

EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Kemal Ahson
Contributors(s)	Kristiina Kumpulainen
Version	1.0
Deliverable	1.1 Critical review of the literature for theoretical framework
WP	WP1: Scoping value and theoretical framework
Due date	30th April 2024
Submission date	2nd May 2024
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract
This deliverable provides a brief summary of key themes that inform our research model for identifying and ascribing value to arts-based education.

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) only and do not reflect any collective opinion of the CLiViE consortium, nor do they reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the European Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

All rights reserved.

Unless otherwise noted, the reuse of this document is authorised under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). This means that reuse is allowed, provided appropriate credit is given and any changes are indicated.

About CLiViE

The Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe (CLiViE) project develops and applies a Theory of Change (ToC) methodology and Social Return on Investment (SROI) framework to increase our understanding of the value of cultural literacy through arts-based education on social cohesion. It will be delivered through four main phases: it 'maps' arts-based education within the context of cultural literacy learning across different learning environments and over different stages of a young person's education; it 'evaluates' arts-based education to help identify and assess their actual outputs and outcomes; it 'values' arts-based education activities through calculating its impact to further contribute to our understanding of the 'where', 'when', 'what' and 'how' young people's cultural literacies are developed, and differentiated in various learning environments; and it 'practices' pedagogies through developing an innovative set of practices and materials to support art-based educators to develop social justice and inclusion and improve the lives of young people through collaborative pedagogy. It has been designed to meet the three main research outcomes of the work programme topic: the ToC methodology and SROI framework for cultural literacies will directly increase our understanding of the value of cultural literacy on social cohesion; the evidencing of value in arts-based education and the collaborative pedagogy practices in cultural literacy through the co-creation of communities of practice (COPs) and a professional development programme (PDP) for arts educators will support the targeted commissioning of activities that will increase cultural literacy in Europe; and the innovative methodology for data gathering (and engaging) through emotional cartography allows young people to find a voice through more effective initiatives to foster cultural literacy around European cultures. CLiViE is funded under the call topic HORIZON-CL2-2023-HERITAGE-01-07 - Promoting cultural literacy through arts education to foster social inclusion, and brings together a multidisciplinary team from thirteen partners across eight countries:

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO (Coordinator), Finland
UNIVERZITA KARLOVA, Czechia
STICHTING DEFENCE FOR CHILDREN INTERNATIONAL NEDERLAND - ECPAT NEDERLAND,
Netherlands
DAUGAVPILS UNIVERSITATE, Latvia
JULIAN COCHRAN FOUNDATION, Poland
ASOCIACIJA KURYBINES JUNGTYYS, Lithuania
RIGAS STRADINA UNIVERSITATE, Latvia
SZKOLA GLOWNA HANDLOWA W WARSZAWIE, Poland
SINFONIA VARSOVIA, Poland
TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITAET MUENCHEN, Germany
UNIVERSITA' DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO-BICOCCA, Italy
VYTAUTO DIDZIOJO UNIVERSITETAS, Lithuania
HELSINGIN NUORTEN MIESTEN KRISTILLINEN YHDISTYS RY, Finland

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	5
2. CONTEXT	7
3. CULTURAL LITERACY LEARNING	9
4. CULTURAL RESILIENCE	17
5. ART AND CULTURAL FORMS	19
6. ART-BASED PRACTICES AS RESEARCH AND ADVOCACY.....	21
7. SPACES AND PLACES OF/FOR LEARNING.....	23
8. TIME FOR LEARNING	26
9. MEASURING WHAT MATTERS.....	28
10.MAPS AND EMOTIONS.....	31
11.CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	33
ANNEX 1: UNESCO FRAMEWORK FOR CULTURAL STATISTICS	35

‘One can only see things clearly with the heart. What is essential is invisible to the eye.’

The Little Prince, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, 1943

1. Introduction and overview

The Cultural Literacies’ Value in Europe (CLiViE) project develops and applies a Theory of Change (ToC) methodology and Social Return on Investment (SROI) framework¹ to increase our understanding of the value of cultural literacy through arts-based education on social cohesion.

This deliverable (D1.1) provides a summary of key themes that inform our research model for identifying and ascribing value to arts-based education and to position it within the wider context of learning and social formation of young people. Although seemingly disparate, this broad set of ideas and literatures come together in the CLiViE project. The aim of this deliverable, therefore, is to provide a shared vocabulary for the partnership and help the research in providing a clear direction of the relevance of different art and cultural forms that are currently employed and how these might be relevant for young people. The selection of the themes, and how they are grouped, is according to how they emerged in the writing of the original CLiViE proposal (although could be arranged in a variety of sequences). The following are covered in this report:

- Cultural literacy learning
- Cultural resilience
- Art and cultural forms
- Art-based practices as research and advocacy
- Spaces and places of/for learning

¹ A Theory of Change is a methodology to promote social change through defining long-term goals and then mapping back to identify necessary preconditions. Social Return on Investment is an outcomes-based measurement tool that helps organisations to understand and quantify the social, environmental and economic value they are creating.

- Time for learning
- Measuring what matters
- Maps and emotions

This report is not intended to provide an in-depth analysis of fundamental conceptual points. Instead, the emphasis here is to flesh out further how these themes relate to the delivery of the CLiViE project. Therefore, for each of these themes some of the key issues for partners related to the delivery of the CLiViE project are highlighted.

This deliverable will inform three other aspects of WP1: the creation of a matrix for categorising and labelling different pedagogies employed in arts-based education in in/formal learning environments (Where) and lifelong learning journeys (When) (D1.2); the creation of an overarching ToC which shows the potential relationship between inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impacts in arts-based education to be used to design, implement and evaluate the twenty eight case studies and, by extension, structure the data gathering and analysis in WP3, WP4 and WP5 (D1.3); and provide a summary of ‘measuring what matters’ and the SROI model in the CLiViE project for arts-based education (D1.4).

This report is based on a rapid review of the literature. Originally it was envisaged that the data and information from any secondary research material used would be supported by qualitative research with educators and stakeholders involved in arts-based education (formal and informal) in each of the case study countries (Task 1.1). However, this aspect of data gathering and assessment has now been moved to WP2 (Task 2.3: Identify and categorise arts-based education). The main reasons for this are twofold: to allow any gaps in the quantitative data and secondary research material to be identified; and provide an opportunity to sense-check some of the initial findings from the mapping covered in the national reports on arts-based education contexts and young people (D2.2).

2. Context

Social cohesion and tolerance face major challenges in Europe.² Profound socio-economic trends and concerns with economic poverty and the aftermath of the COVID-19 health crisis have deepened inequalities and increased social exclusion. Social exclusion, intolerance and challenges to cohesion have many forms – the growing tensions between different ethnic and linguistic groups in the Baltic region (heightened by the Russian war on Ukraine), unequal education and welfare rights in the Nordic countries, the rise in attacks on women in Poland, and the anti-‘foreign’ sentiment that has encouraged the emergence of populist (far-right) parties in Finland, Germany, and Italy for instance – have all contributed to a very pessimistic outlook. The principles of social cohesion and tolerance are seemingly giving way to a ‘new catastrophism’ which imagines dystopic futures of societal collapse, resource depletion, mass extinctions and climate change.³ Unsurprisingly, for many young people there is a growing level of dissatisfaction with many of the institutions and principles of democracy, and their disengagement has been identified as a major challenge in Europe.⁴

Despite this pessimistic perspective of the present-day there remains room for optimism that things can change for the better.⁵ The potential role of *cultural literacy* in shaping the knowledge, skills and competencies of young people needed for effective cultural literacy learning, intercultural dialogue and mutual understanding to encourage social cohesion and tolerance is well documented.⁶ Arts-based education, in particular, has been highlighted as a means to transform mindsets by exposing young people to diverse perspectives on ways of living in the world, and to promote co-learning and emancipation.⁷ Promoted in different formal and informal learning environments it can also help young people to embrace their changing social reality and create improved ‘imagined futures’. Critically, this encouraging of the

² British Council (2021). *Social Cohesion in Europe: Literature Review*. British Council.

³ Urry, J. (2016). *What is the future?*. John Wiley & Sons.

⁴ Kitanova, M. (2020). Youth political participation in the EU: evidence from a cross-national analysis. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 23(7), 819-836.

⁵ Henkens, J. H., Visser, K., Finkenauer, C., & Stevens, G. W. (2022). ‘I think it’ll all blow over in the end’: How young people perceive the impact of COVID-19 on their future orientations. *Young*, 30(4), 309-326.

⁶ Lähdesmäki, T., Baranova, J., Ylönen, S. C., Koistinen, A. K., Mäkinen, K., Juškiene, V., & Zaleskiene, I. (2022). *Learning cultural literacy through creative practices in schools: cultural and multimodal approaches to meaning-making* (p. 151). Springer Nature.

