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Joining forces to live together

Increasingly, the whole world and its individual countries (including Spain) are facing the formidable challenge of managing diversity in terms of culture, ethnic groups, origins, languages and religions. This is a challenge that not only affects each country in itself but also regions and towns, additionally implicating their institutions and organisations and each of their citizens.

One of “la Caixa” Foundation’s commitments since it was set up over a hundred years ago was to take a good look at new social realities and develop programmes for people, with a sense of anticipation and social transformation that can be used as a model for future actions. This vocation paved the way for the Intercultural Community Intervention Project.

Since 2010, the ICI Project has been developed in 17 territories with high cultural diversity, proposing a model for social intervention and management of diversity focused on local communities taking centre stage, with an organised, effective and positive way of tackling the crucial challenge of living together and social cohesion. The ICI Project was extended to 40 territories in July 2014.

Without connections, it would be impossible to live together. Consequently, the ICI Project, along with local administrations and entities in the territory, promotes setting up programmes for meetings, connections and positive interaction between people with different cultural and religious origins and belongings, to ease social inclusion, equal opportunities, social cohesion and promote living together.

Joining forces is a basic yet innovative and transforming idea, involving political and institutional leaders, organisations working in the territory and citizens, prioritising joint-responsibility and shared commitment, focusing on living together. The ICI Project is promoting living together from this joint endeavour and aims to improve the standard of living within a territory.

Its work over the last four years has involved over 1800 professionals, including participation from over 280,000 people. The remarkable results and impacts obtained in terms of improving living together* and social policies in the intervention territories have emphasised that it is possible to adapt the ICI Project’s conceptual and methodological model to different types of territories with diverse socio-demographics.

* 2012 survey on local intercultural living together
Joining Forces to Live Together Collection. The Intercultural Community Intervention summarises the work carried out over the first three years of the intervention. Based on feedback between theory and practice, this work stems from building knowledge among the people who have participated actively in the process, making it available to any persons or institutions interested in developing policies to promote living together and social cohesion.

"la Caixa" Foundation is grateful for the collaboration and invaluable contribution of the experience, knowledge and political intention from all persons, entities and institutions that have taken part in the Intercultural Community Intervention Project.
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Presentation

A theoretical-practical collective work, working from a joint project targeting community praxis

This series of books summarises the experience, achievements, limitations and learning obtained during the first stage of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project, meaning the collective work for living together and intercultural citizenship and social cohesion carried out not by hundreds, but thousands of people in 17 local territories in 15 towns in Spain between September 2010 and August 2013. Currently (I am writing this in November 2014), the ICI Project has been extended to 39 locations and this work is, among other things, a key contribution to be able to tackle new and complex challenges with a shared view and collective intelligence.

By presenting the Joining Forces to Live Together Collection, please allow me to begin by highlighting two deficiencies that are seen all too often in plans, policies, programmes and social projects. Much as I do not wish to get off on a negative foot, I consider that it will help to frame the nature and value of what the reader is about to tackle. I will focus on social intervention projects as this is the ICI Project’s main field.

First stumbling block: in social intervention projects, the knowledge dimension does not always play its rightful role. These initiatives suffer all too often from a lack of due scientific and conceptual grounding. From there, the degree of accuracy or success of this initiative will start to decline. When the theoretical and conceptual grounding fails or is lacking, the practical work for the project players does not consist of dynamic and dialectic practice, receiving feedback on creative symbiosis between thought and action, theory and practice, knowing and transforming. Practice, in short, becomes practicism.

Second stumbling block: all too often again in social intervention projects, once the project or some of its stages have been completed, the experience that it has represented (always complex, by definition) is not systematised and published, thereby wasting its accumulated wealth. In other words, the corresponding action is not duly accumulated among everyone involved. In addition, it seriously weakens possible forthcoming stages, even more so when this project is collective, community and public; this lack (when summarising the experience and spreading the word on what was learnt, results and impacts) represents not giving back to the social, professional and institutional players that made the project and the experience possible.
So then, these five volumes that are now being presented to the many different players in the ICI Project, as well as anyone who is interested in these relevant, decisive and pressing matters of living together and local cohesion, demonstrate the enormous relevance of collective and applied knowledge in this project on the one hand whilst representing a responsible exercise in systematising, publishing and giving back what has been done and learnt on the other.

Actually, these books, devoted respectively to focus, method, education, health and participation (merely using the keyword for each text) were written from knowledge on managing diversity, local development, immigration, minorities, community intervention, conflictology or mediation that were used to design this project, with as strict a grounding as possible, around 2009 to promote living together and validate the hypothesis of community and mediating work. However, and this is important, this reach and collective prior baggage was applied, validated (or not), adjusted and developed, working from the practice of 17 teams in 17 territories and the participation of institutional, professional and technical leaders, tens of organisations and thousands of citizens in these towns.

In this intervention process:

a. A database or control panel was configured to compile a wide variety of weekly, monthly and annual reports.
b. Listening and discussion sessions were organised.
c. Community monographs were drawn up as the key product of shared knowledge.
d. Surveys were run on living together in territories with high diversity in 2010 and 2012.
e. Multiple and constant discussions and contributions were recorded.

Without all of this, without this intensity of applied knowledge and reflection on practice, this work could not have been written.

And, to do the above, it was necessary to draw up (also in this elaboration phase) some systematisation axes that will combine drawing up and writing work for the texts. As the reader might appreciate, the different volumes are structured around four central questions that are the common thread to the corresponding chapters in each work:

1. How we approached the matter in the ICI Project, for example, the methodology from volume 2, the education work in volume 3, etc.
2. How we put it into practice, for example, promoting living together in volume 1, the specific community health line in volume 4, etc.
3. **The specific achievements** in this field or issue, for example, the results from the specific line of social relationships and participation in volume 5.

4. And finally, **what has been learnt and what recommendations** can be made for the second stage of the ICI Project, begun in September 2013.

The Joining Forces to Live Together Collection is a collective work both in terms of design and development.

In fact, developing each of the volumes has fallen, jointly, to the ICI Project advisers and the members of the Scientific Management team. However, it can be stated that this collective work has an even greater reach as it would not have been possible without the local experiences developed by the ICI Project intervention teams jointly with professionals, citizens and institutional representatives in each territory.

The general editing work was organised by a technical publication coordinator working closely with the ICI Project scientific director.

It has been far from easy, due to being written up over many months, among other things, when the ICI Project not only continued running with new activities and challenges but it was also being expanded. Nevertheless, we achieved it. We would like to thank everyone for your valuable contributions and also the “la Caixa” Foundation and particularly the Social Area and its team, as it is not only making this wide-ranging and innovative project possible but also distributing this work.

All that remains now is for the Joining Forces to Live Together Collection to serve its purpose: continue creating **knowledge for action, giving back the experience** to anyone who has made it possible and **being useful** to whoever we are committed to in the fight against exclusion and discrimination by means of promoting real cohabitation - not only coexistence - in local and diverse communities of citizens.

Carlos Giménez Romero

*Scientific Director of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project*
Translator’s Note

The translation of this work has been quite complex in terms of adaptation of certain concepts from Spanish into English, especially regarding the word ‘convivencia’.

The difficulty arises from the general use of ‘pacific coexistence’ in English. However, this project wants to emphasize, as clearly as possible, the difference between the meaning of the concepts of ‘coexistence’ and ‘living together’.

‘Convivencia’ has been translated from the Spanish as ‘living together’ and occasionally more formally as ‘cohabitation’ in an attempt to express the concept of not only living in the same space or alongside each other but actually interacting with each other as well.

Having clarified this key difficulty, we are presenting other examples here of decisions which had to be made in order to adapt certain concepts within this work in the best possible way:
— Convivencia Ciudadana Intercultural: Living Together and Intercultural Citizenship
— Diagnóstico Comunitario: Community Assessment
— Espacios de Relación: Relationship Spaces
— Encuentros Comunitarios: Community Meetings
— Línea de Actuación Global (o Específica): Global (or Specific) Action Line
— Monografía Comunitaria: Community Monograph

We hope this translation is able to give English readers coherent access to the contents of this work and make positive contributions to challenging translations of relevant issues in this field of study: public policies and social intervention.
Introduction

1. Systematisation of an innovative social intervention experience
Joining Forces to Live Together Collection. The Intercultural Community Intervention comprises five volumes that systematise each of the dimensions in which the Intercultural Community Intervention Project experience has taken place during its first stage from 2010 to 2013.

Due to its new social intervention proposal that combines specific action lines (health, education, participation) with an overall backbone line for the whole ICI Project, and the enormous wealth and diversity of the actions carried out in 17 intervention territories, the systematisation of the first stage of the ICI Project was organised into five volumes that match each of its dimensions: living together and social cohesion, methodology, education, health and participation.

The ICI Project is an innovative proposal for social intervention and management of social and cultural diversity that is extending to new neighbourhoods, villages and cities all over Spain, validated by its good results and its impact on improving living together and social policies in the territories where it has been working.

For these reasons, after over three years of praxis, feedback between the theory and the practice and construction of shared knowledge by all people who have actively participated, the time has come to bring this knowledge to society to make it easier to transfer to other people, organisations and institutions that might be interested in setting up intercultural community processes for living together and social cohesion. Drawing up these five volumes is one way, among others, to make this transmission easier.

— Volume 1, Living together and social cohesion, tackles the theoretical focus and the purpose of the intercultural community intervention.
— Volume 2, Methodology, focuses on methodological development followed by implementation of intercultural community processes.
— Volume 3, Education, systematises what has been done from the specific line of education within the framework of the intercultural community process.
— Volume 4, Health, also tackles the specific line of health within the framework of the intercultural community process.
— Volume 5, Participation, finally, focuses its systematisation on citizen participation and how it relates to other players.
2. The first stage of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project

In 2010, on the initiative of “la Caixa” Foundation, the ICI Project adventure began in 17 local territories with intense social and cultural diversity, located in 8 regions. These territories varied in their sociodemographic features and locations: countryside, major cities, historical old towns, suburban areas, coastal zones or metropolitan areas.

A wide range of situations and contexts where the ICI Project has emphasised its flexibility and capacity for adaptation, being capable of obtaining considerable results in practically all territories thanks to active involvement from all players: public administrations, professional resources and citizens.

Developing the first stage (September 2010 - August 2013) made it possible to validate the working hypothesis in practice. Much of the success behind its implementation is due to combining the flexibility required by diversity in local contexts with the intervention’s unique focus and methodology, common to all 17 territories.

This combination of a unique focus and method with local action diversity was strengthened by the synergies established between the social entities responsible for implementation in each territory, working there for a long time, and the ICI Project Scientific Management (DECAF) from the Autonomous University of Madrid that trained, provided skills and carried out continuous monitoring of the intervention teams concerning the focus and methods for the intercultural community processes, using expert consultancy both in the general methodological approach and in specific action lines for health and education.

Another factor that has helped to explain the experience’s good results in its early stage was due to the combination of specific actions, in fields such as health and education, with the development of a global action line that provides a backbone and gives consistency to the intercultural community process.

These good results provide the basis for expanding this innovative, joint intervention model to another 23 territories in the second stage of the ICI Project, begun in September 2013. We understand a "model" not just as an something exemplary or untainted, but as a dynamic set of hypotheses validated by means of the articulating praxis of theory and practice. So then, in the second stage and as a consequence of validating the intervention model, the ICI Project has been extended to other local contexts, now spread over 11 regions plus Ceuta and increasing up to 32 engaged towns, all of which noticeably increases both the diversity and complexity of the ICI Project. The Joining Forces to Live Together Collection will constitute a useful instru-
ment to encourage transmission of learning extracted into new territories, as well as organisations and institutions interested in implementing similar processes.

3. The Intercultural Community Intervention Project proposal

The ICI Project proposal has consisted and consists of a really basic and yet innovative and transforming idea: joining forces (political and institutional leaders, professionals and technicians, organisations and citizens) on living together and social development of local communities (neighbourhoods, villages and cities) as joint-players in the community who share responsibility.

It’s that simple and, at the same time, that complicated. It seems like common sense to everyone and yet it does not usually happen in practice. Whilst the territories seem to have a wide variety of professional resources, NGOs, public services and associations working to solve the problems that affect the population, their enormous complexity and putting public and private resources into sectors make it extremely difficult to articulate them into common projects for living together and social development.

This is what the ICI Project proposal is all about, making it easier and supporting articulation of common projects where everyone fits in: administrations, technical-professional resources from the territory and citizens. All of them, taking centre stage in their own social development process to improve living together locally.

The intercultural community intervention has involved a transformation process in the local communities, facilitating a type of positive interaction between players that did not exist before. This process has generated relationship spaces which have mainly served to strengthen the local communities’ capabilities and opportunities to face challenges stemming from the economic recession and social and cultural diversity.

The intercultural community process has also eased communication, dialogue, collaboration and positive interaction between neighbours from different origins (foreign populations, gypsy populations, native populations), improving positive interactions, foreseeing conflicts and promoting living together in streets, squares and public spaces.

Joint work among so many people, groups, professionals and representatives from the different administrations is helping services and institutions adapt more successfully to the real needs of the population and its growing social and cultural diversity. This is particularly seen in two of the basic pillars of social welfare: health and education.
Maybe the most important achievement will be the qualitative leap involved in assuming that local issues should be dealt with fully and shared among all players. Naturally, that cannot always happen or cover all issues/problems that affect community life, but the process allows this to happen on major common and general matters that are directly related to effective living together and social cohesion. We think that no method is more effective and efficient to tackle issues and solve problems rooted in multiple causes and in the growing diversity, plurality and complexity of post-industrial societies.

The need to work together to tackle their community issues is usually a fairly widespread concern among professionals, members of social organisations and representatives from the administrations; however, in practice and in day to day work, time, method and the resources required to do this are usually in short supply. The ICI Project has helped to resolve these deficiencies, facilitating the conceptual focus, methodological development of the work and the necessary professional resources.

4. The Intercultural Community Intervention Project overall framework
The ICI Project has boosted collective and shared processes for transforming the social and institutional context to adapt it to diversity challenges and new social needs.

It has a clearly defined method, a flexible and adaptable road map, that has guided the entire process throughout its different phases, accompanied by a series of elements that have been used to promote, highlight and back its progress.

The ICI Process has made progress from day one in establishing collaborative relationships with and between technical-professionals, citizens and representatives from the administrations, to later back them through generating shared knowledge of the local reality and development of joint actions among the three key players.

This has thereby generated relationship spaces that have made it possible to articulate a new type of local community organisation. Participative research was carried out and its results encouraged the emergence of shared knowledge and drawing up community assessments. Action plans have been designed, working from the assessment, that we have called community programming to respond to community issues and the main problems and challenges that local communities are facing, thereby contributing to new approaches and a more appropriate articulation of social policies in the territory.

This whole process has been supported by information and communication actions and by organising community meetings demonstrating contributions made by the different players and shar-
ing the progress. To the same extent, general interest activities have been promoted that have made it possible to build up a culture of collaboration among the three key players, such as organising and carrying out global citizen actions, open summer schools, learning and service activities, health promoting agents, business promotion sessions, holding public dialogue sessions, configuring socially responsible territories, etc.

Due to their crucial importance in the population’s welfare, education and health are suitable fields to encourage the confluence of interests and joint initiatives. These specific work fields have made an enormous contribution to the overall community strengthening process.

Through preventive and health promotion actions, such as health promoting agents or service and learning programmes, in the field of education, to name just a couple of examples, not only was it possible to structure collaboration between institutions, professionals and citizens, but it has managed to involve families, young people and children, the three priority collectives for action in the ICI Project.

The overall view of the process and the connection between the different initiatives and actions undertaken within it have been achieved thanks to community teams in each territory that have connected up the three key players and their respective relationship spaces - technical staff relationship spaces, institutional relationship spaces, citizen relationship spaces and participation spaces.

The community teams have acted as a boost, facilitating the whole process, providing consistency to the whole set. Initially, professionals from the community teams were provided by the ICI Project through collaborating social entities, although they were subsequently replaced by professionals from the different public and private resources and services in the territories.

The intercultural community process also has a mediating dimension that has helped to promote living together and social cohesion in the territories. There are several social aspects that this has helped to improve, such as revaluing the different social and cultural collectives or transforming social relations, encouraging dialogue, positive interaction and equal recognition of all parties. However, the greatest mediating achievement being provided by the intercultural community process was promoting a new social context, thanks to mutual adaptation between persons and diverse collectives and adaptation of the institutions to this situation. This achievement can be used as the foundation for a culture of prevention, regulation and peaceful resolution of conflict and for living together and intercultural citizenship.
5. A brief guide to reading or consulting the five volumes of the Joining Forces to Live Together Collection

It is advisable not to take each of the volumes in this collection individually, ideally reading them in order, starting with number 1, followed by number 2 and so on and so forth because their contents are laid out to work from an overall view to a more specific focus. If it is not possible to read the five volumes in order and just one volume is going to be read, there is always the chance of consulting the other volumes to go into greater depth on aspects not developed in that particular volume. This is particularly important for numbers 1 and 2.

Within this collection, this volume has focussed on living together and social cohesion provides the intervention focus and the theoretical elements that help to appropriately interpret the purposes chosen and the expected results and impacts.

Whilst the remaining volumes, to guide your enquiries, have focussed on:
— Methodology: provides the methodological, procedure and operational elements that have made it possible to put the intervention focus into practice and give consistency to the resources used.
— Education: provides the intercultural community intervention focus from the educational field and the practical elements that have made this possible.
— Health: provides the intercultural community intervention focus from the health field and the practical elements that have made this possible.
— Participation: provides the intercultural community intervention focus from the field of positive interactions and citizen participation and its practical application.

However, in the event that it is impossible to consult the rest when reading any of the volumes, this common introduction to the five volumes will give readers a basic, overall understanding of the ICI Project, making it easier to frame that particular volume within the set.

6. Action territories 2010--2013
— Barcelona (Nou Barris / Torre Baró, Ciutat Meridiana i Vallbona) · El Torrent Sociocultural Association
— Barcelona (Ciutat Vella / El Raval) · Tot Raval Foundation
— Barcelona (Sant Martí / El Clot) · Surt, Fundació de Dones
— Daimiel · Fundación Cepaim Acción Integral con Migrantes (Migrant Aid Foundation)
— Elche (Carrús) · Elche Acoge Foundation
— El Ejido (Las Norias de Daza) · Cooperación y Desarrollo en el Norte de África (Aid and
Living together and social cohesion

Development in North Africa), CODENAF

- **Getafe (Las Margaritas)** · Comisión Española de Ayuda al Refugiado (Spanish Refugee Aid Commission), CEAR
- **Granada (Distrito Norte)** · Asociación Gitana Anaquerando (Gypsy Association)
- **Jerez de la Frontera (Zona Sur)** · Centro de Acogida de Inmigrantes (Immigrant Shelter), CEAIN
- **Leganés (Centro, San Nicasio y Batallas)** · Fundación Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (Autonomous University of Madrid Foundation), FUAM
- **Logroño (San José y Madre de Dios)** · Rioja Acoge Foundation
- **Madrid (Ciudad Lineal / Pueblo Nuevo)** · La Rueca Association
- **Paterna (La Coma)** · Secretariado Gitano Foundation
- **Salt** · Casal dels Infants
- **San Bartolomé (Playa Honda)** · El Patio Canary Foundation and Tiemar Women’s Association
- **Tortosa** · Associació per la Cooperació, la Inserció Social i la Interculturalitat, ACISI (Association for Cooperation, Social Insertion and Interculturality)
- **Zaragoza (Casco Histórico)** · Federico Ozanam Foundation
How have we approached it? Living together and intercultural citizenship as a focus and a target
The Intercultural Community Intervention Project (henceforth the ICI Project) sees the notion and the ideal of living together, and more specifically living together and intercultural citizenship in the framework of social cohesion, as the core of its conceptual theoretical focus and its goal and central aim. This first chapter will provide details of how this is all approached within the general design of the ICI Project and find the proper place for the following three chapters, dedicated, respectively, to what we have carried out to promote this concept of living together, the achievements, results and impacts attained in the first stage of the ICI Project (September 2010 - August 2013) and the lessons learnt.

Some of the questions that we wish to answer in this first chapter are as follows:
— What is the background of the ICI Project? Is it a project on immigration, integration or something broader?
— Why has the ICI Project been focussed on managing diversity and encouraging living together and what challenges or needs does it claim to meet?
— How have we defined, understood and specified living together (cohabitation) in general and living together and intercultural citizenship in particular in the ICI Project?
— What was the design of the intervention to encourage or promote living together and intercultural citizenship, what are the identifying traits of the ICI Project and what innovation might we see in it?

The chapter is structured into three sections. Firstly, we will look in greater depth at the nature of the ICI Project, its main features and the role that living together plays in the general design. The second section is dedicated to presenting the intervention’s theoretical grounds and its conceptual reference elements. Finally, the third section tackles the project baseline and how this initial situation was established.
1.1 Living together in the general design of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project

1.1.1 A project to manage diversity positively, peacefully and with participation

The ICI Project was designed in great detail and with broad deliberation throughout 2009 and the first half of 2010 involving a wide-ranging core of professionals. It took as a reference national and international conceptualisation, experiences and best practices on integration and interculturality. The institutional starting point lay in the "la Caixa" Foundation Area of Social Integration wishing to undertake a new project, within its Interculturality and Social Cohesion programme and once the Intercultural Mediation Network project had finished, that would tackle the new challenges of social integration and diversity. The "la Caixa" and IMEDES-UAM\(^1\) teams worked on this design for months, drawing up successive drafts and holding several meetings of experts.

We knew, or we began to accept, that we wanted to tackle this task from the local sphere with full participation from town councils, that mediation would be present although alongside other modes of intervention and that, among other fields, intense work should be done on education and health as well as tackling childhood, youth and family transversely. However, there were still many parts missing to make up what would be the initial ICI Project design, finding the call for projects that would take place from the "la Caixa" Foundation in March 2010; leading to 227 proposals.

Beyond immigration
One key issue was to focus the project, not as an initiative centred on immigration but as a programme centred on positive management of diversity and more specifically, all local diversity. A project that would jointly tackle the important challenges of a "diverse community", mean-

\(^1\) Back then, the "la Caixa" Foundation project managers formulated the idea that the ICI Project would have a scientific board and its corresponding team, assumed by the Institute of Migration, Ethnicity and Social Development at the Autonomous University of Madrid. The design phase also received valuable contributions from Marco Marchioni who acted as a general adviser for the ICI Project from the very start.
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ing a community made up of natives and foreigners, long-term neighbours and new neighbours, whether the latter are Spanish arriving through internal migration or foreigners from other climes, native minorities (such as gypsies) and non-natives or immigrants (such as North Africans, Sub-Saharan, Slavs from Eastern Europe, Asians, etc.). This is one of the ICI Project’s innovative traits and one of the contributions that has been made from the field of social intervention policies.

This was a case of configuring a project for the entire community featuring all its diversity. There can be no doubt that we were aware of the crucial point of immigration in Spain. We were working from the fact that the complex phenomenon of immigration (occurring in Spain since the mid 1970s) was in a migratory cycle change and that the presence of millions of foreigners, all putting down roots, had increased the intense sociocultural diversification in our country.

This context required working on integration and recognising diversity as a source of wealth and development. On the other hand, as the ICI Project was being designed during 2009 and much of 2010, evidence grew that this intervention was going to coincide with a growing economic and social crisis in the country, already begun back in 2007, but that really took off just as the project was being designed and during the actual call.

Consequently, the ICI Project is not a project on immigration. As we were saying, one of its contributions is to approach the convenience of working with the entire population, including the foreign population in this social set. The ICI Project tackles, and looks in-depth, at the problem issue of integration of and with foreign immigrants, but its purpose or mission is broader and refers to society as a whole, specifically, the local community.

We should insist on the fact that the ICI Project was designed to benefit the entire town, meaning all its residents, neighbours, businesspeople, traders and regulars, the set of professionals, specialists or technicians that work locally, the set of administrations with authority over this local field and therefore, it is designed to be a relevant support for institutional and social action for Local Administration.

And, in this respect, it has to be based, on the one hand, on valid categories for the social set, leading us to the holistic definition that the ICI Project gives of integration, cohesion, living together, interculturality and citizenship, as presented in the next section. And, on the other hand, it had to be based on the diversity management models, assuming three points: a) criticism for exclusion models based on discrimination, b) the deficiencies demonstrated over the decades in the assimilation and multiculturalism models and c) community scale development of the interculturalist focus as we will mention below.
So then, way beyond a project on immigration or “integration of immigrants”, the ICI Project was defined as a diversity management project from the approach of all members of the community living together, targeting dynamic social cohesion that would encourage social development. But before all this, we should put the diversity management challenge on the map, nationally and internationally, as contextualisation was another starting point in the intervention design.

**Diversification in the world: global challenge**

A common challenge has increasingly arisen for humanity: how can we make human diversity a positive factor in our evolution and not, on the contrary, a perennial source of mistrust, hostility, disagreement and conflict. In the early days of the Modern Age, round about the 19th century, many people predicted that, by this point in history, the world would be much more homogeneous, a world that was supposed or endeavoured to be entirely industrialised, built up, secularised, where peasants had disappeared along with ethnic groups, some people even said that nations and religions would also fade away. We would have a universal language.

But none of this has taken place. It is true that the world has become internationalised and globalized and similar with cosmopolitan and global cultural phenomena appearing everywhere. Doubtlessly, but at the same time (and this is the other side of the coin), intense and varied social, urban, cultural, ethnic, linguistic and religious diversification processes have been building up over the last few decades that affect daily life, public policies, building the nation and supranational entities, such as the European Union.

However, diversity and differences are not always understood, accepted and esteemed. On the contrary, we are witnessing more and more ethnic conflict, persecutions, the rise of racism and xenophobia, attacking others, people who are different. Certain political and media positions make the most of diversification to boost inequality, discrimination and even hatred and violence. For all countries in the world, for each of their autonomous communities and regions, for each city and town, for many schools, health centres, neighbourhoods and families, for each of us, the challenge of how to make our diversity a source of wealth, peace and development is being directly and crudely spot-lit.

This worldwide starting point for the ICI Project can be reflected in the introduction of the **Municipal Commitment to Living Together**, signed on 05 November 2013 in CaixaForum Madrid by the mayors of the 14 towns that are home to the 17 territories in the first stage of the ICI Project (see appendix I).
The historical and current features of this challenge in Spain

The political, ethical and practical matters of how to manage diversity (of origins, cultural, ethnic, linguistic, religious, legal, etc.) increasingly affect all countries and within them, their constituent geopolitical units. So then, this challenge is approached differently and, as well as sharing experiences and establishing common policies, each country, nation and state should respond and does respond differently.

Spain has a past history of diversity as a long-lasting trait, central in its political and institutional ups and downs. Whilst there have doubtlessly been positive moments, experiences and contributions, it is true that this challenge is frequently tackled negatively from intolerance, centralism, prejudice, not to mention imposition and violence. Since its constitution in 1978, Spain has had a system that acknowledges its plurality. In today’s new historical situation, diversification has been intensified by multiple factors, from greater freedom and expression of own languages and cultures and the stronger emergence of local and urban identities and cultures to migration and internal mobility and becoming a country of immigration, involving a variety of age and gender subcultures.

In point 2 of the Municipal Commitment to Living Together that we quoted above, the following is stated:

In the case of Spain, the arrival and settlement in the different towns of millions of foreigners over the last decades **has added to the diversity of a country such as ours that was already diverse**. Our starting point is to state the new and complex diversification of our towns: actually, alongside our deep-running historical diversity over thousands of years, the democratic formation of a country with constitutional recognition of autonomous communities and official languages, the existence of numerous native ethnic minorities, including gypsies, and diversification from intense internal migration, we can add the presence of persons and collectives from all corners of the globe who contribute to local life with new physiognomy, trade, associations, languages, places of worship, etc.

And point 3 specifies some of the challenges that diversification sets for towns:

We are aware that these sociocultural diversification processes **represent a wide-ranging challenge for local life from many points of view** including: room for everyone in daily life, dangerous processes of residential concentration and possible formation ofghettos, multiculturalism in schools and health centres, the need to adapt public policies, risks of marginalisation, necessary refresher training for civil servants and professionals, the emergence in some places of xenophobic attitudes of rejection, etc.
1.1.2 Deficiencies in intervention policies and the recession context

Community methodology to tackle fragmentation
The towns and Local Administration have been facing up to these challenges of integration, immigration and diversification with plans, programmes, policies and enormously valuable local initiatives and that, along with initiatives from social organisations, they have allowed progress to be made in social integration and have prevented, or at least alleviated, racism, xenophobia and Islamophobia from growing as we have seen in different countries in Europe.

So then, these local policies for immigration, integration and interculturality suffered and continue to suffer, just like the rest of public intervention in social issues, from certain deficiencies, defects and limitations. Above all, we are referring to the lack of inter-administrative coordination, sectorisation of approaches, consequent fragmentation of actions and therefore unavoidable overlaps, and everything this brings in terms of lack of efficacy and efficiency.

Recession as a problem and as an opportunity
On the other hand, these deficiencies in the general social intervention policies and in particular in this field of immigration and interculturality policies have been augmented, to a reasonable extent, by the economic recession and the policy of budget and staff cuts.

As the ICI Project was being designed, we became aware that this was unmistakably going to be an intervention that fell within the context of economic recession, social fragmentation and institutional disaffection, and we became aware that the focus and method being designed would become increasingly meaningful.

We can add here that it was only once the intervention had begun and projects were under-way that we became fully aware, in specific aspects, in the field and with the people involved, of the absolute need and validity of this type of project.
1.1.3 Initial challenges and defining traits

Initial challenges that were considered

Working from convictions concerning the need for an inclusive management approach to diversity focused on living together and a community and mediating methodology, the ICI Project as a whole tackled the need to answer a series of initial challenges that were considered:

— **The scarce, sometimes even non-existent, visibility for social cohesion, living together and interculturality on the public and political agenda.**

In Spain, as opposed to other countries around us, there have not been any significant outbursts of xenophobia and racism, partly due to the valuable, intense and appropriate work by different administrations and social organisations managing the arrival of migratory flows, family regrouping and giving the new population access to social, educational and health resources.

However, we have not gone into greater depth into two-way and intercultural integration, so it is necessary to dive head-first into a new diversity management model. All this, taking into account, among other things, the structural changes required in the country and that, for almost a decade (first decade of the 21st century), Spain had the second highest relative percentage for receiving migrant population in the world (number of immigrant persons / total population).

— **Local reality demonstrated clear fragmentation in the social intervention and a significant absence of common projects that included the socially and culturally diverse population.**

The social intervention focus from the administrations in general and local authorities in particular, was conceived to be broken down and for specific collectives (including the immigrant population) although without generating programmes for common project design with an integral view, that has made interventions less effective and encouraged duplication of services and resources, without actually improving cover for the population's overall needs.

The economic crisis demonstrated the need to change this focus of fragmented policies for another with a more integral and community view in multicultural contexts that should also answer growing demands within a context of diminishing available resources.
— **Severe impact of the economic and sociopolitical crisis in territorial contexts of high cultural diversity.**

The ICI Project began in a context of structural changes and increasing social demands, with tension, latent and explicit conflict issues in many territories, as a consequence of the recession’s impact on the economic and family situation in an increasing number of sectors of the population and particularly among more vulnerable collectives: childhood, old people, unemployed, foreigners with temporary residence or work permits or illegal foreigners.

The ICI Project came to be, in this respect, an opportunity to improve local living together and social cohesion effectively and efficiently, optimising existing resources, generating relationship spaces and collaboration between community players and boosting inclusive public policies.

— **The need to establish mutual recognition between the different players in the territory (as opposed to fragmentation and latent or manifest conflicts) through citizen participation flows created from generating connection and meeting programmes.**

In general, projects began in territories where situations had been reported such as conflict between citizen organisations and local government, association fragmentation and scarce common projects and actions, dependency on public subsidies, obsolescence and division of neighbourhood movement, existence of culturally diverse collectives that augmented the community complexity, formally constituted participation bodies that in many territories were inactive or not particularly operative, etc.

Therefore, this involved starting to generate new relationships between players that represented mutual knowledge and recognition, emerging trust, collaboration and cooperation (joint-responsibility) and building an alternative story to overcome the initial situation.

— **The lack of strict and shared viewpoints on the territory and the population’s needs in the different social intervention projects.**

In most of the territories, the social intervention projects were intended as specific responses to demands received by the administration or social organisations. No analysis (prior assessment) had been run on the real situation to tackle the focus and the conceptual framework of the intervention to be carried out, but urgency, and occasionally visibility,
was more important; in short, interventions tended to provide care, without tackling the cause of the issues.

Nor was it appreciated that the practice should be assessed or systematised, or even less so, harmonised between intervention and social research from a focus that took into account cultural diversity and promoting living together, aspects that are actually considered in the ICI Project’s DNA.

**Defining traits of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project in its initial design**

From all of this, the ICI Project equipped itself with a design in the form of a series of essential traits that defined it and made it stand out from other proposals, working from the following elements:

— **Emphasis on the local and community aspect**, where the intervention is clearly marked out administratively with an appropriate and feasible population scale.

— **Living together and intercultural citizenship** as the focus and basic axis for creating relationship spaces, positive interaction and real living together in high diversity neighbourhoods.

— **Interdisciplinary aspect** in local intervention teams, each made up of four professionals.

— **Local work in a network**, always working from relations and connections with existing local resources and targeting more effective and efficient management.

— **Specific and common methodology** for all local intercultural community intervention projects set up to make it possible to systematise and transfer best practice. The core methodology was made up of interaction between community development tools and intercultural mediation.

— **Central scientific and technical coordination team** to develop a pooled, collective and shared system for information, monitoring, skills training, systematisation, assessment and transfer of knowledge from the 17 territories that implemented a common Intercultural Community Intervention Project.

**1.1.4 The Intercultural Community Intervention Project targets**

In line with what was being presented, the ICI Project has a dual purpose or assignment. On the one hand, promoting living together and intercultural citizenship in these places means making sure that relations between neighbours, residents and traders in each place are peaceful, respectful and that everyone works together. In other words, the local community should not
be divided into opposing sub-groups or groups marked out by mistrust and hostility: between natives and immigrants, between gypsies and non-gypsies, between lifelong neighbours and new arrivals, between young people with different origins and cultures, among traders, etc. This led to formulating central target 1.

**TARGET 1**

Generate processes and local actions to **promote living together and intercultural citizenship**, encouraging integration for **everyone**, thereby helping to promote **social cohesion** and prepare the **actual community** to face its own problem issues by means of creating a structure for collaboration and **pooled action** among **interdisciplinary teams** located in a **national representative sample of towns** with acute social problem issues and high sociocultural diversity.

The second central target of the ICI Project is to transfer an intervention model to society and authorities that is effective and efficient when working on living together and developing communities. When we talk about a **model**, we do not mean **exemplary** or something to be imitated, nor something rigid to be applied anywhere, but we are talking about an interrelated or articulated set of work hypotheses validated in intervention practice. So then, the ICI Project goes far beyond the towns where it is working, and its ultimate purpose is to strengthen a feasible and successful path for anyone who wishes to construct local communities (villages, neighbourhoods, districts, towns) where there is cohabitation instead of hostility. Central target 2 was formulated accordingly.

**TARGET 2**

Apply, adjust and provide a **shared model of intercultural community intervention** that generates **innovative and sustainable** social practice in managing cultural diversity with a strong national impact and international projection, capable of creating a patrimony of social actions allowing it to be implemented in many territories and multicultural contexts.
1.2 Theoretical and conceptual focus

The ICI Project has a focus and a method: focussing on living together and intercultural citizenship within the framework of social cohesion and a method that combines and unifies two complementary methodologies: community development and intervention and intercultural mediation. Below, we will present the conceptual premises founding the intervention, successively tackling the categories of integration, cohesion, living together, citizenship and interculturality.

1.2.1 Integration as something for everyone

In the ICI Project, the category and social, political and ethical ideal of “integration” (essential and central to the European Union and national policies) is taken into great consideration but does not constitute its core, deserving some clarification. Integration is unilaterally associated with immigration, although work has been performed for quite a while to demonstrate that, of course, this is something that concerns everyone or, in other words, it affects all of society. The problem is that if integration is only partially understood, and this is what usually happens, as only affecting the immigrant minority and their necessary unilateral path towards the destination society, then this becomes assimilation, precisely what we wish to avoid or overcome.

Maybe this distortion, confusion or misunderstanding has sprung not only from trends and interests in assimilation but from the limitations of the initial conceptions in Europe. Back in 1989, the European Community emphasised that integration was a process where the immigrant joined the receiving society with equal rights and responsibilities, although without losing their own culture and identity. It was valid to distinguish it from assimilation but it did not say anything about the other side of the equation: the receiving society.

Consequently, proposals were drawn up in this respect in the early nineties. In the ICI Project training sessions and meetings, we considered and studied definitions such as:

Integration is the process of **mutual adjustment** of two sociocultural segments by means of which: a) the minority is incorporated into the receiving society with the same conditions, rights, responsibilities and **opportunities** as the native citizens, without this meaning that
they lose their cultures of origin, and b) the majority accept and incorporate the legal, institutional and ideological changes required to make this possible². (Emphasis is our own).

The conception of mutual adjustment appears in that definition, to a certain extent in line with what others, such as Ricard Zapata, suggested as “accommodation”. This has been well developed in the ICI Project, as we will demonstrate in the following chapters, given that to a great extent living together represents people adapting to each other within a shared community and territory.

And, actually, the evolution of practices in the different countries and the European Union meetings and documents has followed the line of redefining the integration category along these more omni-comprehensive lines. So, in 2004, it was consensually formulated as:

Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States³. (Emphasis is our own).

The influence of that evolution, that turn-around and reformulation, has been felt in some countries, policies and leaders more than others. In the case of Spain, not only was it fully incorporated into the Ministry’s policy but it was developed as a key element of the Strategic Citizenship and Integration Plans for 2007-2010 and 2011-2014 from the General Immigrant Integration Board within the Ministry of Work and Social Affairs, understanding integration as:

[...] a two-way process that implies adaptation both from immigrants and the receiving society, within respect for human dignity and human rights, appreciation of the value of pluralism and recognition that belonging to the society is based on a series of rights, but it also includes responsibilities for all its members⁴. (Emphasis is our own.)

1.2.2 Social cohesion as something dynamic involving conflict management

So what is the connection between integration, now we understand it properly, and social cohesion, key goals within the ICI Project? The question not only arises from its particular or specific connection within the heart of the ICI Project, and the ”la Caixa” Foundation Interculturality and Social Cohesion Programme where the ICI Project is based, but it answers more general


³ Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU (set in 2004 by the European Union Council and member state governments).

questions. Actually, from the dawn of social sciences (particularly since Durkheim’s work) to the present day, much has been written, theorised and written on social cohesion as a valid category for all of society or the community that is exactly what we are interested in now due to all the above. Once again, this means that cohesion does not involve just immigrants or the gypsy population but all of society... just like properly understood integration.

