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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 together 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, focussing 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
sharing 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 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.

Whilst the remaining volumes, to guide your enquiries, have 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.
— 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 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 has the methodology of intercultural community intervention been approached?
1.1

What is the methodology’s role in the Intercultural Community Intervention Project?

A methodology is the series of technical-scientific elements enabling the specification of reality determined by the finalities and principle which are at the basis of a theory or theoretical approach. Since ours involves a case of social intervention, a methodology enables a conceptual approach, the theoretical principles and approaches of intercultural community intervention –based on the ideals and categories of co-existence, citizenship and interculturality– may be applied specifically to our reality and may be transformed into a real praxis of the change.

Since human realities are complex and diverse, it is evident that a methodology and its technical organisation –operating elements and instruments– must be, on the one hand, sufficiently uniform and invariable –consistent with the conceptual approach, principles, purposes and theoretical approaches of the intervention (in our case, of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project)–; and, on the other hand, flexible, to adapt to such complexity and diversity. The application of the methodology will also depend on the existing context which may favour, complicate or hinder it.

Whenever we discuss methodology, it is important to remember that we are talking about three things at once: theoretical approaches –why and for what reason we do things–, technical development –how we do things– and, lastly, operating application–with which instruments we do things. We also have to ensure significant coherence between these three elements. We cannot state that we want participation and then act from a technical standpoint without taking it into account, or adopt measures and take decisions without the participation of the people –organisation, groups, etc.–engaged.

The conceptual approach, the purposes and principles envisaged in the intercultural community intervention of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project (ICI Project), as well as its operating application, have been included and enacted in volume 1 of this collection, accordingly, we will focus exclusively on the methodology applied by the ICI Project in the first stage of its existence (2010-2013).
What has been the initial assumption to design the Intercultural Community Intervention Project’s methodology?

The initial assumption of the ICI Project was to boost preventive and promotional intervention in the local area, which would favour the integration of all people, contribute to social cohesion and, in short, enable all local players to address the problems and challenges of the intercultural co-existence of citizens. These include the need to address the social consequences of the economic crisis on a community basis.

The ICI Project would have to be carried out in accordance with a single procedure model or assumption, which would enable a common methodological strategy to be shared in all the intervention territories and, specifically, for the intercultural community intervention teams (ICI teams), which will be based on:

— Experience in successful intervention in the area of social inclusion, which would be completed and developed based on practice in the different territories and on joint reflection, culminating in a validated proposal which would enable its application in other contexts or experiences.

— Combination and synergies between two methodological strategies, already tested and interdependent, such as community intervention and intercultural mediation. It is not a mechanical sum of two instruments rather a single intervention strategy in, with, from and for the community in multicultural contexts and with intense sociocultural diversification processes.

The procedures which would thus be deployed in the ICI Project were based on community intervention and on intercultural mediation as a single approach, providing feedback, including quantitative and qualitative objective and subjective elements, integrating the management of cultural diversity, mediation, social research, community action and social participation on a dialectical basis. From the outset, this constituted a significant contribution to intervention and social policies in general.
1.3 Encounter between community intervention and intercultural mediation

1.3.1 Background

Community intervention was mainly characterised by its community development facet, and historically arose in social contexts characterised by marginalisation or by underdevelopment and poverty. That is: an “abnormal” intervention “not for everybody”; only, in practice and specifically, for disadvantaged or very needy areas. Although significant precedents exist from the forties and fifties of the 20th century, this intervention nature arises from the UN document\(^1\), dating back to the sixties, which gave life to the concept and praxis of community development, as a contribution to international cooperation. The document, although it assumes the recipient population to be the player, and as part of the improvement process, considers an external intervention with predefined purposes and objectives. However, this process is of fundamental importance, since for the first time it identifies the local authority players in the process –in this case, the governments of the states in which intervention takes place–, the contribution of not only economic resources, but also of technical and scientific resources and, as stated, of the recipient and participating population.

This vision of community intervention extended rapidly, especially in all areas and countries with significant social and economic imbalances. Such countries often had anti-democratic and dictatorial governments –in particular, in Latin America in the sixties, seventies and eighties–, accordingly, community development rapidly became a method and a fight for change, centred on the exclusive prominence of the population, as an alternative to oppressive regimes. To sum up, community development as an element of “revolution”. This vision of community development –already identified in marginal communities or characterised by extreme poverty– was introduced and developed in Europe –especially in Spain through sociocultural activity– without a critical speech as a filter and to keep its approaches in line with situations and realities which, although improvable, had and have little to do with the past reality of Latin American.

\(^1\) Social Progress through Community Development.
Accordingly, the ICI Project is defined as a community intervention project and not as a community development project.

It should be mentioned however that community development in Latin America was not reduced solely to its most alternative version outside of the institutions. Its approach and logic had an impact on the manner of designing public policies in the most depressed rural and urban areas, and a vast number of community orientation projects and programmes persisted, boosted by state, regional and local governments, through specific departments which have often received the specific name of community development or of social development. On many occasions, these development strategies of local communities have been backed by non-governmental organisations and international cooperation agencies, also influencing the intervention prospects of numerous development cooperation projects in which the community was the recipient thereof.

The ICI Project’s community proposal was also fuelled by another intervention tradition: community organisation. Arising at the beginning of the 20th century in the United States as a means of social work itself to coordinate the welfare agencies acting in the same territory, it sought to provide a response to collective problems which went beyond individual and family intervention. The rapid changes in the large US metropolises due to the industrialisation process, spiralling urban development and migrations from Europe generated significant disorganisation and social destructuring problems. Many of these problems were associated with integration difficulties of the immigrant population and other national minorities. In subsequent decades and up to the sixties, progress continued to be made in the community organisation approach in a context of expansion of the welfare state, with the concomitant increase in public services and resources to attend to the needs of the population.

As a social work method, it notably influenced the conception of community work in our country, understanding it to be exclusively the coordination of both the territory’s public and private technical-professional resources. This conception of community work is behind the creation of many social action resource coordination committees in the most diverse sectors: employment services, social services, immigration, etc. However, on rare occasions, these committees have included citizens and administrations as active agents in the social development of territories. The ICI Project proposal has enabled a qualitative leap in this regard, enriching community intervention with an integral, non-sectoral vision, and actively including authorities and citizens.

The relationship with that set forth previously on community intervention and the mediation world firstly pivots around the diverse nature of the community. From the first theories of the
Tönnies, at the end of the 19th century, to the boom of the so-called *community studies*, to the majority of the community development programmes, the community was predominantly understood to be homogeneous. But the local, ethnic, religious communities, etc., were never homogeneous and are even less so nowadays.

The last phases of the evolution of capitalism –from post-fordism to globalisation–, as well as the various phenomena of human mobility and population relocation –through domestic and international migration, refuge and asylum, etc.–, generated profound sociocultural diversification processes of the local communities with a territorial base. And if the community is diverse, an adequate management of such diversity becomes a decisive structural challenge in which intercultural mediation is essential.

In the ICI Project, we begin with a wide concept of mediation which does not reduce it to an alternative conflict resolution system, rather which conceives it as a practical philosophy which, aside from being useful to prevent, regulate, resolve and transform latent and manifest conflicts, is valid to facilitate communication, boost participation and adapt institutions to their increasingly multiculturalised environments. However, this wide concept of mediation does not preclude taking very much into account that the conflict category –and its relationship with the community in our case– is decisive.

Conflict is inherent in social life and, accordingly, in the nature of all human communities, and should be addressed as an opportunity to surpass the initial situations and improve co-existence and, thus, social development. However, the extensive experience of social intervention in the community area seems not to have correctly situated its importance; accordingly, it may be observed that an inadequate management of the sociocultural differences may prevent or destroy community processes. From this standpoint, mediation, as an approach and a methodology is interlinked in terms of functions and synergies with community intervention, and contributes theoretical and technical elements and tools providing community intervention with a wider and more adequate capacity to face the always complex challenge of the participation of all its members.

Although there has been notable development in mediation in recent decades, it is as old as humanity. From the beginning of history methods and figures have existed –such as those of respected persons, babblers, arbitrators, conciliators, pacifiers, good men, justices of the peace etc.– who endeavoured to act as that neutral third party with an ability to distance themselves from the conflict and with acknowledged prestige and authority, who mediated in the disputes between peo-
ple, family and human groups. It has been observed that throughout human evolution and, especially, since the formation of states and colonial empires, the multiple customary, horizontal and local ways of addressing arguments and tension were limited or eliminated, giving rise to a strong tendency towards the formalisation, institutionalisation and legalisation of procedures.

With the arrival of the modern rules of law, the separation of powers and the organisation of the system and of legal power was institutionalised: justice and the supremacy of the judge became the scope and central figure in conflict resolutions. However, this form of resolving conflicts is not always the most adequate or effective, since it involves the imposition of a decision exogenous to the parties, without their active participation in the search for a satisfactory solution accepted by mutual agreement. The limits and deficiencies of the legal system—bureaucracy, lateness, costs, guile, lies and generated hate—meant that, without of course denying the validity of the principle of justice in democratic society and the need for an effective legal system—in the middle of the 20th century, an alternative dispute resolution—ADR—mechanism began to be developed, in order to respond to this social need. Mediation has always been explicitly stated, theorised and systematised, acquiring a new dimension as a professional discipline, also based on a significant methodological and technical apparatus. Since then, mediation has become specialised, on adapting to different contexts and areas: family, school, business, intralegal, health, community cultural-linguistic mediation, etc. The latest type of diversification in the mediation area is that of intercultural mediation.