⁷ Ormond, M., & Vietti, F. (2022). Beyond multicultural ‘tolerance’: guided tours and guidebooks as transformative tools for civic learning. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 30(2-3), 533-549.

multimodality of young people through participatory creative practices, such as aesthetics, arts-based education, and embodied learning, has been shown to encourage positive outcomes for young people.

However, the effectiveness of arts-based education to promote social cohesion, to borrow from Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, remains ‘invisible to the eye’. This ‘invisibility’ is reflected in four key challenges facing arts-based education. Firstly, although arts-based education (and cultural literacy more generally) is ‘judged’ and ‘valued’ as a means to engage and promote inclusion and tolerance among young people, how we *value* it is unclear. Although components of cultural value can be identified in, for instance, heritage projects,⁸ public sector commissioners, funders and policy-makers lack a clear evidence-based framework to promote and support arts-based education. Second, the differentiated impact of cultural literacy and arts-based education on diverse young people has been largely ignored. Although arts-based education can support young people's agency,⁹ persistent structural inequalities and polarisation across, *inter alia*, (dis)ability, ethnic, gender, cultural, linguistic and socio-economic backgrounds, means that it may have different effects on individuals. Worryingly, there is also evidence to suggest that some of these activities can trigger alienation of some (disadvantaged) young people which reinforces rather than mitigates social exclusion.¹⁰ Third, there remains a tendency to treat arts-based education homogeneously and the differentiated effects of different art and cultural forms in achieving wider social impacts has not been fully appreciated. The values of aesthetic education are often pitted against the priorities of scientific-based education reform (promoted by the PISA rankings) and the need to address concerns with achievement gaps.¹¹ However, grouping the ‘arts’ ignores how different forms may have a differentiated effect on young people, such as gender.¹² Fourth, how arts-based education can affect young people in different stages of their education and learning has not

8 Arts and Humanities Research Council (2016). *Understanding the value of arts & culture: The AHRC Cultural Value Project*. AHRC.

9 Pavarini, G., Smith, L. M., Shaughnessy, N., Mankee-Williams, A., Thirumalai, J. K., Russell, N., & Bhui, K. (2021). Ethical issues in participatory arts methods for young people with adverse childhood experiences. *Health Expectations*, 24(5), 1557-1569.

10 Wood, G. K., & Lemley, C. K. (2015). Mapping cultural boundaries in schools and communities: Redefining spaces through organizing. *Democracy and Education*, 23(1), 3.

11 Cahnmann-Taylor, M., & Sanders-Bustle, L. (2019). Art-informed pedagogies in the preparation of teachers in the United States. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*.

12 ART 31 (2018). *Young People and Arts Engagement: What We Need!* Arts Council England.

been fully explored.¹³ Although there is broad acceptance on how arts-based education can be beneficial to all age groups, it remains unclear how (and to what extent) it affects particular stages of education of young people during their lifelong learning perspective.

The CLiViE project is delivered through four main phases. First, it ‘maps’ arts-based education within the context of cultural literacy learning across different learning environments and over different stages of a young person’s education and learning trajectory. Second, it ‘evaluates’ arts-based education to help identify and assess their *actual* outputs and outcomes. Cultural literacy is not considered as a set of individual skills and competencies but as emergent as situated in particular social contexts. This evaluation, then, will point to whether (or how) cultural literacy activities are effective in promoting social cohesion. Third, it ‘values’ arts-based education activities through *calculating* its impact. This will further contribute to our understanding of the *where, when, what and how* young people’s cultural literacies are developed, and differentiated in various learning environments. Fourth, it ‘practices’ pedagogies through developing an innovative set of practices and materials to support art-based educators to develop social justice and inclusion and improve the lives of young people through collaborative pedagogy. Together these four aspects create a circuit of ‘knowledge and practice’ that support young people’s development of ‘self’ and positive engagement and acceptance of ‘others’. Critically, in seeking to *calculate* the impact of arts-based education we are not seeking to adopt a reliance on mathematical language in policy-making. Instead, we aim to integrate this knowledge into a broader and richer conversation about the importance of arts-based education for young people in modern society.

3. Cultural literacy learning

Under the HORIZON-CL2-2023-HERITAGE-01-07 (Promoting cultural literacy through arts education to foster social inclusion) call topic a broad interpretation of ‘cultural literacy’ is assumed.¹⁴ Since Hirsch first introduced ‘cultural literacy’ in the 1980s the debate about its

¹³ Burton, J. M., Horowitz, R., & Abeles, H. (2000). Learning in and through the arts: The question of transfer. *Studies in art education*, 41(3), 228-257.

¹⁴ [wp-5-culture-creativity-and-inclusive-society_horizon-2023-2024_en.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#) [wp-5-culture-creativity-and-inclusive-society_horizon-2023-2024_en.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#)

relevance and importance has gained interest in both academic and policy circles.¹⁵ Essentially, he suggested that cultural knowledge (which for him was gained through reading and writing) was important to allow children to function effectively in society. He further argued that this ‘knowledge’ was constant over time and he gave a particular importance to history, heritage, values and collective memory. However, Hirsch’s position has been heavily criticised. For example, more recent debates have highlighted the need to move away from a knowledge attainment-based normative model to a more fluid and ‘attitudinal’ social practice model of cultural literacy.¹⁶

In parallel to Hirsch, the New London Group argued for the need for a new approach to literacy pedagogy.¹⁷ The context for promoting these ‘multiliteracies’ was twofold: the need for literacy pedagogy to account for the context of culturally and linguistically diverse and increasingly globalised societies; and the need to take account of the variety of text forms associated with information and multimedia technologies. Traditional approaches to cultural literacy emphasised the importance of a shared (national) imagined community, achieved by the reading of books (or at least an engagement with traditional media) and a cultural canon. They argued that the multiplicity of communications channels and increasing cultural and linguistic diversity in the world today called for a much broader view of literacy than portrayed by traditional language-based approaches. This approach has often been used to explore the changing social environment that, *inter alia*, students and teachers face as well as promoting a broader view of literacy teaching and learning, which integrates multimodal ‘text’, including audio, images, sound, graphics, and film through technology.¹⁸ This is considered especially relevant when thinking about learning using digital tools.¹⁹

The CLiViE project adopts the common view that the concept of literacy in general, and cultural literacy in particular, needs to be approached as a normative concept that is embedded in a

¹⁵ Hirsch, ED (1983). Cultural literacy. *The American Scholar*, 159-169.

¹⁶ Maine, F., & Harrison, F. (2018). Cultural Analysis Framework. Dialogue and Argumentation for Cultural Literacy Learning in Schools Project.

¹⁷ Cazden, C., Cope, B., Fairclough, N., Gee, J., Kalantzis, M., Kress, G., ... & Nakata, M. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard educational review*, 66(1), 60-92.

¹⁸ Rowsell, J., & Walsh, M. (2011). Rethinking literacy education in new times: Multimodality, multiliteracies & new literacies. *Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 53-62.

¹⁹ Kumpulainen, K., Sairanen, H., & Nordström, A. (2020). Young children's digital literacy practices in the sociocultural contexts of their homes. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 20 (3), 472-499.

highly selective approach towards economic progress, political democracy and social, cultural and educational mobility.²⁰ Accordingly, our point of departure from traditional understanding of cultural literacy and cultural literacy learning has three main aspects. First, we recognise that learning and education is more than the acquisition of knowledge, skills and competencies and arts-based education can help young people to encode and unravel fixed meanings, identities and boundaries.²¹ Critically, we also aim to employ a spatial lens in our work and highlight the relationship between *how* young people create their cultural literacy learning and *where* they use them. In particular, we will explore the young person's learning outside of formal education contexts, including the role digital technologies, and also consider the border crossings of these practices from the informal (everyday) to the formal (school) and institutional practices.²² Second, in recognising the current consensus on how cultural literacy needs to be understood, we consider that young people have more than one cultural literacy,²³ and that these cultural *literacies* are fluid and may, at times, be contradictory depending on space and time.²⁴ We recognise potential tensions and gaps with young people's emotions and how they are linked to educational and embodied ideas when it comes to tolerance, especially with the advent of new digital technologies.²⁵ Third, in recognising some of the distinct aspects of arts-based education, we avoid the idea of a heterogenous cultural heritage in Europe and emphasise the role of young people in its consumption and production. Here we believe that the cultural and heritage sectors need to reconsider some of its most fundamental assumptions and move beyond simply conserving the past but to foster cultural resilience in the future.²⁶ Importantly, we go beyond the idea of treating cultural literacy as a deliberative process and aim for positive impacts to be achieved through the co-production of the research processes, data collection, and knowledge production. Building on the above we recognise that young people have more than one cultural literacy; in fact we show that cultural literacies are

²⁰ Bryson, K. (2012). The literacy myth in the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives. *Computers and Composition*, 29(3), 254-268.

