" as used by the Network is an **outcome** of investments in social and cultural programs and in social capital. Because of the Government of Canada's stake in maintaining a sense of attachment and common purpose among Canadians, the Network characterized social cohesion as **the ongoing process of developing a community of shared values, shared challenges and equal opportunity within Canada, based on a sense of trust, hope and reciprocity among all Canadians**. This working definition recognized that cohesion is achieved by consensus and by working together, that partnership must be based on trust and that a sense of fairness should be the goal. In this definition, the

[9] Robert Putnam, "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital", Journal of Democracy 6:1, January 1995, p. 67.

process is as important as the outcome -- an objective toward which Canadians must continue to strive, rather than one that can ever be neatly accomplished for all time.[10] As one researcher in the Network has summarized it, the focus is on the non-coercive relationships that hold us together.[11]

The workplan that emerged from the Network's discussions in the early months of 1997 consisted of 12 research issues, organized under three overarching themes:

Theme 1 - Fault Lines

Issue 1 The impact of contemporary diversity on social cohesion
Issue 2 The effects of economic polarization on social cohesion

Theme 2 - Axes of Community Identification

Issue 3 Role of national symbols and institutions in promoting social cohesion
Issue 4 Emergence of the Information Society and its impacts on social cohesion
Issue 5 Civic education and knowledge of Canada
Issue 6 Evolving Canadian values
Issue 7 Effects of current social and demographic trends on civic participation and cultural consumption

Theme 3 - Implications of Changes in Social Cohesion

Issue 8 Relationship between social cohesion and economic development
Issue 9 Interaction between social cohesion and Canadian identity
Issue 10 The roles of the private and voluntary sectors in building social capital
Issue 11 Evolving government institutions and policies to support social cohesion
Issue 12 Measurement issues related to social cohesion

This definition and framework has proven to be flexible enough to accommodate a variety of economic, social and cultural fields of investigation. It has also kick-started an unexpected, but welcome, debate in Canada about the underlying philosophy and motivating forces behind public policies in these areas.

REHEARSAL - PERFECTING THE STEPS

Canadian researchers have spent the past two years tracing the intellectual origins of social cohesion and deconstructing the concept. Jane Jenson, a Canadian academic, undertook an extensive "mapping" exercise that provided valuable insights into European perspectives on the concept, most notably by the French Commissariat général du Plan, the European Union and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of her research was the identification of five dimensions of social cohesion:

[10] Since 1997, this definition has not been without its critics, most notably those who feel that the element of social justice or "equal outcome" is missing. Nevertheless, after four months of debate, the Network felt that further definitional refinement was a lesser priority than getting on with the research itself.

[11] Dick Stanley, The economic consequences of social cohesion. (Ottawa, 1997).

Belonging ..... Isolation
Inclusion..... Exclusion
Participation ..... Non-involvement
Recognition ..... Rejection
Legitimacy ..... Illegitimacy[12]

These dimensions share a good deal of common ground with discussions taking place at conferences like this one and in documents such as In from the Margins.

Belonging, as Jenson points out, is a cultural resource, by which is meant "norms, values, and social attitudes".[13] In from the Margins states that "our cultural identity is what makes us feel we belong, in a deep and permanent way, to a group, a community -- and even a project, an ideal or an aspiration".[14]

Inclusion, in Jenson's taxonomy, is primarily about inclusion in a market economy, For the authors of In from the Margins, "the crisis of the Welfare State, unemployment and "exclusion" are fracturing societies which can no longer rely on an external political threat to maintain a patriotic community spirit"[15], suggesting that inclusion in the economic sphere is linked in some manner to inclusion in the national community.

Participation is also a dimension that is common to both social cohesion and cultural policy research agendas. For the Social Cohesion Network of the Government of Canada, citizen participation and civic engagement is linked to "governance practices, such as partnerships and to increasing responsibility of the "third sector" for promoting cohesion".[16] For the Council of Europe, "Participation is one of the key objects of cultural policy", and should allow all citizens to "benefit from cultural activity through being actively involved in the creative process and the distribution of cultural goods and services.[17]

Another key part of social cohesion, as expressed by Jenson, is "nurturing those institutions which contribute to, rather than undermine, practices of recognition of difference".[18] In this too, the Council of Europe agrees, stating in In from the Margins that "protection, even the promotion, of diversity, both in terms of different ways of life as well as of artistic expression, achieves two significant and desirable objectives. The first of these is a recognition of the right to be different".[19]