Consequently, at the meetings and training sessions within the ICI Project, we have studied this other definition, where integration is made equivalent to generating cohesion. This definition is closely related to what was considered above and where it remains clear that integration not only affects immigrants from a social aspect:

Integration implies generating social cohesion and different cultures living together by means of mutual adjustment processes between two legal and culturally differentiated subjects, by means of which: a) persons of foreign origin are incorporated with equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities into the native population, without having to lose their own identity and culture, and b) the receiving society and State progressively introduce legal, organisational, budgetary and mentality changes as necessary5. (Emphasis is our own).

So then, social cohesion as a concept has the problem that it can be understood as something static and conflict-free. For this reason, this notion is understood in the ICI Project as enabling democratic society as something always to be built on, and including conflict management, tying this category in with living together. However, before going into this, we should look in greater depth at how to understand cohesion, key ICI Project category.

To do this, we are going to issue (complementing it and specifying it for the ICI Project) a text that was recently drawn up by the scientific director of the ICI Project in collaboration with the director of the Encuentro Foundation presenting detailed conceptualisation of cohesion corresponding to the concept inspiring the ICI Project6. We are referring to the general considerations from this Foundation’s Spain Report 2014.

This work indicates that, in the existing scientific-social literature, social cohesion is considered as “the state or situation of a particular society or community - neighbourhood, local organisation, city, country or nation, supranational geopolitical area, international community. The parts within it are voluntarily and positively related and tied together in a wider

set. Within this socio-political unit, the constituent parts maintain different paths, identities, positions and interests. This is not opposed to the fact that logically they can cause tensions and even centrifugal trends with each other” (J. M. Martín Patiño and C. Giménez, 2015, p. xvi). And he adds: “The cohabitation treaty endorsed around the democratic, constitutional system and the Social Rule of Law, is general distinguished as a key aspect. Such is the requirement for good working of the democratic and institutional system and a sufficient level of equity” (idem, p.xvi).

If we apply this conception to the local territory, several elements stand out, but among them it might be emphasised that social cohesion in the neighbourhood, district or town is not presumed to be at all homogeneous but that, on the contrary, this local cohesion is established between different groups because they shared certain ties inside and outside this territorial community.

The authors encompass the notion of cohesion within the framework of Europe, specifically: “In the European Council strategy for social cohesion, it is understood as: “a society’s capacity to ensure well-being for all its members, minimising differences and avoiding polarisation: a coherent society is a mutual support community composed of free individuals pursuing these common aims by democratic means.” And he adds: “in a coherent society, people also accept mutual responsibility, so it is necessary to rebuild a society feeling of belonging and commitment with shared social objectives” (idem, p. xvi).

So then, and once again casting our gaze on the local community, a coherent society or community is one where:

a. At least the majority of its members have an **awareness of belonging** that is voluntary and shared in the collective.

b. **General interests** prevail over individual interests.

c. Some “**rules of the game**” have been set, accepted and respected, with mechanisms to modify them.

d. There are **positive ties** between its different “parts” (persons, sectors, regions, peoples) and in some way “everyone wins” with the established agreement and system.

e. Its **institutions** work correctly.

f. There is **fairness**, at least sufficiently, so that inequalities are not excessive and social inclusion clearly prevails over exclusion.

g. **Conflict is foreseen and regulated**, and conflict solving mechanisms work.
In the conceptualisation that we are following, the four clarifications that they make are particularly interesting, specifically concerning the relationship between cohesion and: a) inequality, b) diversity, c) conflict and d) transformation, as all of them provide important guidance on how to carry out the intercultural community intervention in local territories with high diversity. In order to understand this conceptualisation of cohesion properly, or at least find out what it is not, these questions should be clarified.

One initial question looks at the relationship between cohesion and inequality/exclusion. We have to weigh up [...] the distance that exists between the widest conception of what we understand by cohesion and clear situations of inequality or even exclusion. Can cohesion occur without any type of equity or social justice? Can it be stated that cohesion requires not crossing certain limits of inequality or social injustice? Sousa Santos’s opinions (2011) might be relevant: “The modern capitalist state has the general function of maintaining social cohesion in a society riddled with inequality and exclusion systems.” According to this author, the state tackles inequality by maintaining it within limits “that do not stop subordinate integration from being feasible”. (Idem, p. xvii, emphasised in the original.)

From the point of view of promoting living together and intercultural citizenship, there seems to be a clear correlation in the neighbourhoods between how far the project and the community intervention process have progressed and the situations of fairness/inequality and social justice/injustice.

A second question to be tackled is the relationship between cohesion and diversity.

If cohesion implies sharing principles, goods, values, rules and common belonging, how does that combine with social plurality? In this case, the error lies in identifying cohesion with homogeneity. Way to the contrary:

[...] the idea and the reality of cohesion, considered in its social version, emerges precisely from the existence of differentiated parts, whether they are persons, groups, institutions, social sectors, ethnocultural communities. We have to rule out the structured heterogeneity of society. From there, we conceive cohesion as a “unit of diversity” as proposed by social anthropology, when it considered, for example, the uniqueness of the human species and its multiple cultures as a whole. So then, this “unit” has to be understood not as unification or homogenisation but convergence that is not imposed or defined by dominating parties; meaning tolerated, in permanent dialectic construction. This “unit” is achieved and enriched only because fairness is generated and differences are respected, and a “diversity”
that can only be held as a society, because the general framework that unites it is fairness and justice. (Idem, p. XVIII.)

Applying it to the intercultural community intervention in local territories, this infers the background notion of working for a neighbourhood or a place united in diversity that would represent at least: a) a participative, non-imposed, process of joint-construction by the community’s key players of an identity or feeling of belonging and local ties, and b) a majority attitude of assuming, respecting and valuing pluralism and the diversity existing in the place.

As we will see, particularly when looking in detail at the idea of living together, this implies knowing how to handle, prevent and resolve conflict situations. We now consider how all this (the tensions, disputes, confrontation, fights, etc.) relates to social cohesion. Once again we will follow the aforementioned text:

A third question that should be considered clearly is the relationship between cohesion and conflict. What is the opposite of cohesion? The opposite of cohesion is not conflict but lack of union or rupture. Conflict is inseparable from social life. The category of cohesion is not the opposite of conflict, rather it assumes and incorporates it. A coherent society is one where conflict (social, land development, commercial, political, territorial, inter-group, inter-personal, etc.) is foreseen, regulated and resolved peacefully. In this respect, cohesion requires a “civic conflict culture”, attitudes and mechanisms that favour cooperative dialogue and negotiation. (Idem, p. XVIII.)

And that, the expansion of a civic conflict culture in the intervention territories, is precisely one of the specific targets of the ICI Project and also one of its most considerable achievements as featured in the following chapters. We consider that this is making a considerable contribution to social life in democracy.

Finally, a fourth question to separate off and make the cohesion category operative is the relationship between cohesion and social transformation.

If the society is united, how can we understand its changes and projects attempting to transform it? In other words, do intentions and projects involving transformation represent a loss of cohesion? It is important not to confuse cohesion with status quo, with “what has been established” or with idealised or utopian harmony. As we have stated, cohesion is a dynamic state or situation, in permanent construction. In fact, it can be considered as a continuous process of re-establishing new and authentic cohesions. (Idem, p. XVIII.)
The ICI Project is a project of change and transformation, improving social relations and strengthening the community in terms of organisation, skills training, social development, etc. And all this is an attempt to generate new levels of social cohesion in the town.

1.2.3 Living together as so much more than co-existence

Now we get to the key term, concept and ideal in the ICI Project focus. However, before starting to present it, and adjectives drawn from this cohabitation or living together such as “citizenship” and “interculturality”, we should make a clarification for the reader. Within the ICI Project, we have worked in-depth on these three categories of living together, citizenship and interculturality. They were already part of the initial studies on the state of living together and in the design of the questionnaire and indicators for the 2010 survey on social and intercultural cohabitation in territories with high diversity - both were drawn up at the start of the ICI Project and we will refer to both in the next and final point of this chapter.

During the ICI Project we saw the need to specify these abstract categories as much as possible to be able to apply them to the intervention teams’ daily practice. All this led to formulating a **conceptual and operative matrix** that is known within the ICI Project as the “grid”. That’s actually just what it is, structured into twenty subcategories and lists of questions, from which to look at or make sense of the set of overall or specific actions in the ICI Project. This document appears in Appendix II.

Using it, we will cover two aspects below: on the one hand, only present what is essential for the focus and on the other, annotate or apply it to what would be a territory - town, district or neighbourhood - where living together and intercultural citizenship would reign and prevail.

Regarding living together, and always for the purposes of the ICI Project, the premises and fundamental considerations are:

a. Understanding living together as a **real, predominantly positive relationship** involving respect and communication although completely void of conflict.

b. **Differentiating cohabitation (living together) from mere coexistence**, understood as being different subjects or groups in the same space and time, in an atmosphere that is not at all aggressive but nor is there really or barely a relationship and, in any case, it is superficial and weak.
c. Opposing cohabitation and coexistence, both positive although in different ways, there is latent or manifest **hostility**, the **negative** side of the coin, as it contains rejection, segregation, insult, aggression, etc. and is clearly undesirable.
d. Working from the fact that, in general, it is usual in a specific public, educational, association programme, etc. that there are **always elements of the three types of sociability**.
e. It is fundamental not to lose sight of the fact this is a **dynamic model** as the three poles interact and change the weighting, amplitude and elements where they are demonstrated.
f. It is necessary and possible to specify and make these three types of sociability operational by means of a set of **dimensions, variables and indicators**, which can be consulted in their current form in appendix ii.

As a summary, the ICI Project focus and approach understands living together very strictly, not only as mere coexistence or passive respect between people or inhabitants of a place but as a peaceful relationship of acceptance, respect and trust. It is not enough to live alongside others, live in a particular place without having any type of relationship with others. Of course, this coexistence is much better than hostility in the neighbourhood, much better than confrontation between people due to their origin, appearance or identity, etc. But in addition to peaceful coexistence, and beyond it, neighbours need to get to know each other, share common spaces, work together in developing their community, as this community belongs to everyone.

Finally, we could then say that a neighbourhood or a local territory with strong diversity is a place of cohabitation when:
— There is an acceptable relationship between its neighbours or members and although people are respected no matter who they choose to be with and that each sociocultural group has its own relationships - endogroup - the case is that there are also spaces, times and possibilities in this territory where people with different cultural backgrounds can interact positively.
— Along with this essential trait, it also constitutes a place of prevailing respect, where people are civil and if they do not agree with a rule, there are operative mechanisms to change it; where basic values are shared on living together, etc.

*(for more details, please refer to block II; categories 4 to 12, of the “grid”, appendix ii)*

The following diagrams can be used to display what has been presented.
Graph no. 1. Type of sociability situations

7 Cf: CARLOS GIMÉNEZ ROMERO (2005), text from the article in OMCI.

Graph no. 2. Dimensions of living together

8 Cf: CARLOS GIMÉNEZ ROMERO (2005), text from the article in OMCI and subsequent adjustments.
1.2.4 Citizenship as a fundamental tie in the community

Local living together that the ICI Project is attempting to promote, particularly from the intercultural community processes for each territory, is specified and qualified by means of two adjectives. This is a matter of promoting living together not in the abstract but citizen-based and intercultural. What do each of these two categories and ideals imply and contribute?

The ICI Project citizen emphasis is closely linked to its community methodology and can be summarised in the following premises and considerations:

1. The **most shared and uniting link** between members of the community is that they are all citizens: of general society and the place in particular.

2. Corollary to the above is that culture and ethnic identities link up and unite the actual group, but when it is a matter of creating ties in the diverse community, citizens, civility and civic identities become considerably relevant.

3. Citizenship is understood not only in its classic sense in modern times but also from the perspective of current discussions and proposals regarding “new citizenship”.

4. Citizenship can be understood - at least as a standard and as an ideal - as a relationship between free and equal subjects that: a) hold rights and responsibilities; b) insomuch as they belong to a determined legal-political community, and c) in which there are democratically legitimate institutions to guarantee and protect these rights and require these responsibilities.

5. In this way, and for the purposes of the ICI Project, citizenship implies, in addition to participation, working hard in the community intervention on the focus of rights, the ethics of responsibility, the question of local belonging and how citizens relate to the institutions.

6. A whole series of processes in the world suggest making progress towards extensions and formulas for “new citizens”, essentially (and also for topics in the ICI Project) any that refer to “de-anchoring” the relationship between nationality and citizenship, leading to notions such as transnational citizenship and, particularly relevant in the community intervention, the ideas of local citizenship, residence or civics.

7. Another corollary in all this is the potential of the secular notion of neighbourliness that can be revalued, overcoming all narrow-minded, locally-focussed or chauvinistic conceptions of the term and considering it, on the contrary, as an expression of local citizenship and as something that all residents have in common whether they are nationals or foreigners.

In summary, by being citizen-related, cohabitation takes place between neighbours, between
members of the territorial community and among citizens, whether they are national or from other countries. As it is citizen-based, particular relevance is given in community work carried out to promote it, and in the intercultural community process that generates it, to matters such as: a) exercising rights, b) the message and agreement on the fact that each institutional, professional or technical position, trader, etc., constructs a community when they meet their obligations, c) that everyone or the majority feel that they belong to the neighbourhood or place and d) that local institutions are close to the population and do their job properly.

*(for more details, please refer to block III, categories 13 to 17, of the “grid”, appendix II)*

The following diagrams can help to display what has been presented9:

**Graph no. 3. Dimensions of citizenship**

![Dimensions of citizenship diagram](image-url)
Graph no. 4. **Processes that influence reformulation towards “new citizenship”**

- Human rights and derived international agreements
- Immigration and shelter
- Autonomy, identity and rights (native populations)
- Specific rights for social groups
- National reconfiguration processes
- Configuration of supra-national entities (European citizenship)

Graph no. 5. **Levels and expressions of citizenship**

- **Central distinction**
  - Linked-in acceptances
- **Political citizenship**
  - Legal-political citizenship
- **Social citizenship**
  - Local citizenship
  - Civic citizenship

10 Produced in-house.
1.2.5 Interculturalism as positive interaction and emphasis on what we have in common

A second qualification or adjective for the concept and ideal of living together, as defined in the ICI Project, is intercultural living together. And here intercultural has two acceptances, as in multiculturality: one from fact and another from standards. From the factual point of view, interculturality refers to anthropological concepts of “intercultural relations” and “inter-ethnic group relations” and these should be described and analysed.

So then, when it is used in a standard-based regard we are already referring to an intercultural school, district or society and, in this respect, it is better and probably enlightening to talk about interculturalism as we did for multiculturalism.

Interculturalism can be defined (and this is how it has been proposed and accepted in the ICI Project) as a “new expression within cultural pluralism that, by stating not only what is different but also what we have in common, promotes a praxis that generates equality, freedom and positive interaction in relationships between individual or collective subjects that are culturally differentiated”\(^\text{11}\).

Let’s comment on or scrutinise a little further the synthetic definition to formulate some of the premises and considerations that have been used for its grounds in the ICI Project, following the same guidelines as previously used with “living together” and “citizenship”.

1. **Cultural pluralism** is the paradigm, within inclusion models for managing diversity, that has differentiated itself and opposed several aspects of assimilationism as it accepts and celebrates diversity and sets out a society or community of people who are *equals* (before the law and in terms of behaviour) whilst also *different*.

2. **Two lines** have stood out within pluralism: on the one hand, multiculturalism, its first historical expression, formulated back in the 50s (although with precedents throughout history); this represented considerable progress in different legal ordinances and public policies, at least in our opinion, as it received and still receives considerable criticism; and on the other hand, interculturalism that the modern world has been approaching more recently, since the mid 80s, with increasing strength.

3. From our perspective, interculturalism accepts the principles of equality and difference from multiculturalism although this represents a critical alternative and suggests complementing it with other elements where multiculturalism paid less attention, particularly in its version of “differentialist multiculturalism”.

4. Stating not only what is different and above all not exacerbating the differences but also highlighting similarities and the many things held in common, interculturalism promotes “a praxis that generates equality, freedom and positive interaction” as expressed in the definition we mentioned above.

5. When defined in this way, interculturalism is a socio-political and ethical project that is, at the same time, a utopia that it is worth targeting, a dialogue-based process of tensions, progress and backward steps and a practical method.

In summary, the fact that living together is not only citizen-based but also intercultural means:
— That there are relationships of equality, respect and positive interaction between the different sociocultural expressions in the territory.
— That there is no ethno-cultural discrimination or segregation or ethnic cleansing in this place.
— That acceptance of the other does not happen in exchange for them totally assimilating and forgetting their culture, language or own identity.
— That in this neighbourhood or territory, not only is diversity respected but it is also celebrated and made the most of as something that enriches the community and common projects.
— That differences are not exaggerated or obsessed over, in the sense of referring only or mainly to them.
— That, in addition to respecting differences, emphasis is put at all times on general and common interests that might include local development, standards of living, exercising rights, defending the Rule of Law and Democracy, etc.
— That, within this framework of living together and working from common interests, alliances and cooperation are established between persons, groups or sectors that are ethno-culturally different (workers, women, young people, professionals, traders, etc.).
— That care is taken to train citizens in skills to understand each other, empathy and other “intercultural skills”.
— That people are aware that “improbable” relationship spaces have to be set up as suggested by John Paul Lederach, in other words, programmes where people who usually never meet up can share, exchange, cooperate and learn together.

12 For some authors such as Lorenzo Cachón, multiculturalism has another version as “integrating multiculturalism”, an idea that he prefers to interculturality or interculturalism.
(for more details, please refer to block IV, categories 18 to 20, of the “grid”, appendix II)
The following diagrams can be used to display the above.

Graph no. 6. **Typology of sociopolitical models in the light of sociocultural diversity**
Graph no. 7. Terminological and conceptual proposal
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1.3
The baseline or initial situation

What was the initial situation in the 17 territories when we began the ICI Project back in September 2010? More specifically, what was the initial situation regarding living together socially and exercising citizenship and intercultural relations? As in so many other aspects, programmes and projects, marking the initial situation or baseline as clearly and accurately as possible was a key collective task not only to adjust what we should be doing to it but to be able to assess, identify and measure results and impacts.
In the ICI Project, this “baseline” was set working from two complementary methodologies. On the one hand, and creating the concept of “state of living together”, 17 initial studies were drawn up on the state of living together. On the other hand, this was complemented by carrying out and exploiting an initial survey in the territories, known as the 2010 survey on inter-cultural living together in the local field.

1.3.1 Results from initial studies on the state of living together

Following the same topic-based index and the same report structure (please see appendix III), the 17 teams wrote up this first document on the initial situation in each territory. This had to be done in a short space of time, aware that it was neither an in-depth study nor an assessment. This was more a case of grouping together and systematising the knowledge we already had on the action zone, making the most of the fact that the administrative organisations had been closely tied to the place for some time (with one exception) so they had prior knowledge. In addition, we had to make the most of the existing local documentation.

This was a case, and another difficulty to overcome, of putting all this into the new conceptual mould of the ICI Project as defined above. For this reason, this streamlined writing had the virtue of creating and assimilating incipient common terminology; this work would be developed as the intervention went on. So then, drawing up the seventeen initial studies on the state of living together was not only one of the two ways of marking the baseline or initial situation but also an intense team discussion and training process.

The local studies agreed that each place was dominated by coexistence, that there were some programmes offering really valuable cohabitation that had to be preserved and made the most of and also hostility situations, programmes and processes that we had to bear in mind.

This is not the place to be presenting the peculiarities of each of the 17 territories or the local casuistry of each problem issue. What we will do here is summarise the results of all this work. It should be taken into account that, of course, not all the traits appeared in all the places or with the same intensity.
These studies contributed the following:

a. A variety of demonstrations that coexistence prevailed in local life
   - Scarce or superficial relationships between native and foreign neighbours.
   - Although, apart from a few exceptions, there is no aggression in the town’s daily life, there is no mutual knowledge connection either.
   - Certain ethnocultural collectives grouping together or forming associations that we suggested calling relational endogamy.
   - Residential concentration of certain immigrant collectives, establishing relationships only or mainly among people belonging to the same group.
   - Separation by nationalities in school life (break-time, etc.)
   - No relationships between neighbours with different religions or between the leaders or representatives from these religions.
   - Weak feeling of belonging common to the town.
   - Situations and processes making immigrants invisible.

b. Existence of valuable programmes with genuine cohabitation/living together or local initiatives to promote it
   - Some places have municipal cohabitation programmes within their immigration, integration or diversity policy.
   - Social entities whose collective imaginary and practice explicitly feature work on intercultural living together.
   - Nongovernmental associations and organisations with an in-depth multicultural component where people from different sociocultural groups work together.
   - Certain best practices in the use of public spaces (squares, parks) where people and groups with different cultural backgrounds meet on a daily basis.
   - Experiences of cultural and artistic fusion, particularly in the world of music and urban art performances.
   - Standardised diversification of the commercial offer both in small local stores and in some municipal wholesale markets.
   - Some small and medium-sized trader associations where traders from different countries with different mother tongues meet up and work together.
   - Participation from immigrants in the local festivals.
   - Making the most of the usual connection between believers from very different origins in certain temples and places of worship to promote tolerance and respect.
   - Inter-religious dialogue from entities or platforms that have been working in some of the ICI Project territories.
c. **Existence of clear, negative situations, programmes and processes of latent or manifest hostility**

   — **Racist discourse** and attitudes rejecting the gypsy ethnic group, both from public representatives and in sectors of citizens.
   
   — **Xenophobic discourse** regarding immigration in general and towards immigrants in the place by some authorities and public figures, as well as among sectors of citizens.
   
   — Existence in the territory of **political parties with xenophobic leanings and practice** with or without representation on the local council.
   
   — Existing tension between persons from different origins in competitive use of public spaces leading in some cases to insults, disqualification or aggressive behaviour.
   
   — **Blaming** minorities for problems such as unemployment, insecurity and saturation of public services.
   
   — Historical celebration, in the location’s memory, of conflictive or violent, racist or xenophobic **events**.
   
   — Existence of what is no longer just concentration but **ethnic ghettos**, regarding gypsies, or some **ghetto-isation processes**, relating to immigrant collectives, residually, educationally and in terms of healthcare.

**1.3.2 Results from the 2010 survey on local intercultural living together**

The second way of establishing the project baseline or initial situation for the intercultural community intervention consisted of a survey carried out in November and half of December 2010 among 8,928 persons living in 25 territories, 17 intervention territories and another 8 used as a control (see appendix IV featuring the questions compiled in the questionnaire).

The following table shows the technical data sheet for the survey:
The conclusions from this study complemented conclusions extracted from qualitative studies, with a considerable convergence in both outlooks, from the field and more qualitatively, from the sample and statistical representation.

Firstly, we will synthesize the central idea of the study and then we will summarise the more specific conclusions.

The idea, conclusion or central thesis of this report is that in these territories, and in general terms (as these territories vary widely, even more so depending on the aspect being considered) the processes for new sociocultural diversification and establishing new social and intercultural relationships are occurring within a predominantly positive framework regarding peaceful relations, attitudes of respect and acceptance, and progressive spread of shared feelings of local identification, although, and this is the other side of the coin, with a considerable set of weaknesses, situations of ambivalence, possible risks and other clearly negative aspects including the minority but telling stance of rejection among a relevant section of the local population as well as ambiguity and passive tolerance in other broader sectors. (Giménez & Lobera, 2012, p. 227.) (Emphasis is our own.)
After the central idea, indicating that “each territory and dimension should be put in a broad context and specified strictly and in detail,” three main conclusions were formulated that we will now present:

1. In terms of local sociability, **coexistence predominates** for persons and groups, meaning a social atmosphere of basic respect and acceptance of others and the state of things, all within the usual framework of preferring to form relationships with similar people, and scarce or weak, yet peaceful, interaction with different people.

2. Despite the above, it also identifies **minority programmes for living together and positive interaction**, and very positive aspects in terms of promoting local cohesion on citizen and intercultural bases.

3. In addition, the **(also minority) presence of situations of hostility** is also palpable, bringing disagreeable aspects such as latent conflict and considerable risk for social cohesion. (Idem, p. 228.) (Emphasis is our own).

And it added:

In other words, the situation is generally positive but... these three conclusions could be roughly outlined or seen from a **Gauss bell curve** where the central and majority part could be estimated at around 65%, **occupied by coexistence in the territories**, and the attitudes from a majority of the population; the left hand side would match a **minority sector, maybe 20%, demonstrating cohabitation**, and the right hand side would reflect another **minority sector, around 15%, regarding hostility.** (Idem, p. 228.) (Emphasis is our own).

As for the rest, the survey report made several considerations concerning cautious interpretations: “Two points should be cleared up: firstly that the above is merely a rough approximation, specified in figures and specific variables in the report [...]; secondly, that variability by territory and topic can be appreciated, so these general conclusions and this Gauss bell curve are just an image or snapshot of the whole that does not match the detail, wealth and complexity of local life [...].” (Idem. p.228)

Below we give the **specific conclusions** succinctly in each of these main conclusions, calling the reader’s attention to the convergence between this statistical outlook and what was previously indicated in the qualitative field studies:

**1. PREDOMINANCE OF COEXISTENCE**
  — Majority perception on acceptable relations, both in general and in specific fields.
  — Predominance of relationships with similar people and scarce intercultural integration.
— Very different opinions on the extent to which cohabitation rules are met, without a relevant distinction between natives and foreigners.
— Considerable sector of natives have an assimilationist stance.
— Scarce presence of minorities and immigrants in participative programmes, within a context of general low level participation.
— Sector that behaves indifferently.

2. DEMONSTRATIONS OF LIVING TOGETHER, ACTIVE TOLERANCE AND ASPECTS ENCOURAGING COHESION
— A broad majority of the population value the territory’s cultural diversification positively.
— Attitudes of acceptance and encouraging valuation of immigration and trade run by foreigners.
— Low conflict percentages, tackled predominantly peacefully.
— Feeling of local belonging among a majority of those who have arrived over the last few years.
— High rates of registering on the local census, implying setting down roots and standardised access to public resources,

3. SITUATIONS OF HOSTILITY, INTOLERANCE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS FOR COHESION
— Attitudes rejecting immigration and what it represents, by a minority yet recurring sector.
— Feelings of mistreatment or discrimination among a minority yet significant sector of immigrants.
— A relevant sector rejects the idea of non EU foreigners taking part in elections.
— Mistrust from a considerable sector of the population towards “anything Muslim”.

We can finish off this presentation of conclusions from the 2010 survey by mentioning its complementary conclusions, summarising the initial situation and the implications for this in the intervention.

If the previous conclusions are upheld […], we can deduce a series of extra conclusions. We are not referring to other conclusions from content but the practical implication of the aforementioned results in the light of local policies and the intercultural community intervention, as well as continuation of the research and its contribution from the survey. (Idem. p.237)

Among these practical implications, we can deduce several “in the light of local policies and the intercultural community intervention”. They were as follows:
1. Everything practical and necessary is done to encourage social policies and forms of intervention that **consolidate and make the most of existing cohabitation programmes**, particularly acknowledging and valuing positive attitudes to diversity, minorities and immigration present in the majority of local populations.

2. It would also be practical, as much as possible, to **shed coexistence situations** (predominant as shown by the initial qualitative studies and confirmed (expanded and measured) by the survey) in favour of **cohabitation situations**, for which it is crucial to generate relationships, knowledge and collaboration programmes among neighbours and residents in general and between culturally differentiated subjects in particular, as promoted from the ICI Project.

3. Pooling initiatives among the three key players in the community (public and private administrations, technical and professional resources, citizens) should focus on **making sure the “low” or ambivalent zone of coexistence does not drift into hostility** so it is fundamental to work on civic education, positive awareness raising and prevention along with configuring community meeting and relationship spaces.

4. In any case, work has to be **doubled on overcoming present hostility**: isolating it with community strengthening work, reducing it by means of educational work and preventing it from blowing up aggressively and violently by means of generating a “civil conflict culture”. (Idem, p. 237.) (Emphasis is our own).

As we can see, this all ties in perfectly with the approach of the focus that was carried out previously and, above all, opens up the contents of the next two chapters.

In addition, we are going to reproduce the second block of practical conclusions - subtitled in the report **“regarding the continuation of participative research and the survey’s contribution to it”**, reflecting the process of applying knowledge and participative research that was carried out during the first stage of the ICI Project, continuing into its second stage:

5. **Local or territorial variability regarding the measured results should be explained working from a whole series of both extra-local factors** (which being more or less common can affect territories in different ways, such as the situation of the economy, social policies, migratory policy, etc.) and **local factors** (institutional and social policies, programmes and initiatives; conflicts and critical incidents; new settlements, etc.) which frames a collective discussion task.

6. Another practical conclusion is that this first survey has been used to generate a **wide range of indicators** - for assimilationism, feelings of discrimination, Islamophobia, following the rules of living together, social participation, acceptance/rejection in terms of political rights, local belonging, resolving conflicts and others, although the validity or
utility of this series of indicators should be checked and adjusted by contrasting them with other series of indicators (such as Eurostat 2011 on integration, INDEd, Civic Citizenship, etc.) as well as successive surveys.

7. Actually, along with the above, and as foreseen in the ICI Project, carrying out the next periodic surveys will allow us to find out, firstly, the change that is occurring over time in this or that variable (mainly measured using the indicator system) and secondly, and more generally now, the state of living together in each territory. Working from the second survey in 2012, it will be possible, on the other hand, to contrast results in the control intervention territories, key for evaluating the incidence of the actual ICI Project. (Idem, p. 237-238.) (Emphasis is our own).

However, all this leads us beyond the initial situation, already entering the next chapters that will respectively respond not to how we have approached it and what we started with but how we did it (chapter 2), what achievements have been made (chapter 3) and what learning has been obtained (chapter 4).
What have we done and how did we do it?
This second chapter is related to reconstructing the overall experience of the ICI Project during its first stage regarding promoting living together and intercultural citizenship, paying particular attention to what we have done.

If we take up the nine dimensions of living together presented in the previous chapter, we can produce an initial summary presenting what we have done:

1. We have made good use and generated different types of relationship spaces.
2. Attitudes of inclusion and acceptance of diversity have been valued and promoted in the community.
3. Values of respect and well-understood tolerance were promoted and shared.
4. New lines of work have been opened up on living together and standards.
5. The need has been demonstrated for participation and joint-responsibility as requirements to develop living together and social cohesion.
6. Progress has been made in peaceful and preventive conflict management.
7. Social communication has been made easier and improved between neighbours and collectives with different origins and cultural backgrounds.
8. Common civic identity and local belonging have been brought about.
9. Local democracy and institutional proximity have been strengthened.

So, how did we do it? Below, five key parts will be presented, one for each section, in an attempt to summarise how living together was promoted in its different dimensions.

The first section presents the absolute relevance of mediation, as something central and essential in work towards living together always within a community and intercultural methodology.

After slotting in the first steps, the second section tackles generating relationship spaces, without which we cannot talk about living together in the demanding and genuine sense understood within the ICI Project.

The third section presents the in-depth connection that exists between promoting living together on the one hand and the general ICI Project strategy on the other (connection / shared knowledge / community programming).

The fourth section is focussed on communication and how it took place, as it is crucial both for establishing relationships and for the participative nature of the ICI Project and even more importantly, the process.
Finally, the fifth section is dedicated to conflict, a central category to promote living together, specifically referring to preventive, peaceful and positive management of latent and manifest conflict.

2.1 An eminently mediating and intercultural intervention framework

In chapter 1, we saw how the conceptual focus of living together and intercultural citizenship was connected to its meta-practice though making the dimensions of living together operational (relationships, attitudes, axiology, standards, communications, conflicts, etc.). They were used to determine the aspects of reality that should be analysed and on which an impact should be made to achieve changes in local communities. This exercise, absolutely necessary to define the starting and finish point, has required an intervention framework that determines how to act on the real situation and contextualises (and explains) the methodological and operative synergies that occur within the ICI Project.

The intervention framework consisted of eminently interpersonal work, weaving a new scenario of social relations, making a substantial impact on the social and institutional context of the intervention territories. This was an intervention that premeditatively sought to transform and improve social relations in local communities, with the ICI Project acting as a community-scale mediator. The relationship is present, essentially or in a defining way, in the three major concepts and ideals behind the ICI Project. In fact, living together (cohabitation) is, above all, and as opposed to coexistence, a positive relationship although not without tension, conflict and problems. Citizenship is, above all, the connection between members of a political community that recognise each other as free and equal subjects. And interculturality is, above all, the connection or positive interaction between ethno-culturally differentiated subjects.

An intervention focus that, by applying mediation goals and principles to a community field, has promoted mutual adjustment between persons and collectives from different origins and adapting local institutions to the diverse reality of the territories where they worked. Relying on community and intercultural methodologies, it has given sense and coherence to the synergies established between the two.
Promoting living together and social cohesion has implied working on social relationships in the territories (among people, collectives, organisation, professionals, institutions, etc.) to turn them into positive interactions that smooth the way for mutual adjustment, cooperation around a common community project and adapting local institutions to social and cultural diversity. This mediating work to transform social relationships has been supported by two social intervention strategies: community intervention and intercultural mediation. Both possess intervention methodologies and technologies that have been demonstrated as suitable to transform relationships among players in the local communities and adapt resources and institutions to new challenges in society.

Working from these premises, the community scale mediating work in the ICI Project has focussed on modifying the following seven aspects of the real situation:
— Social, intercultural and inter-ethnic relations.
— Revaluation of the different social and cultural collectives.
— Acknowledgement of the parties
— Evening out resources
— Creation of a new context through mutual adjustment and institutional adaptation.
— Constructing an alternative story to overcome the initial situation.
— Creation of a peaceful culture to resolve conflict.

The ultimate purpose and the logic applied in each of these aspects are summarised over the following pages, providing the keys to interpreting the contents of the whole chapter.

### 2.1.1 Transformation of social connections

The essential aspect of the work developed by the ICI Project consisted of improving relationships between people, socially-differentiated collectives, association fabric, public administrations and technical and professional resources. The whole investment made by the ICI Project to make it easier to establish relationships between the different players and key figures, as well as translating this into creating different connection and confluence programmes has fundamentally helped transform intercommunity relations.
When we talk about connections, we are referring to all the social relationships present between the residents, traders, professionals, etc. linked to the territory - interpersonal, inter-group, institutions. Intercultural connections are a sub-set of the above, meaning any social relationships emerging among individual or collective subjects with differentiated cultural backgrounds (different in terms of national origin, race, language, religion). In turn, inter-ethnic connections are a subset of the above, of intercultural connections, only applicable to social and intercultural connections where ethnic identification, classification and hierarchy are relevant.

Improvements to relationships have been summarised through an architecture of relationship spaces (technical, citizen-based, institutional, community meetings, etc.) as stable channels of positive interaction, communication, dialogue and agreement. This latter aspect is outstanding as, although the primordial aim is improving connection, where agreement is a possible, desirable, consequence of this improvement, the ICI Project is proving to be effective in facilitating agreements, as demonstrated by the 16 consensual intercultural, community programmes in as many other territories15.

From the ICI Project’s mediating focus, conflict is perceived as something positive, as a symptom of imbalance and lack of adjustment that occurs within the communities, providing us with an opportunity to move forwards in improving living together, cohesion and social development.

Transforming social connections is mainly making an impact on interpersonal, participative, communications, attitude and conflict dimensions within living together and intercultural citizenship.

2.1.2 Revaluation of the different social and cultural collectives

The ICI Project talks about three key players: citizenship, professionals and representatives from public administration, in a clear allusion to revaluing the different players within the community, evening them out and empowering them, particularly for the most disadvantaged collectives. This refers to evening out and empowering in the sense of taking centre stage among a community’s social relationships.

15 Please refer to volume 2 of this collection.
All the methodological elements developed by the ICI Project have been in line with the idea of empowerment, revaluing and evening out relationships between players and collectives, raising them to the category of key players in their local community. This revaluing has not implied blurring lines between the roles for each player within the community but that the channels, instruments and relationship spaces built within the framework of the ICI Project have facilitated meetings, dialogue, collaboration and agreement between players from each of their roles: public administrators as representatives of the democratically elected government; professional resources as experts and technicians specialised in applying social projects and public policies, and citizens as active participants in detecting needs and problems that affect them and defining the priorities to be met.

The process described has implied an increase in self-esteem and skills for the players and collectives to participate in and influence the design and running of public policies that affect them, strengthening the community as a whole, as well as providing a scenario where the community is better prepared to face dramatic changes within the globalization era, whilst responding to the democratic ideal of participative governance of public and general interest matters. Finally, it has also promoted optimising the territory’s resources by guaranteeing an overall view that has facilitated compatibility of all actions and synergies between the different sector-based policies.

Revaluing players and collectives is mainly making an impact on dimensions involving participation, standards, interpersonal aspects, communications, attitudes and policy within living together and intercultural citizenship.

2.1.3 Acknowledgement of the parties

In any mediating process, it is fundamental to acknowledge each party, a central issue in the intercultural community intervention process in the territories. The ICI Project’s participative methodology has promoted this, making it easy for all players and collectives to participate in the different process elements (relationship spaces, monograph, meetings and community programming, etc.) and acknowledgement of their legitimacy as valid interlocutors. All parties, players and collectives, have received mutual acknowledgement, proving to be sensitive to other groups’ situations and stances.
They worked on personal, interpersonal and cultural factors\textsuperscript{16} that affected each player and collectives as the necessary context to understand how to see and interpret each party’s reality. This work was necessary to be able to give greater acknowledgement: mutual adjustment between socioculturally differentiated collectives and adapting institutions to the diverse reality in each territory.

Acknowledging parties is mainly making an impact on interpersonal, attitude, participative, communicational and axiological dimensions of living together and intercultural citizenship.

### 2.1.4 Evening out resources

In order to make progress in terms of living together and social cohesion, situations of power asymmetry\textsuperscript{17} should be tackled in connections alongside inequality of resources between players and collectives. This should be tackled from two fields: the actual process of strengthening the community and direct intervention on existing social needs and problem issues. Setting up community teams and technical staff relationship spaces have made technical resources available to all players and collectives that are making it possible to even out the existing asymmetry and disparity between them. In turn, the actions, initiatives and projects promoted by the intercultural community process have sought to improve the population’s living conditions, particularly for collectives with limited resources.

Evening out resources is mainly making an impact on standard-based, political, interpersonal, participative and communicational dimensions of living together and intercultural citizenship.

### 2.1.5 Creation of a new social context: mutual adjustment and institutional adaptation

The process of intercultural community intervention seeks to create a new social context through mutual adjustment and institutional adaptation. Mutual adjustment between the native population, immigrant population and the administrations in the intervention territories where

\textsuperscript{16} For further information on the multi-factor intervention methodology in multicultural contexts, distinguishing personal, situational and cultural factors, please refer to GIMÉNEZ (2002). “Planteamiento multifactorial para la mediación y la intervención en contextos multiculturales. Una propuesta metodológica de superación del multiculturalismo” (Multi-factor approach for mediation and intervention in multicultural contexts. A methodological proposal to overcome multiculturalism), volume ii. Minutes from the 3rd Conference on Immigration in Spain, Granada, Intercultural Study Laboratory.