²¹ Kumpulainen, K., Sintonen, S., Vartiainen, J., Sairanen, H., Nordström, A., Byman, J., & Renlund, J. (2018). Playful parts: The joy of learning multiliteracies.

²² Vehabovic, N. (2021). Picturebooks as critical literacy: Experiences and perspectives of translingual children from refugee backgrounds. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 53(3), 382-405.

²³ Pangrazio, L. (2018). *Young People's literacies in the digital age: Continuities, conflicts and contradictions*. Routledge.

²⁴ Pollock, G., Brock, T., & Ellison, M. (2015). Populism, ideology and contradiction: mapping young People's political views. *The Sociological Review*, 63, 141-166.

²⁵ Thomas, M. (Ed.). (2011). *Deconstructing digital natives: Young people, technology, and the new literacies*. Taylor & Francis.

²⁶ Holtorf, C. (2018). Embracing change: how cultural resilience is increased through cultural heritage. *World archaeology*, 50(4), 639-650.

fluid and young people have different notions of ‘self’ and ‘other’ depending on space and time which may be contradictory when thinking about social cohesion and tolerance. Arts-based education, then, can highlight different literacy practices that encompass the knowledge, feelings, embodied social purposes, values and capabilities that are important for young people.

The various ways in which cultural literacy learning takes place is well documented.²⁷ For the CLiViE project, we draw on UNESCO’s Global Citizenship Education (GCE) framework²⁸ to help structure our work (see **Figure 1**). The UNESCO GCE framework highlights relationships between domains of learning, key learning outcomes, key learner attributes, topics and learning objectives by age/level of education. It is based on the following three domains:

- Cognitive: knowledge and thinking skills necessary to better understand the world and its complexities.
- Socio-emotional: values, attitudes and social skills that enable learners to develop affectively, psychosocially, and physically and to enable them to live together with others respectfully and peacefully.
- Behavioural: conduct, performance, practical application and engagement.

Key learning outcomes, attributes, topics and learning objectives in the UNESCO GCE framework are based on these three domains of learning. It also highlights how they are interlinked and integrated in the learning process.

For the CLiViE project we focus our attention on the socio-emotional domain as this best lends itself in providing a framework for promoting cultural literacy through arts education to foster social inclusion.

²⁷ Maine, F., & Vrikki, M. (2021). *Dialogue for intercultural understanding: Placing cultural literacy at the heart of learning* (p. 163). Springer Nature.

²⁸ Education, G. C. (2015). Topics and learning objectives. *Organisation des Nations Unies pour l’éducation, la science et la culture. Printed in France.*

Figure 1: UNESCO Schema



Mindful of the above, the design, development, implementation of the twenty-eight case studies in the case study countries (in WP3, WP4 and WP5) will seek to achieve one of the following 'learning outcomes' as presented by the UNESCO GCE framework:

- Learners experience a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, based on human rights; and
- Learners develop attitudes of empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity.

For the CLiViE project these 'learning outcomes' can be considered as high level 'impacts' that can be further broken down. More specifically, as highlighted in the UNESCO GCE framework, key learner attributes to being socially connected and respectful of diversity can cover:

- Cultivate and manage identities, relationships and feeling of belongingness;
- Share values and responsibilities based on human rights; and
- Develop attitudes to appreciate and respect differences and diversity.

Although the selection of the particular arts-based education activity in the twenty-eight cases studies is not being initially prescribed (and, by extension, their design and implementation), the (e)valuation and measures to be assessed will need to be referenced against sub-topic areas presented in the UNESCO GCE framework (see Table 1). Influenced by the target age of the beneficiaries the three main topic areas are as follows:

- Different levels of identity;
- Different communities people belong to and how these are connected; and
- Difference and respect for diversity.

Table 1: Sub-topic areas for case studies

	Pre-primary & lower primary (5-9 years)	Upper primary (9-12 years)	Lower secondary (12-15 years)	Upper secondary (15-18+ years)
Different levels of identity	Recognise how we fit into and interact with the world around us and develop intrapersonal and interpersonal skills	Examine different levels of identity and their implications for managing relationships with others	Distinguish between personal and collective identity and various social groups, and cultivate a sense of belonging to a common humanity	Critically examine ways in which different levels of identity interact and live peacefully with different social groups
Different communities people belong to and how these are connected	Illustrate differences and connections between different social groups	Compare and contrast shared and different social, cultural and legal norms	Demonstrate appreciation and respect for difference and diversity, cultivate empathy and solidarity towards other individuals and social groups	Critically assess connectedness between different groups, communities and countries

Difference and respect for diversity	Distinguish between sameness and difference, and recognise that everyone has rights and responsibilities	Cultivate good relationships with diverse individuals and groups	Debate on the benefits and challenges of difference and diversity	Develop and apply values, attitudes and skills to manage and engage with diverse groups and perspectives
---	--	--	---	--

Critically, for the (e)valuation of the twenty-eight case studies these high-level impacts and sub-topic areas from the UNESCO GCE framework need to be aligned to specific outcomes and outputs. For example, when it comes to the impact of art on education, we can look at skills development, increased self-esteem, self-efficacy and confidence, enhanced social ties and networks, and/or improved attitudes toward school. A range of potential (although not exhaustive) outcomes relevant for the CLiViE project can be found in the Culture and Sport Evidence (CASE) programme. This was a joint programme of strategic research in the UK led by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) in collaboration with the Arts Council England (ACE), English Heritage (EH) and Sport England (SE).²⁹

For CLiViE:

For the preparation of D2.2 (National reports on arts-based education contexts and young people), the mapping of arts-based projects/activities need to relate to the two high-level ‘learning outcomes’ (impacts) in the UNESCO framework.

For the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation of the twenty-eight case studies in WP3, WP4 and WP5, at least one of the high level ‘learning outcomes’ (depending on age of participants and topic) in table 1 needs to be selected. This will be highlighted in the Logic Model and ToC created for each of the case studies using D1.3. In turn specific outcomes and outputs will be identified on which targeted data and information will be

²⁹https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a74a738ed915d0e8bf1a0d6/A_review_of_the_Social_Impacts_of_Culture_and_Sport.pdf

gathered. A ToC is a methodology to promote social change through defining long-term goals and then mapping back to identify necessary preconditions. Therefore, the starting point for each of these case studies will be with the selected high-level 'learning outcome' and work back to the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation. Together, these will help tell a 'bottom-up' story of how change is being created by measuring social, environmental and economic outcomes.

For the development of D5.4 (Toolkit/guide for commissioners), key findings and analysis related to what is meant by cultural literacy needs to be included.

For the development of the D.6.2 (Toolkit/guide for arts-based educators) and D6.3 (Cultural literacies across borders initiative developed and implemented), appropriate referencing to high level 'learning outcomes' (impacts) and the need for specificity with outcomes and outputs must be provided.

4. Cultural resilience

The link between culture, literacy and power has been well documented.³⁰ Much of this work has been rooted in historical accounts of cultural production.³¹ But as highlighted in the call topic for this project, there is now a growing recognition of the role that culture can play as a means for building more resilient communities.³² This implies we need a critical examination of the claims made about the 'importance' and 'value' of culture and the arts for individuals and for society.³³

For the CLiViE project the plurality of cultural literacies is tied to our interest in promoting social cohesion. Social cohesion is often loosely employed in research and policy areas and is

³⁰ Gaitan, C. D. (2012). Culture, literacy, and power in family–community–school–relationships. *Theory into practice*, 51(4), 305-311.

³¹ Hesmondhalgh, D. (2006). Bourdieu, the media and cultural production. *Media, culture & society*, 28(2), 211-231.

³² Beel, D. E., Wallace, C. D., Webster, G., Nguyen, H., Tait, E., Macleod, M., & Mellish, C. (2017). Cultural resilience: The production of rural community heritage, digital archives and the role of volunteers. *Journal of rural studies*, 54, 459-468.