Intercultural mediation is a phenomenon which arose in the nineties as a response to the challenges of social relationships and communication in contexts of cultural diversity and specifically tension, imbalances and conflicts linked to cultural, ethnic or religious differentiation processes. One of its most significant developments consisted of favouring the adaptation of the institutions and of the social context to the diverse reality of modern societies. Providing equal access of migrants or ethnic minorities to basic resources such as health, education and social services, or promoting social participation and positive interaction between various social and cultural groups are some of its main contributions. Essential characteristics of an intervention approach and methodology whose purpose consists of facilitating the transition of multicultural companies to intercultural companies, in which collaboration, cooperation and solidarity relationships between socially and culturally different groups is the predominant situation.

In the ICI Project, the most community dimension of intercultural mediation is the one that has been applied. The vocation of intercultural mediation with community emphasis on aspects such as: a) the transformation of social relationships; b) the balancing of resources among different
groups; c) the revaluation thereof with the local community and d) the adaptation of the social context and of the institutions to company diversity. This all connects fully in terms of synergies with community intervention, establishing a symbiotic relationship of mutual enrichment between both methodologies. The raw materials used in community intervention and intercultural mediation is the same –the social and institutional relationships on a local scale–, mutually complementing and reinforcing themselves, to the point of establishing a synergistic relationship of conceptual and methodological synthesis: intercultural community intervention. Community intervention adapts to the diverse community and intercultural mediation fully adopts its community approach.

### 1.3.2 From community development to intercultural mediation to intercultural community intervention

In a democratic system and in the presence of a social state, most commonly known as a welfare state –both improvable–, community development was obsolete and limited to alternative experiences difficult to repeat since, on the one hand, they placed the accent exclusively on the population and, on the other hand, they did not consider the need to improve one –democracy– and the other –the welfare state–, through changes promoted as a result of participative processes. Community intervention assumes the first and the second and endeavours to contribute to its improvement and to its most democratic functioning, thanks to the involvement and participation of all the local players, not only of the population, rather it also includes therefore the public authorities and the group of technical-professional resources which intervene in the territory.

Lastly, community intervention assumes the demand to promote interculturality in view of the on-going, structural nature, nowadays, of cultural diversity in local communities. Accordingly, it must be fed by the contributions of intercultural mediation, both in terms of its approach and its methodology, which enabled the inclusion of a mediation dimension in community intervention not at all different from its nature. In itself, community intervention is a relational and mediation methodology, just like intercultural mediation, which has generated a space for feedback and social innovation. The synergies established between both have enabled, on the one hand, the reinforcement and promotion of the mediator approach to community intervention, while, on the other hand, intercultural mediation would acquire new potential on a community scale. Coherent dynamics set around the objectives and principles of living together and intercultural citizenship.
Accordingly, the encounter between community intervention and intercultural mediation, the main features of which may be summarised as follows:

While community intervention contributes the methodological backbone “of the process”, intercultural mediation contributes the “mediator approach” on a global scale, required to guide and grant meaning to the work for co-existence, a campaign to transform social relationships with respect to local, diverse and multicultural communities, which requires an undoubtable alternative creative and pacific management component, of social relationships, including conflicts.

Feedback between both intervention strategies, eminently related, is evident with respect to their synergic capacity to transform the local social relationships, the main goal of the ICI Project’s mediator dimension. Community intervention considers the strengthening or construction of relationship programmes between authorities, professionals and citizens, and mediation, for its part, contributes elements to manage the difficulties involved in this process, enabling the positive interaction between these players, transforming the traditional existing relationships, in many cases fragmented, disperse and lacking a global vision. To all this is added the transformations promoted between socially and culturally different groups, facilitating a respectful encounter, effective communication, positive interaction, cooperation, solidarity and equal participation.

The transformation of the social relationships is at the same time the basis on which the ICI Project and its end purpose rest. Progress cannot be made in the intercultural community process without a significant investment to establish a new type of relationship between the three protagonists: it cannot be said that they are attaining their objectives if substantial transformations are not noted in local social relationships, transformations which enable one to transfer situations of pacific co-existence to the predominance of situations of genuine co-existence (see volume 1 of the collection).

The intercultural community intervention process is enabling the social and cultural groups to be re-assessed within their respective local communities, gaining prominence within the process and promoting their active and equal participation. The process, in turn, provided a balancing mechanism, on jointly sharing all the existing professional and material resources existing in the territory –belonging to the public authorities, associations, NGOs, etc.–, through the different relationship programmes created.

All such work is promoting the creation of a new social context thanks to the mutual adaptation between different social and cultural groups, as well as the adaptation of institutions, services and resources to the reality of territorial cultural diversity. Alternative stories have also
been built around the situation of the local community, integrators of cultural diversity shared by the three protagonists, which favoured an enhanced identification of people with their community and improved relationships of co-existence. These are some of the main contributions to co-existence made by the ICI Project.

The intercultural community process is backed and led through its different phases thanks to the methodological framework of community intervention, both in terms of its procedural and its organisational elements. These are the “process” methodological elements which have been marking the milestones which should be reached by the ICI Project to move towards its goals. Most notably, they include: the monograph, the assessment and the intercultural community programme, community meetings or a community information system, etc. One of the most noteworthy elements was the ICI team, as a promoter and revitaliser of the entire process (all of this will be analysed in depth in chapter 2 of this volume).

Community intervention contributed the framework to generate processes which will enable equal participation and social development in a diversified reality, enabling the exercise of shared responsibilities by all the local players.

Community intervention has been present in the ICI Project for the following reasons:
— The organisation and participation of all the players in a specific territory was required to find endogenous responses to living together and intercultural citizenship and the prospect of equal social development.
— The ICI team professionals did not represent a specific additional resource, rather a “non-specific” one, whose purpose was to facilitate the community intervention process via a series of methodological instruments and tools.
— The ICI teams had to develop a work strategy which would enable the participation of all players in the territory.
— The ICI Project would have to guarantee the sustainability of the process set up, and that sustainability would not be possible without a strategy and work shared among all assumed by the community as a whole.

As for intercultural mediation, it has been crucial in equally integrating the series of players and groups in the process, overcoming the obstacles which may arise with respect to cultural differences and socioeconomic imbalances.
Intercultural mediation has been present in the ICI Project for the following reasons:

— It was necessary to transform social relationships, providing a new context in which communication would dominate –overcoming mistrust, prejudices and stereotypes–, rapprochement, mutual understanding, dialogue, community meetings, positive interaction and cooperation between groups and players ethnoculturally differentiated from the territory.

— In order to prevent and settle conflicts, promoting agreement, it was necessary to overcome disagreements and establish regulation mechanisms in the intervention territories.

— In order to promote changes in the local communities, via mutual adaptation among groups and the adaptation of institutions to favour integration in equal conditions and the intercultural co-existence of citizens.

The ICI Project’s approaches are based on the philosophy of mediation and on a culture of peace, and the aforementioned methodological elements and features contribute enormously to their obtainment. The ICI teams themselves would make mediation requests when they are not community players, but rather adopt a mediation position.

The ICI Project has favoured and enabled an historical encounter between the experiences of community intervention and social intervention from the standpoint of diversity and interculturality. The introduction of the mediation and management of conflicts in the community methodology and approaches on the one hand; the introduction of the concept of process and of the community dimension in procedures, mediation and intercultural approach on the other.

Accordingly, a conceptual and methodological synthesis was favoured, enabling a new type of scientifically validated social intervention to arise, thanks to its empirical demonstration in sixteen different territories (only one of the 17 territories did not complete the first intervention stage, which reveals a high degree of adaptation and success of the ICI Project’s methodology).

This encounter and this mutual relationship between these two intervention strategies also came about as a result of certain structural changes which have occurred in recent times. Let us see five of them:

— The migration phenomenon which is an on-going structural event –despite the crisis–, granting life to a new multicultural reality in the local communities: immigration is not dispersed in a State’s territory on a proportionate basis, rather it is concentrated in certain areas or zones, particularly urban and periphery, giving rise to an inevitable concentration of social and cultural problems.
— The intensification of social pluralism and the growing existence of middle classes in the Spanish society, due to the on-going economic growth prior to the crisis.
— The on-going tendency towards more complex and heterogeneous realities with respect to a recent past, which we may define as more homogeneous and with more primary demand levels.
— Those arising from the economic crisis and from a new social system in relation to work, employment and job instability, with respect to the past in which occupancy, protected employment and the possibility of each person improving their standard of living prevailed.
— The appearance of new information technologies and communication which, especially in the last decade, have infiltrated our personal, family, professional and social lives, etc. modifying our needs and manner of socialising, while making the glocal diverse vision of our reality more complex and enriching.

1.3.3 Innovation elements contributed by intercultural community intervention in the area of social intervention

In view of the foregoing, as well as the existing context, we could highlight the theoretical and methodological aspects and approaches of the ICI Project which are innovative.

Community intervention
— The ICI Project is decisively placed in the social intervention area which is so qualified according to its possibility of building positive and cooperative relationships, in the name of co-existence and social cohesion, among the persons participating in the same municipal territory and demographically defined area. Intervention has not established the specific objectives thereof beforehand, since they will need to be defined throughout the process by the leading community figures themselves. Intervention may arise in any community, as a result of its capacity to potentially adapt to any reality.
— The ICI Project should not and could not intervene as another project which would increase and complicate the fragmentation of the already existing interventions. The ICI Project could not be just another project in the community panorama. From the outset, it had to be a community resource, that is, a resource for all that which already existed and for the series of players which were already intervening in the territory.
— In this connection, it would require work and a method and, accordingly, from the begin-
ning, the ICI Project contributed a fundamental element: the ICI team, whose function did not consist of providing specific benefits, rather of contributing methodology and the capacity to build assertive and cooperative relationships with and between the leading community figures. As we stated, in the name of co-existence and social cohesion. That is, of “non-specific” purposes, difficult to address from a single area or by a single prominent figure.