\textsuperscript{17} The concept of power within the framework of the ICI Project is not understood in political terms but as each player’s capacity to influence the positions of other social, professional or public administration players.
the different collectives and players are making social changes required to facilitate integration and cohesion equally for everyone, tackling situations of inequality, discrimination and intolerance. This mutual adjustment process, adapting to each other, in turn, requires commitment from the three key players to adapt institutions to the new context being created, institutional adaptation of healthcare, education, care services and institutions in general.

It can be stated that this is one of the ICI Project’s great achievements. The three years of intervention have generated conditions so that, on the close of this collection, agreements are being reached in the intervention territories to set up institutional relationship spaces and acknowledgement from the administrations regarding the remaining technical and citizen programmes.

All progress being made to transform the context, through social and institutional adaptation to diversity will bring the intercultural community programme ever closer to its ultimate purpose: living together and social cohesion.

Creating a new social context, for mutual adjustment and institutional adaptation, is mainly making an impact on interpersonal, standard-based participative, communicative, attitude and axiology dimensions within living together and intercultural citizenship.

## 2.1.6 Building an alternative story for the local community

Another essential element of the ICI Project is communication, understood to be a whole that encompasses the parts and the message. In this respect, it is strategic to build an alternative story that will overcome the initial situations, the blocks that might exist in resolving local problem issues and the latent or manifest conflicts that might be emerging in the territory.

This construction of an alternative story is taking place throughout the process, taking care of the messages it might be giving out to all the key players and emphasising common ground, how we are alike rather than different. In this way, it has been easier for players and collectives to approach and understand each other. Using the different elements of the intercultural community methodology (information sheets, community monograph, websites, blogs and social networks, etc.), this new, more objective and more positive narrative has been constructed in and by the local communities, making sure that the communication sent out collective-
ly reaches all players and collectives without exception and ensuring that stable communication channels are consolidated.

Strategic methodological elements for building an objectified and positive narrative were the monograph and the community evaluation\(^\text{18}\). Its ability to integrate outlooks from all collectives, players and protagonists has made it possible to reformulate the territory’s history and draw up an alternative shared story, where all parties feel acknowledged. This step was essential to achieve collective appropriation for the ICI Project and implication from all key figures in how to meet the territory’s needs and problem issues through intercultural community programming.

Constructing an alternative story for the local community is mainly having an impact on the identity, communication, axiology and interpersonal dimensions of living together and intercultural citizenship.

### 2.1.7 Creation of a preventive culture, resolving conflict peacefully

All the aforementioned aspects lead to the same result: the construction and consolidation of a culture preventing conflicts and creatively and peacefully resolving them when they appear. Developing this civic and institutional culture is an essential requirement for living together and intercultural citizenship.

Intercommunity communication and the positive interactions brought about by the ICI Project, the architecture created with connection and meeting programmes or mutual adjustment and institutional adaptation being promoted, among other aspects, help enormously to build up a peaceful management culture that is positive and participative in local social conflict issues. In particular, because they are building programmes and instruments for mediation and managing conflict that are known throughout the community and because it is perceived by the majority of players and collectives from the territories as willing to strive for mutual adjustment and acknowledgement for all parties.

The intercultural community process is transforming social relationships, by encouraging transit from one culture that perceives conflict as merely negative and destructive to a conception of conflict as something that comes hand in hand with human and social nature that should

---

\(^{18}\) Please refer to volume 2 of this collection.
be standardised and reformulated as an opportunity to improve local communities. From this perspective, it is helping to make sure that conflict is perceived as the demonstration of imbalances and lack of adaptation that occur within the communities (inequality, discrimination or intolerance) that, once detected, can be tackled through the programmes and mechanisms that the intercultural community process is building. Therefore, the ICI Project is easing this transit towards positive regulation where all players and collectives involved are winners, but above all, promoting the leap from one conception that goes beyond conflict and whose purpose is to improve communication and human relations.

Constructing a preventive culture and positive management of conflict is mainly making an impact on the conflict-based, axiology, communication, interpersonal, standard-based and political dimensions of living together and intercultural citizenship.

2.1.8 Transverse elements: the principles of mediation and intercultural methodology

The previous points described the intervention framework for the ICI Project through the aspects of reality that it aims to modify and on which it is making an impact. However, to achieve results in this direction, an intervention method is recommended that is coherent with the ultimate goals. In this respect, the ICI Project in itself is a community scale mediation method that, by working from the general focus of mediation, has developed a synthesis methodology between community intervention and intercultural mediation. Both social intervention strategies, in terms of synergy and summary, have complements, interlinked and strengthened by shedding light on an innovative method of social intervention: intercultural community intervention.

The characteristics of intercultural community intervention, as well as describing and developing its own methodological elements are tackled in depth in volume 2 of this collection, so this point will be limited to highlighting the mediating and intercultural elements that run right across the entire ICI Project. These elements provide the basic keys to interpreting the remaining contents in this volume.

All fields of the ICI Project, from its intervention focus to its different methodological and operative elements, have applied the principles of intercultural mediation, namely:

— Active respect
— Communication and dialogue
— Mutual knowledge
Living together and social cohesion. Chapter 2

— Positive inter-relation or interaction
— Common participation
— Exchange
— Mutual enrichment
— Strengthening what we have in common

Principles that have been applied in all the ICI Project actions, particularly in the relationship spaces that have been articulated within the different intercultural community processes and in organising and carrying out the different actions and activities in the intervention territories. Insomuch as all types of action, from actions involving community research and assessment to actions for community programming and relationship spaces, have promoted communication, dialogue, interaction, mutual knowledge, respect, exchange, mutual enrichment and strengthening what we have in common.

These principles have been joined by a specific and fundamental principle from the world of mediation that should be respected by everyone that has formed part of the intervention teams, given that in itself the role of team mediator within the intercultural community programme is unmistakable: neutrality, impartiality or equal distance between all parties. These principles should not at all be understood as over-sterile or lacking interest, or as the absence / repression of own values or ideology. Quite to the contrary, this is a matter of consciously adopting a technical and methodological (third party) role differing from the key players in the community. This is worked on in and with the community but they are not a member or key figure in this community.

The members of the intervention teams have taken on the role of process facilitators and mediators between the parties, maintaining the right distance so their position does not favour any side in particular when differences and conflicts emerge. Their only stance in terms of the parties has been their unshakable commitment to the intercultural community process and to its purpose: living together and social cohesion.

In themselves, the principles stated are, in turn, methodological and operative elements as they guide which type of actions should be implemented to encourage cooperative dialogue, positive inter-relations, enriching exchange, active respect or mutual knowledge. Actions that are translated into all types of activities, but that essentially "provoke" communication, meetings, interaction and active participation from the different social and cultural collectives in the territory.

19 Please refer to volume 2 of this collection.
Participation is a key strategic element, fundamental in the community intervention process and essential in intercultural mediation. Without it, it would not be possible to apply the principles that guide all interventions.

Participation is “being present in, being part of, being taken into account by and for, getting involved, intervening, etc. Participating is affecting, influencing and taking responsibility. Participation is a process that necessarily ties in the subjects and the groups; a person’s participation in something relates them to others who are also engaged. Being a participant implies being a co-agent, co-participant, co-operant, co-author, co-responsible.” (Giménez, 2002.)

The participative focus incorporates an entire series of verbs that suggest action (affect, influence, intervene, get involved...) and therefore the capacity to work individually and collectively to transform social relations, the grounding of intercultural community intervention processes.

When applying intercultural methodology elements, care has been taken with communicative difficulties to overcome language or interpretation barriers between the different collectives. In this respect, different cultural views of the players’ real situations have been taken into account by making an effort to translate and mediate, thereby encouraging common ties and collaboration.

The intercultural perspective was essential to guarantee that all social and cultural collectives in the intervention territories were integrated within the different relationship spaces (technicians, citizens, institutional) and actively participated in the community meetings and in the different activities promoted by the ICI Project²⁰. Along this line, participation has also been promoted for migrant persons belonging to ethnic minorities within the social fabric of the community (neighbourhood associations, citizen platforms, parent associations, sports associations, leisure and free-time associations, NGOs, festival committees, etc.) and in the citizen participation programmes organised by public administrations (school councils, civic centres, health boards, citizen councils, etc.).

The ICI Project made sure to facilitate equal access for migrant population and ethnic minorities to public services: education, health, social services, employment, sports, etc. in the intervention territories. The intercultural perspective was useful to guide the change processes in the resources and in the institutions tending to favour mutual adjustment and adaptation of institutions to social and cultural diversity in the local communities.

²⁰ Please refer to the other volumes in the collection, particularly volume 2, focussing on ICI Project methodology.
In the light of the initial point of non-existence or weakness of common aspects of local communities, with a driven sector-based fragmentation in the interventions and with a dispersion of discourse, visions, actions and resources, constructing a common story has emerged as an innovative element within social intervention, overcoming the initial situation, legitimising and bringing together the intercultural community intervention process. During this entire process, it has been essential to make it easier to integrate all existing viewpoints in the local community and put together a positive and shared narrative where all collectives and players feel acknowledged.

2.2
Joining forces as a community to live together: generating relationship spaces

Following the general living together and social cohesion approach as a goal and a focus, in addition to the intervention framework, then a crucial question has to be tackled on how we are working. This refers to generating relationship spaces although not before indicating some elements of specific action in the first three years of the ICI Project to promote living together and intercultural citizenship.

2.2.1 Building strategic alliances

From the very beginning, it was suggested that achieving the purposes, targets and focus of the ICI Project involved putting the topic of living together and intercultural citizenship on the agenda of the main players who govern, work or live in the territory. Below, we will highlight the key agreements that allowed the intervention methodology to be situated, deployed and developed to meet this challenge.

It began by formalising agreements that committed important outstanding players from the territories to promoting the ICI Project. Then an agreement was signed between "la Caixa” Foundation and the local authorities. This stated the town council’s interest in developing the ICI Project and its contribution to making this easy to implement and develop.
In parallel, an agreement was set up between "la Caixa" Foundation and the collaborating organisation in each territory to develop the ICI Project. In this other agreement, the parties promised to implement the focus and the methodological proposal, while the organisation contracted a team with the right qualifications.

Finally, it should be highlighted that an essential part of the organisation assuming ICI Project development involved presenting a document where other organisations, institutions or public and private resources from the territory acknowledged interest and predisposition to contribute to the ICI Project purposes and targets.

These agreements and documents represented an important effort to explain the purposes of the ICI Project and the importance of tackling intercultural living together as a community matter, crossing into all fields of action in the territory with shared responsibilities that required implication from all local players.

The investment in contacts, meetings, draft versions, clarification and, in short, time in these early days, was key to overcome the dominant culture of basing this work on sectors that often runs interventions in neighbourhoods, districts and towns without using local players and wasting all the synergies that using them might represent.

### 2.2.2 The outset and establishing initial connections

Once the agreements had been signed, the collaboration agreements established, and the intervention team members selected, they began to work in the territories with a clearly community and mediating profile. These characteristics were a determining factor in successfully tackling a social intervention aimed at creating the conditions required for each community to discover the potential of working together to improve relationships, and the endogenous response that would allow them to positively tackle the difficulties and conflicts inherent to community life.

The first task that the teams undertook with great dedication and accuracy was initial knowledge of the local situation. This element turned out to be fundamental for a process that claimed to work from the existing situation, making the most of all possible resources and synergies to generate a process to improve the initial situation. As presented in chapter 1, two instruments were used for this work: a) the prior community study and initial assessment of the state of
living together, and b) the survey on social living together and interculturality in high diversity territories. The former was carried out by the intervention teams during the first two months, whilst the latter was carried out by an external company over a similar period, specifically by Metroscopia, supervised by the scientific committee (see appendix III).

The initial study compiled all the information from the first steps made by the teams in the field. It began by getting to know the territory, making great use of tools such as the territory resource map, the diversity map or the sociability situations maps. These plans and materials were built up whilst connections were made with each of the identified resources. This work was run individually or through the presence of the team in all significant spaces of community life, whether they had a resource management and administration component, a direct social intervention purpose regarding specific collectives or they simply represented a group of people with common interests or motivation who developed a social, cultural, sport action, etc. in the neighbourhood, district or town.

Work in these spaces was fundamental for two main reasons: Firstly, the relationship and sociability present in these spaces as a determining element for the general situation in the territory. In other words, the relationships between the different players will affect the way chosen to resolve their differences, the interests and motivations that they share, their outlook and feeling of belonging to the territory, opening up to diversity, that will go a long way to determine the climate of cohabitation, coexistence or hostility present in the neighbourhood, district or town. On the other hand, the only way of reaching the entire territory as a whole is to use the formal and informal spaces that operate in it; linked to it, one line of work that has achieved very good results involved introducing or reinforcing living together, as a priority, and promotion of interculturality as elements of local strengthening and development.

The proposal by the ICI Project, supported by the community methodology, consisted of strengthening or creating, when appropriate, a series of relationship spaces to share knowledge and the territory’s general outlook. It was performed in different ways, and this methodological aspect is explored in greater depth in volume 2 of this collection. Subsequently, we will focus on the contents worked on in these programmes that became very important for the work in favour of intercultural living together.

To sum up, the prior community study and initial assessment of how people live together provided important information to analyse and generally put into context the territory’s own characteristics as well as the relationships that take place there.
On the other hand, the survey aimed to analyse how intercultural living together evolved in the action fields, aiming to provide a useful instrument that would help specify actions carried out within the framework of the ICI Project, more specifically in the intercultural community process it was promoting. In this first 2010 survey, the field work consisted of running 8,928 interviews with people aged over 18 living in the 17 intervention territories and in another 8 control territories.

By crossing these two documents, the prior study and the survey provided very valuable information to establish the baseline or starting point for each of the territories and the ICI Project as a whole. This gave greater possibilities of getting the right local strategy for implementing the ICI Project, whilst obtaining sufficient information to develop an evaluating process that will scientifically measure the work done.

2.2.3 Programmes as essential elements for public dialogue and collective construction

The challenge to develop social intervention that will provide citizen-based and interculturalist praxis in territories with high diversity required, as mentioned above, a community, mediating methodology that will allow joint action from all local players. To do this, a significant part of the work was focussed on building and improving relationships with and between: a) political representatives from the different authorities, b) professional technical resources and c) people living in the territories.

Intercultural mediation provided fundamental instruments to appropriately and positively manage local environments where “racial” and ethnocultural diversity, life styles, origins, languages and religions represent both a challenge and an opportunity. However, the initial situation clearly demonstrated that these topics were being treated by sector and in a fragmented way, locating the migratory process as an external adjacent element and ignoring the importance of making integration a two-way process between the people living in the territory and the latest people to join it.

The basis that was built from the beginning was founded on public dialogue as an essential element to create a “new narrative” where the changes that occur in the territory, as people join the community from abroad, become an element of cohesion to tackle processes together to improve local life through community strengthening. Some of the most important strategies to develop this public dialogue and collective construction are described below:
2.2.3.1 Technical staff relationship spaces

Volume 2, dedicated to methodology, provides details on technical staff relationship spaces, descriptions, types, etc.; here we will only mention them in terms of establishing relationships. After work on identification, presentation of the ICI Project and establishing connections with technical resources in the territory, the strategy consisted of providing a stable presence in all existing spaces, providing elements that might improve social practice and optimising their coordination and cooperation work.

The actual characteristics of the community and mediating teams provided very interesting elements that allow them to: a) connect up programmes, b) introduce general topics and c) provide tools that might positively manage elements of diversity or conflict situations that emerge when tackling a topic. Consequently, these spaces became ideal situations to equip all participating professionals with new skills to manage the existing sociocultural diversity in their daily work, overcoming prejudices, labels or generalities, caused in most cases either by lack of knowledge, analysis or discussion on the changes that have taken place in the territories, or due to lack of connection and interaction between technicians and persons belonging to native or non-native minorities.

Another important element in the community and mediating teams’ contributions involved the multiple initiatives intended to improve existing relationships between highly diverse professional resources. Although there were scarcely any cases of explicit mediation, there were several mediating tools developed to encourage joint work between factions, improving communication or constructively managing different positions and interests; all this took shape over the course of the many meetings held.

Fragmentation of a wide range of technical spaces and a lack of joint vision for the territory meant that in some cases they chose to make a wide-ranging invitation to professionals from different public and private services to participate in a work session with the intention of sharing the situation of the territory, the existing resources and the positive or complex situations relating to intercultural living together.

Far from a one-off, this action attempted to bring about creating an overall, stable technical staff relationship space, achieved in the territories where it was performed. This programme, with its progressive development, optimised all organisation work, making the social intervention more effective and efficient and became a fundamental part of introduce elements to improve intercultural living together.
The Logroño experience (neighbourhoods of Madre de Dios and San José)

As an example, we can summarise the experience from Logroño that brought about the creation of new programmes and strengthened existing programmes. The activity’s singularities include:

— **Wide-ranging attendance**: over eighty technical resources from different authorities, as well as private and public institutions and resources. For the first time in the city of Logroño, a programme was set up to share knowledge and make connections to generate synergies that would contribute to optimising existing resources to improve living together and intercultural citizenship, focussed on the Madre de Dios and San José neighbourhoods, ICI Project territory and concentrating significantly high indices of cultural diversity among the population. According to the local census, in February 2012, 21,989 people lived in this territory, of which 5,394 (23.84%) are foreign, amassing a total of seventy different nationalities. After Spanish, the majority nationalities are Pakistani (1,455), Rumanian (1,318), Moroccan (741), Bolivian (260), Colombian (223), Ecuadorian (218) and Ghanaian (204).

— **Player diversity**: making living together and cultural diversity management common elements to all authorities present in the territory, as well as the work and activities run in public or private fields.

— **Common need**: everyone attending shared the importance of collectively tackling changes and situations that the territory is going through, involving the different sectors and socio-cultural expressions present.

— **Starting point**: this first meeting represented a really key milestone for the local strategy. Progressively, this relationship space between technicians became something stable, with periodic meetings to analyse, share, coordinate, run actions for management and improve living together. As previously mentioned, it was also important from the point of view of creating an excellent relationship space just for living together, where the different technical players can share and debate, with a strong common interest to strengthen the community.
2.2.3.2 Relationship spaces from and with citizens

The publication dedicated to participation (volume 5 of this collection) gives further details of the bases and development of the work to improve citizen relationships in the territories. Here, we will only highlight a few key aspects provided by the praxis in relation to building public dialogue and collective construction.

One of the main conclusions obtained from the initial situation in the territories was the need to tackle basic issues such as the general weakness of relations between “new neighbours” and “born and bred residents” as well as the attitudes of each group. So, the first job for the teams consisted of finding out who they were, where life was played out in the neighbourhood, the district or the town, which places they went to, where they interacted, what type of connections were established and what situations of hostility, coexistence or cohabitation exist; they used different tools for this job, particularly the diversity map or the sociability map that are mentioned in the appendices (see appendix v).

Work by the community and mediating team to build assertive relationships with all citizens was fundamental. To do this they had to spend a lot of time and use participating observation strategies, active listening, presence on all types of programmes, adapting working hours, etc.
The main instrument for work from and with citizens is information and knowledge, all respecting the groups and persons’ intimacy, given that we tackle programmes and often handle very personal or even confidential opinions.

Building relationships, with and from citizenship, in a significant cultural diversity context is not simple; investigating and approaching new groups occasionally requires tackling language difficulties, other times knowledge of cultural skills that helps to approach a family, the children, the women, which topics might be offensive: these are fundamental aspects that professionals should know how to tackle, giving themselves the right information and knowledge required to make the right connections.

In this respect, mediation is important again, specifically mediation that some call natural and that from now on we will call citizen-based. Throughout history, there have always been people that, due to their own characteristics and personal skills have been used as a bridge to create connections between different sides, and it is important to detect who they are in each territory and form an alliance with them that will doubtlessly grow during the community process and will provide fundamental instruments to generate dialogue and interaction between different groups.

When approaching the native population, we have to be highly aware of doing it in such a way that generates the trust required for them to be able to express their opinions, perceptions, fears or uncertainties on what is changing in their territory. It is important to remember that the community and mediating team represents a “third position” meaning that it should distance itself sufficiently from all positions to be able to generate the necessary conditions that help parties weave new relationships. We can highlight this element as, within the heart of connections with the citizens who were born in the neighbourhood or who have lived there for a long time, the changes occurring with the significant arrival of people from other countries and cultures occasionally arouse aggressive feelings and expressions. These attitudes have to be managed from a position that, working from the relationship built with the community and mediating group, allows elements of reflection, analysis and relationship spaces to be introduced. If we label these demonstrations as racist right from the start and we block the connection, these situations will be difficult to transform.

Citizen-based connections have been mainly promoted through four fundamental strategies: a) presence and connection with the entire existing association fabric, b) finding out about and connecting with groups that are not legally constituted, c) activities as a connection element and d) building citizen relationship spaces.
a. Presence and connection with the entire existing association fabric

Prior community studies demonstrated how the neighbour associations in general, with very few exceptions, brought together very few neighbours and no longer represented an important meeting and connection space in the neighbourhoods. In turn, the number of associations was significant in practically all territories although each one represented sector-based or trade-based motivations and interests, etc.

The strategy promoted by some of these “born and bred” associations consisted of providing elements that could update the association’s purposes with the profile of neighbours in the neighbourhood.

The Pueblo Nuevo Neighbours Association

One example of this is what happened with La Popular Neighbours Association, in Pueblo Nuevo (Madrid). When the ICI Project began, only a few people took part in this association and, meanwhile, the team was working with people that met up directly in the park. Little by little, they started working together to bring about the necessary conditions to allow joint dialogue.

The conflict demonstrated by some neighbours and the Local Authority was about to stop actions being run in the public space. From this initial situation, a process was managed encouraging the need to join an association and approach the corresponding administration to agree on the use of these spaces. Here the intercultural community intervention team (henceforth the ICI team) played a fundamental role, allowing the Ecuadorian collective to take part in a dialogue with the neighbours association to help them tackle this dialogue with the town council.

The two collectives joining forces represented enormously significant circumstances: on the one hand, the association revived their work to meet the neighbourhood’s needs and, on the other hand, it was acknowledged by the new neighbours as a legitimate entity to maintain dialogue or pressure on citizen uses and customs and the rules, timetables, etc. in the town.

Initially, this work between the two sides was meticulously supported by a person from the team, making the most of the circumstances to start dialogue on several inter-related aspects: participation of neighbours in the association, the methods used to participate in it, the opportunity that existed to bring the “new neighbours” into the association’s life, etc. All this is not an easy job, you have to have a lot of patience and progress is made according to the pace and needs of all participants; so then, to cut a long story short, the results are better than we might have hoped for.
On the one hand, the difficult situation turned out to be key to bring about meetings and relationships between native neighbours and neighbour associations that, after years of playing a key role, now need to reinvent themselves with participation from the new neighbour profiles; this should be added to all the dialogue established on citizen rights and responsibilities for occupation and handling of public spaces. Finally, the work process left a more powerful association, in the midst of renewal, assuming initiatives, new members and agreeing on how to use municipal facilities correctly.

Using this example from community team colleagues acting in the Pueblo Nuevo neighbourhood in Madrid and belonging to the Rueca Association, it is a good time to demonstrate a specific line of work that attempts to incorporate new neighbours into the existing association fabric from both sides working together.

b. Finding out about and connecting with groups that are not legally constituted

The dedication that the community and mediating team made to find out about and get to know the territories gave in-depth knowledge of all the existing relationships in neighbourhood social life. This let us find out about many groups that did not follow any type of guide and that are invisible to the authorities.

Connection with these groups is entirely relevant as, with the right work, it can connect up the affinities of one particular group (quite varied in terms of cultural origin, gender, hobbies, solidarity, etc.) with a community outlook. In other words, it is fundamental from a work point of view to improve living together to establish cooperative and assertive dialogue with, between and from these groups so they can engage in topics of general interest that go beyond the group’s own interests but at the same time maintain all its idiosyncrasies.

Contexts where sociocultural diversity is particularly significant tend towards informal groups that meet the own affinities of their national and cultural origin although, in turn, subgroups are created due to musical or artistic affinities or shared elements such as a youth or gender subculture. In this respect, knowledge and analysis of how these groups are evolving is important, given that, although initially these groups are formed almost “naturally” or spontaneously on arrival and settling, over time, all these groups, by affinity and elements belonging to the youth subculture, gender, etc. should cause interactions between whoever shares in this common aspect, taking it much further than being a member due to origin, culture, ethnic group, language or religion.
In this respect, we have seen the enormous relevance of knowing about, supporting and establishing close relationships with these groups, where it was also necessary to work on spaces and connections at the same time, emphasising common elements.

Many experiences of good practice in the territories appear in the different volumes of this collection. One of them is the Zaragoza Social Circus. If we look back to the origins of this experience, we see how the community team’s connection with a group of youths doing parkour generated a process that went on to implicate a large number and wide range of players in the territory including public and private resources in the fields of culture, town planning, safety and cleaning. This progressive interweaving process firstly brought about a one day activity and then, over time, it ended up recovering a place in the territory that had deteriorated. And all this through a common interest: activities related to the circus. This is used to generate new and transforming intercultural relationships and a great programme for genuine living together.

c. Activities as a connection, dialogue and collective construction element

In citizen relationships, there is an oft-repeated chorus (particularly among technicians) referring to the fact that “people don’t participate”, “they don’t connect”, “everyone looks after themselves”; it seems to be a characteristic of modern societies. According to the common criticism, it is said that people have lost interest in collective issues. This might explain, for example why neighbour associations, not so long ago the backbone of community life, have gradually assumed an insignificant role in neighbourhood life; furthermore, the number of members is very low and community meetings are practically non-existent.

However, the community and mediator teams have been documenting a very different reality in their work in the territories. It is true that the groups are far more fragmented and that there is no common thread that can generate a “feeling” of sharing the same thing, but it undeniable that life in the neighbourhoods, districts and towns holds an immense and intense offer of programmes and activities that allow exchange, connection and even joint work.

So then, the vast majority of this life of exchanges and relationships has been ignored by individualised, group, technocratic and politicised social intervention that has not been able or not wished to see the immense opportunities within effectively and appropriately managing such a great quantity of information, communication and collective knowledge.

From the very beginning of establishing initial relations, the ICI Project has attempted to make use of all this intense life in the communities, particularly seeking out the more invisible con-
nections by means of attending, promoting, encouraging activities, motivating, compiling proposals from the actual players, making sure they get to the technical or political tables so that they can be carried out, making the most of existing resources.

The process that is constructed and developed from which an idea is collected from a group of people, an association or simply a citizen and is supported by equipping it with elements that help it to be carried out offers many opportunities to generate a real school of living together and promote interculturality.

Preparing an event or an action encompasses, if worked on properly, learning regarding respect for diversity, the need to strengthen equity, building new programmes or adapting existing programmes to a new sociocultural profile in the territory, not to mention the relevance of working specifically on attitudes and values or simply managing differences appropriately.

The initial ICI Project hypothesis was that to improve living together and social cohesion in the territories, it was essential to work on participation from all players from respect and backing cultural diversity as an element that strengthens the community by: a) generating a collective process of knowledge, analysis and collective construction, and b) encouraging, assisting and facilitating interculturalist and peaceful praxis through (existing or newly created) actions.

Two strategies have been developed to generate dialogue and collective construction from specific activities. The first is based on intense work on knowledge of what already exists: who organises it, how do they do it, what connections they have with the administrations, technicians and citizens, how they tackle sociocultural diversity, the results this achieves. Working from all this knowledge, obtained from generating an assertive and trust relationship, this is a matter of introducing aspects that provide elements to enrich it and turn it into another medium working on progress in living together, cohesion, interculturality, etc.

The existing activities it is working from can be encouraged from public or private administrations, such as a health week, cultural festivals, fairs, etc. or from citizen organisations such as local festivals, sporting events, etc.

The second strategy that has been developed involved activities encouraged by the actual ICI Project that are designed from the information held on what already existed in the territory and taking into account the matrix or grid mentioned in chapter 1. These activities encouraged by the actual ICI Project attempt to: a) provide elements that complete the whole offer
of actions developed by emphasising needs or situations that have been expressed by key figures in the community and b) generate a process that from an initial time encompasses elements that allow the community to equip itself with new relationships, setting up meetings between people who do not usually work or have fun together, recovering or providing positive elements to programmes that had a bad image, bringing about conditions for the actual activity to allow the community to “educate itself” to work together. In other words, this involves holding positive meetings, letting each other speak, bringing about participation and promoting distributive leadership, giving local players new skills to manage all sociocultural diversity in a positive way.

These actions have been promoted from the ICI Project and supported economically with a small budget that should be completed with own resources provided by all local participants. Actions have varied widely; the many actions performed include: actions to promote family participation, commercial boost, training session cycles, youth and child participation, inter-generational sports, musical, artistic activities, etc. Many of them are mentioned and developed throughout the collection, emphasising their participative, educational and health aspects 21, etc. Subsequently, we will do the same with some in this volume, emphasising their contribution to intercultural living together.

d. **Promotion or creation of citizen relationship spaces**

Promoting participation in the territories as an essential element to make progress in promoting intercultural living together suggested the need to include the existence of stable citizen work programmes among the intervention strategies being run.

These programmes have played a relevant role to strike up dialogue between neighbours, residents, traders, professionals, representatives, etc. and to promote development of an inclusive process where everyone living in the territories works on actions to collectively construct initiatives that strengthen community life and help improve everyone’s standard of living.

People participating in these programmes might be representing others (formal or informal groups, associations, collectives, etc.) or just individuals. Two lines of work have been followed: a) strengthening citizen programmes that already existed in the territories such as an organisation coordinator and b) ad hoc creation of new citizen programmes in the community.

21 Please refer to volumes 3, 4 and 5 on education, health and participation, respectively.
Regarding the first line of work, it has been possible to see how the existence of a solid citizen space, along with support from the community teams, plays a key role to tackle the challenge of citizen implication in the intercultural community process.

In the city of Tortosa, for example, excellent work has been run from a citizen programme called Xarxa per la Convivència, originating from a previous project that, by sharing intercultural living together as a purpose with the ICI Project, used intercultural mediation as an intervention methodology. A wide range of professionals, supervisors and citizens have been participating and collaborating in Xarxa for many years, creating a valuable style of cooperative dialogue.

Another example was the work developed using the Inter-Religious Dialogue Council in the neighbourhood of El Raval (district in the centre of Barcelona). This programme has been very interesting as it contributes the existence and implication of different religious communities in the neighbourhood, as a community strengthening element; this work has come up with products such as a map on religious diversity in the territory or a festival calendar.

Two experiences from intercultural relationship spaces: the Inter-religious Group from the neighbourhood of El Raval and Xarxa per la Convivència in Tortosa

The El Raval Inter-religious Group and Xarxa per la Convivència are strategic intercultural relationship spaces in the territory that existed prior to the ICI Project in each of the territories. The ICI Project task focussed on promoting and stimulating the Group and the Xarxa’s connections with other relationship spaces promoted within the framework of developing the overall community process.

Both programmes have made a clear contribution to encouraging intercultural programmes on living together as well as knowledge, dialogue and understanding between the key players in the community, just by looking at: a) its composition, b) its goals and work topics and c) the specific products of its action.

a. If we look at its composition, the Inter-religious Group provides a relationship space between the different entities and representative associations for the different religions in the territory: Consell Islàmic de Catalunya, Camí de la Pau Islamic Centre, El Carme Parochial Community, Tuluyan - San Benito Philippine Centre, La Cera Evangelical Church, Asociación Interculturalitat i Convivència, Benallar Foundation, Barcelona Centre Protestant Church, Asociación Amical dels Immigrants Marroquis a Catalunya, Asociación Cultural, Educativa, Social Operativa de Dones Pakistaneses, Asociación Intercultural Diàlegs de Dona, Gur-
Meanwhile, Xarxa per la Convivència is defined as a construction programme, open to all neighbours, associations, entities, professionals and institutions, and it tackles a much wider spectrum of participants as it is not hemmed in by a specific topic or an action target as in the case of the Inter-religious Group.

b. Regarding the targets and topics, the Inter-religious Group focuses on promoting social cohesion and living together in the El Raval neighbourhood, through interaction and joint work by the different cultural and religious communities living in the territory. The Inter-religious Group carries out actions aimed at intercultural and religious knowledge. Just being aware of the number of conflicts that are justified for religious reasons, we can see the importance of inter-religious programmes where respect, dialogue and the peace culture are more important than any cultural difference or religious creed.

In the case of the Xarxa per la Convivència, its goal is broader: encouraging a community process that helps to improve intercultural living together relations in the city of Tortosa.

c. Specific products. The El Raval Inter-religious Group action can be summarised in two particular products: the festival calendar and the map of places of worship in the neighbourhood. The aim of designing these products was to promote intercultural and inter-religious knowledge, bringing the territory population closer to the different cultural, community, socio-political and religious celebrations in the neighbourhood as well as teaching the neighbours of El Raval about the different religious resources in the neighbourhood.
In the case of the Xarxa, we can highlight organisation or participation in actions that help to develop their goals, compiled in the point above. Examples of products are the community monograph where the Xarxa took an active part, the five Public Dialogues for Living Together that they organised and holding the different editions of Global Citizen Action (ArtXiBarri). The content of these actions and products can be consulted in the Xarxa blog along with their corresponding videos and photos. http://xarxaperlaconvivencia.blogspot.com.es/
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As far as newly created programmes are concerned, we can highlight some such as in neighbourhoods in the Southern District of Jerez, known as the Grupo Motor de Ciudadanía de la Zona Sur (Southern Zone Citizens Group). This programme was key for joint construction of actions that would generate better conditions for citizen participation. Over thirty collectives and associations participated in this programme, taking an outstanding role at key points in the ICI Process such as the assessment or intercultural community programming and developing specific products such as a community guide to show off the wealth of associations and the work they carry out.

Developing citizen relationship spaces has played a fundamental role in the ICI Project, stimulating dialogue from every aspect of the diversity present in the territory and doubtlessly creating situations that have been strengthening collective construction elements. Volumes 2 and 5 give more extensive information on the development or results achieved.

2.2.3.3 Institutional relationship spaces
Building intercultural living together is framed within a local territory where there are legitimate institutions in a democratic framework; a particularly relevant part of the ICI Project’s success lies in its ability to strengthen joint work between them.
The intercultural community intervention developed backed creating a meeting and relationship space bringing in public administrations whose competences in the territory are decisive; the town council can thereby add local government, regional governments, boroughs, autonomous communities, universities, as well as private institutions (tied to civil society, the world of economics and the service sector).

The category of institutional adaptation takes on great value here, due to the fact that many of the changes the territories are undergoing, such as related to migration (changes in daily visibility of differences, concentration process and even forming residential ghettos, new users of public services, places for prayer and worship, the need for professionals to take refresher courses, etc.) have a direct connection between local and global and require being assumed quickly and appropriately by the administrations and institutions. This is and will be a fundamental element to measure community strengthening.

In this respect, they have worked intensely so that intercultural living together might be well positioned on the political and public agenda for these institutions. From the outset of the ICI Project, all the administrations listened to presentations on its purpose, as well the importance of participation in the intercultural community process promoted and encouraged from the ICI Project. Consequently, the project was presented to institutions related to education, health, housing, security, employment, etc.

Whilst the ICI Project was running, an attempt was made to obtain maximum possible implication through participation from technicians in the work programmes that were set up. From the third year of the ICI Project, once the intercultural community programming had been attained, a strategy was developed to create a stable institutional relationship space that can: a) assume the social intervention developed as a positive fact for the territory, b) legitimise the valuable joint work that has been developed by the technicians from the different administrations, c) make continuity possible, as well as increasing implication in the intercultural community process and d) equip the intercultural community process with an institutional structure that provides legitimacy to optimise all resources in the territory in favour of intercultural living together.
2.3

The connection between promoting living together and the general strategy for the Intercultural Community Intervention Project

In the previous points, we showed some key aspects that constitute the fundamental pillars to develop the ICI Project. As mentioned previously, the methodological model that we have developed is inspired by two main methodologies: a) community intervention and b) intercultural mediation.

Below, we will continue developing key elements of the methodology in more detail, emphasising their contribution to intercultural living together; they are all tackled from a more general and technical perspective in the publication entitled *Intercultural Community Intervention Methodology* within this collection.

The ICI Project intervention strategy focussed as a fundamental means of improving intercultural living together as development of local, social and civic citizenship implying the application of a “focus on rights” meaning working altogether from rights and responsibilities to improve the standard of living in the territory.

To do this, it was fundamental to work from local belonging as a central element in the origin and design of any intervention to acknowledge the wealth provided by the different cultural backgrounds present in the territory and the community.

The idea was to combine rights and responsibilities for everyone to participate in improving the territory from a *responsibility ethics* focus meaning that life in the neighbourhood, district or town would improve if the three key players (administrations, technical resources and citizens) met their responsibilities correctly.

The social intervention developed from the ICI Project boosted an intercultural community process revolving around belonging. So, three fundamental phases were suggested in the strategy and the path to be followed. The first, building relationships; the second, shared knowledge and the third, intercultural community programming.
From the field of mediation and supported by the circular narrative mediation model, we are attempting to build an “alternate story” involving looking in greater depth at communication so that the three key players know all about the territory, share outlooks and agree on a shared strategy on what has to be done to improve the standard of living in the territory. Doubtlessly, achieving a new story on the community jointly constructed by its key players is a particularly significant contribution to move forwards in intercultural living together.

2.3.1 Establishing connections: identification and recognition of all diversity

The first major task for the community teams consisted of and consists of finding out as much as possible about the intervention territory. To do this, it is fundamental to develop direct work, in the field, ethnographics, that help us make contact with the three key players (administrations, technical resources and citizens) by means of presenting the ICI Project and participating in the social life in the neighbourhood, district or town.

The work of professionals from the ICI team begins by meticulously observing everything that happens in the territory and subsequently describing it using different instruments. Given the cohabitation importance of the presence of all types of cultural diversity (not only provided by gypsies or immigrants) and of sociability in the territory, emphasis is put on the presence and existing connection between ethnoculturally different collectives, their concentration or not in certain zones and schools plus their connection with situations of cohabitation, coexistence or hostility.

This contact work in the territories led to two important achievements: firstly, obtaining information that would determine deployment of the intercultural community process and secondly, even more relevant, establishing assertive relationships with the main local players. By means of knowledge and valuing what already exists, it is possible to strengthen the feeling of belonging to the community as well as an opportunity to take part, work together, share and start a process.

In this phase, the teams use a series of instruments to be able to: a) work in an orderly fashion and go into greater depth on all aspects necessary for the intervention, and b) document all the information obtained. This latter aspect is fundamental due to the fact that one of the crucial elements of any intervention is giving back the work performed in the community to all the players.
In order to develop the first steps in the territory, maps are very useful tools to document and go into greater depth on knowledge of what already exists; so it was extremely useful to draw up the following: a) a cultural diversity map for the territory and b) a social map or sociogram (see appendices V and VI).