Finally, the dimension of legitimacy in the context of social cohesion research refers to "the legitimacy of those public and private institutions that act as mediators and maintain the spaces within which mediation can occur".[20] The legitimacy of institutions is also a central concern of those who drafted In from the Margins, which linked the crisis of legitimacy facing European countries to a crisis in values:

---

12 Jane Jenson, Mapping Social Cohesion: The State of Canadian Research, (Ottawa, 1998), p. 15.
13 Jenson, p. 15.
14 Council of Europe, In from the Margins, (Strasbourg, 1996), p. 42.
15 In from the Margins, p. 42.
16 Jenson, p. 16.
17 In from the Margins, p. 46.
18 Jenson, p. 16.
19 In from the Margins, p. 43. (The second objective is enrichment through exchange and interaction between cultures -- the notion of *interculturalism*.)
20 Jenson, p. 16.

> If economic and social systems are losing credibility and legitimacy, it is an illusion to suppose that this can be put right by new economic regulations or dependence on advanced technologies. Seeing that it was initiated by changing values, the crisis will only be resolved by the creation of new socio-cultural structures -- a task calling for ingenuity and imagination.[21]

Paul Bernard, another Canadian researcher, took the five basic dimensions of social cohesion used by Jane Jenson and added a sixth dimension of his own, then divided them into economic, social and socio-cultural categories with either a *formal* or *substantial* character. In his view, formal dimensions provide the structural underpinnings for social cohesion, while substantial dimensions illustrate how these formal measures play out in reality.[22] The resulting grid or conceptual map looks like this:

Typology of the Dimensions of Social Cohesion		
Character of the relation / **Spheres of activity**	**Formal**	**Substantial**
Economic	Inclusion / Exclusion	Equality / Inequality
Political	Legitimacy / Illegitimacy	Participation / Passivity
Socio-cultural	Recognition / Rejection	Belonging / Isolation

Adapted from Social Cohesion: Critical Dialectic of a Quasi-Concept

Bernard's typography is a valuable extension of Jenson's work, in that it attempts to clarify the main spheres of activity of each dimension, makes a useful distinction between principles and outcomes and adds an equity or "social justice" dimension which recognizes equality of *outcome* in addition to equality of *opportunity* (inclusion). It is not without a certain arbitrariness: for example, one could question whether legitimacy of institutions and participation in the life of the community do not also have a socio-cultural, as well as a political, dimension. However, it moves the debate about the different facets of social cohesion to a new level, and (more pertinently for researchers working in this field) furnishes some guide-posts for situating what we are doing. It may be particularly useful for researchers who, in the context of broad definitions of culture as "ways of living together", are struggling to "integrate into its heuristic and analytical frameworks the facts of *diversity of cultural resources*, the *range of forms of participation in the cultural field*, from production to consumption, and the *forms of articulation* of the cultural field with social, economic environmental and ethical policy domains." [23]

This brief tour of common elements in the social cohesion and cultural policy research agendas is not meant to be a comprehensive review of the many strands of either conceptual field. It does, however, illustrate that both sets of researchers have arrived by different routes at a set of similar constructs. We are still in the early stages of the game (or perhaps dance),

---

21 In from the Margins, p. 45.

22 Paul Bernard, Social Cohesion: Critical Dialectic of a Quasi-Concept, (Ottawa, forthcoming).

23 Tony Bennett and Colin Mercer, Improving Research and International Cooperation for Cultural Policy. Preparatory paper VI, UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development, (Stockholm, 1996), p. 20. (Available at http://www.unesco-sweden.org/Conference/Papers/Paper6.htm)

but these dimensions may represent the beginnings of what Tony Bennett and Colin Mercer have referred to as "a new conceptual paradigm" which recognizes "the inherent connectedness of the cultural domain with others such as the nature of "lifestyles" and quality of life, the quality of our built and natural environments, our capacity for creativity and innovation ... and our ability to educate and train for diversity".[24]

The next section of this paper will use the above framework to construct a preliminary map of current cultural research, both in Canada and elsewhere. It illustrates that researchers may have been participating in the dance, even though they were not aware of it and did not know the steps.