Mediation and interculturality
— The ICI Project has enabled the theoretical principles and methodological approaches of mediation to be put into practice at local community level, transcending the application of intercultural mediation beyond the scopes in which it traditionally acted: individual, family, group, or of access of different people and cultural groups to public services and resources—health, education, social services, etc.
— The transcendence at community level of mediation has enabled the ICI Project to acquire a joint mediation dimension (essential perspective to work for co-existence—, integrating, on a completely natural basis, the methodologies on which it is based: community intervention and intercultural mediation.
— An impossible transcendence without the synthesis with community intervention, which has contributed the supporting, procedural and organisational elements of the ICI Project. Accordingly, it may be asserted that after three years of intervention, the community dimension and the mediation dimension of the ICI Project form a whole, interlinked, inter-dependent, coherent and ground-breaking.

After three years’ experience
Based on the conceptual and methodological proposal on which the ICI Project is based, we can state that intercultural community intervention is one of the dimensions in which the local communities grant themselves a new relationship framework—egalitarian, participative, intercultural— to address on a supportive and more organised basis the consequences of the changes which have taken place and to address the future challenges, in a context of local and global (glocal) complexity.

A standardised non-extraordinary intervention which may arise in any community. The ICI Project considers a public political assumption—that is, as a potential part of a country’s social policies—with a proposal which goes, for these reasons, beyond national frontiers, since such matters are common to many countries.
Still based on a private initiative, the ICI Project aspires to and considers general public ends: co-existence and social cohesion. In many regards, these ends constitute one of the fundamental common objectives of the European Union, which may be pursued through a new form of partnership between the public authorities, third-sector social entities and organisations representing citizens.

Accordingly, the ICI Project is not exclusively engaged in the social or solidarity area, rather in the area of a country’s social policies, with the potential to extend to other municipalities—and, as is already happening—, to other regions, other countries and to the European Union. Not as a rigid model, rather as an assumption, applied and assessed in a significant number of realities which, with the due local adaptations, may be used as reference.
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How have we put into practice the intercultural community intervention methodology?
The methodological proposal for intercultural community intervention has been shaped as a work assumption, verified in praxis, which endeavours to address "the revitalisation of community processes in multicultural contexts, based on the demands and requirements of local communities, starting with existing resources and having the active participation of its leading figures, to improve living conditions with sustainability criteria in the interests of co-existence and social cohesion".

Accordingly, the same conceptual and theoretical premises have been used, applying the same operating elements –adapted to the specific local circumstances– which enabled substantial progress towards the goals envisaged.

The methodology has been developed through the work in the Global Action Line and in the Specific Action Lines. The former develops the intercultural community process—which, alone, is non-specific, global and requires certain time—, while the former ensure specific intervention at shorter term and with visible results in areas of significant social importance such as education, community health and the strengthening of the associated fabric and of the relationships of citizens. These intervention areas enable immediate daily action, as well as a medium- and long-term work perspective due to their relevance and weight in the current social policy and public services structure.

Action in these areas has also enabled priority population sectors vis-à-vis the ICI Project to be included in the intercultural community process—children, families and young people—through initiative developed from the outset, contributing notably to increase participation.

In order to more easily identify the steps followed in the intercultural community process, we identify the following itinerary: from the initial relationships with and between the three prominent bodies to the participative construction of the shared knowledge of the community reality and to the deployment of the intercultural community programme.

The times set for these phases are purely indicative, since in reality they are never exact and measurable, and because we cannot divide the process “into bits”. The normal thing would be that they are superimposed at different times which, principally, never begin or end suddenly, rather they evolve at the same time as they are transformed. Anyway, it is clear that a progression and logical relationship exists between one and another and that it will be necessary to take the necessary steps to ensure that this is the case.
In order to better understand the work performed in these three years, we centre on how the methodology was put into practice: context analysis, definition of structural elements and key concepts which characterise an intercultural community process and, lastly, the operating elements, instruments and methods which enable the attainment of the goals and objectives, as well as products and results in the different intervention territories.

2.1 The importance of context when implementing intercultural community intervention

The initial elements characterising context are complexity and diversity. With respect to complexity, since although the social reality is always complex, there is widespread agreement that the contemporary world is especially complex, from any standpoint; and with respect to diversity, because the specific situations involving intervention are human reality and, accordingly, always different—with the added feature of the various sociocultural diversification processes used in globalisation: settlement in towns with new national or foreign inhabitants, shaping of subcultures, based on age, gender, etc.—. These differences have been demonstrated in recent times, in particular, by increasingly intense migration from other geopolitical and cultural areas. Flows which have already been confirmed not to be temporary, rather which are structural and permanent.

The importance of the context is fundamental to pursue certain aims. There are contexts which favour and contexts which hinder or prevent this possibility. Therefore, determining the main elements characterising the intervention context has been fundamental, mainly to ensure that intervention may be developed and that the work may be assessed, extracting more general transferability and sustainability elements.

From this standpoint, when ICI intervention commenced (September 2010), elements would appear which, to a certain extent, we may define as "positive or facilitating", and others which appear as “negative or difficult".
Positive or facilitating elements

— The ICI Project was promoted by the "la Caixa" Foundation, which enabled economic, professional and human resources to be contributed –Scientific Management and expert advice, ICI team, on-going training, etc.– in collaboration with: a) municipal councils with which, after explaining the ICI Project’s goals, a partnership agreement is entered into by both parties whereby they undertake to share the ICI Project’s implementation, and b) local entities, all non-profit-making bodies which, in turn, provided a guarantee from the local authorities themselves, and from other third-sector entities.

— The temporary framework guaranteed the development of intervention over a sufficient time period –three years initially– in order to obtain visible results and avoid the risk of creating expectations which are impossible to comply with.

— Intervention commenced at a time when awareness was rising regarding the fact that the manner in which social policies had been managed to date contained various errors and required changes to be made in many areas. The ICI Project was presented with new elements– although sometimes difficult to understand at first sight– such as the vision of the process, the participation of players, work with public or private administrations, cooperative relationships or the promotion of common and shared initiatives. All of them represented positive elements of change with respect to the existing situation.

— The existence of numerous qualified technical-professional resources despite the crisis and the cutbacks, which worked in the social area in the intervention territories. This represented a highly valuable potential with a view to the ICI Project’s approaches for which it was fundamental to base any measures on what already existed and not be just another project, rather something qualitatively different: sustainable processes which, based on the existing situation, progressed towards the integration of public authorities and private entities, the cooperative relationship between technical resources and the participation of citizens.

— The need to work co-existence and social cohesion to manage a new reality within Spain’s migration processes, just when incidents in Paris or London evidenced that the management of cultural diversity and its relationship with social exclusion risk factors represent a considerable danger with respect to the strengthening and development of any local community.

Negative or difficult elements

— The economic crisis, the rise in unemployment and its social consequences. Cutback policies which began to be applied in all areas generated a climate of tension and social confusion which hindered the understanding of an intervention which did not provide immediate responses to the naturally increasing social demands. The intense rapid growth in unemployment, in particular, created potentially conflictive situations, especially with respect to a cul-
turally diverse population; this happened just when the ICI Project considered the theme of co-existence and intercultural social cohesion as something fundamental.

— The political “crisis”, as well as the poor image of public authorities and of the so-called politicians, did not facilitate social intervention which had a substantial element in the development of participative democracy. In particular, the ICI Project identified in the municipal council –that is, the State in the territory– one of the players of the intercultural community processes, key to its future sustainability.

— The existence of fragmented, sectoralised and uncoordinated social policies. The so-called welfare state had been focusing more and more on benefits in the welfare area, and the community area, which was more progressive and preventive, was gradually disappearing. The absence in many cases of adequate integration between the different administrative competences –state, regional and municipal– also contributed to worsen this situation.

— Relationships between the public authorities and citizens in general were not undergoing a positive or constructive moment, with the scant presence of participative democracy elements.

— Sociocultural diversity present in the intervention territories had been addressed from sectoral logic, without assuming diversity as a permanent and not a transitory event, which had to be faced globally on a community basis, taking into account that this reality substantially modified the traditional community approaches and dynamics.

— The associative reality in the territories in general terms was also characterised by extreme fragmentation and by disorderly aggregation attempts –by matters, problems, specific territorial situations, parties and holidays, etc.– sometimes distorted by the passion for prominence. Customer policies in many municipal councils had fragmented interventions and created competitiveness among the organisations themselves. The situation of citizen participation was quite precarious and characterised by the absence or obsolescence of adequate participation channels and of organisations representing common and general interests. All of this had led to a straining of community life, to a loss of collective horizons and references and to the reinforcement of individual claims.

In total, the crisis and the cutbacks had negative effects on the complex social reality of the time, but it also revealed the need to review the functioning and action of resources in the territory, the role of the local authorities and the involvement of citizens in the processes of improving their reality. The ICI Project therefore could play a key role in considering the need to work “in another way”, on a community, collaborative and intercultural basis, in the territory.
2.2
Intercultural community intervention as a process

2.2.1 Structural elements defining a community process

2.2.1.1 What do we understand by community?
The category and term community is something of considerable use, polysemy and complexity. It has been used for a very long time by different players with various meanings. Together with development –endogenous, local, social–, community is the central concept in the two historical journeys, procedural areas and intervention strategies with which the ICI Project is related: community intervention and intercultural community mediation. In both cases, its use is also plural. In social sciences, especially in anthropology, with its numerous “community studies”, and with the complex relationships between community and culture–, the category of community acquires objective and group representation elements. Accordingly, a clear and operative definition was required for the ICI Project’s purposes, approach and methodology and, at the same time, which was assumed by everybody.

For the purposes of the ICI Project and from a strictly operative dimension, we understand community to be “a territory inhabited by a population which has, –or no– certain resources and which expresses –or no– certain demands”. Accordingly, community intervention methodology always takes into account these elements and their mutual interrelations:

— The territory.
— The population/citizens.
— Both technical-professional and administrative and community resources–that is, those of the citizens.
— The existing demands/needs/potential.