³³ Rutten, K. (2020). Cultural literacies in transition. *Critical Arts*, 34(5), 1-7.

frequently used interchangeably with other terms, such as ‘inclusion’ and ‘integration’.³⁴ There is also some recognition of the different levels of social cohesion around the individual, communities and institutions.³⁵ Digitalisation is also said to be transforming the modalities and practices of cultural literacy in young people’s lives. It is therefore reasonable to assume that it is having some impact on how social cohesion is experienced.³⁶ Here, then, our work goes beyond thinking about the digitalisation of arts-based education and considers what it means to be *tolerant* in the digital age. Given our belief that the cultural and heritage sectors need to reconsider some of their assumptions and move beyond simply conserving the past but to foster cultural resilience in the future,³⁷ we also recognise that young people’s encounter with cultural heritage is changing because of the expansion of digital media; in fact, engagement with culture and heritage, particularly for younger people, is often through digital surrogates, such as virtual reconstructions or digital artifacts. Moreover, social interactions at sites and cultural discussions are increasingly transferred to the digital sphere. Apart from this independent and uncoordinated digital activity by communities, there is also a growing exploration of its potential by professionals and organisations. Besides using information technology initially for data capture and the management of collections and sites, numerous cultural institutions are also experimenting with digital media to communicate in new ways and attract new audiences.³⁸

In the CLiViE project, then, we draw on research that has argued that the concept of cultural resilience is an attempt to move away from social-Darwinist tendencies and to embrace the role of human agency that needs to be integrated into the concept when looking at societal relations and development.³⁹ This aspect is central to how we will ‘value’ arts-based education and look at developing, designing and evaluating the twenty-eight case studies.

³⁴ British Council (2021). *Social Cohesion in Europe: Literature Review*. British Council.

³⁵ Fonseca, X., Lukosch, S., & Brazier, F. (2019). Social cohesion revisited: a new definition and how to characterize it. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 32(2), 231-253.

³⁶ Kumpulainen, K., Mikkola, A., & Rajala, A. (2018). Dissolving the digital divide: Creating coherence in young people's social ecologies of learning and identity building. *Second handbook of information technology in primary and secondary education*.

³⁷ Holtorf, C. (2018). Embracing change: how cultural resilience is increased through cultural heritage. *World archaeology*, 50(4), 639-650.

³⁸ Economou, M. (2015). Heritage in the digital age. *A companion to heritage studies*, 215-228.

³⁹ Beel, D. E., Wallace, C. D., Webster, G., Nguyen, H., Tait, E., Macleod, M., & Mellish, C. (2017). Cultural resilience: The production of rural community heritage, digital archives and the role of volunteers. *Journal of rural studies*, 54, 459-468.

For CLiViE:

For the preparation of D2.2 (National reports on arts-based education contexts and young people), any claims made about the ‘importance’ and ‘value’ of culture and the arts for individuals and for society must be identified and assessed.

For the development of D5.4 (Toolkit/guide for commissioners), any key findings and analysis on what is meant by cultural resistance needs to be included.

5. Art and cultural forms

Art has served a range of purposes, including representing nature, expressing feelings, embodying formal beauty, and preserving or criticising social norms. Some scholars even claim it has a messianic purpose!⁴⁰ As touched on in the debates around cultural literacy learning and cultural resistance, from the CLiViE perspective, art and cultural forms offer a means for young people to encounter otherness and diversity and, through valuing their own culture, can experience agency, such as raising questions on how difference is presented through presenting arts from ‘other’ cultures.⁴¹ They also have been used to increase levels of empowerment and impact positively on mental health and social inclusion.⁴² Usefully, from a research perspective this opens up the possibility to lessen any potential power imbalance between the researcher and young person.⁴³ Major art and cultural forms include painting, sculpture, drawing and printmaking. And since the early 20th century, art has broadened to include photography, performance, installation and new digital media. Art is closely related to design and craft in graphics, typography, textiles and ceramics. In fact, it is not easy to draw a clear line between art, craft, design and culture, because the boundaries between them have changed over time and they continue to inform and enrich each other.

⁴⁰ Florensky, P. (2006). *Beyond vision: Essays on the perception of art*. Reaktion Books.

⁴¹ Knudsen, J. S. (2021). Arts for Children, Cultural Diversity and the Production of Difference. *Nordic Journal of Art & Research*, 10(2).

⁴² Hacking, S., Secker, J., Spandler, H., Kent, L., & Shenton, J. (2008). Evaluating the impact of participatory art projects for people with mental health needs. *Health & social care in the community*, 16(6), 638-648.

⁴³ Carter, B., & Ford, K. (2013). Researching children's health experiences: The place for participatory, child-centered, arts-based approaches. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 36(1), 95-107.

However, some scholars have argued that some of the categories tend to prioritise questions of ‘form’ and that it is now important to generate new categories that allow us to understand, for instance artworks, as products of specific processes of production and consumption.⁴⁴ Put differently, rather than simply creating a topology, art and cultural forms also need be seen as providing moments, places and tools for self-reflection, and critical practice.⁴⁵ Of course, it is also important to recognise that art and artists can also be complicit in historical processes that can have both positive and negative outcomes, such as hegemony.⁴⁶ Here, then, there is some recognition of how arts-based education may be moving towards the trend of the neoliberalisation agenda and the fostering of the ‘knowledge economy’ and ‘creative capital’.⁴⁷

For the CLiViE project the UNESCO Roadmap for Art Education is a useful starting point to bridge some of these issues.⁴⁸ For example, it allows us to avoid simple characterisations as culturally forms and sectors mean different things.⁴⁹ Specifically, it structures arts-based education through three complementary pedagogical streams:

- Study of artistic works
- Direct contact with artistic works, such as concerts, exhibitions, books and films
- Engaging in arts practices

However, in a practical sense we will adopt UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics.⁵⁰ UNESCO defines culture as the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, that encompasses, not only art and literature, but lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs.⁵¹ Whereas it is not always possible to measure such beliefs and values directly, it is possible to measure associated behaviours and practices. As such, the UNESCO framework defines culture through

⁴⁴ Rendell, J. (2008). Space, Place, and Site in Critical Spatial Arts Practice 1. In *The practice of public art* (pp. 33-55). Routledge.

⁴⁵ Rendell, J. (2000). Public art: between public and private. *Advances in art & urban futures*, 1, 19-26.

⁴⁶ Gramsci, A. (2011). *Prison notebooks volume 2* (Vol. 2). Columbia University Press.

⁴⁷ Manning, E., & Massumi, B. (2014). *Thought in the Act: Passages in the Ecology of Experience*. U of Minnesota Press.

⁴⁸ unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000384200/PDF/384200eng.pdf.multi

⁴⁹ https://www.unesco.org/sites/default/files/medias/fichiers/2022/12/Lisbon_Roadmap.pdf

⁵⁰ THE 2009 UNESCO FRAMEWORK FOR CULTURAL STATISTICS (FCS).

⁵¹ UNESCO (2001). UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity. Paris: UNESCO.

the identification and measurement of the behaviours and practices resulting from the beliefs and values of a society or a social group. Usefully, it can also be used as a tool for organising and collecting comparable cultural data, and as a classification instrument, it applies taxonomies of activities, goods and services from recognised international standard classifications to cultural statistics (see **Annex 1**).

For CLiViE:

For the preparation of D2.2 (National reports on arts-based education contexts and young people) the UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics will be used as a tool for organising and collecting comparable data in one of the mapping fields.

For the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation of the twenty-eight case studies in WP3, WP4 and WP5, the selection of the art or cultural form needs to reference the UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics. In addition, a mix of art or cultural forms in the case studies must be aimed for.

6. Art-based practices as research and advocacy

In seeking to gather data that highlights young people's emotions and to work with them to co-create measuring what matters, some arts-based practices (ABPs) can be used as useful qualitative research tools that provide a layer of, often visual, data and information to complement 'textual' data, and to engage with the experiences of young people in society. Different methods, such as draw and tell and letter writing, have been used to include young people in research that reduces the need for verbal skills and allows them to participate in ways that are meaningful.⁵² They also offer the possibility of capturing alternative vocabularies and visual grammars which may not always be highlighted in oral interviews.⁵³ These practices can help extend the researchers' perspectives by providing a meaningful data set and allow young

⁵² Water, T., Wrapson, J., Tokolahi, E., Payam, S., & Reay, S. (2017). Participatory art-based research with children to gain their perspectives on designing healthcare environments. *Contemporary nurse*, 53(4), 456-473.

⁵³ Tolia-Kelly, D. P. (2007). Participatory art: capturing spatial vocabularies in a collaborative visual methodology with Melanie Carvalho and South Asian women in London, UK. In *Participatory action research approaches and methods* (pp. 158-166). Routledge.

people to fully participate in the research process and be recognised as co-researchers,⁵⁴ and build on Article 13 on the Convention on the Rights of the Child which seeks the ‘right to freedom.’⁵⁵

Methodologically, much of this borrows from visual ethnographers and anthropologists, and there is some recognition of the need to consider both the arts that are created as a product for data analysis and the process to arrive at these productions.⁵⁶ Here, many artists take their relationship to materials as their methodological departure with the research context often being another layer of relationality.⁵⁷ For example, visual and photo-elicitation to identify different types of meaning-making is a very strong theme and has been employed to give agency in for example the use of cameras in cultural production practices. There have also been studies on how visual tools used in art-based education can empower young people’s visual capacity even when these spaces are often controlled by adults.⁵⁸ However, the embracing of such practices has not gone uncriticised. For example, sketches, paintings and photographs are socially and technically constructed privilege the photographer’s point of view.⁵⁹ Moreover, there is also the question of who is benefiting and the need to ensure that who defines what is valued in the process and why the need to ensure and to reflect on participation matters.⁶⁰ Usefully, for the CLiViE project the use of ABPs can act both as a knowledge practice and a means of advocacy.⁶¹

⁵⁴ Barton, G. (2015). Arts-Based Educational Research in the Early Years. *International Research in Early Childhood Education*, 6(1), 62-78.