TAKING TO THE ICE - THE DANCE BEGINS

The appropriate ends to be served by cultural policy is a subject of vigorous debate in Canada. In June 1998, the founding colloquium of the Canadian Cultural Research Network (CCRN) issued a strongly worded call for a new citizen-centred cultural policy paradigm:

> The challenge is to frame a new "public interest" discourse for cultural policy which stresses the citizen as much as the consumer, the social and the economic, the enhancement of the quality of democratic life as well as the development of national identity, and civil society as well as the private sector.[25]

Participants at the CCRN colloquium concluded that lack of consumption data was "the biggest gap, requiring new thought about relationships between work and leisure and cultural practices". Recognizing, as Bennett and Mercer have observed, that "value' in value production chain analysis should not be construed in purely economic terms",[26] they also urged that "Canadian statistical resources ... be aggregated in different ways to analyze the longitudinal questions of equity in economic and social participation". Many felt the need for some kind of indicator to measure the "socio-cultural rate of return", while others suggested the need to "advance the theoretical work on the meaning of multiple identities, social cohesion and cultural diversity".[27] Several "researchable questions" were posed to guide future cultural policy studies:

- What are goals and purposes of cultural policy?
- What is the impact of societal changes on the role of cultural policy in the present world?
- What are the effects of arts education in the cultural sector on human capabilities?
- What are the implications of the relationships that are developing between universalism on the one hand and particularism on the other?[28]

This very ambitious agenda is only beginning to be addressed, and as is often the case, developments on the periphery of cultural policy have provided insight into the critical nexus between social citizenship and cultural citizenship.

---

[24] Bennett and Mercer, p. 17.

[25] Catherine Murray, "Linking Policies, Practices and Change Issues: Research Gaps and Future Directions for Cultural Research" in Catherine Murray (ed.) Cultural Policies and Practices: Exploring the Links Between Culture and Social Change. (Waterloo, 1998), p. 1. (Also available at http://www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/ccm/ccrn/)

[26] Bennett and Mercer, p. 19.

[27] Murray, pp. 4-5. (An extensive list of "What's Hot: Future Directions for Cultural Research" emerging from this colloquium is appended to this paper.)

[28] John Meisel, "Report of the Rapporteurs" in Cultural Policies and Practices: Exploring the Links Between Culture and Social Change, p. 61.

A ground-breaking study by Canadian researchers France Gagnon and Michel Pagé, proposing a conceptual framework for citizenship in liberal democracies, charted the complex relationship between the four main components of citizenship: national identity; social, cultural and supranational belonging; an effective system of rights; and political and civic participation. Within each of these components, they suggest that culture policy plays a key role. For example, they state that an "evolving and inclusive heritage" is one of the underpinnings of national identity, while the "relative importance of diversity" is an important indicator of the extent to which citizens experience a sense of belonging. Similarly, cultural rights are among the fundamental rights that underpin participation in political life and civil society.[29] In short, the citizenship policies and cultural policies are not hermetically sealed domains, and in advanced liberal democracies, they may be more complementary and reinforcing than is conventionally supposed.

Cultural researchers in the Department of Canadian Heritage have also taken some small steps toward engagement in a "tango romantica" with social cohesion. We started by surveying who else is engaging in this dance, first by examining the inter-relationship between social cohesion and cultural policies in Australia, the United States and the European Union. This study concluded that "focussing on social cohesion must essentially imply that government policies act to ensure the continued integration of various marginalised groups into the civic community".[30]

We then undertook a literature search which examined recent research on majority and minority cultural participation and consumption in Canada and internationally. We found that "while there is general agreement among researchers that cultural participation and consumption contribute to social cohesion, no national studies were conducted to provide evidence for this opinion". Methodological weaknesses were also uncovered, in that "statistics tend to collect participation rates in dominant western cultural activities, and tend to overlook ethnic minority cultural activities which, if studied, may show contrasting participation rates for the minority and majority groups".[31]

These methodological weaknesses have been concisely summarized by Catherine Murray in another recent study. She believes that audience research in the field of broadcasting is:

> ... weak in avoiding the effort to understand the "little local fact" in the context of its faraway causes ..., looking at consumerism, and communities of taste/play. Not looking at civil society, or the dimensions of belongingness and other elements of social cohesion which Jenson identifies. Not looking at communicative competence, that is, the rise of civility or civic literacy in an antipolitical age.[32]

She has concluded that "broadcasting policy has failed to enjoin the broader debate over cultural development and democratic culture, because audience research has been underestimated as a tool in democratic cultural politics, and because of the epistemological weaknesses of post positivist science".[33]

---

29 France Gagnon and Michel Pagé, Conceptual Framework for an Analysis of Citizenship in the Liberal Democracies (Volume 1), (Ottawa, May 1999), pp. 9-16.