With the term community, we also identify dimensions enabling the development of the participative and community process:

— The municipal/institutional dimension related with the first State body, that is, the munici-
ipality, its government: the municipal council. Disassociating the definition of community from the institutional dimension of municipality and, consequently, of the municipal council, consigns community intervention to a secondary marginal role. Linking it to this dimension, associates it with the country’s legal-constitutional system and converts it into a political possibility of general and repeatable interest.

— The demographic-territorial dimension enabling participation, relationships and direct encounters between the three protagonists. Relationship and community meetings which may be improved or boosted by new technologies –ICT– and other means which, however, should not substitute relationships and direct encounters. Accordingly, the specific physical dimension of each community will depend on many elements –social geography, demographic size, urban development type, type of home, communication networks, etc.–, but it cannot be too big, thereby preventing such relationships. In the existing constitutional system, there are only three possible situations:

— That of a community which coincides with a municipality.
— That of a community which coincides with part of a municipality –a neighbourhood, various neighbourhoods, an urban area, a district, etc.
— That of a community which coincides with the union of small municipalities –a partnership– in order to be able to jointly address a series of themes/problems/services... which it would not be possible to address alone.

2.2.1.2 The protagonists (the local players)

Any process of change and development in modern democratic societies requires the participation of local players, each one in their role, which we define here as the three protagonists:

— The authorities
— The technical-professional resources
— The citizens
Graph no. 1. The protagonists

These three protagonists are fundamental for social development and to help to boost co-existence and social cohesion. The manner in which the three figures participate cannot be identical since they have different roles and functions. Confused roles, lack of understanding of the differences between the three roles, the lack of acknowledgement of the role of others, etc. led in the past to errors and failings in significant positive participative experiences: citizens who wish to take decisions instead of the people chosen to do so, technicians who become engaged and participate at personal level and not within the framework of their work, responsible for public affairs who decide legally, although in an authoritarian manner, matters directly affecting social needs, when they could have done so with the consensus and collaboration of citizens and the contribution of technicians, etc.

Intercultural community intervention underlines the importance of the three protagonists becoming engaged in the community process within their role and without confused functions. That is:
— That people chosen democratically to govern and take decisions do so in the most participative way possible, counting on citizens not only when voting but also on exercising their mandate, introducing formulas and rules which convert participation into a different and positive element of co-existence and government methods.
— That the public and private technical-professional employees performing their work in direct contact with the population do not limit their activity to the welfare management of benefits, rather they help—providing technical-scientific knowledge—citizens to participate more actively in the campaign to enhance its individual and collective reality, and the authorities to govern with such knowledge.
— That the participation of citizens and of social organisations constitutes a central element of community intervention and a constant reference for authorities and for public and private services.

**Local authorities**

The local authorities, that is, the municipal council, per the constitutional system, represents the State’s first link in the territory. The local government heads are chosen in democratic elections every four years by citizens of the municipality. Excluding these representatives from the possibility of participating in the community process is unconceivable and constitutes an error which would inevitably make community intervention unsustainable. Another negative consequence of this exclusion would be a possible “clash” between the community and local power. In the ICI Project, the participation and involvement of the municipal authorities since the commencement of the work has been an essential condition for the promotion, continuity and sustainability of the community process.

The municipal council, that is, the local government has global political responsibility for citizens, beyond its specific competences attributed to it by the constitutional system. The municipal council is the authority which is directly related with the citizens, although it does not possess all of its competences nor resources related with community life, since these are distributed among different public authorities and, nowadays, also among private entities.

The ICI Project has counted on the involvement of the local authorities of the intervention territories in terms of:
— Institutional support, with the involvement of numerous areas or municipal departments, even contributing own resources to the process.
— Technical support for monitoring and collaboration in the process.
Certain quantitative data help us to understand the involvement of the local authorities in the process in general or in the different initiatives carried out at the end of the third year.

- Involvement in the process increased by 50.8% in the ICI Project’s third year (September 2012 - August 2013).
- It forms part of 90% of the TRS (technical relationship programmes) and in 100% of the cases its supports the announcements.
- It has helped its technicians participate in the process in 94% of the territories.
- Other municipal councils/departments have joined the process in 69% of the territories.
- It 87.5% of cases it has participated in the preparation/drafting/design and publication of the monograph.
- In 100% of cases, it has agreed upon the intercultural community programme with it.

Source: Assessment of intercultural community intervention. 3rd year

Likewise, it has been greatly taken into account that the process was known to all the political groups present at the municipal meeting, generating greater trust and greater possibilities of continuity. Furthermore, the normal event of local elections, which involve changes in administrative management with all that such changes involve, was also taken into account. In the ICI Project’s first phase (September 2010 - August 2013), local elections took place in May 2011, just before completion of the first year of intervention, but the work performed before and after the elections enabled the ICI Project’s continuity with the new local government teams.

The involvement of other public authorities and private entities

The existing system currently envisages that other public authorities intervene in the municipal territory, in particular, in certain areas which are fundamental in community life such as health and education, areas in which the municipal council has limited competences. Without going into legal explanations, it is clear that the real problem is that often neither relationship programmes nor channels exist with respect to the different authorities which enable, facilitate and boost effective coordination and integration between the different sectors, areas and administrative competences, and which synergise and improve the performance of existing resources. In recent years, the intervention of numerous private entities has intensified, dependent on administrative subsidies, which increased the dispersion and fragmentation of procedures in the same territory.

In this connection, the ICI Project has assigned great importance, envisaging work with a relationship with and between the different public and private authorities and entities and, consequently, with and between the different technical-professional resources which depend thereon.
Technical-professional resources

The reality is complex and considering its improvement requires technical-scientific knowledge and capacity, as well as the best possible use of existing resources. As a result of the development of the welfare state, all the intervention territories count on the presence of qualified technical-professional resources, although they are not always well used. To ignore or underestimate this wealth and consider that such resources should not play a pro-active role in the community process would lead to mistaken approaches.

The matter we have addressed in the ICI Project is how to help these resources, as well as the benefits provided in their own specific work area, to be a community resource. That is, contribute to common shared products enabling the community to address challenges of general interest, such as co-existence and social cohesion.

The ICI Project has considered that any person operating professionally in the social area in the intervention territory is a potential community resource, beyond the benefits –programmes, activities, etc.– performed by this person in his/her own specific work area. The Project does not intervene in the work area of each existing resource, rather it favours the possibility that, in the framework of the intercultural community process, the existing resources may relate to each other, collaborate and contribute something to the process itself, thereby transforming specific resources into community resources.

In the framework of the constitutional system to which we refer, it is evident that the main leading figures are the citizens who vote for and choose their representatives, and the authorities which, by way of the vote, manage public affairs. The technical-professional resources existing in the territory may not and cannot substitute these two protagonists—in their functions, in their duties and in their rights—, but they may contribute the scientific and technical elements to both so as to better perform their functions: that of participating and governing.

On the other hand, one of the common verifications in the work with the community is the population’s scant knowledge of existing resources, their purposes and their procedures. In practice, it may be stated that each one is exclusively aware of the service it uses, for the reason in question. The process –through the assessment work of existing systems– has not only facilitated and enabled an enhanced and more extensive knowledge of resources and of their drive in the community, but it has also contributed to making its existence and activity more public, making the whole stand out as a collective, community and essential element for the ultimate goal of promoting and forging living together and intercultural citizenship.
The important participation of technical resources in the performance of the monograph, the assessment and the programme –key elements of the methodology–, as well as their involvement in community initiatives of all types, both in the Global Line and in the Specific Lines, enabled them to be discovered or boosted as a community resource.

The process has also enabled a certain “recovery of the street” and a new relationship with citizens among a significant number of professionals, elements which have contributed positively to their integration into community life.

Citizens

The centre and axes of community methodology is the participation of all people, entities, organisations –formal or informal– in the process in equal conditions. All the methodological elements take into account the participation and effective equal conditions of all players, beyond the social, background, class, religious, cultural and language differences, etc.

We have noticed in these three years that work with citizens as agents of the intercultural community process is that which has involved the greatest difficulties, including, inter alia:
— The decline of social organisations capable of interpreting and representing general interest and, alongside this, the appearance of numerous organisations representing individual interests.
— The appearance of new social programmes –in the widest sense– and of organisations from the so-called civil society –NGOs and others– which have intervened in the communities and for the population, but scarcely or not at all with the community and by counting on the citizens. And when they have tried to do so, they have either stopped such work in a short time without explanations, or they have not known how or been able to promote autonomous processes which they were able to maintain.

Re-composing this fragmentation in processes which are common and diverse in turn has been extremely complex. If to the foregoing elements, we add the multicultural change which has come about rapidly and intensively in Spain in the last decade, we may subsequently verify the need for projects such as the ICI Project and, at the same time, the difficulties involved in it.

In order to favour citizen participation in the process, that is, to favour the involvement of organisations, groups and people at individual level in the responses to local demands and needs on a global shared basis, in this phase, the ICI Project has promoted:
— The implementation of **initiatives by citizens** which would strengthen the existing social fabric, promote collaborative relationships and generate positive news in the territory, thereby enabling a positive common visualisation and identification of very different realities and in certain stigmatised cases.

— The creation of **shared spaces for collaborative relationships** facilitating mutual relationships, generating and facilitating local synergies and community strength.

— The **relationships between existing associations** and new additions, favouring mutual understanding and the building of interests and common initiatives.

— The **participation of citizens** in the definition of needs, opportunities and priorities to be addressed on a cooperative basis, together with the other local players, facilitating the adoption of shared proposals, better adapted to the context and with a greater predisposition to be assumed, on being the constituent part thereof.