⁵⁵ <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child#:~:text=Article%2013&text=The%20child%20shall%20have%20the,media%20of%20the%20child's%20choice>.

⁵⁶ White, A., Bushin, N., Carpena-Méndez, F., & Ní Laoire, C. (2010). Using visual methodologies to explore contemporary Irish childhoods. *Qualitative research*, 10(2), 143-158.

⁵⁷ Christensen-Scheel, B., Aure, V., & Bergaust, K. (2022). Artistic and Art-Based Research Methods: The Mutual Developments of Theory and Practice in Contemporary Art Research. *Nordic Journal of Art & Research*, 11(1).

⁵⁸ Lindgren, A. L., & van Vulpen, W. (2016). Estetiska transformationer: Att följa en kanins väg från en konsthall, via en förskola och vidare till konsthallens ateljé. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 21(1-2), 101-124.

⁵⁹ Singhal, A., & Rattine-Flaherty, E. (2006). Pencils and photos as tools of communicative research and praxis: Analyzing Minga Perú’s quest for social justice in the Amazon. *International Communication Gazette*, 68(4), 313-330.

⁶⁰ Matarasso, F. (2019). *A restless art. How participation won, and why it matters. Digital edition. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. Viitattu, 15, 2020.*

⁶¹ Rousell, D. (2019). Inhuman forms of life: On art as a problem for post-qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 32(7), 887-908.

For CLiViE:

For the preparation of D2.2 (National reports on arts-based education contexts and young people) the analysis of the data must consider any differentiated impacts of cultural literacy and arts-based education on diverse young people and different art forms in achieving wider social impacts need to be considered.

For the development of D5.4 (Toolkit/guide for commissioners) key findings and analysis from the twenty-eight case studies need to be included.

For the development of the D.6.2 (Toolkit/guide for arts-based educators) and D6.3 (Cultural literacies across borders initiative developed and implemented) the learning outcomes from the UNESCO GCE framework need to be referenced.

7. Spaces and Places of/for learning

Cultural literacy learning takes place somewhere. The ‘spatial turn’ in research on learning has been around for a while now.⁶² Some of this research has focused on how different spaces and practices and students’ experiences combine and/or interact in different learning environments to affect educational experiences and outcomes.⁶³ There has also been research on how boundaries between online and offline, formal and informal, in and out of school, and education and work are negotiated and experienced by learners and/or educators, and how these create opportunities and tensions, continuities and discontinuities for learning and education.⁶⁴ Research on how learners move between different learning environments and settings, particularly in terms of mobility and challenges, and the imagined geography of education has grown.⁶⁵ There has even been interest in the idea of ‘body as a space’ and a

⁶² Ahson, K., Kumpulainen, K., Gray, S., Camacho Miñano, M. J., & Rich, E. (2023). Exercising space: re-examining young people’s use of digitised health and physical education (HPE) technologies through a spatial lens. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 48(4), 581-595.

⁶³ Kraftl, P., McKenzie, M., Gulson, K., Accioly, I., Blackmore, J., Burke, C., ... & Mannion, G. (2022). Learning spaces: built, natural and digital considerations for learning and learners.

⁶⁴ Smith, A. (2021). COVID-19 and Informal Education: Considerations for Informal Learning During the Pandemic. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Higher Education*, 6(1), 122-127.

⁶⁵ Finn, M. (2021). Questioning recontextualisation: Considering recontextualisation’s geographies. *Recontextualising Geography in Education*, 41-53.

recognition of ‘embodied space’ where human experience and consciousness take on material and spatial forms.⁶⁶ The role of digital technologies in delivering and shaping learning over different contexts, environments, and sites has also been the subject of increasing consideration⁶⁷

Space is often used interchangeably with *place* in the social sciences and humanities, and both have multiple meanings and interpretations.⁶⁸ Space can be considered as a dimension within which matter is located, whereas, place can refer to a portion of space in which people dwell together and a locality, a rank in a list (in the first place), a temporal ordering, (something took place), and a position in a social order (knowing your place).⁶⁹ Place can also relate to a sense of emotions that are attached to a particular area, which give a ‘sense’ of place. Despite various theories of spatiality there is widespread agreement on the need to move beyond thinking in terms of ‘bounded spaces’ and focusing on how they are socially constructed.⁷⁰ This is especially relevant for education and learning, and art-based education in particular, given the claims that space is increasingly being ‘digitally disrupted’.⁷¹

The relevance of the plurality of cultural literacies for the CLiViE project is also linked to debates within economic geography on how to engage with culture. Some existing responses have ranged from those that seek to conceptualise the process as lying on a dualism from the culturalisation of economic life,⁷² to those that view this as the economisation of cultural life.⁷³ These ideas also lend themselves to questions on how culture and cultural activity produce resilient behavior.⁷⁴

⁶⁶ Melcer, E. F. (2018). *Learning with the body: understanding the design space of embodied educational technology* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University Tandon School of Engineering).

⁶⁷ Yu, Shengquan, Hannele Niemi, and Jon Mason. 2019. “Shaping Future Schools with Digital Technology.” In *An International Handbook*, edited by Shengquan Yu, Hannele Niemi, and Jon Mason. Singapore: Springer Nature.

⁶⁸ Harvey, D. (1990). Between space and time: reflections on the geographical imagination. *Annals of the association of American geographers*, 80(3), 418-434.

⁶⁹ Agnew, J. (2011). Space and place. *Handbook of geographical knowledge*, 2011, 316-331.

⁷⁰ Massey, D. (1995). *Spatial divisions of labour: social structures and the geography of production*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

⁷¹ Watermeyer, R., Crick, T., Knight, C., & Goodall, J. (2021). COVID-19 and digital disruption in UK universities: Afflictions and affordances of emergency online migration. *Higher education*, 81, 623-641.

⁷² Pratt, A. C. (2008). Cultural commodity chains, cultural clusters, or cultural production chains?. *Growth and change*, 39(1), 95-103.

⁷³ Amin, A., & Thrift, N. (2007). Cultural-economy and cities. *Progress in human geography*, 31(2), 143-161.

⁷⁴ Beel, D. E., Wallace, C. D., Webster, G., Nguyen, H., Tait, E., Macleod, M., & Mellish, C. (2017). Cultural resilience: The production of rural community heritage, digital archives and the role of volunteers. *Journal of rural studies*, 54, 459-468.

For the CLiViE project, core issues of power and purpose need to be considered. In particular, there needs to be some recognition that some learning spaces, including for arts-based education, may be geographically and emotionally more accessible or better designed to encourage social cohesion than others.⁷⁵ Here, then, there is a clear need for a greater appreciation of the significance of location in hermeneutic encounters by attending to spaces where cultural literacies are created. Put differently, when thinking about space and arts-based education it is may be useful to think of it as a ‘verb’ rather than a ‘noun’.⁷⁶

Conceptually, the idea of ‘visiting’ in the case studies could also allow for an effective and appreciative understanding of cultural literacy which involves an imaginative process whereby somebody – young person, educator, or commissioner, for example - expands their own perspective; that is, people become themselves through awareness of the perception of others,⁷⁷ and allows us ‘unfix’ places where the arts-based education activities will be designed, delivered and evaluated.⁷⁸ In turn, this points to transformative potential of space and place around these activities.⁷⁹ That noted, in practical terms our initial interest in space and place is taxonomic and will have two main aspects covering educational structures (formal/informal organisations⁸⁰) and the target level of delivery (local, regional and/or national)

For CLiViE:

For the preparation of D2.1 (Policy overview and best practice report on arts-based education across Europe), consideration to space and place must be given.

For the preparation of D2.2 (National reports on arts-based education contexts and young people), a taxonomic presentation of the spatial level of delivery will be identified. In

⁷⁵ Anderson, J. K., Howarth, E., Vainre, M., Jones, P., & Humphrey, A. (2017). A scoping literature review of service-level barriers for access and engagement with mental health services for children and young people.

⁷⁶ Doel, M. A. (2002). Un-Glunking Geography: 117 Spatial science after Dr Seuss and Gilles Deleuze. In *Thinking space* (pp. 116-135). Routledge.

⁷⁷ Arendt, H. (2013). *The human condition*. University of Chicago press.