30 Benjamin Hempel, Does Canada Compare? Social Cohesion and Cultural Policies in Australia, the United States and the European Union, (Ottawa, April 1999), p.4.

31 Liudmila Kirpitchenko and Heather De Santis, Social Cohesion and Cultural Practices: Beyond the Mainstream, (Ottawa, June 21, 1999), p. 15.

32 Catherine Murray, Cultural Populism and Policy Practice: Canadian Perspectives on the Agenda for Audience Research, (Firenza, June 1999), p. 16-17.

33 Ibid., p. 19.

Partially to address the types of weaknesses enumerated by Kirpitchenko, De Santis and Murray, Canada has agreed to participate in the Council of Europe's transversal study on the theme of Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity. This study, currently ongoing, seeks to understand and support the development of democratic cultural policy in the context of culturally diverse societies. Along with several other countries, we will be preparing a national report which will map cultural diversity, map cultural policy, and describe how cultural policy has been responding to Canadian cultural diversity. As a second phase of this project, we will be looking at how these processes "play out on the ground" in three or four local jurisdictions in Canada. We view this study as an important piece, as we explore how cultural policy fits into the puzzle of social cohesion.

THE JUDGING - HOW ARE WE DOING?

At this point, it may be useful to return to the question posed at the beginning of this paper: Is cultural research's "tango romantica" with social cohesion a *liaison dangereuse*? Or are we learning something from this *pas de deux*? The following grid is a preliminary attempt to stake out the common ground using Paul Bernard's conceptual framework.

Typology of Cultural Policy Research in the Domain of Social Cohesion

Spheres of activity / Character of the relation	Formal	Substantial
Economic	**Inclusion / Exclusion** Studies on: • access to cultural resources and information technologies	**Equality / Inequality** • Social audits of the arts and cultural industries
Political	**Legitimacy / Illegitimacy** Studies on: • role of culture and the arts in improving the lives of youth, seniors, the marginalized • Evolving governance structures	**Participation / Passivity** Studies on: • cultural consumption • cultural participation • volunteerism and culture
Socio-cultural	**Recognition / Rejection** Studies on: • cultural diversity • roles of cultural institutions and the media in mediating conflict, reflecting difference, building understanding	**Belonging / Isolation** Studies on: • multiple identities • values • diversity of content • cultural "sustainability"

Adapted from Social Cohesion: Critical Dialectic of a Quasi-Concept

This grid is meant to be illustrative, rather than comprehensive, but even in its tentative state it demonstrates that a fair amount of activity is already taking place at the nexus of the two policy fields. Another interesting fact emerging from the typology is that cultural research is *not* hermetically sealed within the socio-cultural sphere and *does* contribute to current debates about civic participation within evolving governance structures. Unfortunately, the role of cultural institutions in promoting a healthy civic life, both unilaterally and in partnership with

other types of organizations, is not well understood, and research activity in the "legitimacy" section of the grid has been quite sparse, at least in Canada.

Where Canadian cultural research has been weakest is in the area of equity, perhaps due to the tendency to view cultural policies as marginal compared to the "really important" economic and social policy domains. However, as Paul DiMaggio has noted, cultural capital's traditional status as a prestige good is being increasingly challenged :

> The virtue of the high culture system is that it succeeded in cordoning off a sector of cultural production from the demands of the marketplace. Its great disadvantage is that it assisted only some kinds of artists in a way that responded to the status interests of the wealthy rather than to the functional needs of either the arts or society. To the extent that the high culture system erodes, we face the challenge and the opportunity of constructing a reclassification of symbolic goods that does not map neatly onto the structure of social inequality: in other words, systems of patronage and cultural authority consistent with a democratic art.[34]