— **Adequate relationships between the protagonists**, through community moments and meetings, or initiatives enabling common products or themes to be shared, enabling all citizens to see a collective improvement opportunity in the ICI Project.

— The possibility of enabling **different positions, conflicts and contradictions** arising in the process or which were already latent or evident in the community to **flourish, mediate or be channelled**, creating conditions to address them positively, constructively and jointly among the parties and players engaged.

— **Communication between different social and cultural groups** and the promotion of meeting and positive interaction spaces, as well as common cooperation and participation, without exclusions, in matters of interest for the whole local community.

### 2.2.1.3 Intercultural community intervention team

A fundamental methodological element contributed by the ICI Project is the existence of a ICI team enabling the development of the process and its sustainability. The team has two essential characteristics:

- **It is a non-specific resource**, that is, it does not provide any specific service, nor attends to a specific group, rather it contributes methodology, time and technical resources for the process and for the participation of protagonists.

- **It is a mediating resource**, since it does not have any purpose or own interest, and it is dependent upon communication between all the local players, providing spaces and dynamics to manage conflicts on a positive basis and to promote the adaptation of the institutions to diversity.
The remaining resources –specific–, also required to develop the process, must maintain correct adequate relationships with and between the three protagonists, valuing what already exists and connecting common initiatives, projects and programmes.

Citizens, authorities and technical-professional resources operating in the territory should feel part of the process and their participation must have an effect on the group decisions of their communities.

Pindado Sánchez (2004:10)\(^2\) refers to the rules of citizen participation in the local area: "There is a perverse trend to believe that the right has been complied with through the preparation of a rule, without taking into account that in order to effectively enable such entitlement, the following are required: firstly, maximum diffusion thereof in order to favour its knowledge and, secondly, the adequate channels and ways to adequately exercise it". Adapting his words to community processes, we can state that: if a team does not exist in the territory which attends to the information needs, the relationships with and between the three protagonists and to the visibilisation of general interests, it will be very difficult to talk of participation or of participative processes in local contexts.

Mixing with all the protagonists, organising socialisation spaces with and between local payers, involving the authorities and connecting groups, entities, leaders, etc., in order to build products or initiatives on a shared basis in which the three protagonists are engaged in some way has been a challenge and a task performed by all the ICI Project’s local teams.

Those persons forming part of the teams have assumed a huge professional challenge. The different roles assumed and the necessary competences acquired or developed during this first stage –all supported by the "la Caixa" Scientific Department and Foundation– has granted them in-depth knowledge of the community reality and acknowledgement and recognition by the three protagonists.

It was also necessary for the team to gradually modify its procedures, assuming the role of collaborator, co-promoter or helper more and more, to advance towards increasing autonomy of the process and of its protagonists. This event has not been exempt from difficulties. For example, when a change in role was required –from "drive and promotion" to "collaboration and

---

co-promotion” – at the same time as the number of prominent figures engaged in the process increased, the initiatives became more mainstream and the complexity itself of the process meant the increasing involvement of the ICI team.

Besides the role of facilitators of the intercultural community process, the teams have fulfilled a mediator role among the different groups and protagonists of the local community. The principle of neutrality and equidistance among the parties, essential in mediation, was applied by the teams, not positioning them at the side of any player, nor favouring some over others. Their only stance vis-à-vis the parties has undoubtedly been that of their commitment to the community process and to co-existence. In this way, rapprochement between different positions and the resolution of possible latent or explicit conflicts which may have existed or arisen as a result of the development of the process have been facilitated.
Table no. 1. Roles of the intercultural community intervention team in a participative and social development process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Facilitator** | — Contributes methods to facilitate a process; from reflection to action.  
— Revitalisation of the process, clarification of doubts and the provision of decision-making support mechanisms. Boosts trust and collaboration between the protagonists.  
— Maintains an attitude of active listening, both in the manner and means of expression, taking into account culture and diversity.  
— Has empathy to know how to interpret and channel opinions from different perspectives. |
| **Communicator** | — Favours the visualisation of ideas, emotions, knowledge, etc., for a global understanding of the process and its diffusion.  
— Empathises and is capable of attracting different types of groups and citizens for shared challenges of general interest.  
— Orders and makes existing knowledge commonly available, generating instruments and products which help to register, synthesise, classify and relate themes and specific contributions, with a general global vision.  
— Presents, returns and socialises results in different physical and virtual medium, taking into account the contributions of the three protagonists and the diversity present in the community. |
| **Capacitator** | — Provides knowledge of the intercultural community methodology –purposes, strategies, tools– to the protagonists.  
— Involves and accompanies the community’s protagonists in the shared knowledge of reality and the programming of the steps to be taken. |
| **Strategy** | — Prepares and visualises strategies for the participation of protagonists in the process, connecting it with municipal or sectoral policies and plans in the territory.  
— Has systemic and strategic thought capacity –process cycles, relationships between and with protagonists, existing resources.  
— Structures data, causes and effects in order to identify opportunities. Systematises the creative collective process and proposes integrated initiatives. |
| **Researcher** | — Coordinates and develops research using participative methods and existing knowledge.  
— Carries out fieldwork and uses information collection and systematisation techniques, converting the process into a resource in itself.  
— Performs community evaluations, using participative methods.  
— Facilitates a critical analysis of the findings with the community, making them comprehensible and communicable for use by all the protagonists and their possible extrapolation. |
| **Mediator** | — Facilitates communication, community meetings, interaction and cooperation between different social and cultural groups, as well as common participation in matters of general interest.  
— Mediates between the parties and favours the creative resolution of conflicts.  
— Favours a re-assessment of the different groups, granting them prominence within the intercultural community process.  
— Promotes the balancing of resources between the different players and groups.  
— Contributes to the creation of a new social context and to the adaptation of services and institutions to the reality of social and cultural diversity |
| **Co-creator** | — Generates conditions to facilitate social creativity throughout the process, involving the community in the joint ideation of possibilities, exploration of alternatives to those established and of new realities.  
— Has the ability to create stories visualising the contents of proposals regarding the future. |

Source: own study by Jiménez Martínez, C. (2014)³

In order to develop their role of revitaliser, communicator, researcher, mediator, etc. the members of the ICI team have counted on the support, in many cases with a significant involvement, of professionals in the territory, municipal technicians and other authorities and, above all, of citizens who have participated in the different phases or moments of the community process, contributing their time, knowledge and energy. What the team has done is to synergise and connect resources and people, demands and potential, objective and subjective knowledge, etc. in order to make all of the foregoing possible.

2.2.1.4 The documentation

Any community process requires an adequate documentation system enabling the collection and systematisation of data, information, contributions etc., in order to provide a work analysis, an adequate assessment and on-going information to the community.

The documentation system should respond to these needs in each of the intervention territories, but also to that of documenting and systematising the whole of the ICI Project in the 17 territories for a general assessment and analysis thereof.

The following considerations were taken into account in this connection:

— The documentation system must respond to the methodological principles of **globality and flexibility**, which meant that, in line with the very characteristics of each territory, certain uniformity was also sought in data, enabling an analysis and assessment both of the local interventions and of the ICI Project in general.

— The data registered will be **public**, except that related with the cases envisaged in the Spanish Data Protection Law.

— The system must combine **quantitative and qualitative elements** which will enable an on-going analysis and reflection of the work and the verification of the progress—or setbacks—of the process in the territories and of the ICI Project from a general standpoint.

— The data collection instruments must be **part of the work and the ICI team organisation**, with direct correlation between the phases, objectives and frequency of the reports or other analysis instruments and systematisation of the documentation.

Based on these needs and premises, all the teams were provided with a common information and documentation system in digital support (DIS), which constituted a valuable and innovative initiative in the area of social intervention.
Without compiling an exhaustive list, in the following table we detail some of the work documentation instruments.

**Table no. 2. Instruments of the Intercultural Community Intervention Project’s information and documentation system. First stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly report</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>— Monthly summary of procedures performed in the month taking into account organisers and participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity report</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>— Activity report generated in the basic data process, description of the activity, protagonists, valuation and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorecards</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>— Territorial and global cards showing data and parameters in order to understand the evolution of processes in the territories and of the ICI Project in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly report</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>— Quarterly report taking into account the process phase, relationships with the protagonists, actions in global and specific lines, priority groups, etc. Planning of the following quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with local players</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>— Interviews with local players of the 16 territories at the end of the third year with quantitative aspects structured into subject blocks and qualitative/open aspects on the valuation of that performed and proposals to take into account thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires to teams and entities</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>— Annual assessment of territorial teams and management entities in relation with the processes and management of entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports by Scientific Management and advisers</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>— Periodic reports performed by the Scientific Management coordination team, the general advisor or specific advisers which respond to different moments or needs of the ICI Project and the processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment reports</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>— Annual assessment reports of the ICI Project and the processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey reports</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>— Surveys on the co-existence status in the intervention territories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own study

This information and documentation system—which underwent certain adaptations considered necessary as they were used— enabled the significant aspects of the work process with generic and accessible IT tools to be monitored, contributing useful information for the management, monitoring and assessment of the territorial processes and of the ICI Project as a whole. The virtual nature of the system to measure the intervention work converted it into a non-replaceable tool for the management and assessment of the ICI Project, as well as for scientific research. Once the first stage had ended, it was considered advisable to maintain and improve its functioning.
The methodology foresaw other instruments for the documentation of the process such as sociograms, community maps, minutes of meetings, etc. To these were added the documentation and information instruments being generated by the teams based on their possibilities such as: physical map and on-line support of resources, experience bank, information points, good practices files and many more...