Another fundamental element was the resources map such as the map produced by the Madre de Dios - San José technical staff relationship space in Logroño.

This first phase of running the ICI Project was able to obtain two products with considerable importance. a) the community file and b) the prior community study and the initial assessment of how people live together.

22 Please refer to volume 2 of this collection.
2.3.2 Shared knowledge and intercultural community programming: essential elements to improve living together

We are working so that the territories are equipped with an intercultural community process as a fundamental mainstay for their strengthening; this is how we understand that living together can be assumed as a positive interaction, assuming that conflict, tension and problems are all present within its enormous diversity but by working so that they are tackled with dialogue and negotiations, from active respect in any case and of course without physical, symbolic or structural violence.

In this respect, and once the territory is familiar and relationships have been established with the main players (both aspects have to be constantly updated) the following steps become extremely relevant: both shared knowledge and intercultural community programming are fundamental and strategic methodological elements for positive interaction from all sociocultural groups in the territory and the community and from a common aim, such as improving the standard of living for everyone23.

The combination and strength of the community methodology and mediation can generate the necessary conditions to tackle collective construction that aims to deal with coexistence situations (marked by non-aggressive yet distant, passive and minimal relationship) or hostility situations featuring clear rejection or mistrust towards certain collectives or persons.

This phase of the ICI Project attempts to strengthen living together from an in-depth focus with a citizen-based approach, given that it provides:

a. Great or better knowledge of the place that is governed, worked in or lived in; not mere knowledge from a few people but shared.

b. It is completely open to participation from all people, groups, collectives, institutions, etc.

c. It creates a context of equality conceiving citizenship as more than just legal-political authority, tackling it from its social and local dimension, where proximity and the everyday aspect belonging to a territorial community are key factors.

d. Local belonging: given that it studies the territory’s needs and potential to work on improving living conditions for everyone.

23 Please refer to volume 2 of this collection.
e. From developing a **participative democracy**, strengthening the role played by the institutions but using dialogue and direct connections with all people working and living in the neighbourhoods, districts and towns.

The shared knowledge and intercultural community programming suggest developing participative research as an essential action. This allows community players to tackle a process of change - intended to improve social cohesion and the standard of living for everyone - given that the research process allows the community to get to know itself and make the very best use of all the resources available to work together. This pooled work is carried out in accordance with a series of priorities identified in an assessment that are met from a planned strategy in the intercultural community programming.

The participative research helps to generate a series of **improbable spaces** where active relationships for mutual learning are strengthened. Developing techniques such as listening help to generate a context guaranteeing that:

a. Everyone who wishes to take part can do so.

b. Each person's opinion has the same value whether this person is a politician, a technician or a recently arrived citizen.

c. Appropriate work is strengthened that guarantees the existence of intercultural communication that can strengthen participation from all collectives, segments or sociocultural expressions in this neighbourhood or district or town.

d. Suitable conditions are created to work on active respect, well understood and experienced tolerance as acceptance of something different. **Collective discussions** prove that a heterogeneous group is capable of sharing by strengthening basic and central values such as the right to be listened to and, in short, to participate.

Developing participative research can strengthen shared identities for everyone living there, governing or working in the territories, given that it is a specific exercise in developing citizenship from a broad, all-inclusive dimension that has a connection with the territory where the ICI project is being run.

The shared knowledge is fed by a specific product such as the **community monograph**. Its public presentation and acceptance by the three key players represent an important collective milestone for community life, given that it did not exist beforehand. This monograph contains an overall view of the territory that combines a more "objective" part obtained via the sector-based wisdom of the technicians, founded in reports, studies, research, etc. and another "subjective"
part obtained mainly via participative research, compiling the diversity of representations, perceptions, opinions and proposals present among the territory’s inhabitants.

This collective and shared knowledge can bring together and emphasise the general interests and duly position the specific interests of different players in the community. Assuming the community monograph as a collective instrument is vital to make building a community assessment the next step.

It is clear that all situations, needs and problem issues cannot be tackled at the same time and with the same priorities as any community’s resources are always limited. Consequently, it is fundamental that the three key players establish a cooperative dialogue process that can set one or two priorities on which to make an important significant joint effort to make it possible to improve the local situation.

The community assessment leads to developing a planned strategy of consensual actions among the three key players that we call \textit{intercultural community programming}.

The intercultural community programming represents a collective effort to provide greater organisation to managing the social intervention locally and it is carried out from the conviction that achieving this agreement or collective treaty is directly related to strengthening the community and therefore improving conditions for intercultural living together.

In summary, developing shared knowledge and intercultural community programming means that a profoundly participative process can be developed, guaranteeing equality and clearly and decidedly backing interculturality, improving how existing cultural diversity is managed. This also makes it possible to build a new narrative on the local situation, positively, shared by all players and collectives as a group.

Finally, we wished to highlight the contribution from this strategy and set of steps or phases to developing a participative democracy, meaning a local political life that respects the crucial role played by the institutions and political leaders and, at the same time, creates opportunities to approach technicians and citizens, thereby constructing solid and sustainable social cohesion altogether.

Volume 2 on methodology, provides specific examples of the work carried out by the different territories when drawing up the community monograph, developing intercultural community programming (working from the assessment) or the participative processes tied to setting up relationships with the different players and collectives.
Communication as a key element for participation

Communication in the ICI Project has been understood as a whole that encompasses the parts (all players and collectives) and the message. From this perspective, what type of communication taking place, and how, has been fundamental. On the one hand, care has been taken with the message that is sent out to all players, emphasising common points to make it easier to approach and understand each other. On the other hand, care was taken with the language used according to who was on the receiving end, particularly with each sociocultural collective. All this, through wide-ranging, continuous information to the local community as a whole, on the actions, activities and events relating to the intercultural community process.

This constant flow of information is what has made it possible for the people in the intervention territories, independently of their availability or motivation regarding the ICI Project, to remain connected to the process and aware, not only of its progress, but also the existing channels of communication and participation.

Communication within the framework of the ICI Project has been worked on via two specific lines: on the one hand, community information, belonging to the process and aimed at the actual local community; on the other, the media (radio, press, TV) with greater reach and projection.

Community information\textsuperscript{24} should keep in mind the existence of possible language and cultural barriers as well as different interpretations of the real situation according to a person’s social and cultural origins. For this reason, care was taken so that no collective was left behind in the process, particularly the culturally differentiated collectives. Immigrants from North African, Sub-Saharan or Asian origin, among others, might come up against informative, psychological, linguistic, legal or social barriers when participating in the intercultural community process so the ICI Project attempted to overcome these obstacles.

\textsuperscript{24} Please refer to volume 2 of this collection.
From this perspective, we have made sure that community information reaches the community, without exceptions, through the process communication tools (information sheets, posters, leaflets, blogs, social networks, etc.) and making sure that the message is appropriate for each recipient, both in their languages (technical or familiar) and in the languages to be used and the cultural aspects to be handled.

The effort to adapt communication to each type of recipient has also been applied to the main ICI Project products such as the community monograph, essential to guarantee shared knowledge and narrative of the real situation. A mention should also go, as an example, to the Chinese translation of the monograph in Tortosa.
The work carried out with the media aims to put across a positive image of the intervention territories and publicly introduce the ICI Project as a proposal for managing diversity that can be extrapolated to other contexts. Transmitting a positive image of the intervention territories was a necessity, particularly for any perceived negatively or even stigmatised by the rest of the inhabitants in a city or area where the territory was located. The chance to put across a different image of the territory, thanks to appearing in the media (mainly, although not exclusively, local) for initiatives promoting living together and certain aspects of the reality in these local communities, was a strategic issue, not only because it helps improve the external image but because this type of positive, outward-looking news helps to increase confidence and self-esteem among neighbours regarding their capability to transform their own situation and encourages identification and a feeling of belonging to the local community.

Since the start of the ICI Project, the intervention teams have made the most of the opportunities that have arisen to spread the word on the process implemented in each territory. Over time, their skills and capabilities have improved to attract the media’s attention, a job that requires a strategy to be defined and communication to be planned if they wish to get results with the media. In this respect, local teams have been very well advised and supported by the “la Caixa” Foundation Communication Area. Consequently, it has been seen that, as the invention years went by, the number of overall media hits for the ICI Project increased. Whilst 520 hits were recorded in 2010 and 2012, there were 706 in 2013 alone, more than in the previous years put together.

**Everyone should feel at home**

“Everyone should feel at home” was the headline chosen by the El País journalist to compile the living together and intercultural citizenship promotion experience run by the ICI Project in Las Margaritas neighbourhood, in the town of Getafe (Madrid region).

The main aim was not so much to generate a media hit with a high number of readers to spread the word on the ICI Project but it also intended to put the message across that when different key figures, mainly citizens in this case, are organised around cooperation and collaboration structures, they generate positive relationship spaces where cultural diversity is understood as an enriching element.

To do this, a meeting was organised among different members of the neighbourhood (who participated actively in community life) and the journalist writing the report. They were all members either of the neighbourhood festival committee or the neighbourhood committee, or even both. In addition, some of them participated in the neighbourhood’s community life through
their associations for immigrants, non-formal education, etc. Therefore, this was a group of men and women, young and old that not only represented the neighbourhood’s cultural diversity but also the citizens’ commitment to making their neighbourhood a place for living together and intercultural citizenship.

One important task for the ICI team was to prepare the interview with the neighbours. To do this, they spoke with each neighbour beforehand. They explained the aim of the interview and what was expected of them: putting across what they were doing to improve citizen relationships in Las Margaritas through the neighbourhood festival, education workshops, health activities, children’s activities, etc. Everyone who had planned to participate in the interview agreed. In some ways, taking part represented acknowledging the value of their participation in the neighbourhood’s community life.

Before the interview, a group meeting was organised to make sure that the message they wanted to put across was clear and that the neighbours did not wish another aspect to be reflected on their neighbourhood.
Of course, if this report were carried out on this volume’s date of publication, it would not be the ICI team suggesting and organising how to tackle the interview but the different citizen participation programmes set up during the community process would autonomously decide who would represent them and the message to put across, without rejecting support from technical resources.

The article was the result of coordinated work between the ICI team in the territory and the “la Caixa” Foundation Communication department.

2.5 Contributing to positive management of conflict issues

All the work described throughout these pages leads to the same purpose: positive conflict management and improved living together. Deploying the intercultural community intervention in the territories is encouraging the emergence of a civic and institutional culture to resolve conflict creatively and positively, by channelling conflict through relationship spaces, meetings, dialogue and agreement set within the framework of the ICI Project. This conflict management is strengthened by contributions from intercultural mediation in resolving specific cases.

For greater efficiency in conflict management, the ICI Project has developed preventive work that not only attempts to stop conflict arising but has helped to create bases so that when it has emerged, it has been conceived as an opportunity to improve the state of things. This is an occasion to understand ‘the other’, work together and reach an agreement where everyone wins.

From this point of view, particular relevance has been given to actions on awareness-raising and education on values promoting mutual respect, intercultural dialogue and living together. Educational actions have permeated throughout the ICI Project, making the most of programmes such as neighbourhood festivals, activities in schools or actions in parks and squares, to name just a few examples, including adding and valuing initiatives that have put across these values through training, recreation and art.
There was also special meaning for preventive work carried out in public places, where conflicts tend to arise associated with the use made of them by different social and cultural collectives. Volume 5 of this collection looks in greater depth at the different types of prevention carried out in fields such as sports courts, parks and squares.

However, despite all the investments made in prevention and construction of dialogue and management mechanisms for conflict, there are times when conflict must be tackled with specific mediation techniques due to its complexity or deadlock on both sides. Here is where the ICI teams have played a relevant role, working as mediators making it easier for conflicts to be resolved positively. As an example, there is the case of mediation in the Campillo de la Virgen de Nou Barris.

**El Campillo de la Virgen: a conflict management experience**

The Campillo de la Virgen park is a public area located in the Torre Barró neighbourhood, in the Nou Barris district. Until 2010, it was rough ground that the neighbours used for different leisure and free-time activities. The work, carried out by the town council, required to transform this useless land into the current park were the result of repeated demands from neighbours. After its inauguration, this space, previously used only by “born and bred neighbours” began to be used by neighbours from different origins, particularly Ecuadorians whose main use revolved around playing *ecavoley* (sporting variation of volleyball).

The shared use of public space soon stirred up problems among its users, people from the neighbourhood and the district, aggravated by lack of connections between the different groups and the consequent lack of knowledge concerning each group’s interests and needs regarding how the park is used.

**The conflict**

Several elements detonated the cohabitation conflict among park users. On the one hand, the presence of foreign neighbours in a public place that was only used before by native neighbours generated mistrust among the latter. This mistrust was due to the lack of relationships between the different groups and exaggerated by using the public place in a different way. One of the groups, part of the conflict, were members of the Club de Petanca Torre Baró that used the park to play petanca (bowls). Some neighbours used the park individually to take a walk, play other sports or simply as a recreation area. And finally, there was the group of neighbours that met up to play *ecavoley*, using the park intensively, around which activities sprang up such as carts selling food and alcohol, going against the municipal rules in force. This differentiated use made the native neighbours feel like they had been invaded.
The definitive trigger, bringing about the intervention, was the violent expression of latent conflict. It was during the St John’s Festival in 2011 (Midsummer’s Eve) that a fight broke out between Spanish and Ecuadorian neighbours where alcohol consumption was certainly a catalyst.

**The intervention**

Due to this unfortunate event it was decided, due to lack of programmes or instruments for mediation or conflict resolution, as proposed by the ICI teams in the territory and the El Torrent Association, to set up the Mesa del Campillo (El Campillo Council). Made up of a group of neighbours who usually played *ecuavoley* in the park, neighbours from the Club de Petanca de Torre Baró, the priest from the Parish of Santa Bernadetta, technical resources from Barcelona City Council, street educators, the Torre Baró Neighbour Association, the El Torrent Association and the ICI Project team, its immediate aim was to reduce the clear conflict, preventing similar events from happening again. In the medium-term, it was centred on generating meeting spaces that would promote mutual understanding programmes and making it possible to use this public place together.

The first task for the El Campillo council focussed on analysing what had happened. The cause of the conflict was isolated and clarified; it had more to do with abusive alcohol consumption than an act of hatred between neighbours with different cultural origins. Subsequently, the intervention focussed on mitigating mistrust among the neighbours. To do this, they ran joint activities between the different groups of park users to encourage a shared use of the space and to seek out common interests. The agreements compiled in the Campillo de la Virgen Cohabitation Commandments should be highlighted as a relevant milestone in the mediation process. This refers to a series of rules for using public places, agreed collectively. The Council members promise to keep them and tell other park users about them. They are:

— The following agreements were made working from the *Campillo de la Virgen Rules for Use*, extracted from the Barcelona City Council civics rules.
— It is forbidden to consume alcohol or place bets.
— It is forbidden to relieve yourself in inappropriate places.
— There will be two keys for the toilets: one for the Club de Petanca and another for the ecuavoley collective who will be responsible for cleaning them.
— The space, furniture and facilities will be kept in good condition.
— The El Campillo Council will monitor that the space is kept in good condition.
— No space will be occupied indiscriminately if the activity or attendance does not justify it.
— Nets will be put up when there are sufficient players. In summer from 4 to 10 pm. In winter from 2 to 8 pm.
— Activities that might generate disputes over space will be agreed on beforehand.
— The El Campillo Council and the Torre Baró Neighbour Association will promote living together and participation.

Learning
The first lesson we have learnt from this experience is that, when conflict arises, it is fundamental to provide a fast, well-organised response. The coordinated intervention between different main figures from the administration, technical resources and citizens, by setting up the
El Campillo Council, meant that the conflict did not get out of hand and encouraged actions to promote living together and intercultural citizenship.

The El Campillo Council, meeting periodically from the very beginning, has been consolidated as a connection and mediation programme. And although it was created as a response to a manifest conflict, it soon became a benchmark instrument for prevention and promotion in the district. Such is the case that Ciutat Meridiana (another neighbourhood in the Nou Barris district) set up a Cohabitation Committee to prevent conflict derived from the use of public spaces. And along this line we can highlight a second lesson learnt: it is easier for a community to use organised prevention actions to promote living together than acting on manifest conflict.
Achievements, results and impacts on living together and social cohesion
Now the time has come to identify and systematize the main achievements, results and impacts on living together and intercultural citizenship in the first three years of ICI Project development and the processes that have been deployed.

We can group the following summaries into seven discussion lines, each one providing details of their meaning, as well as a series of signs, data or manifestations of the different achievements.

— Location of common good and general interest in the public agenda for the diverse community.
— Contributions to consolidating coexistence and turning it into cohabitation (living together).
— Prevention, reduction and overcoming hostility.
— Extension of citizenship and joint-responsibility.
— Integration of minorities as social cohesion of the whole.
— Making use of diversity to boost and qualify common projects.
— Improvements in the internal and external perception of the territory as a place to live together.

Promoting living together and validation of an intervention model: two types of highly inter-related achievements.

Before going on to tackle each of these seven blocks of results and impacts, it is practical to summarise the set of achievements that were obtained in the first stage of the ICI Project as a framework and as an introduction. Taking into account the initial context and the baseline set in chapter 1 and after the three years of the ICI Project, two types of achievements can be identified:

1. Achievements referring to results and impacts on improving intercultural living together and social cohesion, related to target 1 in the ICI Project (promoting living together in 17 territories) and that we mention in detail in this section.

2. Achievements referring to validation of work hypotheses, strategies and intervention instruments, related to target 2 of the ICI Project (generation and validation of an intervention model) and that is tackled, above all, in volume 2 of this collection, Joining Forces to Live Together.

We would refer readers to this volume and the others in the series. However, below we will list some of the methodological type achievements that are now particularly relevant, when appropriate:

a. The confluence and conceptual and methodological synthesis of the community intervention and mediation from an intercultural focus. The effectiveness and efficiency of integrating the community intervention and intercultural mediation focuses have been val-
idated in the 17 territories working from:
— Setting up technical, citizen and administration relationship spaces.
— Running participative research and community monographs.
— Drawing up information sheets and other community information instruments.
— Developing community meetings between the three main key players.
— The approach of intercultural community programming.
— Applying intercultural mediation in prevention and treatment of conflicts.
— Setting up sociocultural enabling actions that have encouraged wider and more diverse ways of participating among the population.

d. Social cohesion and living together as a fundamental purpose of social intervention.
In the ICI Project intervention territories, the partial view of considering immigration as a one-off and sector-based issue that should be tackled with specific resources has practically disappeared. The process in the first stage of the ICI Project (September 2010 - August 2013) meant that we could build a social perception, in a participative way with the three key players, where we could start to approach elements of common general interest and, also to a certain extent, partisanship.

c. The contribution from intercultural community mediation as a strategy and method to develop relationships and for common construction among the main social players in a complex and difficult reality, where needs and cuts are both on the up. Connections have been tackled from nine dimensions or fundamental principles to promote living together in contexts of high cultural diversity and the synergistic mediation connections.

Table no. 2. Principles and synergic relationships of intercultural community mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of intercultural community mediation</th>
<th>Intercultural community mediation synergistic principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— Active respect</td>
<td>— Transformation of social relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Mutual knowledge</td>
<td>— Revaluing different collectives, bringing them to the forefront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Communication and dialogue</td>
<td>— Acknowledgement of the parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Interaction</td>
<td>— Evening out resources out between parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Inter-relation</td>
<td>— Creation of a new social context of mutual adjustment and institutional adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Common participation</td>
<td>— Construction of an alternate story, assumed by the players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Exchange</td>
<td>— Genesis of a civic conflict culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Mutual enrichment</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Strengthening what we have in common</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Community health and education’s contribution to promoting intercultural living together and social cohesion. The ICI Project has taken both fields of intervention as having special strategic capacity to accelerate the community process and strengthen relations between key players, to the extent that both refer to accessing essential public services that should be equal for the entire population (inclusion) but that has been significantly affected by cuts in public policies since the recession.

However, work around these two lines of intervention has not been a separate or isolated sector-based job, but action lines generally linked to a marked sense of process, contributing from the specific (health or education) to the general intercultural community process. This has allowed growing implication in it from agents in the health or education field in the different ICI Project actions in the territories.

Regarding the ICI Project impacts, this refers to the effects that the suggested intervention has on the local context in the field of living together and intercultural citizenship. They measure modifications that have taken place in relation to the ICI Project proposals or purposes. In other words, the medium-long term effects on the environment are observed, tied to the ICI Project purposes or targets and related to the intervention carried out.

From its very design, the ICI Project claimed to have, in the medium and long term, a general impact on inclusion and social cohesion as well as specific impacts to improve integration, interculturality, living together, citizenship and community strengthening. Although it is too early to scientifically measure the positive impact of the project on living together and social cohesion, in the following sections of the chapter we will analyse the first signs of impact after three years of execution.
Graph no. 8. The virtuous cycle of the intercultural community process
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Living together and social cohesion. Chapter 3
According to the previous diagram, when we talk about the **intercultural community process** we are referring to transforming social relationships in the intervention territories, making it easier to establish a type of connection that did not exist before between the three key players (administrations, professionals and citizens) around a shared cohabitation and social development project, that includes all social and cultural collectives and that, in parallel, promotes transformation of the social context and the institutions to adapt to diversity and the population’s needs.

After this introduction, we can now tackle each of the seven blocks that we previously used to frame the results and impacts regarding promotion of living together and intercultural citizenship and social cohesion in the 17 intervention territories in the first stage of the ICI Project.

### 3.1 What progress has been made regarding putting common good and general interest on the public agenda for the diverse community?

There are **three key principles** that have allowed progress to be made in this field.

1. **The existence of the same conceptual and methodological approach applied to a wide variety of territories**, where Local Authorities and service sector entities have been given a central role to implement and manage the intervention.
2. **The clear, unambiguous location of the ICI Project in the field of participative democracy, as an element of integration and strengthening representative democracy.**
3. **The central focus of interculturality and diversity, on the one hand, and the community process and participation on the other**, as catalysts and backbones for the new local reality.

This has been made possible by **two strategic elements** that help to apply the intercultural community intervention model in the different territories.
1. Opening and availability of the "la Caixa" Foundation. Promoting and funding the ICI Project, equipped with an unspecific, community and mediator team where priority is given to full, public interest in the intervention and implication from all the key players, therefore substituting the character of a mere user or beneficiary of the population (belonging to other projects) in favour of a participative and starring role, meaning that in general people play a more active citizen role, particularly citizens, public leaders and professionals in the territory.

2. Assuming the town council as a fundamental reference and "partner" in the ICI Project. This means establishing a nuclear partnership with State representatives in the intervention territories, despite the political and social difficulties that this brought about, particularly during a recession with predominant budget cuts, swimming against the tide nowadays. And, in this respect, the inter-institutional dialogue was particularly far-reaching that took place between the town council, as the benchmark authority, the "la Caixa" Foundation, as sponsor and funder of the ICI Project and the social entities, responsible for its technical implementation.

The intervention territories are now demonstrating the need to make living together and social cohesion a fundamental purpose of public policies and an explicit priority to meet local challenges, that has been publicly laid down in the Declaration for intercultural living together and social cohesion signed in Madrid by the town councils participating in the ICI Project as a conclusion to its first stage (see appendix I).

This collective effort carried out in 17 territories by over 7,600 persons, including supervisors from the local authorities, technical and professional resources (from the Administration and service sector) and citizens (organised and non-organised), has come to light in the form of drawing up or suggesting intercultural community programming, from an outlook jointly constructed by the key players that, in their entirety, have explicit contents on living together and community monographs that reflect explicit and detailed references on diversity in the territories and analyse ways of socialising - levels of cohabitation, coexistence and hostility. This was used to create better conditions to generate strategic alliances required to continue making progress in developing a social intervention model that favours and strengthens social cohesion and intercultural living together.

Public implication of the town councils in the intercultural community process, despite the present difficulties, has represented fundamental progress in acknowledging the role of the ICI Project (“the ICI Project is not just another project”) and the “factual” if not always “rightful” acknowledgement of the need to seek out new lines in the light of the challenge of living together and social cohesion and facing the need to give a more integral and commu-
Community response to new and old social demands. All this is happening at an extremely difficult time for relations between the Administration and citizens, due to cuts and economic hardships in significant sectors of the population.

The political and institutional implication of the town councils has made it easier and has regulated, to a large extent, the implication of the municipal technical benchmark and the set of professional resources from the town and other administrations, in turn engaged in activities and initiatives related in one way or another to the intercultural community process. With a view to the second ICI Project (begun in September 2013), this means that intercultural community programming can be assumed with better and more solid perspectives.

In several cases, some very important, the ICI Project and the intercultural community methodology are being assumed as a reference or support for other plans for the public administrations, to be extended to other territories (neighbourhoods or districts in the city) or to redirect their lines of work by some foundations or social organisations.

In conclusion, public administrations are now part of the intercultural community process in all the territories, with different levels of implication and with different levels of acceptance, despite enormous difficulties right now. All this makes it possible to move forward more decidedly towards constructing an institutional space that can add on effort and resources to the intercultural community processes implemented by the ICI Project.

Another positive impact is the ICI Project’s effect on public discourse and the media, thanks to a consistent communication strategy in the territories aiming to:

— Give positive visibility to the frequency stigmatised territories by means of a process in which mediation is described as positive reformulation and positive connotation.
— Implicate the population, professionals and political leaders as key players in positive news and improvement initiatives.
— Spread the word on a solid approach to tackle diversity and local living together.

The intervention teams and other players can take an active part in designing and developing the strategies, tools and communication practices.
3.2

What contributions have been made to consolidating coexistence and turning it into cohabitation?

The general impact envisaged is associated with the ICI Project’s capacity to slow down, avoid and overcome social exclusion processes and situations in territories with high diversity. In this respect, the most substantial progress is mainly tied to:

— **Consolidation of relationship spaces** promoted within the ICI Project. A mention should be given to the work carried out between ethnoculturally differentiated collectives where communication has been brought about between people and groups that were previously indifferent to or rejected one another.

— **Joint development of initiatives** that have helped to generate a feeling of belonging to the territory, beyond origins and existing cultural diversity.

This is upheld in the different monitoring and assessment reports drawn up within the ICI Project as well as quantitative analysis of the intervention’s effects on the territory included in the general report *Social and intercultural living together in territories with high diversity*, working from the 2012 survey data on intercultural living together in the local field\(^2^5\) (see Appendix vii). The latter presents seven complex indicators: **Interpersonal, attitude, standard-based, association-based, belonging and discrimination; all linked to social cohesion and the quality of intercultural connections** and constructed from the ICI Project’s conceptual framework. These indicators have been calculated by working from 57 other indicators (simple indicators working from a single variable and compound indicators with two or more variables) and they help to detect signs of specific impact\(^2^6\).

---

\(^{25}\) GIMÉNEZ, C. & LOBERA, J. (2014). This report analyses the evolution from the start of the ICI Project in 2010 to October 2012 for indicators related to quality of intercultural connections with a direct link to the ICI Project, comparing them with control territories where the Project was not run.

\(^{26}\) As indicated in the aforementioned report (p.208): “Simple indicators are made up of a single variable whilst compound indicators are made up of two or more. Complex indicators, on the other hand, are the result of grouping together simple and compound indicators in the seven dimensions selected from the ICI Project conceptual framework.”
Graph no. 9. Impacts related with equal treatment, active respect and positive interaction

Impact related to generating or promoting
a. Equal behaviour in open, educational and healthcare programmes;
b. Active respect and consideration towards anything that is different;
c. Positive and collaborative interaction among neighbours.

Impact indices
– Effect of the recession: Slight worsening of the Complex Discrimination index (+1.1%) and drop in Complex Respect index (5%)
– Considerable improvement in intercultural connections in the 17 territories. Improvement of Positive Interaction (Complex Interpersonal index) (5%)

The positive results related to **interculatinality**, meaning, to improving positive interactions in the intervention territories, could be measured within the framework of the 2012 survey. The complex interpersonal indicator, measuring whether there has been an improvement in intercultural relations, recorded an increase of 5.4 points on the starting point in 2010, whilst this number fell in the control territories27.

Not all the dimensions evaluated have shown positive trends. The complex indicator for discrimination, measuring behaviour in the different programmes, recorded a minimal increase in the intervention territories (+1.1 percent) that is fundamentally explained within the framework of the impact of the recession on the territories. However, this is a particularly important aspect for the ICI Project, due to decisive backing of inclusion models and so it is going to require appropriate monitoring and attention in its second stage.

On the other hand, the complex indicator for respect has dropped both in intervention territories (-5 percent) and in the control territories (-6 percent). Among other perceptions, this measures solidarity, religious tolerance and acceptance of foreign immigrants in the territory. This

27 The variation is -3.1 in the control territories, corroborating that the intense work to build relationships, particularly during the first two years, has been reflected in an improvement in intercultural relations.
worsening might point to how a feeling of greater individualism is growing alongside a loss of values and social cohesion as the recession begins to bite.

In relation to measuring positive interaction and collaboration between neighbours, the evolution is positive and we can corroborate it again with the complex interpersonal indicator: +5 points in the intervention territories compared to +2 in the control.

There have also been other positive impacts from the perspective of living together.

Graph no. 10. Impacts related with co-existence and hostility

Impact related to
a. Territories will not live in mere coexistence;
b. They will have overcome or isolated certain elements of hostility (mistrust, insults) and prevented the emergence of future hostilities.

Impact indices
- Important change of perception regarding the territories: identification with more positive elements
- Recession effect: slight worsening of the Complex Attitude Index (down 1.6%) more contained than in the control territories.
- Relevance of activities for Children, Young People and Families (in 2013, more than 20 free-time and leisure activities, 40 training activities, 23 festive and 9 cultural activities)

Table no. 3. Key ideas (2012 survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predominant coexistence relations in public places. More signs of living together among neighbours with daily contact and living close to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive perception of the neighbourhoods: safe, good places to live, not perceived as hostile or cohabitation conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recession is perceived negatively but not transferred as an impact to the perception of living together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICI Project has generated an important change in perception relating to the territories where participation and meeting processes are visible between Administration and citizens to improve the existing situation. Carrying out the monograph, the assessment and the community programming are specific and visible steps in this process of transforming the territories and constructing living together and intercultural citizenship.
The survey data timidly reflects these results. The complex indicator for attitude shows a slight worsening both in the intervention territories (-1.6 percent) and in the control territories where it was more acute (-4.7). This drop is explained by general social and economic evolution after four years of recession, but it is more contained in the intervention territories where a range of different organised activities have been deployed specifically for different collectives and that has counted on native and foreign population.

There is noteworthy relevance to the set of activities organised for children, young people and families over these years. Just in 2013, this refers to over 20 leisure and free-time activities, 40 training activities, 23 festival activities and 9 cultural activities. This rich and varied deployment has significantly contributed to living together in the territories to the extent that this has brought about positive interactions. In this case, the complex interpersonal indicator compiled in the 2012 survey has seen an upturn, plus 5 percent for positive interaction among residents in the intervention territories compared to 2.4 in the control territories.

3.3 What achievements have been made in prevention, reduction and overcoming hostility?

As revealed by the 2012 survey (Giménez & Lobera, 2014), for the time being, the recession has not had a significant impact on the perception of local diversity. The greatest change that might be mentioned since 2010 (date of the first survey and the start of the ICI Project) was a slight rise in ambivalent positions. However, there are three main conclusions that the 2012 survey report reflects (p. 200-201):

a. **Maintenance of a predominantly positive context regarding social cohesion in territories studied with high diversity.** The following positive elements might be highlighted:
   — **Slight improvement in resolving conflicts.** The conflicts experienced by the subject and that people deemed to be resolved went from 61% to 65% whilst unresolved conflict went from 36% to 33%.
   — **Slight increase in feelings of belonging to the neighbourhood,** from 40% to 43%.
— **Preference for staying in the neighbourhood**, with a slight increase of two points, whilst the preference for moving to another neighbourhood dropped six points.

— **Slight increase in satisfaction with the local environment**. Persons that stated they were very or quite happy in their town went from 76% to 78% whilst dissatisfaction dropped by two points from 12% to 10%.

The report highlights the significant result that there has been no inclination towards hostility “in the midst of political cuts, with continuous growth of unemployment, with processes such as evictions and in a general atmosphere of citizen protests of all types and criticism of the “political class” and, in any case, at a time of “difficulty, suffering and uncertainty” (p. 200). Just because cohabitation and coexistence have not deteriorated, or the discourse or attitudes towards immigration have not become tougher, it does not mean that there is no other “negative” data to take into account, as mentioned by its authors.

**b. Better social and intercultural living together situation in the whole of Spanish society than in the territories with high diversity being studied.** The perception of acceptable relations (cohabitation + coexistence) is more positive in Spain as a whole than in the territories with high diversity being studied. This means, according to the authors, that “the main challenge for intercultural living together lies precisely in territories with high diversity” (p.201) and would confirm the need to consolidate actions and policies as contemplated in the ICI Project.

**Table no. 4. Key ideas (2012 survey)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— There is the majority perception that most living together rules are met in the residence building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Almost half the population in the study territories feel that the basic rules of living together are not met in their neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— The national population tends to perceive less abiding by the rules of living together than the foreign population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— There is a high degree of agreement on the existence of values of tolerance and living together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— One in every five Spaniards in the study territories expresses intolerant opinions towards cultural diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Among immigrants with school age children, there is a predominant preference for cultural fusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Explicit intolerance is a little higher among people aged over 55 than among people under 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— The level of manifest conflict among the population in the study territories is relatively low, around 16%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Discussions and verbal aggressions are the most frequent type of conflict, with a minority presence of more serious conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— One in every three incidents that took place in the territories remains unresolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— When they are resolved, the main way of transforming conflicts is direct dialogue between the persons involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c. Slight deterioration in the state of living together in some specific aspects.** The less positive results from the 2012 survey compared to the 2010 survey refer to:

— **A downturn in explicit acceptance of immigration** among the native population (from
has been a spread of citizenship and joint-responsibility?

The progress made over these three years is mainly seen in the three aspects of particular interest for the ICI Project impact that have made it possible to draw up objective answers among the three key players, both in preventing conflicts and promoting positive interactions as part of living together:

— The focus is extended to the entire community, meaning all the different existing origins and sociocultural expressions.
— Diversity is tackled from a broad set of social resources: health, education, security, sport, culture, etc.
— Politicians, technical-professional resources and the actual citizens take joint responsibility for this work.

The immediate result is **community strengthening** that is captured in co-responsible collaboration among the key figures from drawing up the community monograph to the agreed definition for intercultural community programming, involving joint participation for all players (design and running) in different actions carried out by the ICI Project in the territory. An alternate story is being built up by the three key players that helps to overcome the initial situation, based on a shared view of reality, mutual acknowledgement and exercising co-responsibility among all of them in terms of meeting the challenges and needs facing the community.

The **new dialogue-based centrality of the town council** in the process and how it deals with diversity, compared to previous community experiences, is another result of the ICI Project.
Although the presence of an administration is important, this is particularly relevant in a local atmosphere and a greater political and institutional responsibility due to its direct and immediate connection with the population and its needs, independently of and beyond its specific administrative authority.

Despite current general difficulties for anyone standing up to local governments, the municipal institution has been strengthened thanks to the intercultural community process under-way in the intervention territories. On the other hand, acknowledgement of their central and starring role in the territory’s social politics can establish a new connection with the citizens. This is key to develop the intercultural community process and particularly to encourage implication from other public administrations and private entities that manage resources and work in the territory.

Mutual acknowledgement has been the basis for establishing a new relationship “between” the key players. The process has allowed and brought to light the need for meetings, dialogue and collaboration between the three key players in the actual process and the social reality in general: the administrations governing the “public aspect”, the technical-scientific resources that manage programmes and services and the population or citizens, often assumed as a simple recipient and not as an active subject, to change and improve their community reality. Each one has their roles without mixing them up.

This new relationship can be interpreted and catalogued as a simple functional mechanism. However, this doubtlessly refers to initial steps towards ambitions for a more participative democracy, with more dialogue, more “cohabited”, where the element of diversity, ideological or biased differences does not prevent but rather, on the contrary, it enriches community life and makes it possible to find points to come together and improve what already exists. This co-responsibility between players constitutes a substantial element for any approach to living together and social cohesion. The process has encouraged these meetings and dialogue and has offered organised times and places, useful products and specific, visible initiatives for all this. And it has allowed acknowledgement of the need to implicate the three key players, to be able to move forwards and give a valid response to the old and new social demands in a real climate of living together and social cohesion. Naturally, it is not all plain sailing and there are always contradictions, limitations, backwards steps and errors.

Another palpable result from this community strengthening and mutual adjustment of the key players is acknowledgement for technical-professional services as a community resource when generally working from a situation where the population barely knows about existing
resources, their purposes and their actions. The process, through work to value what already exists, not only facilitates and allows better and more extensive knowledge of the resources and how they work in the community but it helps make their existence and their individual and collective work more public, bringing to light the whole set as collective and community patrimony. The resources guide drawn up in different territories within the framework of the ICI Project or the boost to creating technical staff relationship spaces has contributed to this acknowledgement, avoiding the danger of the technocratic cave.

Both elements have made it possible to establish collaborative and permanent relationships among all the existing technical resources, a sine qua non condition to be able to exchange experiences, collaborations, integrate programmes and services, run common projects, etc. This fact in itself ensures a substantial improvement on what already exists, also able to tackle the challenge of community programming derived from the shared knowledge (monograph and community assessment): all this lays down the work programme for the second stage in the fields of organisation and development.

The ICI Project’s contribution to building a technical staff relationship space, actually recognised by the public administrations and private entities related to the territory, has freed up time and work, for all professionals, dedicated to jointly producing community products (such as the monograph, the assessment and the first programming lines) with a clear intercultural focus that would not otherwise exist. In turn, these products bring another two consequences with them: on the one hand, they help and improve what already exists and on the other, they allow coordinated, cross-discipline and integrated confrontation of priority topics that can only be dealt with together.

The cultural change compared to the recent past is enormous and heralds passing from sector-based and fragmented use of professional resources to what we might define as “community use”. The new reality of the territory’s set of resources and their participation in the intercultural community process have effectively contributed to the fact that many services, and even some administrations, have come up with internal changes, assuming the hypothesis of a “community change” towards the intercultural focus to develop their work.

The implication and participation of professional resources has been great and valuable. But the most important aspect might be that the professionals have rediscovered citizens, discovering them as an active and necessary subject of social change and not as recipients/users of services. The presence and active participation of professionals in community activities, outside their working hours, has also been a revelation for citizens.
Another aspect to highlight is the impact that the community process has had on some professionals, particularly any that traditionally followed hand-out dynamics, isolated from other citizen services, as might be the case of the social-healthcare professionals. This has made it possible to get to know other technical resources outside their usual relationships, in the sense of revaluing and becoming aware of the potential of coordinating their action with other resources.