This evolution, or perhaps revolution, in the discourse about culture is supported by a growing body of literature (arising mostly from research outside the cultural field) about the role of cultural capital in significantly improving the life chances of youth at risk.[35] In this regard, cultural policy researchers may have been less active, and as participants at the CCRN colloquium noted, more attention to equity issues and the "social rate of return" from investments in the arts might help to reinforce the evidence being accumulated in other research fields.[36]

At the end of this *tour de horizon*, it is probably safe to conclude that cultural research's participation in the social cohesion "dance" has more of the flavour of the tango romantica than the *liaison dangereuse*. This is not to say that cultural research need abandon its traditional partners or engage only in this particular dance. Indeed, much work remains to be done in such areas as cultural trade, cultural production and cultural governance, which are key areas of interest for cultural stakeholders. On the other hand, there is much to be learned from researchers in the fields of youth studies, crime prevention and social justice that would help build an empirical case for the central role of culture in promoting a healthy, cohesive and sustainable society. We must begin to sharpen our blades.

---

[34] Paul DiMaggio, "Social Structure, Institutions, and Cultural Goods: The Case of the United States" in Social Theory for a Changing Society (Eds. Pierre Bourdieu and James S. Coleman). (Boulder, 1991), p. 152.

[35] For example, a recent book by John Hagan and Bill McCarthy noted that "When social capital is abundant in the community and family, [these] cultural responses often include the amassing of credentials and higher education and involvements in high culture, for example, including participation in the arts. In these community and family settings, social capital is used to endow children successfully with forms of cultural capital that significantly enhance their life chances." (Mean Streets - Youth Crime and Homelessness, (Cambridge, 1997), p. 230.)

[36] A study based on data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth found that "When children participate in sports and the arts, they quickly gain skills and enrich the quality of their lives". (David R. Offord, Ellen L. Lipman and Eric K. Duku, Sports, The Arts and Community Programs: Rates and Correlates of Participation, (Ottawa, October 1998), p. 3.)

APPENDIX

WHAT'S HOT:
FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR CULTURAL RESEARCH
(COMPILED BY CATHERINE MURRAY)

Cultural Diversity
- Theoretical expansion of the 'diaspora' and multiple identities;
- Research on cultural consumption and participation of ethnocultural groups in Canada and internationally;
- Study of 'education for plurality' in formal and non-formal educational realms;
- Review of new Canadian ownership, finance and control of cultural production and distribution;
- Case studies on organizational diversification (Toronto Arts Council);
- Qualitative evaluation of the role of the media, new Canadians and racial controversy;
- Comparative social values across diaspora and social hybridization of identity;
- The development of industry and policy guidelines for generation of new national and international cross-cultural markets for cultural products that would appeal more to a growing multicultural population;
- Indicators to evaluate cultural differences from a trans-cultural perspective.

Third Sector and Civil Society
- Mapping the third sector;
- Deepening understanding of the role of volunteerism;
- New models of cultural participation (e.g. Australian Everyday Study) in cultural networks;
- Capital flows/donations;
- Share in governance structures;
- Developing new models for understanding political culture;
- Monitoring progress of social equity over time;
- Designing and conducting a social audit of the arts;
- Case analyses of spontaneous social control, resolution of conflict and intercultural mediation;
- Study of the early adopters of technologies and hypotheses of socio-cultural activism and diffusion of that innovation;
- Participatory design and evaluation of virtual environments for citizenship and cultural participation;
- Case studies of the appropriation of and decision to participate or not to participate in new technologies by aboriginal groups and other minorities.

Trade
- Beyond the third pillar: Canada's role in international cultural development
- Mapping exports, people, ideas and finance flows;
- Exploring the cultural implications of a shift within economic theory from a trade-based model for development to an endogenous growth one
- Options of parallel accord versus a rights-based regime in cultural services
- Examination of the cultural dimensions of sustainable development and record of parallel environmental accords as a model for culture

Policy

- Rethinking the theoretical bases for state intervention;
- Developing models for understanding distributed policy networks;
- Making the case for 'democratic' cultural policy in a mixed economy;
- Comparative studies of municipal, provincial and federal policies;
- Patterns of participation of stakeholders;
- Citizen access to policy development;
- Designing 'qualitative' indicators for the cultural industries;
- Rethinking the goals of cultural access and cultural equity;
- Evaluating effective power sharing, and cultural empowerment by gender, age, race and class.