An **internal use platform** has also been used in the project area—with a specific domain: [www.convivenciaciudadana.org](http://www.convivenciaciudadana.org)—which enabled:

— A main page to be shared with news, videos, a calendar, etc.
— A collaborative environment for communication and exchange between territorial teams.
— A library with ICI Project documentation.
— The storage of reports, scorecards and other significant documentation.

### 2.2.2 Key concepts

#### 2.2.2.1 The process dimension

The social policies of recent decades, even those based on budgets, laws and advanced approaches, have been managed in a tight manner and, above all, through more specific projects. All of this has been favoured by administrative dispersion and by the absence of institutional integration policies, issues which are under discussion nowadays due to the deficit and the crisis, but which were already evident even in the years of economic growth.

Territories which were going to be involved represent complex systems with multiple tangible and intangible interactions; social and sustainable development being examined had to be approached not as a purpose in itself but also as an open, dynamic process in transition. The idea of a process was therefore not only ground-breaking, but also potentially broke away from the reality existing in the territories. The ICI Project considered that social intervention at local level should exceed the culture of “project” and progress towards the culture of “process”, generating situations in which significant changes and improvements took place.

With the idea of process, it wished to express the need to implement something which was going to be developed through phases or stages, on an undefined or unspecified basis, in which objectives could not be predetermined. To this theoretical and operating process dimension, it would be necessary to add sustainability and continuity, a condition of normality and repetitiveness in other realities.
In this way, intercultural community intervention could not be translated into a finalist project with predefined objectives. These processes were undefined and unspecified since they were based on the principle that “each community is a specific reality which had to implement its own development itinerary and that this would be different from any other”. It would be the same participative and community process –dialectical and dynamic– which was going to determine this journey and its priorities.

2.2.2.2 Participation

With respect to intercultural community intervention, participation is related with a series of basic elements –arising from specific experiences– which have demonstrated their significance over these three years: These elements may be summarised as follows:

— Participation is, at the same time, a basic human need, a right and a requirement for the success of any initiative.

— Participation is, at the same time, both a means and an end: without participation there would be no process and no substantial and sustainable changes.

— We do not work or mix with users, clients, patients or beneficiaries. We mix with citizens, taking into account their role –rights and duties– in community life.

— It is not true –as with all generalisations– that people do not participate. People, and different groups and organisations of a community participate in what they deem to be important, related to their needs and interests, with their expectations of well-being and happiness, etc., and they do so in many ways.

— The methodological process does not exclude anyone from the possibility of participating. The methodology ensures that whoever does not wish to participate can naturally be excluded, but he/she cannot say that the community process has excluded him/her.

— Participation does not mean attendance at events or activities. Participation is involvement, feeling part of something and contributing to make this something worth being improved, boosted, etc.

— We do not link the participation of a person –in an activity, in a relationship programme, etc.– with his/her physical presence in all activities and community meetings, etc. The main thing is to maintain the relationship with this person who, very often, cannot always be present. Here community information and the team’s capacity to maintain relationships plays a fundamental role.

— Participation must be linked to processes which facilitate self-organisation. If the people participating do not feel part of an organisation itself, they will always feel that they will depend on others.

— A participative process therefore means that its various players assume greater prominence,
while that of those promoting participation diminishes.
— Interaction between ethnoculturally different groups belonging to a community is an essential element to strengthen and socially develop the territory itself.

**The theory of the three circles**

On saying “everyone participates” we build a mirage. We know that not everybody can participate in everything—it will depend on the moment, the circumstances, the possibilities, etc.—. When with respect to ICI Project it is affirmed that “everybody participates” it means that the process is potentially open to everybody. The fact of the matter is whoever wishes to or is able to participate may do so whenever they want, to the extent they want.

In the ICI Project we have worked to ensure that everyone can participate, despite knowing that in practice and in reality only a minority participates. But the ICI Project’s methodology has worked to ensure that this minority is always open to the integration of new participants and does not close itself off.

It has also been greatly taken into account that active participation may be a “weight” for people and, accordingly, steps have been taken to ensure that this weight is as light as possible—for example, holding fewer and shorter meetings—and that participation is a normal sustainable event. Accordingly,—in order to adequately systematise the experience—we have used the theory of three circles, which was adapted to the different players—people, groups, entities, authorities, etc.

— **Circle no. 1.** People or entities which share and totally support the initiative. In the ICI Project, we have given them the title *engaged*.

— **Circle no. 2.** People or entities which share the initiative but only participate in it on a specific, partial and provisional basis, etc. In the ICI Project, we call them *collaborators*.  

— **Circle no. 3.** People or entities which do not want or do not wish to participate—their motives are not important—but which are informed of the process. They are known as *informed*, and the idea is that, as situations change, certain people or entities which, at a certain time have been unable to participate, may change their mind or their circumstances and begin to collaborate or become engaged. Furthermore, for example, people from circle 1 may pass to circle 2 or 3 and be substituted by others.
Graph no. 2. The theory of the three circles

This theory, aside from quashing the useless justifying set phrase, "people don’t participate", has enabled us to understand and verify that the continuity of the participative process is important, not the continuity of the people. Situations –subjective and objective, internal and external– change and this is a fact or proof which must be assumed. The methodology must guarantee the continuity of the process, beyond that of the people themselves. Even from the standpoint of democratic health, generally it is good to change people and positions or roles so that they are not eternally filled by the same person.

All intervention and action areas of the ICI Project have worked to ensure that everybody participates in equal conditions in their own role, an event involving respect and mutual acknowledgement. Accordingly, the ICI Project could be considered to be a participative democratic space, a fact which is of great importance and is not only symbolic, in a context in which class differences and cultural diversity still have significant weight.
2.2.2.3 The process is self-educational and transforming for all players

The community process is dialectical since it involves three protagonists and an equal relationship between them. The three protagonists do not participate in the same way, because their role is different, their participation intermittent, their relationships change constantly and also because their reality changes, their situations change and all of this, in turn, produces changes in all three of them.

The community process is complex, given the complicated, integral nature of reality and participation. The process requires adaptation to the local context and, at the same “open doors and windows letting in currents of air in ghettos of local specificity” (Sousa Santos, 2010).

The community process must become the experience of participation in the main source of collective learning. The local teams and protagonists have stood out as an important contribution of the ICI Project, which has meant a learning process and improvement actions for all on promoting innovative forms of working and socialising.

2.2.2.4 Mainstreaming and globality of the intervention

The ICI Project has not intervened in the territories to implement campaigns to meet specific demands, rather to promote participative and collaborative processes among all the players engaged and to therefore contribute to enhancing co-existence and social cohesion. This is an innovative approach which, in the long run, has become key to the ICI Project’s success, and a methodological element, also key, to overcome the existing difficulties, granting life to something substantially new with respect to that which we have defined as a predominant culture.

The community process inevitably involves a journey which organises, on the one hand, a general and comprehensive vision –global– in order to connect individual and sectoral matters within a global framework and, on the other, a mainstream vision, since community matters may never be addressed from a single area and require synergies, collaboration, integration of different sectors, different protagonists, different resources.

The intercultural community process was developed through two interrelated and symbiotic axes: the Global Action Line and the Specific Action Lines. The first deals with the global development of the process and of the relationships and was organised in common and general elements –such as shared knowledge and programming, for example–, whose obtainment is always slower and whose importance takes longer to be perceived and understood. The second enabled the ICI Project’s contribution to be adapted to the existing reality, helping to improve
the most immediate responses, without which the ICI Project would appear to be abstract. In short, this was summed up through three elements:
— The progressive integration of the different public authorities and also of private entities.
— Technical inter-institutional and inter-sectoral collaboration.
— The integration of all the players/protagonists in all lines and initiatives.

2.2.2.5 Collaborative relationships in a complex context
“... Accepting complexity in forms of government involves organising diversity and fragmentation with coordination or integration mechanisms. Governing in a complex environment involves, in other words, acknowledging the multiple players [...], accepting their participation in government tasks and managing the relationships established between them in order to generate integrated procedures.” Subirats, J. (2010)⁴.

On managing the complexity, after three years of intervention, we can identify certain key issues:

a. The three protagonists—each one in its role and in its specific reality— are no longer mere definitions, rather realities with a name and a surname and with objectively difficult situations. This complexity is reflected both in its internal dimension—that is, in each one of the three protagonists—and, especially, in their mutual relationships. We can talk about internal complexity in the technical area; another in the political-administrative area and also in the citizen area. It is necessary to highlight that, in general, intervention has enabled the production of elements which did not exist in community life and which now constitute solid references on which to build, for example, technical relationship programmes in practically all territories.

b. Basic and fundamental tasks should have been affronted to promote co-management and co-participation processes among the three protagonists. These are technical and socially complex tasks which have required an investment in relationships.

c. A strong mediation component should have been requested and specified—by the teams, the management entities and, very often, by the municipal technical references—in all areas and with all the protagonists, especially to facilitate the positive and productive encounter of all three parties.

The ICI Project’s local teams, in their assessment of what the ICI Project had contributed in the territories, highlighted elements such as the following:

— A new culture of sharing.
— More people help others.
— The political, democratic culture has been enriched.
— There is more conflict at present and, in turn, more collaboration.
— The acknowledgement of all.
— Relationships in areas of equality.
— Move from rivalry to cooperation.
— A certain waiver of individual prominence to move towards joint prominence.
— Change of look, seeing that it “is possible”.
— Recovery of learning from “others”.

Following the first phase, the progress of collaborative and cooperative work has been demonstrated. With the completion of shared knowledge and the development of a proposed intercultural community programme, the community has gained an enhanced system of functioning whereby a) communication and joint work –authorities, technical resources and citizens – are improved; b) all the existing resources – plans, programmes, projects, etc.– are identified; c) existing knowledge is managed on a shared basis and priorities are identified and agreed upon, and d) more effective and efficient communication, coordination and collaboration systems are established.