Also as part of the mutual acknowledgement of the three key players, the ICI Project is also reinforcing the citizen perspective thanks to significant deployment of activities and processes in which citizens actively participate to improve territories. Some data illustrates this valuation: in the intercultural community processes under way in the territories, 7,642 participants have been recorded including administrations, professionals and citizens.

**Graph no. 11. Impacts related with normativity and belonging**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact related to</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Residents from these areas see and treat each other as free subjects with equal rights and responsibilities;</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Progress will have been made in the meaning and common feeling of belonging to the neighbourhood and esteem towards the local aspect that is common to everyone, and</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The public institutions’ implication (from the Town Council, school, health centre, etc.) will have been strengthened in participative management of the area’s diversity and civic respect for public institutions.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis from the 2012 survey and its comparison with results from 2010 corroborate these positive results and show signs of progress from a citizen perspective.

The complex standard-based indicator has increased since 2010 in the intervention territories (+5.2 percent) more than in the control territories (+0.5 percent). This indicator measures the perception or positive attitude regarding whether rules are followed, both in the building’s immediate surroundings and rules that regulate public space or the neighbourhood in general.
The aforementioned increase reflects increased interaction and maintenance of positive attitudes as a result of intense work to promote relationships in the territories.

On the other hand, the complex belonging indicator presents an upturn in both the intervention territories (+4.5 percent) and the control territories (+3.7 percent); this partly proves the positive effects of the ICI Project on the feeling of belonging to the neighbourhood.

However, the same 2012 survey continues to demonstrate very low participation figures, among both Spanish and foreign residents. Barely 5% of the foreign population living in the territories with high diversity being studied is tied to any immigrant association. The right for foreigners to vote in local elections is defended by half the Spanish population and by 71% of foreigners.

3.5
Are minorities being integrated as a key element in joint social cohesion?

From the perspective of intercultural community mediation, it contemplates not only the need for mutual acknowledgement among the key players as illustrated in the previous section but also evening out the population in terms of access to resources and setting up a new context through mutual adjustment for the key players and institutional adaptation to social and cultural diversity in the territories. In this respect, the intercultural community process has been promoted by taking into account equal access for migrant population and people belonging to ethnic minorities to public services including education, health, social services, employment, sports, etc. although this result should be looked at in greater depth in the second stage of the ICI Project, as upheld in chapter 4.

During the first stage and particularly in the third year (September 2012 - August 2013), it was possible to see that the community process brought about participation from a large number of people within the framework of different programmes, fields of intervention, specific initiatives, extraordinary activities, talks, etc. This participation (with different degrees of implication and continuity) has been a constant in the intercultural community process, demonstrating a grow-
ing and constant trend. Beyond its difficulties and intrinsic contradictions, this element doubt-
lessly represents a result and collective patrimony for the intercultural community process.

The most substantial modification is that in the intervention territories not everyone but a lot
of people knew or perceived in one way or another that there is “something” (a process, commu-
nity team, entity, etc.) that was tackling general interest topics, promoting activities where eve-
ryone can participate and that very different people can take part in these activities, regardless
of their culture, gender, age, condition, role (administrators, technicians and citizens) and that
it is all public and anyone who wishes to take part can do so. The fact that this focus or commu-

nity enabling centre exists in the territory is really the new and fundamental aspect that was
achieved in the first stage. This does not mean that everyone participates in this process (that
would be an idyllic outlook, and not real) but that they can potentially do so because it is open,
they are informed about it and nobody is excluded regardless of their character or situation.

Beyond demagogic outlooks, citizen participation (multi and intercultural, evermore independ-
ent) has been one of the fundamental axes of the ICI Project in the first three years. With highs
and lows, difficulties and wise decisions, moving forwards and backwards at times, the ICI Project
has always acted openly and inclusively. And all this has taken place in the territories guarantee-
ing mutual respect and equality meaning that living together and social cohesion were being con-
structed at all times.

The participation programmes promoted within the framework of the ICI Project are some-
thing more. They are equal participation programmes, with non-hierarchic, equal relationships
between the three key players, respecting each one’s different role and in favour of participative
democracy. Independently of the degree of conflict and the asymmetrical connections between
the players in the territory, the ICI Project programmes have worked from this community and
mediating perspective (dialogue, listening and mutual acknowledgement) that has taken col-
aboration relationships one step further.

In themselves, the elements of the intercultural community methodology fulfil a highly rele-
vant symbolic and emblematic function: making it visible and understandable to everyone
that the way of doing things in the ICI Project attempts to relate in-depth and systematically to
the project’s purpose and values.

In this sense, we are talking about integration and social cohesion from the key players build-
ing a new community and intercultural story.
The first signs of impact relating to integration could be measured two years after the ICI Project began and are related, among other factors, to the consolidation of the relationship spaces built within the framework of the ICI Project and with good management of the sociocultural diversity in the activities carried out, both from the global action line and from each of the specific lines.

Analysis of the 2012 survey results reflects this initial progress. The complex interpersonal indicator demonstrates a 5 percentage improvement in positive interaction between residents in the intervention territories. Along the same line, the complex association-based indicator shows increased participation in different associations in the territories, up 2.7 points. In a general initial context that we classified as “low participation”, an increase of 2.7 points is significant and reflects the work being done with citizens and in the different relationship spaces, also taking into account that, in the control territories where the ICI Project is not being implemented, there is a downward trend of 2.1 points. It is equally remarkable that the socio-educational field, specifically school parent associations (AMPA), has recorded the greatest increase in participation, corroborating the importance of work carried out in this field.
3.6
What steps are being taken to make the most of diversity as a resource to encourage and classify common projects?

The results obtained regarding mutual acknowledgement and work with and among the three key players (community strengthening) mentioned in sections 3.6 and 3.7 constitute important progress in defining and implementing common projects with a community, integral and intercultural perspective, fundamentally from building shared knowledge. Although this section has emphasised the central role of the town council and the progress made regarding technical and professional resources’ work, on this occasion we might add the impact on community strengthening from the active role played by citizens over the first three years of the ICI Project.
The actions carried out in this time have brought a conceptual and methodological proposal to local practice that has made it possible to jointly construct intercultural community programming and all this from integral knowledge of the territory, using technical and survival instruments working from generating optimum conditions for participation from everyone who governs, works or lives in the territories. It has demonstrated the wisdom of introducing methodological instruments that can help administrations, the professionals’ work and the actual citizen relationships adapt to the needs of a complex social reality and a multicultural
context that changes at an ever-increasing pace and where migratory processes have a crucial and significant influence.

From the beginning, the ICI Project has assumed the challenge of active and conscious implication from citizens in the intercultural community process; both from citizens already participating in social groups and organisations and individual citizens. Although citizen participation is acknowledged by the Constitution and by other laws in different fields or social sectors (participation regulations in the municipal field: health boards, school boards, etc.), the crisis in politics and among parties and general connections between the people governing and those being governed are not in their finest hour. However, the work carried out in this complex context has been able to **provide answers with and from the citizens**, including:

— **All ICI Project activities**, initiatives, actions (both overall and specific) have always counted on participation from groups, associations and individuals with whom connections have been established, demonstrating cultural diversity and creating equal intercultural connection situations, that does not mean that 100% of what already existed has been covered, acknowledging that there are gaps in the connection work.

— Programmes, **bodies and core groups** have been set up in all territories to ensure citizen participation in any initiative or activity. In this section, it is particularly relevant to mention participation in the monograph and listening activities and other community initiatives.

— **Community meetings** were the milestones that most demonstrated and publicised the intercultural feeling of the community process.

In order to implicate citizens and help them participate in the ICI Project, different tools have been used that have turned out to be valuable and effective, such as **global citizen action**, the **open summer school** and other initiatives in the community health and education fields. This has led to progress in inclusion and participation of many social organisations, groups of young people, women or old people, and many individuals, sharing something in common and breaking down former barriers, not only related to cultural diversity.
### Table no. 5. The contribution of education and community health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific action line for Community Education:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— 235 professionals involved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 747 activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 32,128 participants (72.4% diversity).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Growing implication of socio-educational agents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Sustainability: the ICI Team role tends to be less and the territory agents gradually assume a promoting role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Open Summer School: this has been consolidated as a key strategy to enable territories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific action line for Community Health:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— 154 professionals involved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 450 activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 13,889 participants (58.4% diversity).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Community health has been consolidated as one of the process centres of attention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Growing implication from health agents has intensified as they take on a promoting role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work carried out during the first stage consolidates **collaborative and cooperative local work dynamics** in all territories that are a considerable improvement on what existed at the start of the intervention in 2010. Developing a participative, innovative, collective and solidly-based social practice is encouraging **sustainability** for all the work carried out in favour of positive, effective and efficient management of cultural diversity for living together and social cohesion. The ICI Project development has been able to value the methodology it applied as a contribution to **integrated management of social policies**, an essential element for effective, efficient and sustainable social intervention.

In the first three years of the ICI Project, new conditions and situations were generated that configured a new scenario for the intervention. Although it might seem partly premature, some signs of impact can be identified that, in the long run, could uphold sustainability outside an intervention. These **sustainability indices** are concerned with **contents, relationships and programmes**.

— In relation to the contents, one element of particular interest for community process sustainability is the important work carried out by the three key players within the framework of **intercultural community programming**. This important collective effort has been carried out in all the territories and it has been specified in consensual strategic documents that will make up the **collective route map**.

— Regarding the **established relationships**, progress is being made on sustainability thanks to high **implication from the three key players** and the tendency of the ICI teams, already seen in the third year, to start to approach certain activities in a collaborative way rather than promoting them. This trend has particularly been seen in the socio-educational action line, where the number of agents in the territory has grown considerably, gradually assum-
ing an activity-promoting role.
— Finally, consolidation of **stable and recognised programmes** by the three key players has helped to generate a culture and work practice that encourages sustainability, particularly the configuration of **technical staff relationship spaces although also the steps in some territories prior to setting up institutional relationship spaces**, a milestone that will be dealt with intensely in the second stage. Regarding the former, these work and relationship spaces between professionals and technicians work actively (although with different degrees of implementation and implantation) in all the territories and they have a considerable effect on coordinating and generating synergies and complicity. In some territories, there are also conditions and the first steps, although tentative and uneven, have been taken to implement the **pooled local structure** that will be a key pillar for sustainability.

**Graph no. 14. Impact related with the process, participation and community organisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– Enabling of participation produces community strengthening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Progress towards a culture of participation and collective construction of territory transformation processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Considerable progress in Intercultural Community Programming and consolidation of Community Organisation in the territories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Increase in participation in associations that act in the territory (particularly parents’ associations).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact refers to**

a. An own and sustainable community process will have been enabled in these territories;
b. Community organisation and participation will have been increased and improved.
c. The community will have been equipped with shared knowledge that will help it to carry out an Assessment and Intercultural Community Programming.

The important results in quantitative and qualitative terms obtained in this dimension are widely documented in the weekly and monthly monitoring reports, as well as the quarterly and annual assessment reports produced within the ICI Project. They prove the important progress made in intercultural community programming and the consolidation of the community organisation in the territories. All this is generating a culture of participation and collective construction of transformation processes that might lead us to hope that the ICI Project might make an
impact on community strengthening that is also corroborated by the evolution of the complex association-based indicator analysed from the data in the 2012 survey; it increased 2.7 points between 2010 and 2012, while it dropped 2.1 points in the control territories.

The results and impacts of community strengthening have been produced over the three years of the ICI Project.

In the **first year**, the work focussed mainly on three tasks:
— Full knowledge of the territory.
— Establishing positive relationships with and among players.
— Knowledge of existing resources.

In total, 1,623 contacts were made with different collective players. At the close of the first year, there was a collaboration connection with 377 contacts and an engagement connection with 253 of them. In total, 3,375 actions were counted including activities and meetings.

In the **second year** of intervention, significant progress was seen related to:
— Generating actions and processes intended to improve living together, development of interculturality and local strengthening; in addition there were a number of activities with high and diverse participation from technical resources and citizens.
— The implementation of a methodological focus that started to give excellent quantitative and qualitative results thanks to shared knowledge and building technical staff relationship spaces.

This process attempted to promote the feeling of belonging to the territory and a common project, and 29,159 people participated in it.

In the **third year**, the intervention model or hypothesis was consolidated with the intercultural community programming progress plus connection and meetings among the three key players - community meetings. Community meetings were held in 88% of the territories (15 out of 17). 1,781 people took part in the first community meetings: 298 administrators, 554 professional resources and 987 citizens. There were 1,898 participants in the second community meetings: 195 administrators, 340 professional resources and 1,189 citizens. As far as cultural diversity is concerned, the first meetings were attended by 158 people from 26 different nationalities, and the second meetings by 336 people from 41 nationalities.
The three years of the ICI Project have made it possible for the territories to make an initial pact between administrations, technical resources and citizens to improve social transformation in the community. This is a collective and collaborative planning tool making it possible to get cooperation and social commitment thanks to a positive interaction, living together and exchange process working from effective management of all existing diversity and from positive conflict.

The data provided helps to affirm that progress is being made in checking one of the initial hypotheses: enabling participation produces community strengthening. This progress is particularly seen in the socio-educational field. The ICI Project has helped to generate a new way of connecting with and among the key players, generating common initiatives that worked from what was being done in the territories. Intercultural community processes have provided purposes, principles and universally acknowledged values, human and technical-scientific resources, etc. to be able to tackle the complexity of the path to meeting our goals. And it is the actual community (its key players, its resources, its potential, etc.) that has to act by participating, defining times, pace and specific paths from which to describe endogenous responses to its needs, problem issues and challenges.

As a summary of the results listed in sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 with an impact on community strengthening in the territories where the ICI Project has been developed, the following could be highlighted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>BY KEY PLAYER</th>
<th>FOREIGN NEIGHBOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Medium / territories</td>
<td>Public managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First meetings</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second meetings</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 15 out of 17 territories
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Table no. 7. Community strength

| — The territorial community has been consolidated as a promotional intervention unit for Living Together and Intercultural Citizenship |
| — Improvement in the acknowledgement and work between the three key players: administrations, particularly locally, technical resources and citizens |
| — In 100% of the territories, there is a programme hypothesis with each of the key players, as well as community spaces: implication can be seen from the three key players. |

Main achievements:
1. New central role of the Town Council
2. Connection with the public administrations
3. A new connection “among” the key players
4. Technical-professional services as a community resource
5. Citizen participation

3.7

What improvements are being made in the internal and external perception of the territory as a place to live together?

Applying the intervention model has made way for valuable connection and communication processes **recognising the great potential and existing knowledge in the community.** In some cases, even after only three years, this has **helped to create a more positive, less stigmatised, image of the territory.**

The positive “visibility” of the territory - the neighbourhood, district, area, village, etc. - takes on a new representation and also a new starring role in several senses. The ICI Project intervention territories are characterised by a strong multicultural component. Very often, these territories appeared on the horizon of public opinion excessively characterised by negative and conflictive elements; now they can be represented by considerably more positive elements and even assumed as a reference for other territories or for another type of public or private intervention.

The territory now appears in a new dimension because it also contains consistent participative processes and there is the meeting between administrations and citizens to jointly define, targets, priorities, progress lines, etc. along with the necessary technical contribution,
to help improve the existing reality. The monograph, assessment and community programming, all performed using participative methods, are the visible signs of this mutation in the territory that helps them move forwards seriously towards building living together and intercultural citizenship.

This important change of perception is also being achieved by means of a careful information and communication strategy that has been consolidated year after year. One of its pillars has consisted of maintaining presence in the media. In the first stage of the ICI Project, exhaustive monitoring has been carried out on its impact in the media, particularly relevant in the local field. It particularly highlights the impact on digital media, followed by appearances on the radio, press and local TV. Just between January and August 2013, 369 hits were counted in the digital press, 115 on local radio, 103 in the local press, 30 references on local TV, 9 references in the national press and 1 hit on national TV according to the media impact data compiled by the community teams in the 17 territories.

Table no. 8. Media impact (period: January-August 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Number of hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital press</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local radio</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local press</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local television</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National press</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National television</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL HITS</strong></td>
<td><strong>627</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own work drawn up from local team reports

We should also highlight the important role played by some instruments to ensure the information for the community process. The most remarkable case is the information sheet that has demonstrated itself to be highly effective in terms of informing the community in general on the process’s goals, activities, contents, etc. During the third year, this instrument has doubtlessly been consolidated, not only due to the significant number of information sheets produced and distributed (32) but also due to the diverse and strategic use made of them by the territories. We should highlight the information contained in the information sheets on the presentation of the community monograph (87.5%), on the results from the community meetings (37%) or on the presentation of the community programme. The teams also showed remarkable ability to adapt information sheet content and formats so that different collectives could identify with the information.
The 2012 survey (see Giménez & Lobera, 2014; p. 196 and 178) also reveals important data on the ICI Project results regarding the resident population’s perception of the territory and feeling of belonging:

— A quarter of the people know about the organisations that intervene in the ICI Project in the territories and their activities are viewed positively.

— However, there is a clear lack of optimism on how changes are taking place in the territories, particularly among the native population.

— Among the measures that would improve living together in the neighbourhood, residents particularly highlight a higher level of available employment (35%).

— The feeling of belonging is increasing among the Spanish population regarding the neighbourhood, the town, everyday life and, inversely, it is dropping in terms of things that are further away and the administrative levels that seem more abstract to them (regional, state, European).

— Among foreign residents, their strongest identity nexus is logically their country of origin. Secondly, they identify broadly with the territory and town where they live. In general, it is appreciated that this population does not renounce the identity it constructed before arrival and generally constructs a new identity working from its closest environment.

— The greatest identification with the local environment corresponds to declaring relatively high levels of satisfaction with the territory: close to three out of every four residents state that they are happy living there, both Spanish people and foreigners.

— As a consequence of the above, a broad majority (60%) demonstrates its desire to continue living in the same neighbourhood. Among those who would prefer to move, the majority would go to another neighbourhood in the same town.

— 9% (almost one in ten) of foreigners living in the study territories demonstrated a wish to return to their country of origin.

**Summary of the impact of the ICI Project relating to intercultural living together and social cohesion.**

To round off chapter 3, the following table lists and summarises the main impacts of the ICI Project relating to intercultural living together and social cohesion at the end of the third year and how far they have been met in the 17 territories.
Table no. 9. Summary of the impact of the ICI Project (intercultural living together and social cohesion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurements Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integration       | 1. Existence of a consensual document for intercultural community programming in the territory.  
2. Existence of general topics of interest for the population in the monographs  
3. Participation from local administrations in the monographs  
4. Participation from local administration, health and education professionals in the monographs.  
5. Citizen participation in the monographs. | 100%                 |
| Interculturality  | 6. Citizen participation in the overall process looking at diversity, regarding ethnic monitoring of at least the three most notorious in terms of percentage.  
7. Participation from the gypsy population in the overall process in places where their presence is notorious.  
8. Percentage of diversity in activities for the specific lines. | 100%  
100%  
+50%          |
| Living together   | 9. Holding community meetings in the territory  
10. Participation from the three main figures in community meetings.  
11. Participation of notorious diversity in the territory in the community meetings.  
12. Existence of diversity contents in the monographs  
13. Presence of contents on living together in the community programmes. | 82%  
82%  
82%  
100%  
100%          |
| Citizenship       | 14. Development of activities that promote the citizen connection beyond hand-out connections.  
15. Existence of milestones that show that collaborative and community citizen relationships are being built in the territory.  
16. Promoting citizen participation in associations, groups or individually in the territory. | 100%  
82%  
100%          |
| Community         | 17. Existence of territorial or sector-based technical staff relationship spaces.  
19. Existence of engaged contacts for the three key players who potentially drive the intervention. | 82%  
47%  
82%          |
| strengthening     |                                                                                   |                     |

Source: drawn up by DECAF using ICI Project data and the general advisor report (third year)
Learning and recommendations
In this last chapter we will systematise the reflections and valuations that we have been making during this volume to produce a summary that can turn them into proposals, recommendations or suggestions in two fields: a) as recommendations for improvement in the new stage of the ICI Project, and b) as suggestions that could be valid in other initiatives also aimed at promoting local living together and social cohesion.

4.1 Learning from practice

4.1.1 What learning have we gained?

The main learning comes from actually implementing the innovative intervention strategy by integrating two different social intervention models in the same conceptual and methodological framework: community intervention and intercultural community mediation. The synergies established between the two complementary methodologies, with enormous potential for mediation between public and private players (citizen rallying and social development) have been demonstrated to be effective when promoting living together and social cohesion in 16 different social contexts out of the initial 17 to the extent that an innovative social intervention hypothesis is being validated thanks, not only to its proven methodological effectiveness in the field as shown by its achievements but also its real impact on the state of living together and social cohesion.

The validation of the intervention hypothesis is also making its own impact on local, regional and state public policies. On the one hand, in 16 out of the 17 initially implemented ICI projects, the way in which public administrations are intervening in these territories is being transformed, by means of leaping from a fragmented and sector-based intervention to an integral intervention perspective, put together between different key sectors (education, health, social services, citizen participation, etc.) and coordinated, organised and developed among different players (local, regional and state administrations); technical resources; associations and NGO; citizens.

On the other hand, the intervention hypothesis has made an impact on public policies as shown by incorporating living together into neighbourhoods and some of the significant ele-
ments of the focus and ICI Project method either in other municipal plans or by reinforcing the subsidy line in the Ministry of Employment and Social Security neighbourhood programme.

The validation of the intervention hypothesis and its impact on the local and state policies open up a favourable framework for the ICI Project’s sustainability after executing its first stage and for the extension of its conceptual and methodological proposal to new territories and fields.

Below, we are going to summarise some lessons that we believe to be essential for which we are prepared to develop a social initiative in order to improve intercultural living together.

4.1.2 Five particularly significant lessons learnt

a. Information and knowledge are key aspects to make living together a community matter

In all the territories, we have been able to observe that the first obstacle when attempting to improve living together was what the community actually knew about itself and what was missing from an information system that facilitates knowledge on daily life.

It was a common denominator that each of the local players with whom a connection was made had extensive knowledge of the reality from their centre of interest, whether this was a service, programme or project, regarding the technical aspect or whether this, in the case of citizens, was knowledge from their more direct environment, the building and its surroundings, public or private services that they used, etc. In general, and with some logical exceptions, there is a lack of overview for the territory, fed by the players’ varying knowledge and outlooks, occasionally aggravated by labels, prejudices, generalisations, etc.

In this respect, the main learning obtained was the qualitative contribution representing the local team’s investment in time and dedication to provide the territory with overall knowledge and an information system that facilitates mutual knowledge and inter-relation between players, initiatives, actions, etc.

Four key methodological elements that have made it possible to make living together a matter than concerns the whole community, respectively, by initially establishing relationships, participative research, direct field work and the community information system:
— **Initial contact and compiling information** with the widest possible range of local players. This work helps to obtain at least two products:  
   a) an updated **community file** ready to be shared among the whole community and  
   b) an **initial document** that gives us overall knowledge of the territory; in the ICI Project we call this document *Prior study on the community and the initial state of living together* (please refer to appendix II).

— **Participative research** is an essential tool to develop the intervention model proposed by the ICI Project; this is discussed at length in previous chapters and in volume II of this collection. On this occasion, we would only like to emphasise the crucial importance of this research work in terms of generating integrated knowledge in the territory that compiles the objective, documentary and proven knowledge on the one hand and the outlooks, priorities and subjective contributions from a significant sample of the community on the other. The action run on this occasion provides a key product to work on living together from a shared outlook: the community monograph.

— **Regarding direct field work**, it is best to start by saying that the unspecific nature of the community and mediating team, meaning, without any function intended to provide a final and specific service, gives it direct presence in the street, and in functions, meetings and events of all types that mark the daily life of any community. This activity helps to obtain really valuable information on relationships, situations, conflicts and difficulties that crop up in the neighbourhoods, districts, etc. This activity also leads to generating key products such as:  
   a) **sociogram or map of connections** that occur in the community,  
   b) **diversity map** and  
   c) **map of the key points for cohabitation and conflict**, etc.

— Finally, in reference to the **community information system**, in the same way as for previous points, please refer to volume 2 of the collection to obtain more extensive information on this instrument. Here, we will only highlight this system’s essential role in learning. Complete and positive management of diversity requires the right tools that allow the same information to reach the specifics of each local player in the right way; otherwise it would be impossible to share an overall view of the territory. This is not a simple challenge, but implementing and developing a community information system is decisive in terms of generating participation, co-responsibility and commitment in a community. As Marco Marchioni repeatedly said, “with no information there is no participation, but just information gives no participation either.” Developing this action in the ICI Project has generated many products working from common premises; they have included **information sheets**, different **blogs**, **Facebook and Twitter accounts**, **wall displays**, **pictograms**, etc.
b. Constructing assertive and cooperative connections among the main players in the community as an essential part of improving living together

As we have been establishing and explaining in detail in previous chapters, the main core of living together and interculturality lies in factual connections and positive interaction. The need to invest time, methodology and enthusiasm from the community teams when building, making possible, maintaining and managing the relationships between the different local players from all the existing socio-cultural expressions in the territory is, without a doubt, one of the most important lessons learnt in this first stage of the ICI Project.

Specifically, we can highlight four key points that have sustained the good results in this aspect; these action lines go from meticulously studying how to present the ICI Project to respecting what already exists, including using a mediating philosophy to deal with tensions or suggesting and boosting innovative lines of community work.

— Firstly, we will highlight the simple and essential fact of presenting the ICI Project to the main players in the territory, particularly to anyone engaged in any way with its purposes and goals, dealing with representatives from the administrations, public and private technical professional resources as well as citizens, both organised into legally constituted organisations and relevant groups or persons in the community.

— Showing interest and valuing the work that is already being done by each of the players (in quite a lot of cases for many years) whilst offering to help, strengthen, cooperate with what is being developed.

— Tackling existing difficulties, tensions and conflicts among the different players by providing mediation tools and techniques. In this aspect, we should highlight the importance of improving communication, using reformulation to attempt to compile players’ opinions while introducing elements that help to generate conditions to overcome obstacles and make it possible to work together, etc.

— Creating new work programmes and proposals, and this is where ICI Project activities are heading, as widely explained and documented in the different volumes of this publication. Global citizen action, open summer schools and other community activities have been key to approach each other, overcome prejudice and labels, improve knowledge between ethnoculturally different players and, in short, allow interactions and relationships between anyone who has never had this or who has had a negative experience with it in the past.
4.1.3 Mutual adjustment and institutional adaptation as key elements to improve living together

The question is not so much **what we are doing** (although no doubt this is important) but **how we are doing it** and, more specifically, the cohabitation sense that we give to each and every one of the activities in the ICI Project and its process. In this respect, the use of the “grid” (or operational conceptual matrix) has been essential as mentioned in chapter 1 and included in the appendix.

The significant learning that we have extracted, asserts the initial ideal from which we started: improving how we live together is not so much based on carrying out many activities, projects or programmes but the key to change lies in knowing how to adapt certain tools, techniques and attitudes to the specific social context that help to develop an intervention strategy with common ends assumed by the different key figures in the community. This makes it possible to strengthen social cohesion and consequently improve living together.

In this respect, work developed to improve relations through procedures that have generated new cohabitation experiences in existing or new programmes that might have been technical or citizen-based or mixed. These cohabitation relationship spaces in turn, make way, through collaboration and joint work, for an important transfer of collective knowledge, adding to the collective patrimony. In this way, throughout the intercultural community process, there is progressive promotion of improving situations of mere coexistence or overcoming elements of latent or explicit hostility.

Adapting services, programmes or projects present in the territory from the intervention model’s contribution boosted by the ICI Project therefore allows us to improve relationships, attitudes and behaviour. All this, always over time and using the participative process, makes it possible to reflect on the standard-based framework of local life that has frequently been left obsolete with the passing of time or, even worse, has been sealed off in adjustments based on prejudice regarding the new multicultural reality in the territory.

In this respect, initiatives such as configuring the map of the different multicultural festivals in Barcelona’s Ravel neighbourhood make it possible to discuss changes that are taking place as an analysis on how to generate an intervention strategy that meets the neighbourhood’s diver-
sity and that is based on an integrating key aspect, meaning a positive outlook on the territory’s complete cultural patrimony.

In this work to improve the adaptation of institutions, groups and persons from a particular territory to their increasingly culturally diverse reality, there is also a fundamental role played by strengthening common values such as active respect, solidarity or mutual understanding. Only this will generate positive relationships that strengthen community life.

This process to adapt the community as a whole to overall and local changes that are being produced at a considerable pace also requires, as we have been mentioning, working to improve intercultural and inter-linguistic communication, responding to an increasingly diverse community and strengthening aspects that reinforce respect and valuing of diversity but that also promote common belonging, from fairness and qualitative development of what it means to be a citizen.

Finally, we should mention how existing municipal plans in the intervention territories (related to the topics of managing diversity, living together, social cohesion or citizen participation) are making the most and using elements of the ICI Project intervention model, meaning its focus and methodology applied to intercultural community processes, to enrich and adapt their initial approaches.

4.1.4 The most specific, meticulous or particular aspect is used to promote living together

Improving living together is constant, daily, continuous and permanent work. This, which doubtlessly seems so simple and coherent, is another lesson to be learnt in this first stage.

It is complicated to modify the inertia of fragmented social intervention founded on projects and initiatives that are rarely in line with a common, organised and cooperative strategy as required by living together.

The ICI Project attempts for any action being developed in the territory to emphasise living together as one of its main purposes. In this respect, the cultural, sport, training or artistic offer in a particular town constitutes a magnificent opportunity to be able to give it cohabitation-based direction: from there, reasoned use of the “grid”, or the diversity maps, or ethnic moni-
toring, etc. This manages to generate participation and consistency that grounds positive and solid connections bringing the increasingly diverse and changing community together.

Each territory has its own peculiarities due to history, urban morphology, social distribution, ritual festive cycle, emblematic places, etc. which allow (with the right work) elements to be included that make it possible to strengthen common identity. In this way, we have been able to see how an urban allotment, a social circus, a games festival, commercial dynamics, etc. can generate processes full of meaning, joie-de-vivre and participation which, in turn, show a clear improvement in connections and communication, even improving generally latent conflict situations.

The aforementioned activities have been able to produce meetings and new connections in cases such as the following:
— Improving relationships among culturally diverse traders, and between them and citizens and administrations, as demonstrated in open processes in the neighbourhoods of San José and Madre de Dios in Logroño, or in the El Raval neighbourhood in the centre of Barcelona, or in the old town of Zaragoza, etc.
— Improving joint work and connections between the field of health, education and local and regional authorities that work in these fields, as emphasised in the processes generated in the neighbourhood of El Carrús in Elche, in Playa Honda in the town of San Bartolomé (Lanzarote), and in the La Coma neighbourhood in the Valencia town of Paterna, etc.
— Improving relationships and producing “improbable meetings” among young people, technical resources from different areas of administrations and new citizen participation, as shown in the cases of the Social Circus in the centre of Zaragoza, the Games Festival in Playa Honda (Lanzarote), work on historical memory in the Pueblo Nuevo neighbourhood in the district of Ciudad Lineal in Madrid or in El Raval, etc.
— Improving relationships and producing new participation, carried out in the case of the Girona town of Salt with its urban allotment experiences or the Time Bank in the One Million Steps initiative in neighbourhoods in the southern district of Jerez, contributions and support for the Carrera del Gancho in Zaragoza, etc.

4.1.5 Training and skills: essential elements

The reality of the ICI Project starting point in each territory implicated the need for tools to improve the work and it is already being run with adjustments made to the proposed intervention model.
We soon became aware that most of the local players’ knowledge and skills on community intervention, mediation, cultural competences, diversity management and promotion of interculturality were, in general, far from the essential minimums.

This was a long-term job that had to be started immediately. In this respect, this was a case of contributing (to improve community skills training) certain collective learning and shared training actions:

— **Team training work.** The actual community team’s main functions must include facilitating information, training and elements that contribute to skills training for administrators, professional technical resources and citizens. To do this, it is fundamental that the endo-training process of the actual ICI Project can be transferred to local players.

— **Skills training by means of action.** Developing any action in the territory, as well as tackling any difficulty or conflict situation, provides magnificent opportunities not only to tackle the situation in itself but to provide a theoretical framework, techniques and tools that will make the specific aspect important background work for all players participating or connecting in some way with the situation.

— **Time for training.** Reserving time in existing programmes, technical or citizen-based, intended for clear, explicit and organised training, pedagogically adapting the contents to the recipients.

— **University training.** Developing, as in the first stage of the ICI Project, intense, good quality training intended for key players in the territory. To do this, from the ICI Project, university training action has been developed, with participation from people from all territories, mostly with Local Administration responsibilities.

### 4.2 Recommendations: how can we continue to improve intercultural living together?

The important work carried out has, on the whole, managed to reverse a situation with many limitations to be able to tackle living together appropriately, and in a municipal field where global phenomena such as migration has a very dynamic effect and requires appropriate responses to manage it positively.
This process, boosted by the ICI Project, is just the beginning. There is a lot to be done, but the conditions at this time allow it to be tackled from a more global, integral, coordinated and cooperative outlook.

Right now, the ICI Project should continue to make progress and improve intervention proposals, as well as being enriched by actual practice; this is the only way we can make a significant and long-lasting impact.

Here we have the great continuity challenge for the ICI Project: making the most of the community and intercultural processes that have already been started and implemented to demonstrate how the hypothesis or intervention model provided is useful, efficient, effective and above all sustainable to strengthen local communities in a fast and dynamically-changing reality.

**Four significant recommendations**

4.2.1 Make progress to validate and transfer an intervention model and hypothesis

As mentioned previously, the ICI Project claimed to be **much more than just another social intervention**. In its essence, it is the validation of a set of work hypotheses or intervention models that can be transferred. This implies that it should be strictly endorsed by scientific instruments.

The first stage was accompanied included some aspects such as the survey, the information and documentation system, the assessment reports, etc. The patrimony this generated represents an important basis so that, once put into practice, we can then outline and enrich, in short, improving the work so that it helps us work out what has been done, how it has been done and how it improves the initial situation.

So then, this is not enough to make sure that the work carried out can be transferred; it is necessary to create pedagogic resources that can connect up the knowledge generated and spread it appropriately.

To do all this, a series of actions is planned for the second stage of the ICI Project (begun in September 2013):
— Improve the ICI Project qualitative and quantitative indicator grid.
— Improve the information and documentation system.
— Improve and optimise the monitoring reports.
— Set up new inter-learning programmes between the different experiences.
— Set up explicit training programmes for transfer.
— Connection with international networks that share the ICI Project motivation and purpose.

4.2.2 Strengthen common and shared interests

Experience in the intervention territories has shown how, in general, labels, prejudices, fragmentation, lack of mutual knowledge and tolerance that is a long way from approaching ‘others’ generate attitudes that lead to situations of mere coexistence, frequently interwoven with latent and intense hostility.

The progress made until now, as has been discussed previously, is the result of improving interaction and knowledge between members of local communities.

Therefore, moving forwards towards an improvement in living together involves improving belonging as one of the central elements for everyone who lives, governs or works in a territory.

To do this, some actions are proposed that will doubtlessly help to improve attitudes, values and shared standards, and that will allow implication in the community to be managed peacefully, positively and with participation, from a democratic framework:
— Strengthening the development of positive public attitudes in favour of diversity as an element of identity and patrimony, generating public discourse and symbolic actions.
— Promoting the development of community and intercultural mediation, facilitating communication, dialogue, interaction and mutual understanding.
— Including the intercultural living together focus in all processes, initiatives and actions in the territory.
— Providing instruments, tools and techniques, in summary, appropriate community teaching that can help to develop positive joint work experiences in favour of improving living together.
4.2.3 Develop a strategic and integrated view of social intervention to promote living together as a central axis of sustainability

The work carried out to date has helped to lay the foundations for a structure in the territories that is capable of tackling living together from a global and integral outlook.

The continuity of the processes implemented involves consolidating and developing the knowledge and work programmes for the main local players - administrations, technical resources and citizens. This necessary development involves:

— Strengthening institutional leadership through representatives from the different administrations in favour of living together, social cohesion, diversity and promoting interculturality as an important factor for quality of life in the territories.
— Specifying the institutional commitments acquired to promote intercultural living together in plans, programmes, projects and actions.
— Improving technicians’ skills in public and private administrations in terms of improving how we live together and managing cultural diversity.
— Generating procedures and intervention protocols to improve intercultural living together among public and private resources.

4.2.4 Strengthen quantitative and qualitative participation from the main community figures in terms of improving living together

The ICI Project has managed to rally a significant number of people. So then, a lot of work has to be done to attain higher participation levels. There are several challenges that must be tackled and overcome in this respect. On the one hand, there is part of the older population who have lived through previous processes and that on many occasions feel disappointed; on the other hand, there are well-supplied sectors of citizens that have no experience in collective work, not to mention the difficulties involved in conciliation, work, families, etc.

Another important aspect refers to the lack of significant participation in community life from new neighbours, particularly in the social fabric and even more so in management bodies.
It is necessary for participation in the territories to meet the existing ethnic monitoring, meaning coherence between the existing cultural diversity and the number of people with different origins that participate in the activities, actions, meetings, etc. This approach is also valid for the number of women involved, meaning ethnic and gender monitoring should be important aspects to be improved in the participative processes we are developing.

Some actions that can help to improve quantitative and qualitative participation are:
— Culture, art and sport as elements for improving relationships, knowledge and belonging to the territory.
— Training in social pedagogics, to live together and promote interculturality among associations (both legally constituted and informal groups).
— Visualisation and transfer of best practice for setting up and managing participation.
— Strengthening the fields of education (inside and outside schools) and community health as generators of new participation.
— Strengthening dynamisation of public places: squares, parks, etc.

We will close this chapter, and with it the first volume of the Joining Forces to Live Together Collection, with two considerations.

The first is the desire for this systematization of the focus on living together and intercultural citizenship (its approaches, strategies, achievements and learning) to be of interest and use for all players in the ICI Project and the local processes, as well as for everyone generally engaged in work against discrimination and exclusion, and for social cohesion in diversity.

The second and final consideration is simply to invite readers to complete what is presented here with further reading on methodology, education, health and participation, specific topics in the following four volumes.
Appendices
APPENDIX I
Municipal commitment to living in harmony
Commitment to social cohesion and intercultural harmony

The entire world and several countries in particular, one of which is Spain, are faced increasingly by the formidable challenge of how to manage cultural, ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity and differences in people’s place of origin. This is a challenge that not only affects each country overall, but also its regions and towns, involving also institutions and organisations, families and each and every citizen.

In the case of Spain, the arrival and settlement in many different towns of millions of people of foreign origin since the turn of the century has added diversity to a country like our own that is already diverse. Our starting-point is to put on record the complex, new diversification of our towns and cities. In effect, the presence of people and groups coming from the most varied parts of the world is an addition to our own historical diversity, to the democratic shape of a country that recognises Autonomous Communities and several official languages in its Constitution, to the existence of autochthonous ethnic minorities, in particular the Gypsy people, and to the diversification caused by intensive internal migrations. These new groups contribute to local life, among many other things, new physiognomies, trade, associations, languages and beliefs.