⁷⁸ Massey, D. (2013). *Space, place and gender*. John Wiley & Sons.

⁷⁹ Rendell, J. (2008). Space, Place, and Site in Critical Spatial Arts Practice 1. In *The practice of public art* (pp. 33-55). Routledge.

⁸⁰ Formal education spaces include schools, colleges, libraries; informal education spaces include community centres, museums.

addition, in the analysis, consideration to how space affects and is affected by the arts-based education practices must be given.

For the preparation of D2.4 (Report on funding what matters for arts-based education across Europe), consideration to space and place must be given.

For the preparation of D2.5 (Report on policy synergies for arts-based education across Europe), consideration to space and place must be given.

For the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation of the twenty-eight case studies in WP3, WP4 and WP5, consideration to space and place must be provided in the Logic Model/ToC. In addition, in the analysis of the case studies consideration to how space affects and is affected by the arts-based practices must be given.

For the development of D5.4 (Toolkit/guide for commissioners) following the results of WP2, consideration to space and place must be given.

For the development of the D.6.2 (Toolkit/guide for arts-based educators) and D6.3 (Cultural literacies across borders initiative developed and implemented), consideration to space and place must be given.

8. Time for learning

The CLiViE project's twenty-eight case studies focus on geographically and demographically diverse young people from two cohorts of age groups (10-13 and 15-18). Here the aim is to generate knowledge about their cultural literacies at crucial life phases which inform their self-identity and which characterise distinct phases when young people are often transitioning in formal education. Transitioning in this context refers to the way formal education is typically structured rather than any relation to the psychological development of a child. Our selection of the two cohorts is aligned to the International Standard Classification of Education

(ISCED),⁸¹ which has also been used by the European Commission in its recent assessment of the structure of European education systems.⁸² The ISCED is used for compiling statistics on education internationally and covers two cross-classification variables: levels and fields of education with the complementary dimensions of general/vocational/pre-vocational orientation and education-labour market destination. For the CLiViE project two of the categories are particularly relevant:

- ISCED 2: Lower secondary education Programmes at this level are typically designed to build on the learning outcomes from ISCED level 1. Students enter ISCED level 2 typically between ages 10 and 13 (age 12 being the most common).
- ISCED 3: Upper secondary education Programmes at this level are typically designed to complete secondary education in preparation for tertiary education or provide skills relevant to employment, or both. Students enter this level typically between ages 14 and 16.

Usefully, these two categories are broadly aligned to the UNESCO's GCE (see **Section 3**).

For CLiViE:

For the preparation of D2.1 (Policy overview and best practice report on arts-based education across Europe), consideration to the ISCED categories must be given.

For the preparation of D2.2 (National reports on arts-based education contexts and young people), consideration to the ISCED categories must be given.

For the preparation of D2.4 (Report on funding what matters for arts-based education across Europe), consideration to the ISCED categories must be given.

⁸¹ UNESCO, Institute for Statistics, 2012. International Standard Classification of Education. ISCED 2011. Available at: [international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf](https://unesco.org/publications-and-products/publication-detail/?id=72071) (unesco.org)

⁸² European Commission / EACEA / Eurydice, 2022. The structure of the European education systems 2022/2023: schematic diagrams. Eurydice Facts and Figures. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

For the preparation of D2.5 (Report on policy synergies for arts-based education across Europe), consideration to the ISCED categories must be given.

For the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation of the twenty-eight case studies in WP3, WP4 and WP5, consideration to the ISCED categories must be given.

For the development of D5.4 (Toolkit/guide for commissioners), consideration to the ISCED categories must be given.

For the development of the D.6.2 (Toolkit/guide for arts-based educators) and D6.3 (Cultural literacies across borders initiative developed and implemented,) tailoring and targeting for target groups covered by the two ISCED categories must be undertaken.

For D7.1 (Exploitation, communication and dissemination plans) and D7.2 (Project website and social media accounts), tailoring and targeting for target groups covered by the two ISCED categories must be undertaken.

9. Measuring what matters

As detailed in the CLiViE proposal in seeking to *calculate* the impact of arts-based education we are not seeking to adopt a reliance on mathematical language in policy-making. Quantification is seductive as it offers concrete, numerical information that allows for easy comparison. However, as suggested by some scholars, targets and indicators can be undermined and distorted and lead to a paradox when it comes to addressing issues related in inclusion and inequality.⁸³ In fact, it can be argued that they are part of a particular ‘social imaginery’ that fulfills a self-serving function and suppression.⁸⁴ In the CLiViE project we also

⁸³ Fukuda-Parr, S. (2019). Keeping out extreme inequality from the SDG Agenda—the politics of indicators. *Global policy*, 10, 61-69.

⁸⁴ Taylor, C. (2004). *Modern social imaginaries*. Duke University Press.

recognise that the processes to arrive at indicators are not value free,⁸⁵ and the need to identify and reflect the ‘epistemic infrastructure’ that provides the framework for them.⁸⁶

For the CLiViE project, then, we are not seeking to provide decontextualised and homogenised knowledge that is remote from the local conditions that emerge. In particular, we recognise that any approach to calculating a SROI for arts-based education will be framed by social and political processes of knowledge production and that any claim to legitimacy of truth is reflected in the social and cultural environments that create them. As noted earlier, it is important to consider whose interests are being served by arts-based education, who defines its aims, and what is valued in the process?⁸⁷ Moreover, it is recognise that some of the institutionalised values that are quantified risk initiating young people in a world where everything, including their imagination, can be measured.⁸⁸ Fundamentally, in the CLiViE project we recognise that those who are measured typically lack a voice in the construction of categories and measurements, but that if calculating a SROI for arts-based education is framed by particular power relations, then there are also points of resistance.⁸⁹

Accordingly, for the CLiViE project a fundamental aspect of our approach will be to ensure that the young people we work with, and from whom we collect data about the value of arts-based education, identify and inform the ‘measuring what matters’. We will seek more democratic and co-creative ways when designing our arts-based education case studies to develop relevant indicators for calculating the SROI. To help structure this we will adopt a threefold approach with the young people when it comes to how we will (e)valuate the case studies and produce commensurability’: how to create equivalence across individual differences; how to create categories and classifications that reflect social life; and how to then encode and classify individual phenomenon into one category or another.⁹⁰

⁸⁵ Ball, SJ (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *The Australian Journal of Education Studies* , 13 (2), 10-17.

⁸⁶ Merry, S. E. (2019). The sustainable development goals confront the infrastructure of measurement. *Global Policy*, 10, 146-148.

⁸⁷ Matarasso, F. (2019). *A restless art. How participation won, and why it matters. Digital edition. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. Viitattu, 15, 2020.*

⁸⁸ Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling Society*. Marion Boyars.

⁸⁹ Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction, volume I. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage*, 95, 1-160.

⁹⁰ Merry, S. E. (2016). *The seductions of quantification: Measuring human rights, gender violence, and sex trafficking*. University of Chicago Press

A parallel challenge when it comes to ‘measuring what matters’ is the need to ensure good outcomes data that is captured during the (e)valuation. Therefore, when thinking about the indicators that are co-created with the young people we also need to think about what data are available. Any quantitative data gathered here does not exclude qualitative data gathered in developing, delivering and evaluating activities and our approach to SROI is through a collaborative approach to data gathering. Therefore, when we gather data we will be as interested in ‘how’ particular knowledge, such as through the identification and use of relevant ‘proxies’ and indicators, is produced, as the data themselves.⁹¹ It is important to note that we will not be seeking to create a uniform set of indicators across all the twenty-eight case studies for simple comparison purposes as we recognise that they may be framed by implicit theories of what is important and what is not. Instead, in line with the need to achieve meaningful impacts in the CLiViE project we will seek to strike a balance between advocacy, monitoring and social science research.⁹²

For CLiViE:

For the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation of the twenty-eight case studies in WP3, WP4 and WP5, the young people we work with are involved in all key aspects will be involved in identifying and informing the ‘measuring what matters’. The process of arriving at the indicators and the data to be captured needs to be documented in D3.3 (Impact maps for each case studies) and D5.2 (Impact Map and SROI report for each case study). Following the analysis of the twenty-eight case studies it also needs to be reflected in D5.4 (Toolkit/guide for commissioners).

For the development of the D.6.2 (Toolkit/guide for arts-based educators) and D6.3 (Cultural literacies across borders initiative developed and implemented) key findings and examples of best practice around co-creation must be provided.