An example of cooperative relationships are the community summer schools, promoted by the ICI Project in southern Jerez, those of Norias de Daza in the municipality of El Ejido (Almeria) or that of the Carrús neighbourhood, in the town of Elche. Through this initiative, the technical-professional and community resources, with the collaboration of public authorities and private entities, have worked on a collaborative basis to combine resources and efforts in an activity required for the area such as programmes for children and young people over the summer period.
Community information

The theory
— The same information for the three protagonists.
— The same content in different forms and languages.
— Nobody is excluded.
— The information is public and it is made public.
— All knowledge must be socialised.
— It may also use existing informative means.

The methodology
— The places of the community meetings and the community or key premises.
— The resources and associated fabric.
— The mediators, leaders, etc.
— The community information plan.

The instruments
— Letters, minutes, documents, etc.
— Community file.
— Manifestos/posters.
— Three-page leaflets and brochures.
— General or specific information sheets.
— Resources, monograph guide, etc.
— Newspapers, magazines, etc.
— Blog, web, RSS, etc.
— Etc.

2.2.2.6 The information is public and the process makes it public

A participative process cannot be understood without extensive on-going information to the three protagonists regarding its activities, projects, programmes, successes, failures, etc. It may be stated that there is no participation without information, although it is not sufficient either to provide information to ensure participation.

Experience tells us that information must be the same for the three protagonists—although with a different language—in order that they may participate in the process on an equal footing. The community process is essentially a public process and, consequently, everything related therewith must be public.

The ICI Project, although arising from a private initiative, was shaped as a public service, understanding public in a double sense, on the one hand, which pursues general interests and, on the other, which involves three protagonists that play a different role in community life. This required everything to be done within the scope of the process to be made public and for everyone to know what was being performed, who was doing it, why and for what motive. Without documentation, all this was not possible and the information would be occasional, specific, provisional, and intermittent, etc.
Information, as an instrument for participation, required an activity, on-going work –an information system and documentation– which enabled both an assessment of the work performed and on-going information to the community to be provided at all times.

The ICI Project has distinguished:
— The information produced by the same process, mainly by the ICI team, such as brochures, information sheets, reports, etc.–all envisaged in the information plan for each territory.
— The information produced by the existing information media—television, radio, newspapers, etc.– with which it is necessary to establish a correct relationship in order that they may adequately inform upon the process and its activities. This information has been called impacts of media, has meant a valuable visualisation instrument for the ICI Project and has generated a positive image of the territories, traditionally dealt with in the media with negative news.

The use of different IT medium has depended on the skills of the team members or of local resources used by it, as well as on the support provided to the ICI Project by the Communication Department of the “la Caixa” Foundation.

The information sheets have been a common instrument used by the teams in all the territories. The information sheets are simple and easy to distribute adapting, on the one hand, to the ICI Project’s general needs–common format and a common name: Share– and, on the other, to the signs of identity, themes and local references. The information sheets, published frequently, have provided accessible information regarding that performed in the process and the different initiatives performed in each territory.

The new technologies –web, blog, SMS, social networks, forums, RSS, etc.– and different artistic or cultural means which were developed throughout this first phase in very different formats have enabled communication and information possibilities to be multiplied and increased. The instruments and diffusion media were diverse. In the first stage, the teams designed and implemented different manners of providing information, both with respect to the process in general and to measures and initiatives implemented in the Specific Action Lines.

The symposiums or community meetings with the protagonists, the resource guides etc. were also used by all the teams. Street work, mouth to mouth, diffusion via local leaders, as well as other relationship instruments were also significant diffusion and information medium.
Murals, blogs, radio programmes, leaflets, posters, etc. and other artistic elements or elements related with new information technologies and communication have enabled knowledge to be provided and socialised in different manners in line with the type of protagonist. These different ways of providing information and socialising work were also adapted to the groups or persons with which the teams mixed or to the medium arising as a result of the context and its reality. Accordingly, those who have worked more closely with groups of young people have implemented blogs or radio programmes with them, and those which have had artistic means available in the territory have created murals, videos, clowns, circus activities, concerts, etc.

**Information plan**

The fundamental methodological instrument of the information is the information plan which, based on three dimensions of information diffusion, combined with three other content dimensions, generates three assumptions:

**Table no. 3. Assumptions of the information plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption 1</td>
<td>Assumption 2</td>
<td>Assumption 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumption 1.** Envisages the content maximum –studies, proposals, etc.– but, in view of the technical nature of the information or the fact that its size hinders diffusion to all players, it envisages a more reduced diffusion, aimed at a more technical level or at people/entities which may really be of use to them.

**Assumption 2.** Envisages the same content but more reduced and understandable. Accordingly, it envisages a more extensive diffusion than the previous one, through leaders, representatives, etc.

**Assumption 3.** Content was adapted for a greater understanding and diffusion. Technical elements were adapted in forms and languages to all the protagonists, accordingly, their diffusion is maximum and takes place through information sheets or other means.

Note: both in Assumption 2 and 3, the availability of all the knowledge or information for all those requiring it will become evident.
Nowadays new technologies will facilitate the diffusion and broadcasting of information and knowledge with greater ease. That is, a community monograph which, a few years ago, was envisaged in book version may nowadays be prepared through an ebook, a blog or a pen drive, etc. But we cannot forget that at the same time, it may represent a barrier to access information, since not everybody has knowledge or the possibility to access such technology.

The assumption is as follows: the same information for the three protagonists although in different forms and languages. In order to promote participation in the local area, it is necessary to use the language, codes, symbols, images, references, examples, means of identity and forms of cultural expression and communication of each community and protagonist. Always move within people’s imaginary conceptual universe. Use different languages.
The return and socialisation of knowledge

Another fundamental element of the methodology consists in guaranteeing information on all that performed within the framework of the intercultural community process to ensure the participation of all the players, and that they all have the same information. The same should occur with respect to materials, studies or other knowledge related with the process.

To all of this, we apply the principle of “return” of the information and knowledge, which has special significance in the moments in which the process builds important products for their future, such as, for example, the monograph and the assessment.

However, with a process involving a multitude of people, with different levels and cultures, it is not sufficient to provide and diffuse the information and knowledge in a certain way. Taking into account these differences and the need to ensure that everybody has the possibility of using such knowledge, the methodology progresses one step and envisages the matter of “socialising” this information and this knowledge; that is, of diffusing it in different forms and languages, thereby enabling everybody to use it. It is evident that in realities with cultural diversity and with significant social differences, such as those in which the ICI Project intervenes, the mere fact of translating the informative material into different languages in itself already represents an absolutely necessary step. It is more complicated, however, ensuring that the content of the information is actually accessible to everybody.

2.2.2.7 The intercultural perspective and the mediation dimension

The intercultural perspective, as a mainstream element in the methodology deployed by the community process, has attempted to ensure that no group has been excluded from the process, especially culturally different groups. Certain immigrants, such as Maghrebis, sub-Saharan, Orientals, etc. face information, psychological, linguistic, legal and social barriers which distance them and hinder their normal access on an equal footing to the institutions and local participation areas, as well as to public and private resources.

Co-existence and social cohesion as an inclusive and integrating goal of all existing sociocultural diversity in territories would require a dynamic perspective to enrich the methodology and its potential to include all groups in the community process. Its emphasis on avoiding the obstacles hindering the participation of all people, regardless of their origin, contributed a necessary glance to avert the risk of exclusion and situations of conflict associated therewith.
The intercultural perspective is not only an approach, a form of seeing and interpreting reality, it is also a methodological proposal which affects positive interaction between people and groups. Arising as a response to the weaknesses of multiculturalism, interculturality prioritises the relationships between the different social and cultural groups, the main failing of the multicultural model. Although this diversity management model, with its emphasis on respect for differences, represented significant social progress with respect to the integration of migrants or ethnic minorities, it did not succeed, on the other hand, in enabling people to mix among themselves and constitute situations of authentic co-existence. Rather it helped to reinforce the predominant trend towards social co-existence. Faced with it, interculturality became a dynamic perspective which sought to bring about relationships and interaction between groups.

The application of the intercultural perspective to the community methodology boosted the scope thereof, thanks, above all, to the interrelation established with intercultural mediation. Both social intervention strategies, with strong relational methodologies, jointly contributed to establish previously improbable relationships among human groups, players and leading figures, etc.

The intercultural perspective has contributed greatly to ensuring that territorial diversity is represented in the relationship programmes generated by the intercultural community process, be they technical relationship programmes, citizen participation or institutional relationship programmes. In the same way, it was endeavoured to ensure that the same happened in all initiatives and activities promoted by the ICI Project. The obstacles hindering the participation of people belonging to the different social and cultural groups have been removed, and the presence of all visions has been ensured in key moments of the process, such as in the preparation of the monograph, the assessment and programming or in the community meetings.

The mainstream methodological proposal contributed by interculturality was extremely useful to avoid exclusion and bring about new types of social relationships. However, it is not sufficient in itself to attain the ICI Project’s objective: co-existence and social cohesion. The attainment of this goal also requires the application of a mediation dimension at community and group level.

The community facet of the mediation dimension relates to the changes being promoted by the ICI Project in the institutional area and in a social context to attain the full acknowledgement of all the parties – social and cultural groups – and their re-assessment within the local community. This involves a type of global mediation essential to grant form to the very characteristics...
of a social situation of full co-existence. Intercultural community intervention, as a conceptual and methodological synthesis between the intercultural and community standpoint, is that which makes it possible to mediate with respect to protagonists and players to promote changes in the territory’s services and resources, in the institutions and local regulations, and in the relationships arising between groups, associations, organisations, etc.