Networking

- Remove the language 'barriers' of access to cultural research in English and French in Canada;
- Decentralize policy research;
- Diversify representation in CCRN by geographic region, occupational classification, and discipline;
- Advance debate over a cultural research agenda for the new millennium.
- Develop benchmarks to measure productivity of cultural networking.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Margaret Atwood, Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature, Toronto: House of Anansi Press Limited, 1972

Baeker, Greg. From "Where is Here?" to "Who Are We?": Public Interests and Cultural Policy. Toronto: ACP (Applied Cultural Principles), 1998.

Bennett, Oliver. "Cultural Policy, Cultural Pessimism and Postmodernity" in Cultural Policy, Vol. 4, No. 1 (1997), pp.67-84.

Bennett, Tony and Colin Mercer. Improving Research and International Cooperation for Cultural Policy. Preparatory Paper VI. *The Power of Culture - The Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development.* Stockholm: UNESCO, 1998. (Also at http://www.unesco-sweden.org/Conference/Papers/Paper6.htm)

Bernard, Paul. Social Cohesion: Critical Dialectic of a Quasi-Concept. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc., forthcoming.

Council of Europe. In from the Margins - A contribution to the debate on Culture and Development in Europe. Strasbourg: CC-CULT(96)7, 1996.

Department of Canadian Heritage. Culture and Heritage: Making Room for Canada's Voices. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1998.

Department of Communications. Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1982.

DiMaggio, Paul. "Social Structure, Institutions, and Cultural Goods" in Social Theory for a Changing Society. (Eds. Pierre Bourdieu and James S. Coleman). Boulder: Westview Press, 1991, pp. 133-155.

Gagnon, France and Michel Pagé. Conceptual Framework for an Analysis of Citizenship in the Liberal Democracies, Volume 1: Conceptual Framework and Analysis. Ottawa: Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate, Multiculturalism Directorate and Citizen Participation Directorate / Department of Canadian Heritage, May 1999.

Hagan, John and Bill McCarthy. Mean Streets - Youth Crime and Homelessness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hempel, Benjamin. Does Canada Compare? Social Cohesion and Cultural Policies in Australia, the United States and the European Union. Ottawa: Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate / Department of Canadian Heritage, April 1999.

Jenson, Jane. Mapping Social Cohesion: The State of Canadian Research. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc., 1998.

Kirpitchenko, Liudmila and Heather Di Santis. Social Cohesion and Cultural Practices: Beyond the Mainstream. Ottawa: Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate / Department of Canadian Heritage, June 21, 1998.

Meisel, John. "Report of the Rapporteurs" in Cultural Policies and Practices: Exploring the Links Between Culture and Social Change (Report of the Founding Colloquium of the CCRN, Ed. Catherine Murray). Waterloo: University of Waterloo, June 3-4, 1998. (Also at http://www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/ccm/ccrn/)

Murray, Catherine. "Linking Policies, Practices and Change: Issues, Research Gaps and Future Directions for Cultural Research" in Cultural Policies and Practices: Exploring the Links Between Culture and Social Change. (Report of the Founding Colloquium of the CCRN, Ed. Catherine Murray). Waterloo: University of Waterloo, June 3-4, 1998. (Also at http://www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/ccm/ccrn/)

Murray, Catherine. Cultural Populism and Policy Practice: Canadian Perspectives on the Agenda for Audience Research. Firenza: Fondazione Hypercampo, Osservatorio sulla Fiction Televisiva Italiana, June 1999.

Offord, David R., Ellen L. Lipman and Eric K. Duku. Sports, The Arts and Community Programs: Rates and Correlates of Participation. Ottawa: Applied Research Branch / Department of Human Resources Development, October 1998. (Also available at http://www.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/arb/)

Putnam, Robert. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital", Journal of Democracy. Vol. 6, No. 1 (January 1995), pp. 65-78. (Also at http://muse.jhu.edu:80/demo/jod/v006/putnam.html)

Stanley, Dick. The Economic Consequences of Social Cohesion. Ottawa: Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate / Department of Canadian Heritage, 1997.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Action Plan on Cultural Policies for Development. Stockholm: UNESCO , CLT-98/CONF.210/4 Rev., 8 April 1998.