We are aware that these processes of social and cultural diversification suppose an enormous challenge to local life in many ways, such as everyone’s adjustment in day-to-day life, the dangerous processes of concentration of housing and the eventual formation of ghettos, multiculturalism in schools and health centres, the need to adapt public policy, the risks of marginalisation, the necessary retraining of public officials and professionals or the emergence in some places of xenophobic attitudes and rejection, etc.

We share the idea that the local area, the town or city with its areas, districts and neighbourhoods is the most relevant stage for this highly complex situation. This is for two main reasons: first, it is at the local level where the challenge is expressed most directly, with the greatest intensity and rawness. And second, it is in the local environment that the main work can and must be done to avoid exclusion and build cohesion and harmony.
We are convinced that **this challenge has to be confronted creatively** and positively. It needs to be seen as a great opportunity. It has to be tackled peacefully, through the prevention and regulation of the conflict that may arise. Above all, our aim must be to include all citizens as residents and neighbours belonging to the same local area, encouraging each other in good relations, understanding, collaboration and acceptance of what is different.

Consistent with this, **we adopt publicly the commitment** to do everything we can, to the degree that the competences and resources of our towns permit, to promote social cohesion, intercultural living together in harmony, civic behaviour and solidarity, all of which are key values of our democratic system and social life.

In line with this commitment and as part of the municipal policies, plans and initiatives in all our institutions, we have been participating actively and decidedly in the **Project of Intercultural Community Intervention**, promoted for the last three years by "la Caixa" Foundation in seventeen areas of Spain. This project relies on the collaboration of our Town Councils and the dedication of so many other organisations that administer the teams of experts working with the project in each place.

We want to make clear that **we are pleased with the results of the First Stage of the Project**, a period of intense joint work, in which local government, technical resources and the general public established relationships and meeting spaces, and undertook a great many initiatives, mainly in the areas of education and health, with special emphasis on childhood, youth and families. They also shared knowledge through valuable documents on local areas and agreed Community Programmes that will be developed with full participation in the Second Stage during the next few years.

We want to highlight the **validation in local practice of the Project’s initial hypotheses**, in the sense that, if you work together, with everyone contributing from their area of concern, with a proper and demanding focus on intercultural living in harmony, without excluding anyone, and above all setting up, consolidating and sustaining community and participative processes, this gives excellent results and positive impact. All this, as well as being a contribution to the search for formulae to improve and modernize the function of the Welfare State, is especially significant in a period of crisis such as the one we are living through and in which the Project is being developed.

We are convinced that this crucial, essential task has to be everyone’s business. As such, we want to declare our profound interest in **sharing our experience with other local entities**,
such as those associated with *Intercultural Cities* and the *Spanish Network of Intercultural Cities*, to which several of our cities belong. Like us, other municipal leaders and corporations are working along these lines, each from their respective realities and possibilities. From here, we want not only to acknowledge their work, but to encourage everyone to continue sharing experiences and exchanging with each other what we have learned. We want too to encourage the *Spanish Federation of Towns and Provinces* to continue to promote this channel of collaboration between towns in favour of social cohesion and intercultural living in harmony.

Finally, we feel proud of the work that all of us together are carrying out, in order to construct one single society, based on cohesion, diversity and solidarity. Our own experience tells us that the **intercultural model** is the best paradigm for managing cultural diversity, because of its profound roots in the mutual respect and recognition of everyone.

**Institutions that have joined the municipal commitment to living together**

1. Ministerio de Empleo y Seguridad Social Secretaría General de Inmigración y Emigración
2. Fundació "la Caixa"
3. Ayuntamiento de Madrid
4. Ajuntament de Barcelona
5. Ayuntamiento de Zaragoza
6. Ayuntamiento de Granada
7. Ayuntamiento de Elche
8. Ayuntamiento de Jerez de la Frontera
9. Ayuntamiento de Leganés
10. Ayuntamiento de Getafe
11. Ayuntamiento de Logroño
12. Ayuntamiento de El Ejido
13. Ayuntamiento de Paterna
14. Ajuntament de Tortosa
15. Ajuntament de Salt
16. Ayuntamiento de San Bartolomé
APPENDIX II
Promoting living together and intercultural citizenship in high diversity neighbourhoods. Ideas and experience for community praxis

This article was originally published in:

1 Introduction

What follows below is a conceptual framework to found a citizen-based and interculturalist practice in “multicultural neighbourhoods” or, more precisely, in local fields with high sociocultural diversity. This is a case of stating how to act, how to found our intervention when this is a case of collectively generating living together and intercultural citizenship as a community in neighbourhoods. This is particularly important in local environments where there are wide-ranging sectors of residents, neighbours and traders that are:

a. Internal or national migrants, meaning anyone who arrived from other parts of the country, either some time ago (development period in the 60s) or more recently. It is important to include these internal migrants to consider the entire community and all its diversity, and so as not to see migration just as international migration.

b. Native ethnic minorities (e.g. gypsy population). This is also a necessary inclusion, as in the previous point, not only to include all the diversity in the entire community, but so as not to make the mistake of neglecting or reducing “the intercultural aspect” to a foreign component.

c. Foreign residents (who continue to be foreigners or who have taken Spanish nationality, first generation or children of immigrants), who have built up socioculturally differentiated communities and non native minorities, and whose presence as new residents (and even as new neighbours) can be seen in perspective compared to other migrants (internal, “domestic” or national), and whose ethnocultural differentiation is better tackled by also considering native ethnic minorities.

d. Subcultures of gender, age (for example, some urban tribes or youth gangs; or areas where older people carry greater weight) occupation (work cultures), religiousness (for example, areas of Granada or Cordoba with considerable Muslim presence, not only immigrants but also converts), sexual orientation (for example neighbourhoods such as Chueca in Madrid, with strong presence from the gay community) or others.
This all goes to build a considerably diverse community in terms of race and ethno-culture, lifestyles, origins, languages and religions that represent a challenge and an opportunity from very different points of view.

What theoretical and conceptual frameworks can help us guide planned or induced social action in these contexts? What notions or key ideas can be used to found an “intelligently performed action” to use an expression coined by John Dewey, pragmatic philosopher and educational reformer? How can we found local cohabitation praxis that is not a generic, merely discursive call for good will, sometimes too aseptic? How can we conceptually secure an intervention design that does actually consider existing inequalities appropriately and that, by identifying them, aims to help overcome them?

This proposal works, above all, from a specific conceptualisation and way of operating from three socio-political and ethical ideals: Living Together, Citizenship and Interculturality, where the author has been working with different teams and projects over the last twenty years, adding new elements and developments after each experience. The reflections below are, specifically, the result of current theoretical, conceptual and methodological writing work within the framework of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project that forms part of the Interculturality and Social Cohesion Programme by "la Caixa" Foundation.

This joint initiative has been run since September 2010 in 17 local territories (neighbourhoods, zones, districts) in 15 locations in eight autonomous regions. The "la Caixa" Foundation has signed collaboration agreements with these towns. Four-person multidisciplinary teams are working in each of these territories, where the responsibility for each team and local project falls to other entities with which collaboration agreements have also been signed. The next chapter, written by Marco Marchioni, general advisor to the Project, along with José Álamo, scientific management board coordinator, looks at the community intervention methodology and action lines. It is also related to this project, and it is complementary to more conceptual contributions made here.

The practical core or proposal that we wish to contribute is a discussion matrix or "grid" as we tend to call it in the project, featured in Appendix I at the end of the text. This is a twenty category protocol, accompanied by topics and questions, and it can be used by any entities or pro-

---

1 This theoretical and practical work, for research, teaching and transfer, and on the topics of immigration, social public policies, mediation, interculturality and joint-development, has been carried out by the Autonomous University of Madrid since 1989 within the framework of the Migration and Multiculturality Programme that, along with other research groups, created the Institute of Migration, Ethnic Groups and Social Development (IMEDES) at this university in 2006.
fessionals engaged in fieldwork in a local territory. This is a conceptual instrument and its methodological correlation which, when used properly by the Intercultural Community Intervention Project teams, could be useful in this Manual.

We call this discussion matrix a “grid” because it is used to strengthen, order and systematise how we look at the complex and changing reality of multicultural neighbourhoods by means of certain categories, topics and questions, so that institutional, technical and social players can individually and collectively, separately and/or jointly think about a series of relevant aspects that, without this type of tools, could be left in the background or simply ignored².

Below, we will give more details of the Project’s conceptual grounding and our proposal to found promotion for living together and intercultural citizenship on solid conceptual bases and we will do this by synthetically indicating the meaning of each of the categories, topics and questions from the Grid, following the order they appear in it.

2 Block I. Spaces, situations and processes (categories 1 to 3)

Before “working” the Grid, using everything relating to the three socio-political and ethical ideals within the purpose of the local intervention (living together, citizenship, interculturality), it is necessary to consider what is relative to the space where this intervention is going to be promoted, the more relevant social situations in this social and territorial space and processes that are already up and running and what they wish to promote.

2.1 Spaces

We will start with space, working from the fact that the neighbourhood is, all at the same time, a physical or material space (buildings, infrastructures, premises, squares, etc.), a social socio-cultural and symbolic programme (history and memory, milestones, identifications, everyday world and daily cycles, weekly and seasonally; ritual and festive cycle in the year, neighbourly relations, external image of the neighbourhood, etc.), and a virtual space (the neighbourhood and its inhabitants in the Cloud, social networks, websites related to the neighbourhood, etc.).

² The Matrix or Grid was developed in work sessions by the Project Manager and members of local teams and it was later used in some territories by technicians and/or members of civil society from that place. Within the Intercultural Community Intervention Project, one outstanding example of the use of the matrix or Grid is the community monograph drawn up in Tortosa by a long list of participants, in a task coordinated by the ICI team, managed by the Associació per la Cooperació, la Inserció Social i la Interculturalitat (ACISI).
One starting point is to consider the local territory as a privileged space for working on living together. And it is essential to start with a complete characterisation of the territory or neighbourhood on what the community intervention is going to be deploying. For example, in a case that I have studied, such as the neighbourhood of Lavapiés, in the Centre district of the city of Madrid, sufficient attention should be given to its condition as a neighbourhood: it is very old (historic), central, a real icon for the city, popular, classless, a hub for different social movements, under renovation, where born and bred neighbours, recently arrived natives and foreign immigrants coexist, as if comprising the “three thirds of the neighbourhood”. This is a case of taking into account and deducing the implications of each of these traits for social life and for the intervention.

However, other neighbourhoods are more recent: neighbourhoods on the periphery or outskirts, etc. Others are expansion districts, or very marginal areas. In any case, any planner or activist is aware that characterisation and analysis of the social-urban space is an essential requirement to design the intervention project appropriately.

So then, it is crucial to deal with this matter specifically when this space contains intense socio-cultural diversity (residential, commercial, association-based, community-based, etc.) and where diversification processes are being developed (social, commercial, cultural, linguistic, religious, etc.). In this respect, one of the outstanding aspects to be analysed is whether this socio-anthropological and ethnographic characterisation corresponds to the neighbourhood’s collective imagination, both for its residents and from the outside. One useful instrument in this regard is drawing up a Diversity Map, plotting all the available information on groups, commercial areas, associations, etc.

2.2 Situations

After analysing this space, its characteristics and social subjects, it is necessary to identify and value the neighbourhood situation: the context, deficiencies, opportunities, nature and problem issues of its social connections. In this process, we set out the Starting Situation or Base Line of the intervention that we wish to carry out.

The first thing that we did in the Intercultural Community Intervention Project, as well as ‘setting ourselves up in the field’ and making initial contact with the people in the territory, was to draw up an Initial Study on the State of Living Together: compiling all the information already available for this and making some key enquiries. We did not wish to call it an assessment so as not to fall into the bad habit of adding “just another assessment”, given that (on the contrary) we did consider existing assessments; and so as not to confuse it with the Community or Par-
ticipative Assessment that we would perform in the third year of the Project once the we had achieved Shared Knowledge in the second year.

The “state of living together” idea covers the analysis and valuation of local relations, meaning connections between neighbours, residents, neighbours and traders, as well as between groups and institutions. Terminologically, interpersonal, group and institutional connections can be distinguished as well as a combination of the three. In addition, going from the most general to the most specific, we can distinguish social, intercultural and inter-ethnic connections. Social connections coincide with the interpersonal universe as a whole; some of these social connections can be called intercultural (in the factual sense, not in the standard-based sense of interculturalism, as we will see later on); and in turn, only some intercultural connections would be inter-ethnic (where ethnicity is present as the main identification, classification and hierarchy).

In any case, capturing and stabilising the local state of living together accurately involves seeing if there is actually a connection and between whom (as the absence of connection is as frequent as it is significant); classifying these neighbourly, local and neighbourhood relationships as good, bad or indifferent; if they are inclusive or exclusive, concerning acceptance or rejection, cooperation and complementary or competitive and antagonistic, if they are related to cohesion, tension or conflict (in the latter supposition), if they are latent or manifest, etc.

The idea of state of cohabitation can be useful, or at least we are finding it useful. Firstly, to centre the focus of the intervention on the major question of living together and intercultural citizenship, referring the many, varied issues in local life to it. Secondly, to encompass all types of situations within this concept of “state of living together”: every day, residential (overcrowding, vertical slums, concentrations, ghettos), economic (new businesses, inclusion in markets, or not, etc.), spatial (use of squares, parks and other public spaces), association-based, institutional, political, festive (participation in the neighbourhood’s ritual cycle) or denominational. In order to carry out this study, local teams were guided by a topic index or common content structure for everyone, following the logic of categories mentioned in detail in blocks II, III and IV.

2.3 Processes
Along with the Spaces and Situations, we have to look at the Processes occurring in these spaces that generate these situations. If this is a case of promoting an intercultural community process in a specific high diversity territory, it is in any case crucial to analyse the processes that are taking place (dynamically, not only at the start of the intervention and as an ex ante study). Returning to the neighbourhood of Lavapiés, in our study we can identify and interrelate pro-
cesses regarding settlement, concentration (residential, school, healthcare, commercial, etc.), demographic renewal (population pyramid becoming younger), multiculturalisation (shops, restaurants, clothing, music, etc.), gentrification, citizen rallying, commercialisation and transnationalisation among others. All this leads to inclusion/exclusion situations, and implications for social, intercultural and inter-ethnic relationships.

These are processes that actually take place: any that exist at the start and during the intervention. We have to distinguish them, or at least we do this in our project, from the Intercultural Community Process, either what exists at the start of the intervention (and that we try to reinforce) or what we have to generate during the project. The terminological, conceptual and methodological distinction between Project and Process therefore comes into its own. One crucial aspect is to be clearly aware that the Project falls, to a large extent, within our “control field” but not necessary the process that fully belongs to the community and its key figures.

In terms of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project and following methodological bases provided by Marco Marchioni, we can distinguish, analyse and promote participation in this Process from the three key players in the community: 1) Administrations (very specifically the local authority), 2) professional and technical resources (public and private) and 3) organised civil society and citizens as a whole. Each of these three key players has its own specific nature (stances, interests, needs, cycles and timetables, languages, symbols, etc.) to which we have to pay due attention if we wish to help generate own and shared relationship spaces.

3 Block II. Living together (categories 4 to 12)

3.1 Living together, coexistence, hostility

We understand living together as a real, predominantly positive interaction involving respect and communication although completely void of conflict. Therefore, living together is a peaceful interaction, not because it does not contain tensions and problems, but because they are tackled with dialogue, negotiated or measured; in any case, with active respect and without aggression (verbal aggression, symbolic or physical) and even less with violence.

We understand living together to be a rather demanding connection, going far beyond mere coexistence. In it, people, groups, institutions or communities share a particular space at a given time, or (in other words) they cohabit in this space and time. This demanding conceptualisation of living together (or cohabitation) takes on all of its relevance as an ideal and guided action
programmed when it is contrasted with coexistence. In other places\(^3\) we have shown that, if living together constitutes a positive interaction with active respect, in coexistence there is barely a connection at all or there is no connection in any sense; and if there is respect, it is passive. If cohabitation tackles conflict with dialogue, peacefully and positively, in coexistence, conflict remains latent, bubbling under the surface, without being dealt with most of the time. If cohabitation is profoundly dynamic, coexistence is rather more static.

This whole contrast does not mean that if cohabitation is positive (which it is although not problem-free) then coexistence is, on the contrary, negative. It is rather more that, the type of sociability incarnated by coexistence has the undeniable advantages that it enjoys certain peace, although fragile, as in it (in addition to a scarce or null connection) there is usually no aggression, insult, manifest hostility; this leads us to the third type of sociability proposed by the model.

Hostility does actually constitute the **schema-conceptually negative pole** given that, when hostility prevails, then there is a connection but a bad one; an interpersonal and social connection charged with mistrust, aversion suspicion, rejection or hatred; and therefore latent or manifest, structural, physical or symbolic violence if we follow the typology proposed by Galtung (1964). If we specify it in a neighbourhood with high diversity, hostility is demonstrated in many ways: discourse that blames foreigners and anyone who has recently arrived for all the “bad things in the area”, avoiding anything different, posters or graffiti against immigration or a determined place of worship, expression of rejection towards the Other when participating in public activities in the neighbourhood such as markets, or festivals, etc.

**3.2 Dimensions of living together (categories 5 to 13)**

We are not going into great detail here as readers can find developments on these ideas in the bibliography as well as examples for fields such as families, schools and neighbourhoods. What we will do is explain the writing work that we have been doing in the sense of identifying levels where these three modes of sociability are expressed (Giménez, 2005, 2007 and 2011). This refers to interpersonal, attitude, standard-based, axiological, participative, communicational, conflictual, identity and political levels\(^4\), showing what cohabitation, coexistence or hostility exists in a particular situation and place and finally, in a determined neighbourhood. These nine dimensions correspond to categories 4 to 12 of the Matrix.

---

\(^3\) Please refer to Giménez, 1997, 2005, 2008 and 2011

\(^4\) In the first versions of the conceptual Cohabitation/Coexistence/Hostility model (Giménez, 2005), eight dimensions were proposed, later adding Politics (Giménez, 2008), after comments from the ethnographer Menara Lube, and above all its local expression, as a ninth dimension.
The interpersonal dimension goes first because living together is, above all, a *de facto* connection, a relationship ruled by positive elements, cohesion and respect. In coexistence there is barely any connection, and in hostility the connection is marked by aspects of negativity from the point of view of understanding, cooperation and cohesion.

This dimension takes on other aspects. The entire interpersonal aspect, for example, has to be taken into account as local situations and processes are going to vary considerably if what prevails in its inhabitants is an attitude of acceptance, understanding or respect, or if, on the contrary, the extensive and assumed attitude involves rejection, mistrust and intolerance towards anything different.

Following this multi-dimensional model (drawn up not only from discussion but also applied projects), when working on living together in the neighbourhood, due attention would have to be paid (observe, comment, analyse, programmes, activities) to other dimensions such as any relating to: the rules (uses, customs, standards), values (any that are shared and any that are not shared), participation in the broadest sense (not only associations), communication (languages, flows, moments, misunderstanding), everything relating to conflict (latent and manifest) and its inhabitants’ identities (shared and not shared). All this looks at the whole and the part meaning contemplating the community as a whole, but also its different sociocultural segments. The outline is “finished off” with the political dimension, as it is as decisive as the interpersonal aspect: all connections have a political expression, in the public aspect and in politics.

This work to make the project operational has been able to identify up to nine inter-related dimensions for cohabitation, coexistence or hostility. This line of work was able to identify a series of qualitative indicators for cohabitation / coexistence / hostility that began to take shape in the field of the Madrid City Council Observatory for Migration and Intercultural Cohabitation and that were explicitly formulated within the framework of the CIEN Project (Promotion of Citizen Cohabitation in neighbourhoods of seven European countries) and that are provided as APPENDIX II.

This precision step has been used for different tasks. So, working from these nine dimensions, the seventeen local teams in the Intercultural Community Intervention Project drew up the aforementioned documents on "Initial study on the state of living together in each territory (in

---

5 This is a European project led by the Barcelona Local Government, including participation from entities in Sweden, Germany, Italy and other countries.
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October 2010), that was used to set the Baseline or the Starting Line for the Project. In turn, establishing this Starting Situation for the Project made it possible to analyse (in each dimension and as a whole) the changes operated in the territory regarding the cohabitation/coexistence/hostility situation, deducing the corresponding practical implications for the action.

4 Block III. Citizenship (categories 13 to 17)

4.1 Working for new citizenship
The goal or focus point proposed in the neighbourhood intervention is achieving or promoting living together and intercultural citizenship. Before summarising the enormously relevant reasons for the “citizen aspect” of this issue, I would like to briefly clarify the notions of citizenship and new citizenship that we are working from.

We are including several theoretical and political contributions here on New Citizenship that have been made over the last few years (among others: Soysal, 1994; Kymlicka, 1996; Miller, 1997; Nussbaum, 1999; Kroes, 2002; and in Sweden, Germany, Italy and in Spain, de Lucas, 1994 and 1998; Martín and De la Obra.; Ortega et al, 1999; Pajares, 2000; Cortina, 2001; Porned and Velasco, 2003; Suárez, 2005 and 2006). Working from the citizen contract historically inaugurated with Modern Age revolutions in England, France, United States, etc. and assuming it, this is a matter of updating its principles in the contemporary world in the midst of globalisation. This does not take anything away, quite to the contrary, from the ideal of citizenship for everyone on the basis of establishing a relationship between free and equal beings, meaning between citizen subjects (and not subordinates) that:

1. Share rights and responsibilities, in so much that
   2. they belong to a socio-political community whose constitution and legislation acknowledges such rights and responsibilities, and as this community is
   3. organised around certain institutions that are charged with legitimacy, that make sure the set of rights are respected and that each person meets their responsibilities within the common rules.

This ideal and political and ethical project for citizenship should now be updated by the proclamation of Human Rights in 1948 and its development in international treaties, the emergence of supra-national entities, the rise of social movements (for example feminists, ecologists, native peoples, etc.), the relevance of human mobility (migrants, refugees, etc.) and other processes that set challenges in terms of inclusion or exclusion of subjects in citizenship, sov-
ereignty of citizen contracts or the need to also consider collective rights or, in Kymlicka’s formulation (1996: 71 and beyond) differentiated rights depending on the group.

The citizen-based approach becomes enormously relevant in founding the intervention in the neighbourhood or territory, for at least three reasons.

Firstly because it joins, or more exactly ties, each and every inhabitant, inhabitants or residents from this territory meaning: their role as neighbours, as being from the place, and the fact that they live in a space where they exercise determined general rights (driving on the streets, using public spaces, accessing public services, participating in local life, etc.) and they are subject to certain rules and duties (taxes, traffic laws, municipal orders, etc.). In other words, they hold rights and responsibilities, the primary core of the idea of citizenship.

A second reason for the relevance of the citizen-based approach to promote local living together, specifically when we come across local contexts with high diversity, is that this is essential to make progress in actual interculturalism. If we do not wish the interculturalist emphasis to suffer, either from culturalism (conceiving cultures as something homogeneous and static; attempting to explain social processes exclusively for “cultural” reasons, not paying attention to the economic and political factors) or from essentialist multiculturalism (exaggeration or exacerbation of cultural differences, ignorance of similarities, not paying attention to the common points and interests), we are required to put all our energy into the matters suggested by citizens.

A third argument in favour of the relevance of the citizen-based emphasis in an attempt to achieve local living together is contextual or general. The neighbourhood or local territory is a “part-society”, it cannot be understood in itself or isolated from the larger society encompassing it. The zone or district around which the intervention project revolves forms part of a broader socio-political whole. So then, for the existence or not of cohesion in local life, it is entirely relevant how we move forwards or backwards in this broader context (the actual city, the autonomous region, Spain, the European Union, etc.) regarding citizens (broadening or restricting rights, extending or retracting civic awareness and civility, etc.).

4.2 Dimensions of citizenship (categories 14 to 17)

Working from the previous conception of Citizenship, as with Living Together, the idea consists of carrying out an enabling task that will help to break down this notion and ideal into minor units and thereby be able to discover what each of these dimensions implies in local life and,
above all, analyse what they represent in high diversity local contexts. As mentioned, three axes
or aspects can be made out, corresponding to rights and responsibilities, belonging and insti-
tutionalism (for more details, please refer to Giménez et al, 2008).

Rights and responsibilities
When designing, carrying out and/or evaluating social intervention projects in neighbour-
hoods, we consider that both rights and responsibilities take on great ideological and practical
value. Above all, this is a case of founding, permeating and encouraging the action programme
from the “rights focus”, meaning understanding that improving quality of life, satisfying social
needs, covering deficiencies or channelling demands form an inseparable part of citizens exer-
cising their rights.

This represents not ever losing sight of the fact that the plan or intervention programme, regard-
less of its particular features (field, players, aims, etc.), is carried out within the framework of
a Social Rule of Law; it takes place in a greater society, where the neighbourhood is located, a
society whose ideals and standards are governed by a democratic system and a Rule of Law.
However, the local or neighbourhood project not only has this context but, in turn, it should
be guided towards promoting and contributing what it has to offer to consolidating and devel-
oping this Rule of Law.

When we are tackling a community intervention, full meaning is given to the conception of
participants as subjects of law, not only in general society, but also locally, giving notoriety to
anything related to local, social, civic or resident citizenship: varied forms used to describe the
theories and proposals of New Citizenship. These adjectives used to describe citizens certainly
lead to specific issues and emphasis (residential, civic, social, local) but they all have the fact in
common that they refer to citizenship, not a legal-political authority, a nationality or if some-
one wants a passport, but an authority of proximity, everyday life, being a member of a partic-
ular territorial community.

And in this respect, the category of neighbourliness becomes very relevant, being a neighbour
in common with your neighbourliness. Like any local approach, there is the risk of localism with
neighbourliness. This means conceiving the local community separately from its context; resort-
ing to chauvinistic feelings about the neighbourhood; having short-sighted approaches that do
not reach far, lacking a broader outlook (absolutely necessary in these times of globalisation and
all things “glocal”); designing the project for “our neighbourhood, separate from the city.” No, this
is not the approach that we wish to make, nor the place to base the neighbourhood’s relevance.
This is a case of picking up on a long term category in the history of Spain and its populations: the neighbours’ commune, the open council, the joint neighbour-owned hillsides, urban neighbourhoods, neighbours’ associations, communities of neighbours, and give it new meaning for new local citizenship at a time of moving forwards towards transnational and cosmopolitan citizenships.

So then, we are not looking at a merely local and community intervention but an intercultural aspect. Consequently, the focus of rights that we are analysing and proposing takes on a new, in-depth and complementary meaning for what we have seen so far. And it is that, in the interculturalist perspective (in which we will shortly go into more detail), this is a case of seeking out and collectively identifying the points that neighbours have in common, beyond their different cultural backgrounds, beyond their identities and specific belongings. So then, one of these “points in common” involves rights as members of the community: right to local residence, rights of access to public resources, right to participation in local life, etc.

Along with rights, and within the ideal and standard-based framework brought about by citizenship, we have responsibilities. Members of the local community share a set of obligations regarding: use of public spaces, hygiene, cleaning and rubbish; local taxes; uses, customs and rules for everyday living, etc. If we previously saw that the focus of rights is a necessary approach loaded with enormous potential in terms of work for living together and intercultural citizenship, we can now propose the same for the focus of ethics of responsibility.

A territorial approach to citizens living together should emphasise the idea that local life would improve if everyone met their obligations; if the institutions, all types of groups, associations, residents and traders assumed common and specific responsibilities. Social cohesion would rest on firmer bases. This general framework for the ethics of responsibility and this collective requirement that each person meets their responsibilities presents a whole line of local action that is undoubtedly interesting with valid potential for our project.

Belonging

Let’s take a further step in the citizen-based approach, entering into the second of its dimensions: belonging. The inhabitants’ condition as local citizens of a determined territory, holding rights and responsibilities, lies in the fact that they are members of the community. If the neighbourhood category must be updated and reconfigured within community praxis, the same goes for belonging. There should be several reasons explaining why this idea has remained invisible in the social intervention schemas. Some of the reasons explaining this absence might hypothetically be as follows. A first hypothesis explaining the reduced use of the reality and category of
belonging (specifically in the field of the studies) is the emphasis put on identity. Certainly, over the last few decades, work has been included on post-national belonging and multiple belonging. However there are many more, really endless, works on identity, both social identity and individual identification, and above all anything touching on national, cultural, ethnic or religious identity and gender identity. There are far fewer works and proposals on class and age identity.

Despite this imbalance of attention paid to the different classification and hierarchy systems in societies of late, and therefore to their identity systems (much more attention is given to ethnocultural and gender identities than class and age), it is clear that the profusion of analysis and discourse on identities is not something we can see in terms of belonging and feelings of belonging. Maybe one has led to the other.

A second hypothesis explaining the reduced use of reality and category of belonging, now in the field of institutional and social action and among social intervention professionals, might be linked to the ideas of participant, then meta population, and subsequently beneficiary (direct and indirect) and above all user. This refers to increasingly passive and receptive notions that might have prevented strong emergence of the classification of member and the category of belonging.

And this brings the third and final explanatory hypothesis that we are proposing: precisely the weakness of the citizen approach, both in terms of analysis and intervention. And above all, the lack of correlation between the progress of citizenship issues in fields such as the philosophy of law, political science or ethics studies (just to mention some of the fields that have given it the most relevance) and the institutional and social models and modes of action. It is precisely this disconnection between theory and practice that we are attempting to overcome here, deducing citizenship implications for community praxis. Actually, the notion and ideal of citizenship implies, as we have seen, the category of belonging; given that it is because they are members of the political and social community that individuals take on rights and responsibilities.

The potential behind the idea of belonging for the intervention practice is considerable, as it allows players to work from the angle of their feelings of belonging to the group, the town, the municipality, the autonomous region, the people, the nation, the supranational entity and, of course, Humanity. Specifically, and within the local, territorial and diverse community, this feeling of belonging might bring up questions such as the plural us (“we’re all us”, high regard for all things local, the community development as an expression of collective will, etc.).
One last consideration for the category of belonging: the community intervention project can take into account that there would be shared belongings among the residents and neighbours such as local or neighbourhood belonging, or others, such as belonging to the town or country, etc. In addition, there would be belonging that was not shared such as belonging to a specific national collective or a certain cultural, linguistic or religious group. An attempt is made to facilitate and strengthen common and shared belonging, when appropriate, as well as respect specific or non-shared belonging. The same happens in this point as with values (remember how they were treated in the axiology dimension of living together): making the most of democratic, civic values, etc. that are shared; and respecting any values that belong to each one, without affecting Human Rights. This is not at all easy or immediate, but precisely the goal of the community work and intelligent, critical and fair activities in favour of living together and intercultural citizenship.

**Institutionalism**

There is a third axis that runs from the citizenship perspective: institutionalism, from the moment when the citizen pact is upheld in a political community where there are legitimate institutions or legitimised in the Rule of Law. The democratic system and Rule of Law revolve around a set of principles, agreements and standard frameworks (respecting Human Rights, Constitution, rule of law, separation and autonomy of executive, legislative and judicial powers, etc.) that give the institutions legitimacy. Without any doubt, and of course in current times where there are notable deficiencies in the system and where certain sectors of the institutional system (certain practices from political parties, judges, etc.) leave a lot to be desired, they are justifiably criticised and contested by civil society.

What is maintained here is that, to move forwards in the citizen approach, not only does this require greater and better social participation, respect and exercising of rights, each person assuming their responsibilities, sharing common belonging at least among the majority, respect for non-shared yet legitimate belonging, etc.; but also respect, vigilance and criticism of the democratic institutions requiring that they fulfil their role of looking after citizens’ rights and demanding responsibilities.

In terms of intercultural community intervention in favour of living together and local cohesion, institutionalism is a decisive sphere. This is due to the fact that both public (bound to the administrations and particularly the local authority) and private institutions (bound to civil society, the world of economics and the service sector) play a key role in people’s everyday lives, in distributing resources and in general in quality of life and local development.
It is therefore essential to include institutions in the community process. If we look at socio-cultural diversity in the community, we work from the pressing need for this set of institutions to work inclusively, i.e. not demonstrating ethnocultural discrimination, including professionals from different origins among the staff, etc.

5 Block IV. Interculturalism (categories 18 to 20)

5.1 The added value of the intercultural focus compared to multiculturalism: specifying it in local spaces

The Matrix or Grid compiles three final categories that correspond to the three dimensions of all interculturalism: equality, respect for diversity and positive interaction. Below, we will give some ideas and stakes for each of these axes, always looking to promote living together in neighbourhoods and local cohesion.

Equality

The need to strengthen equality in the eyes of the law and equal behaviour already put in a strong appearance in 1960s cultural pluralism approaches. Equality of rights and responsibilities among natives and immigrants was always included in integration definitions for European policies. It is another matter entirely that many key points have not been tackled.

From the point of view of progress towards positive and inclusive management of cultural diversity, it is necessary to assume that the emphasis on equality policies and programmes (at least legal equality, equality in the eyes of the law, equal treatment, and preferably mentioning equal opportunities and gender equality), it is an essential requirement to move forwards in the fight against exclusion models (racism, xenophobia, discrimination, segregation) and in promoting inclusion models. Without an equality reference, diversity management policies tend towards culturalism or "ethnic additive".

In terms of community work in the neighbourhood, and specifically promotion of intercultural living together and social cohesion, this emphasis on equality can incorporate (or be demonstrated in) different aspects such as: measures to even out educational opportunities for boys and girls in the territory, equality among neighbours in terms of access to health and social resources in the town, equality of dialogue for culturally differentiated subjects, equal consideration as members of the community, etc.
Even at a “micro level”, in a specific activity that is carried out, this equality axis challenges us to make sure that participation from culturally differentiated persons or groups (in an open summer school, in a committee to promote community health, business sessions, in learning and service communities, etc.) is fair and equal, with equal dialogue, levelling out communication.

Respecting Diversity
In addition, this second principle, positive valuation of diversity, the “right to difference”, featured from the start in the cultural pluralism approaches. Diversity cannot be managed positively if it is not valued, respected and used properly. Respect for diversity complements the principle of equality perfectly: only in a framework of equality (at least a certain equality or lack of strong inequality) can cultural, ethnic, linguistic, religious, origin-based differences really be respected; and in turn, only by appropriately taking into account (without exaggerating, or essentialisms, or paternalisms) the particular features and own traits of different groups and people can we make progress towards well-understood equality. In other words, this does not refer to everyone being equal in everything, or a philosophy or policy of exacerbated egalitarianism: on the contrary, it is a case of equality with respect for difference, respect for diversity within equality, unity in diversity.

If we capture these considerations or premises relating to this second axis of all interculturalism (shared with multiculturalism, of course) in the field of the intervention in neighbourhoods, this demonstrates the relevance of incorporating aspects into the project design such as: a) public recognition of the town’s different cultural, linguistic or religious expressions, b) making sure that “the others” (we are all others) are present in the project meetings, c) actions to “multiculturalise” the composition of associations and technical spaces, etc.

What interculturalism specifically brings to this point is that it puts the principle and value of active respect for diversity (common to multiculturalism) within the framework of working for positive interaction between different parties and the emphasis put on what they have in common (identification, search and agreement on common points). This is, after stating (or at the same time as we state) that we are all neighbours or parents of students or patients, and whilst explicitly establishing what is shared, what joins us or binds us, we should also formulate that there are specific aspects, differences to take into account or to take care of: never diversity in itself but always in the light of the many things we share, although this leads us to the third axis, the most specific concerning the intercultural perspective.

Positive interaction and emphasis on what we have in common
In this third axis that we are proposing as specific for interculturalism compared to multicultural-
alism (Giménez, 1997 and 2003), the background approach revolves around what has already been expressed on: emphasising what we have in common, making the most of different aspects to formulate and strengthen this common sphere and establishing collaboration or intercultural cooperation. So then, this common field is not something given but dynamic, historically changing, to go on seeking, identifying and formulating in a participative and collective way.

Below, I will state some possible elements of this positive interaction between different aspects and this emphasis on what we have in common. Suddenly, we have everything relating to the common interests of persons, citizens, less advantaged, vulnerable people. They might be common interests among wide-reaching sectors (it all has implications); not only generic but at a local level: a) common concern for development and well-being and improving quality of life; b) defence and exercise of citizen rights, and the rule of law and democracy; c) the feeling, acknowledgement and exercising of common and inclusive citizenship; d) collective, social and citizen participation as a meeting place; e) sharing civility or civil behaviour, f) common identities and behaviours.

Secondly, community work can be done on anything related to common interests and intercultural collaboration by sector: a) alliances and cooperation between culturally differentiated workers, b) alliances and cooperation between culturally differentiated young people, c) common interests, alliances and cooperation between culturally differentiated women, d) alliances and cooperation in other social groups: traders, professionals, etc.

Finally, we can list some of the community work requirements for positive interest and intercultural collaboration. We can highlight the following three points: a) reciprocal requirement of responsibilities, b) intercultural mediation and c) intercultural dialogue.
Appendix I⁶. The focus on living together and intercultural citizenship

Conceptual and methodological matrix to discuss the meaning of activities carried out in an intervention project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference categories</th>
<th>Guidance questions for discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Programmes</td>
<td>— Has the actual activity constituted a cohabitation programme, according to the terms defined in the Project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Situations</td>
<td>— How have the existing situations in the community appeared as the activity was developed, in terms of cohabitation, coexistence and hostility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Processes for transformation</td>
<td>— Was the activity useful to contribute in a small way to overcoming hostility, moving from hostility to coexistence, or moving from coexistence to cohabitation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Connections</td>
<td>— Has this activity managed to establish relationships between persons or groups that were usually not connected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attitudes</td>
<td>— What attitudes of acceptance/rejection, inclusion/exclusion, acknowledgement, etc. have been demonstrated in this activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Standards</td>
<td>— In which standard framework does the activity take place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— When running the action: has this framework or standard adjustment been explained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Are the players aware of it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Values</td>
<td>— What values are the basis of the activity and which have been expressed in it, either explicitly or implicitly (solidarity, hospitality, respect, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Communication and languages</td>
<td>— When running the activity or experience: has communication been good or bad (either verbal or non verbal)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— What has been outstanding from a linguistic point of view?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Who made communication easier?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conflict</td>
<td>— Did the activity have any component of prevention, regulation or resolution of conflict issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Does it represent progress in extending a civic culture of conflict?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Was there any dialogue (direct or facilitated by third parties)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Participation</td>
<td>— What circles of participation can be made out when running these activities (according to the theory of the three circles⁷)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— How has participation from culturally differentiated persons and groups in the same activity helped to establish new relationships and overcome prejudices and stereotypes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Identities</td>
<td>— Does carrying out this activity help to extend or strengthen shared identities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— When preparing, carrying out and valuing the action carried out: has respect been expressed in any way for the identities of others that are not common or shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Local political life</td>
<td>— Has the political dimension of living together been taken into consideration in the activity design? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Citizens</td>
<td>— Does this initiative represent any progress in terms of considering non nationals as citizens?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Does it generate greater civic awareness in any way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rights</td>
<td>— Has the rights focus been present in the approach and carrying out of this activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— What rights are implicit in this field of action?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁶ Adaptation and development of the methodological instrument generated within the framework of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project by the ‘la Caixa’ Foundation.