⁹¹ See the Excel tool developed by Greater Manchester CBA model for an idea of the scale and scope of potential proxy indicators and how these might be costed:

<https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/research/research-cost-benefit-analysis/>

⁹² Merry, S. E. (2016). *The seductions of quantification: Measuring human rights, gender violence, and sex trafficking*. University of Chicago Press

10. Maps and emotions

One of the most obvious areas of quantification (and concomitant controversy) that is relevant to the CLiViE project centres on the importance of maps. For each of the twenty-eight cases studies of arts-based education we are seeking to create a ‘map of meaning.’ However, as with statistics,⁹³ maps are not necessarily transparent, simply reflecting reality, but are socially constructed and reflect power.⁹⁴ Mapping and maps, then, are themselves contention.⁹⁵ Like a graph the representation of ‘data’ on a map influences the interpretation of the content and nature of the sources.⁹⁶ For example, Geographical Information Systems (GIS) has often been considered as emblematic of certain power that interrogates data spatially and temporally.⁹⁷ Many of the maps that have been created through GIS, although useful in examining structural inequalities, do not capture qualitative data or the subjective qualities of human experiences, such as social cohesion and tolerance. In fact, such approaches to GIS tend to show a limited grasp of social processes and, therefore, it is important to move beyond the fixity of a map in the CLiViE project and think of space and place as a realm of practices (see **Section 7**).⁹⁸

The ‘maps of meaning’ in the CLiViE project aim to present different spatial and emotional realities upon the felt geography of cultural literacies in different learning environments. These maps will aim to examine where cultural literacies occur and to broaden our understanding of where social inclusion can be potentially enhanced. This project seeks to reimagine arts-based education through supporting the co-creation of policies and strategies to encourage social inclusion and tolerance, and provide a stronger evidence-base to promote and integrate the effective use of arts-based education in formal and informal learning environments. The idea behind this can be traced back to the fields of psychogeography and emotional geographies.⁹⁹

⁹³ Huff, D. (2023). *How to lie with statistics*. Penguin UK.

⁹⁴ Pinder, D. (2014). Mapping Worlds: cartography and the politics of representation. In *Cultural geography in practice* (pp. 172-190). Routledge.

⁹⁵ Monmonier, M. (2005). Lying with maps. *Statistical science*, 215-222.

⁹⁶ Ogborn, M. (2014). Knowledge is power: using archival research to interpret state formation. In *Cultural geography in practice* (pp. 9-22). Routledge.

⁹⁷ Knowles, A.K., Westerveld, L. and Strom, L., 2015. Inductive visualization: A humanistic alternative to GIS. *GeoHumanities*, 1(2), pp.233-265.

⁹⁸ Crang, M. (2002). Relics, places and unwritten geographies in the work of Michel de Certeau (1925–86). In *Thinking in space* (pp. 136-153). Routledge.

⁹⁹ Bondi, L. (2016). *Emotional geographies*. Routledge.

Psychogeography, in particular, with its advocacy of walking, strolling and different pedestrian practices as a tool to transform urban life was popularised in French texts of the 1950s,¹⁰⁰ although its roots can be traced to the various 18th century ‘Godfathers’ of psychogeography’, such as William Blake and Daniel Defoe found in English (London?) literature.¹⁰¹ Some of this work has encouraged a spirit of political radicalism and provocation although the practices that have been employed have not always been easily translated into methods of academic research and enquiry.¹⁰² Nonetheless, activities, such as the *derive*¹⁰³ and ‘visiting’,¹⁰⁴ could allow for a more effective and appreciative understanding of cultural literacy which involves an imaginative process. In contrast, popular tools from GIS,¹⁰⁵ tend to focus on the political, social and cultural implications of visualising intimate biometric data and emotional experiences using technology.¹⁰⁶

How young people are emotionally connected to different people, places and times plays an important role in how they understand social cohesion and demonstrate tolerance. Unsurprisingly, young people’s emotional reactions towards different social groups can influence their tolerance of other and how they feel about social cohesion. Therefore, through improving young people’s emotional state positive attitudes can be increased. Emotional attachments are critical as they create a sense of place and a series of cognitive, affective and embodied understandings that are developed through place-based experiences and relationships.¹⁰⁷

In the CLiViE project, then, the ‘maps of meaning’ are not simply a research method. Instead, drawing on the wide literature of critical geographers, the maps and the process of mapping are part of an approach that seeks social transformation,¹⁰⁸ which can also function as a ‘space for

¹⁰⁰ Sidaway, J. D. (2022). Psychogeography: Walking through strategy, nature and narrative. *Progress in Human Geography*, 46(2), 549-574.

¹⁰¹ Coverley, M. (2018). *Psychogeography*. Oldcastle Books Ltd.

¹⁰² Singleton, A. (2024). Urban research in film using walking tours and psychogeographic approaches. *Visual Studies*, 1-12.

¹⁰³ Debord, G. (2021). *The society of the spectacle*. Unredacted Word.

¹⁰⁴ Arendt, H. (1967). Truth and politics. *Truth: Engagements across philosophical traditions*, 295.

¹⁰⁵ Nold, C. (2009). Emotional cartography: Technologies of the self

¹⁰⁶ Griffin, A., & McQuoid, J. (2012). At the intersection of maps and emotion: The challenge of spatially representing experience. *Kartographische Nachrichten*, 62(6), 291-299.

¹⁰⁷ Steger, A., Evans, E. and Wee, B., 2021. Emotional cartography as a window into children's well-being: Visualizing the felt geographies of place. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 39, p.100772.

¹⁰⁸ Pinder, D. (2014). Mapping Worlds: cartography and the politics of representation. In *Cultural geography in practice* (pp. 172-190). Routledge.

agitation' for young people.¹⁰⁹ Critically, we go beyond thinking about emotional cartography as a set of (technological) practices used in mapping but also use it to provide (alternative) ontological and epistemological entry points for conducting research in art-based educational contexts.

For CLiViE:

For the design, development, implementation and (e)valuation of the twenty-eight case studies in WP3, WP4 and WP5, the young people must be involved in the co-creation of D4.2 (Maps of meaning for each arts-based education case study). The method and format of the 'maps' are not prescribed but will be arrived at through a process of (e)valuation of the case studies.

For the preparation of D7.3 (Pop-up exhibition and app) and D7.4 (Booklet for maps of meaning targeting the public), presentations of the 'maps of meaning' need to be included.

11. Concluding remarks

This deliverable provides a summary of key themes that inform our research model for identifying and ascribing value to arts-based education and to position it within the wider context of learning and social formation of young people. There is recognition that the idea of a 'common vocabulary' can be contentious as it still necessitates an exercise in power-over.¹¹⁰ However, the CLiViE project seeks to re-engage with some of these themes as it evolves through, for example, scientific outputs and deliverables.

This report has not addressed contentious issues related to possible epistemological and methodological tensions between artists and qualitative researchers. It also has not addressed whether there are categorical distinctions between 'scientific' and 'artistic' research,¹¹¹ whether there is something distinct about art and cultural forms which suggest we should not

¹⁰⁹ Crang, M., & Thrift, N. (Eds.). (2000). *Thinking space* (Vol. 9). London: Routledge.

¹¹⁰ Massumi, B. (2015). *Politics of affect*. John Wiley & Sons.

¹¹¹ Klein, J. (2010). What is artistic research. *Journal for Artistic Research*.

follow the scientific paradigm for research,¹¹² or even critiques of bifurcation between ‘science’ and the ‘arts’.¹¹³

Fundamentally, however, one of the biggest challenges in the CLiViE project will be the need to shift from examining art-based education in research to using it as a means of social engagement. Here, then, we are acutely aware of the challenges we face in mobilising our intellectual activities and identities in different contexts.

¹¹² Christensen-Scheel, B., Aure, V., & Bergaust, K. (2022). Artistic and Art-Based Research Methods: The Mutual Developments of Theory and Practice in Contemporary Art Research. *Nordic Journal of Art & Research*, 11(1).

¹¹³ Stebbing, L. S. (1926). Science and the Modern World. By Alfred North Whitehead, FRS (Lowell Lectures, 1925. Cambridge University Press. 1926. Pp. xi+ 296. Price 12s. 6d.). *Philosophy*, 1(3), 380-385.

Annex 1: UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics

A. Cultural and Natural Heritage

The domain Cultural and Natural Heritage includes the following activities: Museums, Archaeological and Historical Places (including archaeological sites and buildings), Cultural Landscapes, and Natural Heritage. Cultural Heritage includes artefacts, monuments, and groups of buildings and sites that have a diversity of values including symbolic, historic, artistic, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological, scientific and social significance. Cultural Landscapes represent combined works of nature and by humans, and they express a long and intimate relationship between people and their natural environment (UNESCO, 2007). Natural Heritage consists of natural features, geological and physiographical formations and delineated areas that constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants and natural sites of value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty. It includes nature parks and reserves, zoos, aquaria and botanical gardens (UNESCO, 1972). Activities related to cultural and natural heritage encompass the management of sites and collections that have historic, aesthetic, scientific, environmental and social significance. Preservation and archiving activities undertaken in museums and libraries are also part of this category. A Museum is defined as a “non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment” (ICOM, 2007). Other forms of museums included in this domain include living museums, which contain objects that are still used for rituals or sacred ceremonies by the communities and virtual museums, which are those represented in an electronic form such as a CD or on an Internet site.