⁷ Outline proposed by Marco Marchioni working from the consideration that the players’ participation is never equal or the same degree but that it can be classified in at least three circles of greater to lesser implication where this dynamic location is such that whoever is in the core today might move into an outer circle of potential collaborators in certain activities at another time.
15. Responsibilities
--- At any point in the activity, have each person’s responsibilities been called on?
--- Participation in this activity: does it explicitly or implicitly represent meeting any obligation or responsibility (as neighbours, parents of students, professionals, political leaders, etc.)?

16. Belonging
--- Has acknowledgement of the other as belonging to the same community been demonstrated in any way?
--- Have common belonging categories been used to refer to the Other (such as “neighbours” or “us, people from the neighbourhood”) or, on the contrary, is reference to the Other always made in terms of: immigrant, nationality, other culture, religiousness, etc.?

17. Institutionalism
--- Has participation from political leaders represented progress in their legitimisation as such?
--- Have demands been expressed towards representatives from public institutions?
--- What was their attitude and response?

18. Equality
--- Was there equal dialogue between participants from different sociocultural segments of the community?
--- How do inequality contexts affect the development of activities such as the reference activity?

19. Respect for diversity
--- Was there mutual respect?
--- Is this passive or active respect?

20. Positive interaction
--- Has work been done on common interests, rights or needs?
--- Has this aspect been emphasised?
Appendix II. Qualitative indicators for cohabitation, coexistence and hostility

Table no. 1. Qualitative indicators of cohabitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Interpersonal| — There are active connections among the people living in the place, with elements of reciprocity, mutual learning and cooperation.  
                  | — Working from shared interests (as neighbours, parents of students, etc.) there are reasonably solid ties between ethno-culturally differentiated people.  
                  | — It is usual for there to be mixture or fusion spaces (physical, artistic, associations, cultural) without this representing assimilation or discrimination. |
| 2. Standards    | — Moral and legal standards are respected and assumed, specifically rules for neighbour communities, use of public spaces and general civic norms. |
| 3. Axiological  | — The community’s basic or central values are respected and assumed as they belong to the community (we would be talking about neighbourhood communities, etc.).  
                  | — There is an awareness that differentiated values exist in the social groups and communities that are respected when this does not contradict human rights and/or legal ordinance.  
                  | — If there is a conflict of values, this is tackled peacefully with dialogue. |
| (values)        |                                                                                           |
| 4. Participative| — It is actively promoted and in fact it manages to get foreign and/or ethnic minority population participating in local institutions and community life.  
                  | — Public spaces are shared in a standardised and peaceful way, without competition, tension, aggression or segregation of ethno-cultural groups in the space. |
| 5. Communication| — In general, there is intercultural communication, this is usually respectful and effective.  
                  | — There is a successful linguistic policy for learning the host society's language for anyone who does not speak it, as well as respect and value for other languages present in the environment. |
| 6. Conflict-based| — There are specific measures to prevent and avoid conflicts.  
                  | — When tensions and confrontations arise, they are tackled with peaceful procedures such as negotiation or mediation. |
| 7. Attitudes    | — Institutionally and socially, the local medium values diversity positively.  
                  | — There is active respect.  
                  | — Tolerance is understood and experienced as full acceptance of something different, even the opposite. |
| 8. Identity     | — Independently of other identities and belongings, the set of inhabitants clearly identifies with the city and/or its neighbourhoods.  
                  | — A certain degree of local belonging is assumed. |
| 9. Political    | — Local citizen rallying includes the majority discourse, attitude or will to build on living together.  
                  | — There are basic agreements between the different local political formations to encourage living together and cohesion locally. |
Table no. 2. Qualitative indicators of coexistence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal</td>
<td>Connections between people with differentiated cultural backgrounds are not active; they live separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is interpersonal endogamy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarce knowledge of (and interest in) other people’s culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Among people who perceive themselves as different, there are barely any solid interpersonal links: visits, shared association friendships, couples or kinship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Standards</td>
<td>The basic rules of deference, neighbours, etc. are met but at the very lowest level without harming anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Axiological</td>
<td>The values may be divergent, but this situation is accepted as long as there is no conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(values)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participative</td>
<td>Although there is some participation among the foreign and ethnic monitory population in the local institutions and in community life, their main participation takes place in their own (“ethnic”) spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They cohabit in public spaces because they come across each other there but there is barely any relationship between them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication</td>
<td>Communication remains restricted to their own identification, national, cultural, ethnic, religious or linguistic group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conflict-based</td>
<td>Good relations are reduced to mere non-existence of conflict, disputes and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When conflict emerges, it is not tackled or it is tackled badly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attitudes</td>
<td>Neutral attitude (neither positive or negative) towards diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is respect, but it is rather passive, letting things happen, with nil or little interest in the Other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance is understood and practised rather more as putting up with the Other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Identity</td>
<td>Identification prevails along with the feeling of belonging to one’s own social and cultural group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration of the feeling of common belonging to the city, to the neighbourhood...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Political</td>
<td>Social participation is expressed separately among the different sociocultural segments of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no agreement, but nor is there confrontation, among the local political groups, regarding immigration and cultural diversification in the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table no. 3. Qualitative indicators of hostility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Interpersonal | — High incidence of mistrust, antagonism, avoidance, non acknowledgement and blaming others in social connections.  
 — The other is perceived as a threat.  
 — There are not usually any interpersonal ties (except perhaps instrumental connections); these ties are even criticised if they take place (generally by the dominant and excluding group).  
 — Rivalry prevails over cooperation.  
 — They live in separate spaces, with marginalised areas that are ethnically differentiated (ghettos).  
 — There is frequently discriminatory, unfair behaviour, selectively: depending on who you form relationships with. |
| 2. Standards  | — The Others are constantly criticised for not following the rules.  
 — The hostile group does not follow the democratic rules of respect and equal behaviour.                                                                                       |
| 3. Axiological (values)  | — The Others are constantly criticised for not sharing basic values.                                                                                                                                              |
| 4. Participative  | — The Others are rejected and an attempt is made to stop them participating in institutions and community life.  
 — In public spaces, there is an atmosphere of tension and confrontation (or it is frequently created).                                                                                                         |
| 5. Communication  | — Usually, there is no communication with whoever is being rejected.  
 — When there is, the tone is negative, and it is not unusual for this to be reduced to discrediting and insults.                                                                                                   |
| 6. Conflict-based  | — There is an awareness that there is latent unresolved conflict and that people are even living in clear conflict that is not properly regulated.  
 — There is no social peace, not even passive peace as an absence of incidents.                                                                                                                                    |
| 7. Attitudes  | — Rejection of diversity.  
 — There is no respect or tolerance, not even in its passive sense.  
 — An aggressive attitude can turn into (and does actually turn into) verbal aggression, or even physical attacks.                                                                                                          |
| 8. Identity  | — Obstacles are raised for shared identity and belonging.  
 — A considerable sector talks exclusively about our society, our neighbourhood, our school, as they and the others are not part of each other.  
 — They do not claim to include the minority.                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 9. Political  | — At a local level, there are political or trade union formations with xenophobic attitudes or programmes.  
 — The local community is divided and oppose each other (also) in politically opposing segments.                                                                                                                    |
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APPENDIX III
Outline of the prior community study and the initial state of living together

Part one. Analysis and general context

1. Unique and unmistakable features of the intervention community: basic structural outlook
   1.1 Description of the territory: town planning, neighbourhood, human geography, housing, barriers, parks, communications.
   1.2 Demographic history of the community and relevant events over the last few years
   1.3 Demographic analysis at three points in time: recent past, present and imminent future
   1.4 The community economy: companies, trade, business activities, etc.
   1.5 Summarised history of the association movement and participation
   1.6 Administrative and political history (electoral data)

2. Sectors into which society is normally organised, including analysis of existing resources
   2.1 Educational
   2.2 Healthcare
   2.3 Work and occupation, unemployment
   2.4 Sport
   2.5 Social care

3. The community from the four major phases of human life
   3.1 Childhood
   3.2 Youth
   3.3 Adults
   3.4 Old People
   3.5 Gender Perspective

4. Problems and demands that require specific analysis
   4.1 Housing and accommodation conditions
   4.2 Citizen security
Part two. State of living together

5. Cohabitation, coexistence and hostility
   5.1 The existence or non-existence of intercultural connections and their nature
   5.2 Standards, rules of the game and civility
   5.3 Values in local life: shared and not shared
   5.4 Participative dimension
   5.5 The existence or not of communication between groups and persons from different collectives
   5.6 Latent and manifest social conflict issues: how they are tackled
   5.7 Attitudes to diversity and immigration
   5.8 The issue of identities and how they are expressed locally
   5.9 The democratic cohabitation framework and the local political sphere

6. Integration and social exclusion
   6.1 Integration/exclusion of minorities
   6.2 Attitudes among the majority: acceptance/rejection
   6.3 Role of the administrations: plans, programmes and devices

7. Intercultural connections in the community
   7.1 Equal treatment / discrimination-segregation
   7.2 Valuing diversity and attitudes of respect/aversion
   7.3 Interaction among different groups: fields and methods

8. Local citizenship
   8.1 Acknowledging and exercising local rights and responsibilities
   8.2 Belonging, local identification and neighbourliness
   8.3 Institutional legitimacy and role of civil society

9. Community strengthening
   9.1 Community organisation: background and deficits
   9.2 Social and citizen participation: experiences and deficiencies
   9.3 Community skills training: heritage and needs
APPENDIX IV
Questionnaire

2010 survey

**Study no.**  
10083

**Questionnaire no.**

---

** Territory:**

---

**Date:**

---

**Name of the interviewer:**

Hello. I am (name of interviewer), from Metroscopia. We are running a survey to find out what people think about life in their neighbourhood. Would you mind answering the questions in this survey? We can assure you that it is completely anonymous and that nobody will be able to see your answers individually. Thank you very much for your help.

---

**Q.1 Gender**

- Man
- Woman

---

**Q.2 How old are you?**

---

**Q.3 In which country were you born?**

** Spain**

- Province:
- Town:
  - Go to Q.7

** Outside Spain**

- Country:
- City/region:
  - Go to Q.4

---

**Q.4 What is your nationality?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Moroccan</th>
<th>Romanian</th>
<th>Ecuadorian</th>
<th>Colombian</th>
<th>Peruvian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Senegalese</th>
<th>Guinean</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Others (specify)</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**ONLY ASK Q4 TO PEOPLE BORN OUTSIDE SPAIN, CODE 2 IN Q.3**

---

**FOR EVERYONE**

**Q.5 In some areas of Spain, as well as in some countries, there are certain groups or sectors of people that, as well as identifying with their country, also feel part of a certain ethnic or cultural group as happens in Spain in the case of gypsies. Is this your case?**

- Yes. Which group do you feel part of?
- No
- No opinion
Q.6 To what extent do you feel that you belong to the following groups? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They feel like they are from (territory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They feel like they are from (town)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They feel like they are from (autonomous region)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They feel Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They feel European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For people not born in Spain: they feel (country of origin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.7 How long have you lived in Spain?

- Time in months
- Time in years

Q.8 How long have you been living in (name of territory)?

- Time in months
- Time in years

Q.9 In general, to what extent do you like living this (name of territory)? READ

- Very happy
- Quite happy
- Neither happy nor unhappy (do not read)
- Not very happy
- Not at all happy
- Don’t know
- No opinion

Q.10 If you could choose freely, what would you choose? READ. JUST ONE ANSWER

- You would continue living in the same neighbourhood
- You would move to another neighbourhood in this town
- You would move to another city or village in this same region.
- You would move to another city or village in another region of Spain.
- You would go to another country.

For people not born in Spain

- You would return to your country
- Don’t know
- No opinion

Q.11 What is your civil status?

- Single
- Married - Civil Partnership - Living with partner
- Divorced - separated
- Widow(er)
- No opinion

Interviewer:
Core family is understood to be the group of people living together and sharing the same home for most of the year with close family ties. The kinship connection is established working from the interviewee. If they share their home with other families, they should only consider their own family. If they live alone in a rented room, the core family is just them individually.

Q.12 How many people make up your core family, including yourself? IF THE INTERVIEWEE LIVES ALONE, PUT 1 AND GO TO Q.14

- Don’t know
- No opinion
**Q.13 What is your kinship connection with the other people in your core family? MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner. Do q.13.1 and 13.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents (yours and/or your partner’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father (yours and/or your partner’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother (yours and/or your partner’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (yours and/or your partner’s) aged 16 or under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (yours and/or your partner’s) aged 17 or over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings (yours and/or your partner’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members of the household that are not family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOR EVERYONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.14 Are you registered on the census?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ONLY ASK Q.14.1 TO PEOPLE LIVING WITH THEIR CORE FAMILY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.14.1 Are the people in your core family registered on the census?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all of them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOR EVERYONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.15 As you might be aware, in the forthcoming municipal elections, it will be possible for resident immigrants from non EU countries to vote, as long as there is an agreement with their country. Do you agree or disagree with the idea that immigrants can vote?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t agree or disagree (don’t read)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree. Go to q.15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ONLY ASK Q.15.1 TO PEOPLE WHO ANSWERED “DISAGREE”, CODE 3, IN Q.15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.15.1 Why do you disagree?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q.16 Before you mentioned that you had children aged under 17 residing in Spain. What type of school do your children go to? READ. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State financed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are taking professional qualification courses (PCPI, Social Guarantee, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are not at school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.16.1 In your children’s school...READ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are more foreign than Spanish students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are as many foreign as Spanish students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are more Spanish than foreign students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.16.2 How do you feel about there being students from different cultures and nationalities in the school? READ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s excellent, it is enriching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine, although it seems to create problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d like it not to be like that, but that’s how it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like it and I think it is damaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.16.3 Do your children usually socialise with their school-mates outside school? READ SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, never or almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.16.4 Are your children’s usual playmates the same nationality as you or from other nationalities? READ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are only from their own nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority are from the same nationality although there are also others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are from several nationalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.16.5 Do you go to meetings with your children’s form tutors or teachers?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.16.6 Do you have any type of relationship with the mothers and/or fathers of your children’s classmates? READ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We just exchange greetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I am friends with the odd father and/or mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have a close and regular relationship with some of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FOR EVERYONE

**Q.17** How would you define the type of relationship that you have with the people in (name of territory) on the whole? MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE, MAX TWO ANSWERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We ignore each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We know each other by sight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We just greet each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation from time to time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We invite each other over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We usually go out together in the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.18 What standards or rules are important to you to get on well together in (name of territory)? MAX THREE ANSWERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Standard/Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don’t know

No opinion

### Q.19 In general, are the basic standards or rules for living together followed in your building (OR IN THE CASE OF INDIVIDUAL HOMES, IN THE HOUSES NEXT DOOR) regarding...? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard/Rule</th>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding bad smells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using common spaces appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping it clean and putting out the rubbish at the right time in the right place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying community rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending community meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite and respectful behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.20 What relationship do you have with...?

Q.20.1 What is the nationality of the people with whom you have a bad relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good relations</th>
<th>Indifferent yet polite relations</th>
<th>No contact</th>
<th>Bad relations</th>
<th>I don’t go to these places (DO NOT READ)</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>P.20.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The neighbours from the same building or the house next door.</td>
<td>The same nationality as you</td>
<td>A different nationality from you</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours from the same street</td>
<td>The same nationality as you</td>
<td>A different nationality from you</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours from the neighbourhood</td>
<td>The same nationality as you</td>
<td>A different nationality from you</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People that I see in the shops</td>
<td>The same nationality as you</td>
<td>A different nationality from you</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I come across in schools, cultural events, sports events</td>
<td>The same nationality as you</td>
<td>A different nationality from you</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people that I meet in the park or garden in the area</td>
<td>The same nationality as you</td>
<td>A different nationality from you</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People that I see in the associations</td>
<td>The same nationality as you</td>
<td>A different nationality from you</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.21 Is there anyone with whom you can share concerns and feelings, for example, your problems when you are worried or when you are physically ill?

Yes. Go to q.21.1

No. Go to q.22

No opinion. Go to q.22

ONLY ASK Q.22.1 TO PEOPLE WHO ANSWERED YES, CODE 1, IN Q.21

Q.21.1 What relationship do you have with this person?

It is their partner

It is their son

It is their sibling

It is another (female) family member

It is another (male) family member

It is a friend

It is a professional or an expert

Other (specify)

Don’t know

No opinion

ONLY ASK Q.22.1 AND Q.22.2 TO PEOPLE WITH CLOSE FRIENDS

Q.22.1 How many of your closest friends are the same nationality as you? READ SCALE

Q.22.2 How many of your closest friends are the same religion as you? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.22.1 Nationality</th>
<th>Q.22.2 Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a few</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR EVERYONE

Q.22 Where do your closest friends live? READ MAX TWO ANSWERS

Here in this neighbourhood

In this city/village

In this region

In other regions of Spain

(Inmigrants only) In your country of origin

In another country

They do not have any close friendships.

Go to q.23

Don’t know

No opinion
FOR EVERYONE

Q.23 Over the last few years, there has been an increase in (name of territory) of people coming from different countries and cultures. How do you see it that...? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>OK (DO NOT READ)</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Indifferent (DO NOT READ)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are people wearing different clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You hear different languages in the street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is food available from other places around the world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are people with different physical traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different religions are followed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other artistic and cultural forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.24 Part of the population of (name of territory) comes from different countries. What do you think about that? READ SCALE
Q.24.1 And how do you think the majority of people in (name of territory) feel about it? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Neither good nor bad (DO NOT READ)</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q.24 For you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.24.1 For most people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.25 In the building where you live (OR IN THE CASE OF INDIVIDUAL HOMES, IN THE HOUSES NEXT DOOR), are there people from other nationalities and/or people from other ethnic groups/cultures? MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other nationalities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish from other ethnic groups/cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.26 Regarding the health centre that you attend, are you very, quite, not very or not at all satisfied with...? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Quite satisfied</th>
<th>Not very satisfied</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
<th>I have never been (DO NOT READ)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The time that the doctor usually spends with you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the doctor treats you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long you have to wait to get an appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your health centre, in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q.27 When you or a member of your family have been to the health centre, have you ever felt like you were not treated properly? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to your religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to your nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to your cultural and health customs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to your race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to how you were dressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For another reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.28 Over the last 12 months, has your health or your family members’ health been affected by...? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pollution caused by traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution caused by industry or factories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollen at certain times of year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone antennas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of chemical products in your home (insecticides, solvents, varnishes, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of animals (beetles, rats, pigeons, cats, dogs, etc.) or their excrement in your home or nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution or poor quality water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise from outside your home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.29 In the last 12 months here in Spain, have you visited a...for health reasons? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>More than once</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homoeopathic doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteopath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturopath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acupuncturist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiropractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healer/witch doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.30 Do you go to the following places in the (name of territory)? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets or hypermarkets in name of territory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small stores run by Spaniards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small stores run by foreigners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars/restaurants run by Spaniards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars/restaurants run by foreigners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone booth establishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.31 Concerning stores run by foreigners in (name of territory), do you think there are...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too many</th>
<th>Sufficient, the right amount</th>
<th>Scarce, hardly any</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q.31.1 In your opinion, the fact that there are foreign-run stores in (name of territory) means that... READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They have boosted trade in the neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have not had any effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have sunk traditional trade in the neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have provided different types of products and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They provide a necessary service for everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are for foreigners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.32 Which of these activities do you usually do in your free-time? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go to the cinema, theatre, museums or cultural visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time in the street, squares or parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to associations or volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the library or training activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to bars, discos or restaurants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic pursuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go on excursions to the country or nature parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to a religious centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.33 Usually or quite frequently, do you...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read newspapers related to an immigrant collective or cultural group (e.g. Latino, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read general newspapers (El País, El Mundo, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to radio stations or programmes related to an immigrant collective or cultural group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to general topic radio programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch TV channels or programmes related to an immigrant collective or cultural group (e.g. Canal Latino, Al Jazeera, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch general TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult websites related to the news for an immigrant collective or cultural group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult websites related to the news in Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONLY ASK Q.33.1 TO PEOPLE WHO ANSWER YES TO ANY MEDIA RELATED TO AN IMMIGRANT COLLECTIVE, ITEMS 1, 3, 5 AND 7 OF Q.33

Q.33.1 Why do you read, listen or visit these newspapers, radio programmes, TV channels or websites related to an immigrant collective or cultural group? MAX THREE REASONS

1.

2.

3.

Don’t know 98

No opinion 99

FOR EVERYONE

Q.34 Do you think that the following exists in (name of territory)...? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity and help among people even though they don’t know each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for a person or group’s beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance between people from different religions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect towards people from other nationalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance between people from different races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.35 Do you think that the following is taken into consideration in (name of territory)? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not bothering others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiding by municipal ordinances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping the building/ space clean and hygienic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting traffic rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using public spaces appropriately (streets, squares, parks, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting others’ beliefs and there ways of life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.36 Would you say that all people in (name of territory) respect these rules of living together equally?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some more than others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.37 Are you a member or do you currently participate in a...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPA (school parents’ association)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONLY ASK Q.37.1 TO PEOPLE WHO ANSWERED YES IN Q.37

Q.37.1 Do you hold a position or office in any of these entities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. In which? (write down)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR EVERYONE

Q.38 What organisations do you know that work to improve living together and resolve problems in (name of territory), even if it is only by name? DO NOT READ. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE

Q.38.1 And out of this list I am going to read (READ ANY THAT WERE NOT MENTIONED SPONTANEOUSLY), which do you know, even if it is only by name, that work to improve living together and to resolve problems in (name of territory)? DO NOT READ. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.38</th>
<th>Q.38.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caritas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Council social services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Social Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business foundations with social content (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural associations (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant associations (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entity or association that promotes the project in this territory (CODENAF, ANAQUERANDO, CEAIN, EL PATIO, EL TORRENT, SURT, TOT RAVAL, ACISI, CASAL DELS INFANTS, ELCHE ACOGE, FEDERICO OZANAM, LA RUECA, FUAM, RIOJA ACOGE, SECRETARIADO GITANO, CEAR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.39 Have you ever, since you have lived in (name of territory), gone to an organisation to ask for help with an issue? READ MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.38</th>
<th>Q.38.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caritas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Council social services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Social Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business foundations with social content (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural associations (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant associations (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entity or association that promotes the project in this territory (CODENAF, ANAQUERANDO, CEAIN, EL PATIO, EL TORRENT, SURT, TOT RAVAL, ACISI, CASAL DELS INFANTS, ELCHE ACOGE, FEDERICO OZANAM, LA RUECA, FUAM, RIOJA ACOGE, SECRETARIADO GITANO, CEAR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (do not read)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ONLY ASK Q.39.1 TO PEOPLE WHO TURNED TO AN ORGANISATION IN Q.39

Q.39.1 Did they solve that problem for you? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Do not particularly agree</th>
<th>Do not agree at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but only partly/ only sometimes / some yes, others not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They did not solve it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR EVERYONE

Q.40 I’m now going to read a few phrases on (name of territory). Please tell me if you agree a lot, slightly, not particularly or not at all with each of them. Your neighbourhood...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Do not particularly agree</th>
<th>Do not agree at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is a good neighbourhood to live in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has too many foreigners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has cohabitation conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is multicultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is tolerant with people from other cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has people from different religions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has a lack of public services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.41 In your opinion, is the fact there there are people from different countries in (name of territory) an advantage or a disadvantage? Q.41.1 And other religions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q.41 Different countries</th>
<th>Q.41.1 Other religions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is an advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a disadvantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is neither an advantage nor a disadvantage</td>
<td>(do not read)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are not too many nationalities or religions</td>
<td>(do not read)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.42 Among neighbours in (name of territory) from different cultures, nationalities or religions... READ

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is barely any relationship but people let others get on with their lives, there is respect, and barely any conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is tension and even hostility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a good relationship and if a problem emerges, it is resolved peacefully.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.42.1 In your opinion, to what extent is it important that immigrants...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain customs from their original culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt customs from Spanish culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.43 Do you follow a religion? Which one? JUST ONE ANSWER

- None (atheist, agnostic). Go to q.43.2
- Catholic (not to be confused with other Christian denominations)
- Orthodox
- Protestant - evangelical, other Christian denominations
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Buddhist
- Hindu
- Others (specify)
- No opinion

ONLY ASK THE MUSLIMS

Q.43.3 To what extent would you say that there is mistrust in Spanish society regarding Islam? And in (name of territory)? And towards you personally?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the territory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR EVERYONE

Q.44 Have you personally or any of your core family ever had a problem with a person or group from (name of territory)?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
- No opinion

ASK Q.44.1 TO PEOPLE WHO ANSWERED YES, CODE 1, IN Q.44

Q.44.1 What was the cause of the problem? IF THERE WAS MORE THAN ONE, ASK WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT OR, FAILING THAT, FOR THE LATEST ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise (music, parties, voices, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad smells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor use of common space (stairway, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt or taking out bins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How you or a family member was treated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q.44.2 What happened? There was... MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insults or verbal attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.44.4 Was the problem resolved?  
ONLY ASK Q.44.5 TO PEOPLE WHO ANSWERED YES, CODE 1, IN Q.44.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking directly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By negotiation with lawyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By mediation with third parties (mediator, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letting time go by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In another way (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.44.3 The neighbour with whom the problem occurred is... READ MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The same age as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same gender as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same nationality as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same ethnic or cultural group as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same religion as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same socio-economic level as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR EVERYONE

Q.45 In (name of territory), have you ever felt mistreated or discriminated because of...? READ SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>3 or more times</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The colour of your skin or physical traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your cultural customs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your political ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONLY ASK FOREIGNERS

Q.46 Have you ever suffered because you were foreign...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasty tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrust/suspicion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorn / lack of respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal threats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR EVERYONE

Q.47 What would you suggest to improve living together in (name of territory)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q.48 Do you share your home with other families or people outside your core family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ONLY ASK Q.48.1 AND Q.48.2 TO PEOPLE LIVING WITH OTHER PERSONS, CODE 1 FOR Q.48

Q.48.1 How many other people in total do you share your home with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q.48.2 Are they from your own nationality? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>The majority</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FOR EVERYONE

Q.49 The house where you live is...READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rented by you or someone in your core family</th>
<th>Purchased by you or someone in your core family</th>
<th>Lent to you by a family member or friend</th>
<th>Lent by an entity or institution free of charge or for symbolic rent</th>
<th>Rented by you but more than one family / individuals live there</th>
<th>Provided by your employer or company where you work</th>
<th>A rented room</th>
<th>A hostel or residence</th>
<th>Another answer (specify)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|                                           |                                            |                                              |                                        |                                                            |                                                            |                                                                |                |                        |                        |            |            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.49.1 Is you home official protection housing (VPO)?</th>
<th>Q.53.1 Over the last five years, how many homes have you lived in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.50 What type of home do you live in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat in a block of flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.51 How many homes are there in your building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.52 What is the floor area of your home?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square metres:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.53 How long have you lived in your current home?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.54 What is your native language?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan/Valencian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berber/Amazigh/Rif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.55 Do you speak any other languages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ONLY ASK Q.56 AND Q.56.1 TO PEOPLE WHO SPEAK ANOTHER LANGUAGE, CODE 1 IN Q.55

**Q.56 Which languages and to what level? (READ SCALE. POSSIBLE MULTIPLE ANSWERS FOR LANGUAGES AND SCALE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Understands</th>
<th>Talks</th>
<th>Reads</th>
<th>Writes</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan/Valencian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berber/Amazigh/Rif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.56.1 Which language or languages do you speak at home, in your family and which do you speak in the neighbourhood? MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>At home</th>
<th>In the neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan/Valencian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berber/Amazigh/Rif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR EVERYONE

Q.57 What level of studies have you completed? And your father? And your mother?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your father</th>
<th>You mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannot read (illiterate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No studies, but can read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete primary studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pre-school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior School (Primary, entry level, etc.) (studied until age of 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school / 1st cycle (EGB stage 2, 4th ESO, school leaving certificate, secretarial studies, general culture, etc.) (studied until age of 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school / 2nd cycle (BUP, COU, FP1, FP2, PREU, baccalaureate, university entrance, language school, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education (university school, technical engineering / surveyors school, diplomas, ATS, social worker, teaching degree, three years of university studies, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary university education (university, senior technical school, graduates, etc. completing all years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONLY ASK Q.58 TO PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT SPANISH BY NATIONALITY, CODE 2 OF Q.3.1

Q.58 Do you have...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporary residence permit</th>
<th>Residence and work permit</th>
<th>No papers</th>
<th>Other situation (specify)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR EVERYONE

Q.59 What is your current situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Looking for first job</th>
<th>Housewife</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ONLY ASK Q.59.1 TO PEOPLE WHO WORK, CODE 1, IN Q.59

Q.59.1 Do you work...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For yourself</th>
<th>For someone else?</th>
<th>No contract</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONLY ASK Q.59.2 TO PEOPLE WHO ARE EMPLOYED ON A CONTRACT OR SELF-EMPLOYED, CODES 1 AND 2 IN Q.59.1

Q.59.2 Do you employ others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>How many? (note)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No

WRITE DOWN THE INTERVIEWEE’S JOB IN DETAIL

ONLY ASK Q.59.3 TO PEOPLE WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED, CODE 2, IN Q.59

Q.59.3 How long have you been unemployed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in months:</th>
<th>Time in years:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE DOWN DETAILS OF THEIR LAST JOB
### FOR EVERYONE

#### Q.60 What do you most like about living in (name of territory)?
**MAX THREE ANSWERS**

1. 
2. 
3. 

Don't know
No opinion

#### Q.61 What do you least like about living in (name of territory)?
What are the three main problems?

1. 
2. 
3. 

Don't know
No opinion

#### Q.62 What do you think (name of territory) will be like in general in 10 years time? READ SCALE

Better
The same
Worse
Don’t know
No opinion

#### Q.63 NOTE DOWN IF THEY ARE FROM THE GYPSY ETHNIC GROUP DO NOT ASK DIRECTLY.

Yes
No

---

**Name of the interviewee:**

**Address of the interviewee:**

**Telephone no.:**

**Duration of the interview:**

**Name and signature of the interviewer:**

---

**FIELD CHECK**

Reviewed
Coded
Telephone supervisor
Personal supervisor
Recorded
Null
APPENDIX V
Map of cultural diversity in the territory

A diversity map is a graphic representation of a territory’s sociocultural reality. It is built up from a series of variables that offer specific information on the presence of different collectives, types of occupation and use of the urban space (residential, work-related, for services, for leisure and free-time, worship, etc.).

What is it used for?
This tool allows us to obtain a dynamic snapshot of the diversity in the territory, the relationships that are established among the different groups and the state of general sociability (cohabitation, coexistence or hostility), making it possible to identify elements of cohesion and conflict within and between groups.

Description
Firstly, we define the variables to be observed regarding the composition of the diverse population: origin, nationality, ages, gender, languages, religion, cultural traits, commercial activity and services, association-movement and participation, etc. Once these variables have been identified, they are put on the map and crossed with other variables referring to the territory: economy, housing, infrastructures, etc. In this way, we manage to obtain a dynamic view of diversity and the state of sociability that can guide intercultural community intervention work.

Depending on the variables that are compiled, the map will present different “layers” of information. Each layer is, in itself, a topic-based diversity map, as it stresses some specific variables.

A brief guide is offered below on nine sociocultural variables that can be taken into account to make the diversity map for a territory plus crossing with another three territorial variables, making it easier to analyse sociability.

Recommendations
It is advisable to review each territory’s diversity map over time to identify and assess any possible changes that have taken place as a consequence of the community process or other local or external factors.
On the other hand, and taking into account that in the next two points we are going to compile variables to be considered, both when drawing up the diversity map and when analysing the state of sociability, we should issue a warning: this is not a case of having information on all the variables but being aware of them throughout the community process, to capture and enrich them through different topic-based diversity maps.

All the information presented in the following points will help us to adapt a map on which to base an initial sociability analysis for the territory, showing what relations are like among neighbours, potential or actual conflictive situations, potential or actual opportunities for living together, etc.

**Variables to be considered when drawing up the diversity map.**

**Population profile by origin, migratory profile and belonging to minorities. Historical configuration of diversity.** This data will give us an initial panorama of how migration affects the territory, if it is traditionally a host neighbourhood having experienced previous migratory processes from other areas of Spain; how the foreign population has been incorporated into the territory: gradually or abruptly, and their weight in the population as whole.

a. Historical evolution of the migratory processes in the territory:
   — Internal migration: periods, origins, current situation.
   — Foreign migration: chronological development, relevance of the different origins.

b. Current presence of foreign population within the territory’s population as a whole:
   — Percentage of foreign population in the territory.
   — Most numerous nationalities.

c. Percentage of gypsy population in the territory.
   — Historical evolution of this population in the territory, current situation.

**Population age profile.** This profile shows us the average age of the population living in the territory, as well as the ageing or rejuvenation processes that are taking place in it. Age is a relevant variable when analysing the sociability processes: for example, we often find ageing native populations alongside young populations from other origins, leading to different ways of organising daily life: different timetables, needs for relaxation, leisure, etc. It is also relevant because it shows which interventions, measures, resources and equipments are necessary to meet the population’s needs properly.
   — Average age of the native population / foreign population.
   — The territory’s ageing/rejuvenation processes.
Population gender profile. Closely linked to former items, knowing the demographic weight of men and women in the territory, and how it relates to age and origins, it is relevant to understand the social processes that take place and the needs that can be detected.
— Percentage of men/women among native population.
— Percentage of men/women among foreign population.
— Relating this data to the average age.
— Relating this data to origins: for example, if there is a more emasculated or feminised group.

Religious diversity
— Different religious denominations present in the territory.
— Places of worship: which spaces they use, how they are represented in the environment.
— Public displays of religiousness: ritual festive cycle, celebrations, processions, etc.
— Spiritual/religious leaders living in the territory.

Linguistic diversity
— Different languages or dialects spoken in the territory.
— Ties between languages/origins/ethnic group.

Cultural diversity. Although the previous two points also refer to cultural diversity, here we are rather more referring to demonstrations of different:
— Customs
— Rites
— Values
— Roles

Business and services. On this point, the business and services map for the neighbourhood will be compiled taking into account the following:
— Evolution of the business and service fabric over the last few decades.
— Types of business and services: small business, shopping arcades, traditional markets, shopping centres, hospitality and catering, personal services (telephone booths, hairdressers, estate agents, travel agents, etc.).
— Profile of the people running them, native or foreign trader, living in the neighbourhood or not, age, gender, amount of time the business has been open...
— Services and products that are sold: generic, specialised, aimed at different population profiles...
— Client profile: “born and bred”, native, foreign, sporadic...
— Participation from the business structure and local businesses in neighbourhood life: festivals, rallies, protests, etc.

**Association activity in the territory**
— Type of association movement.
— Profile of association members.
— Services that are offered to the territory.
— Participation from neighbours in the territory’s association movement.

**Other diversities.** On this point, it seems relevant to mention other possible varieties of diversity that are known about and that might be interesting when analysing sociability in the territory: sexual orientation, disabilities, youth subcultures...

**Variables to analyse the state of sociability working from diversity**
The diversity map can be crossed with variables relating to social inequality that offer a panorama of the relationship between diversity/inequality, mentioning the **key structural issues for the territory that affect its social connections.**

**Economic data**
a. Territory’s income level  
b. Unemployment rate:  
   — Among native / foreign population  
   — Men/women  
   — Age  
c. Presence of underground economy:  
   — Estimation of economic volume  
   — Sectors of submerged economy  
   — Profile of people engaged in underground economy  
d. Data on subsidies, service provision, economic funding, etc.

**Housing**
a. Data on rehousing, evictions, etc.  
b. Stock of state housing in the territory  
   — Protected housing  
   — Public rental
Infrastructures

— Equipment and basic services: schools, health centres, social services centres, libraries, civic centres, youth centres...
— State of conservation of the territory: cleaning the streets, green areas, parks, lighting, conservation of public equipment...

As a brief and synthetic initial example to give us a first snapshot, a cultural diversity map is reflected below for the neighbourhood of Las Margaritas (Getafe, Madrid).

Variables: population profile, religious diversity, cultural diversity, associations and business.
APPENDIX VI

Sociogram or social map

A sociogram is a graphic representation of the social connections at a particular time between the set of social players such as administrators, associations or certain sectors of the population.

What is it used for?
Synthetically, the sociogram allows us to identify the stance of the community’s key players regarding the ICI Project goals. In turn, it allows us to see relationships that are established between the different key players, giving us guidelines on how to intervene to transform relationship dynamics.

Description
In order to build the map of connections, we must follow these steps:

Step one
First of all, we should identify all the relevant social players within our field of intervention and assign them each a geometric symbol. Assigning a geometric figure per player will help us in the final interpretation of the sociogram. For example:

- The star represents the **ICI team** and how it puts itself on the map.

- A circle represents **social organisations** (associations, NGO or trade unions, etc.) related to our focus field or goal.

- The triangle represents **public administrations** with the capability to make political decisions, e.g. government, ministry, autonomous region, councils, consortiums, districts, town hall, district councils, police, etc.

- Technical or professional resources from other entities, programmes or the Administration, for example: social workers, intercultural mediators, etc.

- Finally, the diamond represents the **information groups** present in our territory (citizen assemblies, groups of young people, etc.)
Step two

Once all the relevant social players have been identified, we will put them on the connections map with two axes. The **power axis (x on the map)** and the **affinity axis (y)**.

The **power axis** (x) refers to this social player’s capability to affect and cause social and political changes in the community. The greater the power of the social player, the higher up it is on the x axis.

The **affinity axis** (y) refers to the social players’ affinity-opposition connection regarding the ICI Project goals. Within this axis, there are different graduations, corresponding to:

- **Allied players**: they know us, they acknowledge our legitimacy, common actions are suggested.
- **Indifferent players**: they know us but there is no cooperation; the relationship goes no further than being aware of our existence.
- **Distant players**: they don’t know us.
- **Opposing players**: they know us but they are resistant and even confrontational to our suggestions.

The social player is placed at one point or another along the y axis depending on the degree of affinity.

We only have six players in this example. What actually happens in each territory is much more complex, with multiple players on the map and a dense network of lines interconnecting them, describing their type of relationship.
Fictitious example

A thick, solid line indicates a trust and collaboration relationship.

A thin dotted line indicates one-off or occasional relationships.

A thin solid line indicates an information exchange relationship.

A solid line with a cross indicates a conflictive relationship.

Step three

Once we have put all the social players on the connections map, we establish the relationship between each of them visually. To do this, we will combine the different symbols on the map, representing the diverse key players, using lines that indicate different relationship intensities.

No line at all demonstrated the absence of a connection.
Step four

Finally, once all the connection lines have been drawn, we will focus on the players that have usual collaboration relationships. These players form action sets, allowing us to identify players that act together or that have enormous potential for joint action in the near future.

Recommendations

It can be very useful to produce sociograms at different points in the process. Whilst at the start of the intervention, we can use this as a prior assessment for connections between the three key players, after a year and a half, it is useful for us to identify how connections are changing and weigh up the community process in the territory, as well as redefine the action strategies if this were the case. At the end of the first intervention phase, the sociogram that we used as an analysis or assessment tool is going to allow us to evaluate whether the intervention in the process has had an effect on the cooperation relationships between the different figures in the territory.

On the other hand, working on the tool from a technical or citizen-based relationship spaces will enrich the connection map analysis, particularly if it is done from cooperation programmes to encourage living together and intercultural citizenship.

Finally, we can complete the connections map analysis by means of questions to be discussed in the group, such as: What needs are arising in our territory? What demands are made by the different players to resolve the detected needs? What are the major centres of interest? and so on.
APPENDIX VII
Questionnaire

2012 survey

Study no. Questionnaire no.
12005

Territory:

Date:

Name of the interviewer:
Hello. I’m (name), an interviewer from Metroscopia. We are running a survey to find out what people think about life in their neighbourhood. Would you mind answering the questions in this survey? We can assure you that it is completely anonymous and that nobody will be able to see your answers individually. Thank you very much for your help.

Q.1 Gender
Man
Woman

Q.2 How old are you?

Q.3 Were you born in this town?
Yes. Go to q.4
No. Go to q.3.1
Don’t know. Go to q.3.1
No opinion. Go to q.3.1

Q.3.1 Were you born in this province?
Yes. Go to q.4
No. Go to q.3.2
Don’t know. Go to q.3.2
No opinion. Go to q.3.2

Q.3.2 In which country were you born?
Spain
Morocco
Romania
Ecuador
Colombia
Peru
Pakistan
Bulgaria
Senegal
Guinea
Bangladesh
China
Argentina
Bolivia
Philippines
Honduras
Sahara
Other (specify)
Don’t know
No opinion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4</strong> What is your nationality or nationalities? MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE</td>
<td>Spanish, Moroccan, Romanian, Ecuadorian, Colombian, Peruvian, Pakistani, Bulgarian, Senegalese, Guinean, Bangladeshi, Chinese, Argentine, Bolivian, Philippine, Honduran, Saharan, Others (specify), No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q5</strong> To what extent do you feel that you belong to the following groups? READ</td>
<td>They feel like they are from (territory), They feel like they are from the town of (town), They feel like they are from (region), They feel Spanish, They feel European, For people not born in Spain, They feel (homeland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q6</strong> How long have you lived in Spain?</td>
<td>Time in years: 00 Less than 1 year, 98 Don’t know, 99 No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q7</strong> How long have you been living in (NAME OF TERRITORY)?</td>
<td>Time in years: 00 Less than 1 year, 98 Don’t know, 99 No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q8</strong> In general, to what extent do you like living in (NAME OF TERRITORY)? READ</td>
<td>Very happy, Quite happy, Neither happy nor unhappy (do not read), Not very happy, Not at all happy, Don’t know, No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q.9 If you could choose freely, what would you choose? READ. JUST ONE ANSWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You would continue living in the same neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would move to another neighbourhood in this town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would move to another city or village in this same region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would move to another city or village in another region of Spain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would go to another country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For people not born in Spain</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would return to your country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.10 Have you experienced any of the following situations because of the recession? READ. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaying a mortgage payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving money from a family member or friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancelling a holiday trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly buying poorer quality food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving money to a family member or friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out less with friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above (do not read)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.11 In your opinion, would you say that the recession has influenced living together in [NAME OF TERRITORY]? READ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It has improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has had no influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has worsened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-only ask Q.11.1 if code 3 in Q.11

### Q.11.1 How would you say that the recession has worsened living together in [NAME OF TERRITORY]? READ. JUST ONE ANSWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is more crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more suspicion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more tension or conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOR EVERYONE**

### Q.12 How many people live in your home, including yourself? IF THE INTERVIEWEE LIVES ALONE, PUT 01 AND GO TO Q.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People living in your home, including yourself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.13 Do you live with your partner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you live with your partner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have a partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ONLY ASK Q.13.1 TO PEOPLE WHO HAVE A PARTNER, CODE 1 OR 2, IN Q.13

Q13.1 What is your partner’s nationality?

- Spanish
- Moroccan
- Romanian
- Ecuadorian
- Colombian
- Peruvian
- Pakistani
- Bulgarian
- Senegalese
- Guinean
- Bangladeshi
- Chinese
- Argentina
- Bolivian
- Philippine
- Honduran
- Saharan
- Other (specify)
- Don’t know
- No opinion

FOR EVERYONE

Q.15 Do you think that the following exists in (NAME OF TERRITORY)…? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity and help among people even though they don’t know each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for each person or group’s religious beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect towards people from other nationalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.16 How would you define the type of relationship that you have with the people in (NAME OF TERRITORY) on the whole? DO NOT READ. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE MAX TWO ANSWERS

- We ignore each other
- We know each other by sight
- We just greet each other
- Occasional conversation
- Cooperation on occasions
- Friendship
- We invite each other over
- We usually go out together in the neighbourhood
- Others (specify)
- Don’t know
- No opinion

FOR PEOPLE NOT BORN IN SPAIN

Q.14 Are you registered on the census?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
- No opinion
Q.17 What elements are important to you to live together well in [NAME OF TERRITORY]? DO NOT READ. MAX TWO ANSWERS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More civility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More tolerance with immigrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each person should be honourable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants should adapt to customs here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More dialogue between people living in the neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More respect for others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More money / better standard of living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.18 In general, are basic standards or rules for living together followed in your building (OR IN THE CASE OF INIDIVIDUAL HOMES, IN THE HOUSES NEXT DOOR) regarding...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending community meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite and respectful behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.19 Do you think that the following is taken into consideration in [NAME OF TERRITORY]...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not bothering others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping the building/space clean and hygienic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate use of public spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.20 Would you say that all people in [TERRITORY] respect these rules of living together equally?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONLY ASK Q.20.1 TO PEOPLE WHO ANSWERED CODE 2 IN Q.20

Q.20.1 Who do you think respects them the least? DO NOT READ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Arabs/Muslims/Moroccans/Pakistanis</th>
<th>Africans/Sub-Saharanis</th>
<th>Latin-Americans</th>
<th>Romanians</th>
<th>Gypsies</th>
<th>Tourists</th>
<th>Young people/teenagers</th>
<th>Old People</th>
<th>Some neighbours in particular</th>
<th>Others (specify)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR EVERYONE

Q.21 Are you a member or do you currently participate in a...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports club</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPA (school parents’ association)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.22 Do you know about any social-community projects that has tried to improve life in (NAME OF TERRITORY)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.22.1 Have you taken part in any social and/community projects to look after a specific collective or a need?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.22.2 Do you know (NAME OF ASSOCIATION WITH COMPLETE NAME AND INITIALS)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.22.3 How important are the activities organised by the (NAME OF ASSOCIATION) for (NAME OF TERRITORY)? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Doesn’t know about their activities</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR EVERYONE

Q.23 Usually or quite frequently, do you...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Read newspapers related to an immigrant collective or cultural group
2. Read general topic newspapers
3. Listen to radio stations or programmes related to an immigrant collective or cultural group
4. Listen to general topic radio programmes
5. Watch TV channels or programmes related to an immigrant collective or cultural group
6. Watch general topic TV
7. Consult websites related to the news for an immigrant collective or cultural group
8. Consult websites related to the news in Spain
ONLY ASK Q.23.1 TO PEOPLE WHO ANSWER YES TO ANY MEDIA RELATED TO AN IMMIGRANT COLLECTIVE, ITEMS 1, 3, 5 AND 7 OF Q.23
Q.23.1 Why do you read, listen or visit these newspapers, radio programmes, TV channels or websites related to an immigrant collective or cultural group? DO NOT READ. MAX TWO ANSWERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To keep up to date on YOUR country</th>
<th>To find out more about OTHER cultures</th>
<th>To learn other languages</th>
<th>For entertainment or fun</th>
<th>Because you understand them / they are in your language</th>
<th>Because you find other points of view not found in other media</th>
<th>Others (specify)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.24 What relationship do you have with...? READ
ONLY ASK Q.24.1 IF THEY ANSWER "BAD RELATIONS"
Q.24.1 What is the nationality of the people with whom you have a bad relationship? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good relations</th>
<th>Indifferent yet polite relations</th>
<th>No contact</th>
<th>Bad relations</th>
<th>I don’t go to these places (DO NOT READ)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Q.24.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The neighbours from the same building or the house next door.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From your nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours from the neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A different nationality from you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people they come across in schools, cultural events, sports events...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people that they meet in the park or garden in the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Living together and social cohesion. Chapter 5

Q.25 I'm now going to read a few phrases on (NAME OF TERRITORY). Tell me to what extent you agree with each of them. Your neighbourhood... READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is a good neighbourhood to live in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has cohabitation conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.26 Part of the population of (NAME OF TERRITORY) comes from different countries. And how do you think the majority of people in (NAME OF TERRITORY) feel about it? READ

Q.26.1 What do you think about that? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Doesn't agree or disagree (DON'T READ)</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.26.2 Over the last few years, there has been an increase in (NAME OF TERRITORY) of people coming from different countries and cultures. How do you see it that...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Neither happy nor unhappy (DO NOT READ)</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Indifferent (DO NOT READ)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are people wearing different clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You hear different languages in the street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is food available from other places around the world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are people with different physical traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different religions are followed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other artistic and cultural forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.27 In general, and thinking about all the possible cases, to what point do you think it acceptable that...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Very acceptable</th>
<th>Quite acceptable</th>
<th>Not very acceptable</th>
<th>Not at all acceptable</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When giving someone a job, preference is given to contracting a Spaniard over an immigrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A girl was expelled from a school for wearing an Islamic veil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are protesting about a mosque being built in their neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal immigrants are expelled from the country for committing any crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.28 In your opinion, immigrants receive from the State...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Much more than they provide</th>
<th>More than they provide</th>
<th>As much as they provide</th>
<th>Less than they provide</th>
<th>Much less than they provide</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.29 Is there any particular collective of foreigners that you like more or that you are more sympathetic towards? DO NOT READ. MAX TWO ANSWERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.29</th>
<th>Q.30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>Romanians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuadorians</td>
<td>Peruvians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombians</td>
<td>Argentineans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Italians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.30 And any that you like less or towards which you have less sympathy? DO NOT READ. MAX TWO ANSWERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.29</th>
<th>Q.30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>Romanians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuadorians</td>
<td>Peruvians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombians</td>
<td>Argentineans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Italians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.31 In the building where you live (OR IN THE CASE OF INDIVIDUAL HOMES, IN THE HOUSES NEXT DOOR)... READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Everyone is Spanish</th>
<th>Almost everyone is Spanish but there are some foreigners</th>
<th>There are as many Spaniards as there are foreigners</th>
<th>Almost everyone is foreign but there are some Spaniards</th>
<th>Everyone is foreign</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.32 To what extent do you agree with the opinion that public healthcare has been affected negatively by the rise in immigration? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.33 Do you go to small stores in (NAME OF TERRITORY) run by foreigners? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q.34 Concerning stores run by foreigners in (NAME OF TERRITORY) are there...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too many</th>
<th>Sufficient, the right amount</th>
<th>Scarce, hardly any</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q.35 In your opinion, the fact that there are foreign-run stores in (NAME OF TERRITORY) means that...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>They have boosted trade in the neighbourhood</th>
<th>They have not had any effect</th>
<th>They have sunk traditional trade in the neighbourhood</th>
<th>They provide different types of products and services</th>
<th>They provide a necessary service for everyone</th>
<th>They are only for foreigners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.36 In your opinion, is the fact that there are people from different countries in (NAME OF TERRITORY) an advantage or a disadvantage? DONOT READ.

Q.36.1 And other religions? DONOT READ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Different countries</th>
<th>Other religions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is an advantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a disadvantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is neither an advantage nor a disadvantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are not too many nationalities or religions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.37 Do you believe that among neighbours in (NAME OF TERRITORY) from different cultures, nationalities or religions...? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is barely any relationship but people let others get on with their lives, there is respect, and barely any conflict</th>
<th>There is tension and even hostility</th>
<th>There is a good relationship and if a problem emerges, it is resolved peacefully.</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.38 Often, the immigrants that come to (NAME OF TERRITORY) have a different culture, language and customs. In this respect, which of the following phrases do you agree with most? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Even if they learn the language and the customs from here, it is good for them to maintain their language and customs as well.</th>
<th>If immigrants wish to stay here, they should forget their customs, learn the language and accept the customs from this country.</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Q.39 As you might be aware, in the past municipal elections, it was possible for resident immigrants from non EU countries to vote, as long as there was an agreement with their country. Do you agree or disagree with the idea that immigrants can vote? DO NOT READ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Doesn’t agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree. Go to q.39.1</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ONLY ASK Q.39.1 TO PEOPLE WHO ANSWERED “DISAGREE”. CODE 3, IN Q.39

Q.39.1 Why do you disagree? DO NOT READ. JUST ONE ANSWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depends how long they have been here</th>
<th>Spanish people cannot vote in other countries</th>
<th>They would vote in favour of their own interests</th>
<th>They already have too many rights</th>
<th>Only Spanish people should be able to vote</th>
<th>They should leave Spain</th>
<th>Others (specify)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Don’t know

No opinion
FOR EVERYONE

Q.40 Do you have any children? How many? IF THEY DO NOT HAVE ANY CHILDREN, ENTER 00 AND GO TO Q.42  1 child (average)

Q.40.1 How old are your children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Only ask about children between 6 and 25 years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of your children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.40.2 Do they study or have they studied in Spain? (Yes/No/Don't know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.40.3 What was the last school year they finished? Show study card and write down the code (Yes/No/Don't know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.40.4 Are they still studying? (Yes/No/Don't know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.40.5 Will they go to university? Only to people whose children are taking the baccalaureate (Yes/No/Don't know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.40.6 Will they take a Baccalaureate / Vocational Training? Only to people whose children are in 3rd or 4th year secondary (Yes/No/Don't know)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONLy ask if they have children between 6 and 18 years old.

Q.41 How do you feel about there being students from different cultures and nationalities in the school? READ

- They think it's excellent, it is enriching.
- Fine, although it seems to create problems.
- They don't mind.
- They'd like it not to be like that, but that's how it is.
- They don't like it and they think it is damaging.
- Don't know
- No opinion

ONLY ASK PEOPLE NOT BORN IN SPAIN THAT ALSO HAVE CHILDREN

Q.41.1 What do you think would be better for your children? READ

- Adopting as many customs as possible from this country
- Conserving as many customs as possible from your country of origin
- Combining both cultures
- Don't know
- No opinion

FOR EVERYONE

Q.42 Do you follow a religion? Which one? JUST ONE ANSWER

- None (atheist, agnostic). Go to q.43.1
- Catholic (not to be confused with other Christian denominations)
- Orthodox
- Protestant - Evangelical, other Christian denominations
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Buddhist
- Hindu
- Others (specify)
- No opinion

ONLY ASK PEOPLE THAT STATE THEIR RELIGION

Q.42.1 To what extent do you practice your religion? READ

- A lot
- Quite a lot
- A little
- Not at all
- Don't know
- No opinion
### Ask Everyone Except the Muslims

**Q.43.1** To what extent would you say that there is mistrust in Spanish society regarding Islam? And in (NAME OF TERRITORY)? And you? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Spain</th>
<th>In the territory</th>
<th>You</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Only Ask the Muslims

**Q.43.2** To what extent would you say that there is mistrust in Spanish society regarding Islam? And in (NAME OF TERRITORY)? And towards you personally? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Spain</th>
<th>In the territory</th>
<th>Towards you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For Everyone

**Q.44** To what extent would you say that there is mistrust in Spanish society regarding gypsies? And in (NAME OF TERRITORY)? And you? READ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Spain</th>
<th>In the territory</th>
<th>You</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.44.1** Do you consider yourself to be from the gypsy ethnic group?

| Yes       | No | No opinion |

### Q.45 Over the Last Year, Have You Experienced Any of the Following Incidents in (NAME OF TERRITORY)? READ (Multiple answers are possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Insults or verbal attack</th>
<th>Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical attack</td>
<td>Official complaint</td>
<td>No incident (do not read). Go to q.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.45.1** Was the problem resolved?

| Yes       | No | No opinion |

**Q.45.2** How was it resolved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talking directly</th>
<th>With an official complaint or police report</th>
<th>By mediation with third parties (mediator, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of address</td>
<td>Letting time go by</td>
<td>We ignore each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In another way (specify)</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR EVERYONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.46 Over the last year, have you felt mistreated or discriminated in (NAME OF TERRITORY) due to...? READ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Once or twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The colour of your skin or physical traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your cultural customs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your political ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONLY ASK FOREIGNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q.47 Have you ever suffered because you were foreign...? READ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrust/suspicion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorn / lack of respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR EVERYONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q.48 The house where you live is...READ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented by you or someone in your core family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased by you or someone in your core family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent by a family member, friend, entity or company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A rented room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another answer (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q.49 Is you home official protection housing (VPO)? |
| Yes | | |
| No | | |
| Don’t know | | |
| No opinion | | |

| Q.50 What type of home do you live in? |
| Flat in a building of neighbours | | |
| Individual construction | | |
| Others (specify) | | |
| Don’t know | | |
| No opinion | | |

| Q.51 How long have you lived in your current home? (PUT AMOUNT IN YEARS, IF LESS THAN ONE YEAR, WRITE 1) |
| Don’t know | | |
| No opinion | | |
Q.51.1 Over the last five years, how many homes have you lived in, including your present home?

Don’t know
No opinion

Q.52 Talking about politics, people usually describe themselves using some of the following expressions. Which of them do you most identify with or do you feel closest to? READ

Far right
Right
Centre right
Centre
Centre left
Left
Far left
None (do not read)
No opinion

Q.53 Do you remember which party you voted for in the general elections in November 2011? DO NOT READ.

PP
PSOE
IU
UPyD
CiU
PNV
ERC
Other
They do not have the right to vote
Blank
Not old enough
Did not vote. Go to q.54
Does not remember
No opinion

ASK ANYONE WHO DID NOT MENTION A SPECIFIC PARTY OR DOES NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Q.54 In any case, which party do you like best or you feel is closest to your way of thinking? DO NOT READ.

PP
PSOE
IU
UPyD
CiU
PNV
ERC
Other
Blank vote
They wouldn’t vote / none of the above
Don’t know
No opinion

Q.55 What is your native language?

Spanish
Catalan/Valencian
Basque
Galician
Romany
English
French
Arabic
Berber/Amazigh/Rif
Romanian
Portuguese
Bulgarian
Chinese
Others (specify)
No opinion

Q.55.1 Do you speak any other languages?

Yes
No
No opinion
ONLY ASK Q.56 AND Q.56.1 TO PEOPLE WHO SPEAK ANOTHER LANGUAGE. CODE 1 IN Q.55.1

**Q.56 Which? MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Catalan/Valencian</th>
<th>Basque</th>
<th>Galician</th>
<th>Romany</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Berber/Amazigh/Rif</th>
<th>Romanian</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Others (specify)</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FOR EVERYONE**

**Q.57 What level of studies have you completed? And your father? And your mother?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your father</th>
<th>Your mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannot read (illiterate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No studies, but can read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete primary studies (pre-school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior school (Primary, entry level, etc.) (studied until age of 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school / 1st cycle (EGB stage 2, 4th ESO, school leaving certificate, secretarial studies, general culture, etc.) (studied until age of 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school / 2nd cycle (BUP, COU, FP1, FP2, PREU, baccalaureate, university entrance, language school, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education (university school, technical engineering / surveyors school, diplomas, ATS, social worker, teaching degree, three years of university studies, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary university education (university, senior technical school, graduates, etc. completing all years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ONL Y ASK Q.58 TO PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT SPANISH BY NATIONALITY, ANSWERING CODE 1 IN Q.4**

**Q.58 Do you have...? READ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporary residence permit</th>
<th>Residence and work permit</th>
<th>No papers</th>
<th>Other situations (specify)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
FOR EVERYONE

Q.59 What is your current situation?
- Working
- Unemployed. Go to q.59.1
- Looking for first job
- Housewife
- Student
- Retired
- No opinion

ASK Q.59.1 ONLY TO PEOPLE WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED. CODE 2 IN Q.59

Q.59.1 How long have you been unemployed?
- Time in years:
  - 00 Less than 1 year
  - 98 Don’t know
  - 99 No opinion

Q.60 What do you most like about living in (NAME OF TERRITORY)? DO NOT READ. MAX TWO ANSWERS
- It is well connected
- Many services
- Good relations among neighbours
- There is cultural diversity
- Their family and friends are here
- Green areas
- Peace and quiet
- They like everything (do not read)
- They don’t like anything (do not read)
- Others (specify)
- Don’t know
- No opinion

Q.61 What do you least like about living in (NAME OF TERRITORY)? What are its two main problems? DO NOT READ. MAX TWO ANSWERS
- Lack of security
- Lack of civility
- Pollution
- Lack of parking
- Dirty
- Drugs
- Drinking in the streets
- Noise
- Immigration
- Discrimination/xenophobia
- Nothing, everything’s fine (do not read)
- Others (specify)
- Don’t know
- No opinion

Q.62 Do you believe that living together in (NAME OF TERRITORY) is better, the same or worse than 5 years ago?
- Better
- The same
- Worse
- Don’t know
- No opinion

Q.62.1 And what do you think it will be like in 5 years time? READ
- Better
- The same
- Worse
- Don’t know
- No opinion
Q.63 What would you suggest to improve living together in [NAME OF TERRITORY]? DO NOT READ. MAX TWO ANSWERS

More security
More cleanliness
More dialogue
More tolerance
Foreigners should adapt more to local customs
Less immigration
More work
More civility
More education
Less discrimination against immigrants
Nothing, everything is fine
Others (specify)
Don’t know
No opinion

Q.64 NOTE DOWN IF THEY ARE FROM THE GYPSY ETHNIC GROUP. DO NOT ASK

Yes
No

Name of the interviewee:

Address of the interviewee:

Telephone no.:

Name of the street where the interview took place:

Duration of the interview:

Name and signature of the interviewer:
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Glossary
This glossary compiles the main terms used within the framework of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project according to the meaning this project has given each one. This is not a scientific-technical catalogue claiming to exhaustively compile the entire range of interpretations for the same concept, although it does intend to often a simple explanation for the specific and operative meaning given to each term from the ICI Project focus and methodology.

A

Assimilationism
This is a sociopolitical model or proposal, contrary to the ICI Project philosophy, to manage diversity in multicultural contexts based on cultural uniformity, understanding this to be a process where the minority acquires the values, language, culture and identity of the majority.

B

Belonging
Belonging is usually considered to be a person’s self-assignation and identification with a collective. The ICI Project perspective has promoted the feeling of belonging for persons and collectives with their local community as a necessary step to encourage cohesion and living together.

C

Citizenship
Beyond the concept of citizenship bound to belonging to a political community, normally a Nation-State, and the rights and responsibilities derived from this, exclusive to the nationals of this State, the ICI Project considers citizenship from its social and living together dimension above all, with the defining traits of community participation, working together to achieve general interest and implication in building an intercultural and inclusive local community, independently of national origins or cultural belonging.
Coexistence
Coexistence is a type of social situation where, as opposed to cohabitation, there is barely any relationship between the people belonging to different social and cultural collectives living in the same space and time. They coexist but they do not cohabit. This is the predominant social situation in most local contexts, characterised by passive respect between persons and collectives, with no positive interaction between them and failing to tackle any latent conflict that might exist.

Cohabitation/Living together
Cohabitation/living together is a type of social situation where people, independently of their social or cultural belonging, communicate and relate to each other, respect each other mutually, share values and common interests, work together and interact positively and prevent and resolve conflict creatively. Living together requires continuous learning and it is a dynamic process that we can always build on.

Collaborators
Participation from persons, players and protagonists in the ICI Project framework revolves around three circles that define the degree or level of participation in it: informed, collaborating and engaged. Collaborating persons or players participate from time to time in ICI Project actions or activities. Depending on their availability over time, they could become engaged or simply informed. The actual flexibility of the intercultural community methodology makes it possible to change how much they participate.

Collaborative relations
These are the essence of the intercultural community process; without collaborative relations between the three key players in the community, we cannot talk about emergence, existence and consolidation of the process. The ICI Project methodology is channelled towards bringing about this type of relationship, deemed “improbable” due to being practically exceptional in the local socio-political context.
Community

Although there are different definitions of community that cover spatial frameworks (local community, regional community, national, European, international community, etc.), or look at traits shared by human groups or collectives (values, interests, customs, language, culture, etc.), for the ICI Project, the community will always be local (a neighbourhood, a zone, a village or a city) and it will be made up of four structural elements: territory, population, resources and demands from the population.

Community-based

This is the type of social intervention promoted by the ICI Project where the community not only receives the actions but it is also the key player in its own social and cohabitation development process.

Community information

This is a fundamental element of the intercultural community methodology: it is used to inform the local community as a whole about progress within the process and the existing initiatives and participation programmes. This consequently helps to make the process public and motivate people and players to take part or get involved in it. Community information can be put across in the following ways: information sheets, posters, leaflets, websites, social networks, blogs, etc.

Community meeting

A community meeting constitutes a symbolic meeting place between the three key players in the local community, sharing and pooling the work done by each one within the framework of the intercultural community process.

Community methodology

This is a set of methods that guaranteeing cohesion between the focus inspiring the ICI Project and the specific practice of working in local communities. It is made up of a series of methods, instruments, techniques and actions to promote the local communities’ starring role in their own social development process and when constructing living together and intercultural citizenship.
Living together and social cohesion. Chapter 7

Community monograph
This is an indispensable community methodology instrument that has the fundamental purpose of allowing analysis and overall understanding of the intervention community plus shared knowledge, making it possible to establish an assessment and planning aimed at improving the existing situation and connecting the different initiatives with the overall community and intercultural process.

Community organisation
Community organisation is the process by which the three key players in the local community come up with participation programmes, the relationship spaces, and the community adapts them to develop community programming as effectively as possible.

Community programming
This is a key methodology element to make progress in the intercultural community process. It marks a qualitative leap in collaborative relations between key players by jointly programming a series of actions to meet the priorities set in the community assessment.

Community team
This is a fundamental element in the intercultural community methodology, acting as a resource for the actual process, enabling collective relations between the three key players and making it easier to move forwards in the different Project phases (shared knowledge, assessment, programming, etc.). Initially, the community team was essentially made up of the ICI Project intervention teams but, as the intercultural community process went on, it incorporated professionals from other public and private resources in the territory.

Conflict
Conflict is not conceived as negative in the ICI Project but as an opportunity to improve situations involving inequality or exclusion that might occur in a local community. From this perspective, conflicts, even latent conflicts, are tackled creatively and resolved positively.

Culturalism
Excessive or one-sided emphasis on the cultural factors that have a negative effect on appropriate management of diversity. The ICI Project philosophy rejects this type of differentiating emphasis, preferring to work on common values and shared interests.
Culture
We understand culture to be the set of guidelines for behaviour and meanings for reality (rules, values, beliefs, customs, etc.) expressed symbolically and forming a relatively structured whole shared by a population (differing according to gender, age or social class) that is transmitted from generation to generation, as a device for adapting to the natural and human environment and therefore a changing reality.

Demands
This constitutes one of the community’s structural elements comprising explicit or implicit requests among the population to solve problem issues or satisfy their needs and interests. It comes down to the intercultural community intervention process to identify them, make them visible, prioritise them and respond to them.

Difference
The ICI Project has applied the principle of the right to difference that implies respecting identity and rights for each differentiated person, group and social and cultural collective.

Discrimination
Discrimination consists of treating persons or collectives unfairly, compared to other persons or collectives in similar situations, due to their national origin, gender, age, social collective or belonging to ethnic or religious groups. There are two types of discrimination: direct and indirect. The first essentially matches the previous description. The second occurs when an apparently neutral rule, criterion or practice puts some people or collectives at a specific disadvantage compared to others.
Engaged
Participation from persons, players and key players in the ICI Project framework revolves around three circles that define the degree or level of participation in it: informed, collaborating and engaged. Engaged people or players include anyone continuously participating in actions, activities or relationship spaces for the ICI Project. Depending on their availability over time, they could change to collaborate or simply be informed. The actual flexibility of the intercultural community methodology makes it possible to change how much they participate.

Equality
Democratic principle that recognises equal rights and responsibilities for all citizens and proposes equal treatment in the eyes of the law. Enforcing this basic principle occasionally requires policies that promote equal opportunities, overcoming social, economic and cultural obstacles that affect more disadvantaged persons and collectives. This principle guides the intercultural community intervention’s own actions.

Ethnic group
The ethnic group is characterised by having cultural, physical, linguistic or religious traits assumed by its members or attributed by others that form part of wider societies where they relate with other majority or minority ethnic groups within it.

Ethnic minority
Any ethnic minority is an ethnic group but not all ethnic groups are an ethnic minority. This is usually characterised by a situation of subordination, marginalisation or lower status compared to the majority groups in society.
Ethnicity

Ethnicity refers to social identification of a human group working from the cultural, physical, linguistic characteristics that they supposedly share. Ethnic group is often confused with race, meaning sociocultural attributes with genetic attributes. While the ethnic group has scientific and sociopolitical recognition, race lacks scientific validity as, on the one hand, the boundary of the racial group depends on as many and whichever classification criteria are taken into account (cranium shape, eyes, hair, etc.) and, on the other, genetically inherited traits neither determine nor explain sociocultural traits. Beyond “physical race”, “sociopolitical race” is relevant meaning representations and discourse on the racial aspect.

Ethnocentrism

Attitude that judges or values other cultures from our own perspective, considering the customs, values, belief, etc. of our own group as the best, normal, correct and even superior.

Foreigner

Citizens who do not hold the nationality of the State where they are living, subject to the specific laws that regulate their stay in the country and that establish the civil, political or social rights of anyone with access to them.

Ghetto

This refers to a concentration of population belonging to a social or ethnic group or groups in determined urban areas that are usually segregated off from the rest of the city, normally perceived negatively by the rest of the population. The term ghetto is associated with negative connotations - poverty, poor housing, lack of security, etc. and this is usually due to combinations of discrimination, social exclusion and spatial segregation.
Global action line

This is the backbone of the intercultural community processes, as the action line that has defined the focus and methodology of the whole ICI Project, establishing the guidelines and the process, organisational and technical elements required for development.

Global citizen action

Global citizen actions are strategic due to their potential to involve the three key players and present the intercultural community process to the majority of the population in the territory and make an impact on the collective imagination, either by raising awareness on a specific topic or by helping to promote the feeling of belonging to a territory.

Hostility

As opposed to cohabitation and coexistence, hostility is a social situation where relationships between people belonging to differentiated social and cultural groups are charged with lack of trust, suspicion, avoidance and rejection, including non regulated conflict and clear demonstrations of verbal aggression and even physical and symbolic violence.

Identity

This refers to how persons and human groups are perceived and define themselves. Identity has a self-conception component as well as attribution and even recognition by other groups or society.
Impacts
Impacts refer to the effects and changes that intercultural community intervention has caused on the social context. Impacts should be measured in the medium and long term in relation to the ICI Project’s goals: social cohesion and living together and intercultural citizenship.

Inclusion
This is the process that, by identifying the sociocultural differences between people and collectives and their specific needs, promotes the policies and social changes required for their equal presence and incorporation in society. From this perspective, in intercultural community processes we would be talking about inclusive local communities: a) when there is an increase in positive interactions between collectives and a re-assessment within the community of the most disadvantaged; b) when there are mutual adaptation processes between collectives and standard and institutional changes that acknowledge this situation, and c) when the shared image of the community is improving.

Indicators
The ICI Project indicators make it possible to permanently monitor and assess the progress of the intercultural community processes in each territory and from the overall perspective. This includes qualitative indicators that can identify the different situations the territories are going through and quantitative indicators that make it possible to measure how far goals have been met through results and impacts. Depending on what we are trying to identify or measure, both types will be classified according to: 1) initial indicators, 2) process indicators, 3) results indicators and 4) impact indicators.

Informed
Participation from persons, players and key players in the ICI Project framework revolves around three circles that define the degree or level of participation in it: informed, collaborating and engaged. Informed persons or players are any that do not participate in actions, activities or relationship spaces in the ICI Project either because they cannot or do not want to, but they are always informed about how the process is progressing. Depending on their availability over time, they could go on to collaborate or become engaged.
Integration
There are many conceptions of integration but from the perspective of intercultural community intervention this is the process of mutual adaptation between differentiated sociocultural groups where minorities are incorporated into society by means of equal conditions, rights, responsibilities and opportunities without this representing the loss of their identity or cultural traits whilst the majority accept and incorporate the standard-based, institutional and ideological changes required to make the above possible.

Intercultural community assessment
This is a crucial element in the intercultural community methodology as it makes it easier to pass on shared knowledge of what is really happening in community programming. Assessment can prioritise the local community’s demands, obtained from the participative research process and express them as specific actions that will be reflected in community programming.

Intercultural education
Approach to education that takes into account cultural diversity, strengthens exchange between different cultural subjects and that, in turn, guarantees own cultural knowledge and facts, strengthening common elements and not differences. It is developed from a global perspective that involves all parties: school, students, families and environment.

Intercultural mediation
Intercultural mediation emerged as a mediation method in contexts with a significant multicultural aspect that has been applied to different fields: education, healthcare, legal, social, etc. Its more community-based dimension has been applied to the ICI Project, providing the focus to bring together the entire intervention in terms of purposes to achieve and the specific intercultural methods that have inspired the community methodology and made it possible to resolve conflict creatively.

Interculturality
Compared to the multicultural approach that recognises sociocultural diversity through the right to difference but without creating real interrelation situations between the different collectives, interculturality is a sociopolitical approach that aims to overcome this situation, promoting a new social context, emphasising points in common rather than differences and where positive interaction and collaboration between sociocultural collectives is the norm.
Key players
Community processes are framed within the social, political and institutional context of local communities, where their key players are representatives from the democratically elected administrations, professionals belonging to the public and private technical resources working in the territory and citizens who live in this territory.

Learning and service
Learning by carrying out community service. This is an educational proposal where learning takes place by means of people providing services to their own community, thereby helping to improve the society around them.

Living together and intercultural citizenship
The ICI project’s intervention focus is living together and intercultural citizenship, understood to be a framework to build positive relations and interactions between citizens from the same local community, independently of their administrative situation or social or cultural belonging, where they share rules, values and common interests.

Milestones
These are actions or specific achievements that take on strategic and symbolic transcendence to demonstrate qualitative leaps in the intercultural community process. Some examples of this type of actions would be: holding the first community meeting, the first technical staff relationship space meeting or presenting the community monograph, among others.
Objectives

These are the goals or achievements to be attained in the ICI Project or in any of its action lines, making them both general and specific. The ICI Project has two general aims that can be summarised as generating local processes to promote social cohesion and living together and intercultural citizenship and validating and transferring an innovative and sustainable social intervention practice.

Open summer school

This is an element that accelerates the community process thanks to its potential to connect collaborative relations between key players and due to the visibility of the community process in the territory because it satisfies an important citizen need, covering part of children and teenagers’ leisure time during their summer holidays (although not only then) by means of recreational-training actions.

Participation

Participation constitutes an essential, cross-discipline element running through any intercultural community intervention, as a means as well as an end. Without participation from the three key players and citizens, there is no intercultural community process. It has been tackled from its different dimensions: as an exercise in citizenship and participative democracy and as an element of social cohesion and living together, among others.

Positive discrimination

Treating people differently in a way that aims to correct negative social conditions originating from discrimination towards a group or person. This is the only type of discrimination that has a place in the ICI Project and only when it is considered relevant.
Prejudice
This is a prior presumption about a person or group based on partial, biased, indirect or incomplete knowledge.

Products
Products are the results that appear in any type of material required to make the process visible and make progress within it. Examples include the monograph, community programming, publishing a guide or editing a video, among others.

Public
The adjective *public* has two fundamental meanings in intercultural community processes: on the one hand, it means that the community process is public, open to everyone who wishes to participate whilst on the other hand, it means that it should inform the community about any progress and allow access to the documentation and knowledge that the process is generating.

Racism
Active discrimination of persons or groups for reasons related to their origin or ethnic or cultural features. ICI Project approaches fight racism, along with other types of discrimination.

Relationship spaces
These are programmes bringing together participation from key players in the local community and the organisational structure being given to the intercultural community process. Due to the different roles played by the key players within the process, there are three different types of programmes: technical staff relationship spaces, institutional relationship spaces and citizen relationship spaces.

Resources
Resources are one of the community’s structural elements where public and private technical-professional resources are essential both in terms of attention to persons and collectives’ specific needs and when resolving local demands from a complete and community perspective.
Results
ICI project results are the specific effects or consequences of the set of activities developed within the strategic action lines. They can range from the number of participants in certain activities to carrying out the community assessment as a result in itself.

Segregation
Institutional or social practice consisting of separation and isolation of persons or differentiated sociocultural collectives, either physically or spatially, or in certain fields of public life.

Social cohesion
There are different conceptions of social cohesion, the majority of which emphasise common wellbeing, equality vs inequality, resolving conflicts through democratic frameworks, citizen participation or respecting sociocultural diversity in their approaches. The ICI Project, from the local community perspective, promotes cohesion through social ties, participation from the different key players in the community, resolving any possible conflicts positively and legitimising institutions.

Social exclusion
Process by which a person or social group cannot be fully developed as an integral member of society in full right, supposing a loss of rights and responsibilities, characterised by lack of access to resources that this subject or group require to feel part of society.
Specific action lines
Intercultural community processes have developed three specific action lines (health, education and citizen relationships) that, revolving around the global action line, have inspired and strengthened the whole process. The fields of health and education, due to their focus on common social rights for the whole community and implication among different administrations, resources and players, are strategic programmes to establish collaborative relationships between key players and to bring together collectives and players’ common interests. In exchange, citizen relationships have been decisive in terms of involving citizens in the process and encouraging positive interactions between people belonging to different sociocultural collectives.

Territory
This is one of the community’s structural elements. It refers to the intercultural community intervention’s geographic and spatial field, marked out by its political-administrative dimension: municipality or part of a municipality (zone, neighbourhood, district, etc.).

Unit
Principle of unit in diversity: implies full recognition and constant search for real and effective equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities as values and purposes shared by distinct sociocultural collectives.