B. Performance and Celebration

Performance and Celebration include all expressions of live cultural events. Performing Arts includes both professional and amateur activities, such as theatre, dance, opera and puppetry. It also includes the celebration of cultural events – Festivals, Feasts and Fairs – that occur locally and can be informal in nature. Music is defined in this domain in its entirety, regardless of format. As such, it includes live and recorded musical performances, music

composition, music recordings, digital music including music downloads and uploads, and musical instruments.

C. Visual Arts and Crafts **Visual Arts** are art forms that focus on the creation of works, which are visual in nature. They are intended to appeal to the visual sense and can take many forms. Although, it is acknowledged that some contemporary visual arts may include multidisciplinary art forms such as 'virtual art'; these art forms are included in domain E, Audio-visual and Interactive Media. The Visual Arts and Crafts domain includes Fine arts such as paintings, drawings, sculpture; Crafts; and Photography. Commercial places where the objects are exhibited, such as commercial art galleries, are also included in this domain. The FCS adopts the International Trade Center (ITC) and UNESCO definition of Crafts, or artisanal products, described as “those produced by artisans, either completely by hand or with the help of hand-tools or even mechanical means, as long as the direct manual contribution of the artisan remains the most substantial component of the finished product. The special nature of artisanal products derives from their distinctive features, which can be utilitarian, aesthetic, artistic, creative, culturally attached, decorative, functional, traditional, religiously and socially symbolic and significant” (UNESCO and ITC, 1997). UNESCO (UNESCO and ITC, 1997) has identified six broad categories of artisanal products based on the materials used: Baskets/wickers/vegetable fibre-works; Leather; Metal; Pottery; Textiles and Wood. The guide also identifies complementary categories comprising materials in craft production that are either very specific to a given area, or rare, or difficult to work, such as stone, glass, ivory, bone, shell, mother-of-pearl, etc. Extra categories are also identified when different materials and techniques are applied at the same time and refer to decorations, jewellery, musical instruments, toys, and works of art. Many crafts objects are produced industrially; nevertheless, FCS considers the products, which have a traditional character (pattern, design, technology or material) as part of the FCS. Contemporary crafts are not in Visual Arts and Crafts, but are included in Domain F, the Design and Creative Services domain.

D. Books and Press

This category represents publishing in all its various formats: Books, Newspapers, and Periodicals. This category remains the same as in FCS 1986 (UNESCO, 1986) but it also

includes the electronic or virtual forms of publishing such as online newspapers, ebooks and the digital distribution of books and press materials. Libraries, both physical and virtual, are included in this domain as are Book fairs. Printing is not normally included in cultural classifications, or in definitions of cultural industries, and is not a cultural activity in its own right. However, according to the production cycle model, printing would be included as part of the production function of the publishing industry. In this way, the FCS includes printing activities that have a predominantly cultural end use. The difficulty arises when attempting to distinguish between these printing activities using the existing statistical classification systems. Generally, printing activities related to the publishing industry are included within the Books and Press domain as a production function of publishing, while Other printed matter – the printing of business supply catalogues or ‘quick’ printing – is excluded. FCS recommends placing these related printing activities in equipment and supporting materials.

E. Audio-visual and Interactive Media

The core elements of this domain are Radio and Television broadcasting including Internet live streaming, Film and Video, and Interactive Media. Interactive Media cover video games and new forms of cultural expressions that mainly occur through the Web or with a computer. It includes online games, web portals, websites for activities, which relates to social networks such as Facebook, and Internet podcasting such as YouTube. However, Internet software and computers are considered to be infrastructure or tools and, for the production of interactive media content and should be included in the transversal domain Equipment and Supporting Materials. Interactive media and software are important fields of activity. While many interactive media products and services have a cultural end use (computer and video games, interactive web and mobile content), the same cannot be said for the software industry. Interactive Media is considered by the FCS to be part of the Audio-visual and Interactive media domain. In practice, this will depend on the classification system used and its ability to separate interactive media activities discretely from mainstream software and telecommunications activities. The Central Product Classification (CPC) allows for some, but not all, interactive media activities to be identified. When activities cannot be identified discretely in the CPC, or in other classification systems, these activities should be included as part of the transversal domain Equipment and Supporting Materials. Interactive Media can be

defined as being interactive when either (1) two or more objects have an effect on one another; (2) the user can effect a change on an object or within the environment (users playing video games); (3) they involve active participation of a user; or (4) there is two way effect as opposed to a one way or simple cause-effect (Canadian Heritage, 2008). Video games and their development (software design) are also included in this category because they represent an interactive activity.

F. Design and Creative Services

The Design and Creative Services domain did not exist in the 1986 FCS (UNESCO, 1986). This domain covers activities, goods and services resulting from the creative, artistic and aesthetic design of objects, buildings and landscape. The domain includes Fashion, Graphic and Interior Design, Landscape Design, Architectural and Advertising Services. Architecture and Advertising are part of the core cultural domains, but only as services. The primary purpose of architectural and advertising services is to provide a creative service, or an intermediary input, into a final product that is not always cultural. For example, the final product of creative advertising services may be a commercial advertisement, which is not a cultural product itself, but is generated by some creative activity. In order to avoid double counting, decisions are made to categorize some design activity into other categories rather than in domain F. For example, all buildings that are included as part of heritage are already considered in the domain A, Cultural and Natural Heritage, while Interactive design media content is included in Domain E, Audio-visual and Interactive Media.

G. Tourism

Tourism is qualitatively different from the other cultural domains, as it cannot be classified readily as a sector in the traditional sense, i.e. measured by either a particular market or industrial output. Rather, tourism is better understood as a demand-driven, consumer-defined activity, and as such, is linked intimately with all other domains within the cultural sector, as each contains activities that are undertaken regularly by tourists. For this reason, there is also a now well-established international methodology for measuring the economic impact of tourism based in part on the development of the tourism satellite accounts (TSA) (e.g. see Eurostat, OECD, UN and UNWTO, 2001). - 31 - Ideally, the FCS would refer to the cultural

dimensions of tourism such as Cultural tourism, Spiritual tourism and Eco-Tourism activities. Although there is no international accepted definition of cultural tourism, the FCS proposes the following: “customised excursions into other cultures and places to learn about their people, lifestyle, heritage and arts in an informed way that genuinely represents their values and historical context including the experiencing of the difference” (Steinberg C, 2001). It can also take the form of Spiritual tourism or Ecological tourism. These activities are considered as cultural domains and counted in the domains A, B, C or in Intangible cultural heritage. For example, a tourist visiting a site or attending a concert is already included in the cultural domains. Tourism statistics, following the TSA approach, measure the demand of visitors for goods and services (international or domestic). It includes expenditure on travel, accommodation and other expenses. However, it should also cover the non-monetary data that focus on numbers of visitors and the purpose of visits. Therefore, to avoid double counting, tourism activities are included within this domain (e.g. tourist guides and tour operators) as well as those activities outside of the cultural sector in which tourists are likely to account for the bulk of activity (e.g. accommodation).

H. Sports and Recreation

Sports

Sport is considered in the FCS in its broader definition as it includes organized and/or competitive sports as well as Physical fitness and well-being and physical recreation activities. Both professional and amateur sports are reflected in the FCS. For some countries, particular sports are closely related to their cultural identity, as sport may be associated with social structures and traditions. An example might be sumo wrestling in Japan. In other countries, sports may be no more than a recreational past time, or most commonly undertaken for little more than physical exercise. Moreover, the same sport may have very different associations in different countries. In some classifications (European Commission, 2002), spectator attendance in sports events or watching sports events on TV are perceived as the cultural activity, while professional sport may not necessarily be viewed as being cultural. These strong differences of approach, and a common interpretation that it is participation and not sport as a ‘product’ or ‘sector’, which is ‘cultural’, have led us to consider sport as a related activity.

Recreation This domain also includes Recreation, which is defined as an activity undertaken for pleasure or relaxation that diverts, amuses or stimulates. It includes Gambling, Amusement and Theme parks, and other leisure activities. It excludes physical recreation activities, which are included in Sports.

Gambling

Gambling consists of units engaged mainly in providing gambling services such as casinos, bookmaker-betting facilities on racetracks, bingo halls, video gaming terminals, lottery agencies and off-track betting agencies (ABS, 2001). In some countries like the United Kingdom, gambling through lotteries, for example, is a major source of funding of culture. This explains why gambling is part of the FCS but included in a related domain. Amusement and Theme Parks This activity includes amusement and themes parks and similar attractions.