The changes promoted are different and consistent among themselves due to the ICI Project’s mediation approach, its convergence making it possible to progress in the area of co-existence and social cohesion. These changes are as follows:

— The transformation of social relationships.
— The re-assessment and empowerment/strengthening of the different groups acquiring prominence in the process.
— The acknowledgement of the parties.
— The balancing of resources.
— The creation of a new context through mutual adaptation and institutional adaptation.
— The construction of an alternative account surpassing the initial situation.
— The creation of a pacific civil and institutional conflict resolution culture.

The ICI Project’s entire investment to facilitate the founding of relationships between the different players and protagonists, and to create different relationship programmes, contributed to the transformation of the nature of social relationships in the territory. The architecture of technical, citizen and institutional relationship programmes and community meetings etc.—created by the Process established stable positive interaction, communication, dialogue and agreement channels. Special attention must be drawn to this last aspect, since although the objective of the mediation approach is to improve relationships, the agreement being a possible consequence of this improvement, the ICI Project is proving to be effective in enabling agreements to be reached, the best proof being the intercultural community programmes agreed upon in 16 of the intervention territories.

The ICI Project involves three protagonists: citizens, professionals and representatives of the public authorities, clearly referring to the re-assessment and balancing of the different players within the community, especially in the most disadvantaged groups. It involves a re-assessment in the sense of acquiring prominence with respect to the social relationships occurring in the local community. The ICI Project boosts those actions, initiatives and spaces for collaborative relationships which have enabled the different players and groups to be active agents within their community.
This re-assessment has not meant the suppression of the roles played by each player, rather the opposite. The instruments and relationship programmes built within the ICI Project’s framework have enable community meetings, dialogue and agreement regarding the role played by each of them: the public authorities as representatives of the democratically chosen government, the professional resources as experts and technicians specialised in the application of the social projects and public policies, and citizens as active participants in the detection of the needs and problems affecting them and the definitions of the priorities to be met.

Progress in the area of co-existence and social cohesion involves addressing situations of asymmetry and unequal resources between players and groups. Such situations have been approached from two angles: that of the actual process of strengthening the community and that of direct intervention with respect to the existing social needs and problems. The creation of ICI teams and of technical relationship programmes has made available to the whole local community—which encompasses all the social and cultural groups—the territory’s technical resources and services, enabling inequalities to be balanced out and disparities among existing resources to be reduced. In turn, procedures, initiatives and projects promoted by the intercultural community process have improved standards of living among the territory’s population, especially those of groups with scant resources.

The ICI Project’s participative methodology promoted the acknowledgement of all parties, facilitating the participation of players and groups within the process—in the relationship programmes, in the monograph, the assessment and intercultural community programmes and in community meetings, etc—and the acknowledgement of their legitimacy as elected delegates. In this way, all the parties, players and groups grant their mutual acknowledgement, demonstrating that they are sensitive to the situations and positioning of others. Situational factors—economic, social, cultural—of each group and player—have also been worked as a necessary contextualisation to understand the form of seeing and interpreting the reality of each party. This task was essential to be able to grant the highest level of acknowledgement: mutual adaptation and institutional suitability.

Mutual adaptation of all the groups to the reigning social and cultural diversity in the territory, through the changes required to facilitate equal integration of all the parties, combating situations of inequality, discrimination and intolerance. This mutual adaptation process requires in turn the commitment of the three protagonists to adapt the institutions to the new context being created. Institutional adaptation of the health, education, welfare or regulatory systems, among others. Various adaptation and suitability proposals have been promoted by the ICI Project, especially technical relationship programmes and public and institutional services.
Another essential element of the ICI Project’s mediation dimension was communication, understood to be a whole which encompasses the parties and the message. The construction of a narrative or alternative account enabling a fragmented vision of reality to be overcome was crucial to unblock stagnant situations in the resolution of local problems or to address latent or manifest conflicts. This construction of an alternative account took place throughout the whole process, supervising the message transmitted to the players, placing emphasis on the common points more than on the differentiating elements, or facilitating rapprochement and mutual understanding. Here the mediating factor of the ICI team has been fundamental. As has community information, ensuring that the information reaches the entire community, without exception, through process communication tools –information sheets, posters, blogs, social networks, etc.–, ensuring that the message adapts to each recipient, both in terms of language –technical or popular– and of the languages to be used.

The monograph and the community evaluation were strategic to build an alternative integrating account overcoming the initial situation or base line of the ICI Project. Its ability to integrate the vision of all groups, players and protagonists has made it possible to positively reshape the territory’s history and prepare a shared alternative account, in which all the parties feel acknowledged. This step was essential to achieve the collective appropriation of the assessment and the subsequent involvement in the definition of the responses to be granted to the needs and problems detected through the intercultural community programme.

All the ICI Project’s aforementioned mediation aspects lead to the same place: the construction and consolidation of a pacific civil and institutional conflict resolution culture, an essential requirement of co-existence and cohesion. The transformation of social relationships, the architecture of relationship and community meeting spaces for collaborative relationships, mutual acknowledgement and the adaptation of the context and of the institutions, among other, contribute greatly to the building of a culture of peace or of pacific conflict resolution.

Likewise, the process has also generated conflict management and mediation spaces and instruments known to the entire community, belonging to the intercultural community process, where discrepancies and conflicts between players and groups are discussed and resolved. In turn, it is becoming crucial in the ICI team role, as a neutral or equidistant part, without own interests and authenticated by all the parties, in order to mediate in the specific cases of conflict which have arisen between players and groups.
The ICI Project is facilitating the transit of a culture which perceives conflict as something negative to a concept of conflict as something concomitant to human nature and social reality, which should be resolved and re-defined as an opportunity to improve society. From this standpoint, conflict is no more than an expression of imbalances and inadequacies occurring within communities: inequality, discrimination and intolerance which, once detected, are addressed through a standard conflict resolution process. In short, a positive conception and re-definition in which all the players and groups in question win and participate actively in improving social relationships and, consequently, co-existence and social cohesion in their territory.

2.3 Operating phases and instruments

2.3.1 The community process evolves

The intercultural community process has been implemented in progressive phases, in which each was related to the next, in a development which could not be lineal rather dialectical, since in the future obstacles, difficulties, progress and setbacks would arise... In reality, these phases would never arise or be measured exactly at the same time, nor could the process be divided “into bits”. The normal thing would be that they are superimposed at different times which, principally, never begin or end suddenly, rather they evolve at the same time as they are transformed. Anyway, it is clear that a progression and logical relationship exists between one and another and that it will be necessary to take the necessary steps to ensure this is the case.

The first stage of the ICI Project identified three phases or moments of the development of the intercultural community process.
2.3.1.1 The starting point

However, it was necessary to establish certain elements that indicated the starting point to us. These elements were as follows:

— Basic knowledge of the community: territory, population, demands, resources and potential.
— Knowledge of the history, cultural diversity and community dynamics prior to the ICI.

Each community has its own characteristics and history and begins a community process without taking into account that the starting point would constitute a serious error. In order to begin with what already exists, the ICI teams performed a preliminary work—an initial study—which envisaged all these aspects—volume I of this collection details how the base line or starting situation was prepared (September-October 2010) based on two instruments: the *Initial studies on co-existence status and the 2010 Survey on co-existence in the local area.*

The phrase “begin with what already exists” was, in the first place, the demonstration of an attitude of respect—community work can never be “invasive”—for and with the people, entities and social organisations which have been working and contributing, in their way, to improving reality. Based on this respect, it was possible to begin to weave non-invasive relationships and to examine an enhancement of existing relationships. But all that would be a shared product with the people, entities and organisations engaged in the process through these relationships.

An example of beginning with what already exists may be found in the Raval procedures grid, which has been worked on in the ICI Project in the Barcelona neighbourhood el Raval.
Raval procedures grid

The Raval procedures grid is a knowledge and analysis tool of the procedures which develop Raval’s public and private resources and services. This instrument was created as a result of the need expressed by different agents of the territory –Comissió Social de Tot Raval, Distrito de Ciutat Vella, Grup Educació i Comunitat and Taula Intercultural del Raval, among others–, to collect and promote the different programmes and projects being carried out in el Raval.

The need is detected to visualise the full intervention being performed as far as possible in order to be able to prepare an analysis in community code, in order to assess whether it is necessary to optimise any interventions or whether it is essential to boost any work areas based on existing needs.

Accordingly, this instrument includes programmes, projects and activities which from certain areas are performed in el Raval, based on entities and services. Its structure enables these procedures to be related with aspects regarding the entity or service promoting it, and with typical aspects of the procedure –for example, age groups, recipients, work groups, etc.

Based on the information collected, and on the conclusions arising from the analysis thereof, an assessment will be prepared which will serve to develop a community programme which responds to the needs detected (2nd phase of the ICI Project).
2.3.1.2 Construction of assertive and cooperative relationships with and between the protagonists

If we take into account the context at the intervention date, the importance and need to invest greatly in the building of relationships will be understood. Only a project such as the ICI Project –which “would free up” an ICI team so that it could methodologically devote its time and its work to building relationships with and between the protagonists– could assume this task at that time.

The building of relationships –always assertive and non-excluding– required time, work and methodological approaches. Each one of the local players –on an individual and group level– would require adequate information, documentation, knowledge of who promoted the intervention, but also it would require different timetables and a different language for each protagonist.

All of this work did not take place in neutral contexts or in simple situations. The relationships and progress of the process were enacted in complex contexts, with own dynamics often deeply rooted and unlikely to mix or collaborate with other players which are often even considered to be antagonists.

This reveals that the relational work was not only crucial to “begin with what already exists” and to “land” in a non-invasive manner in the community reality, but that it was a constant factor, consolidating the method, whose continuity had to be guaranteed at all times: initially by the team with the group of protagonists and then, by the protagonists themselves. A particular moment in these relationships was their involvement through the building of shared knowledge.

Relationships and knowledge of the territory and its resources have enabled a community file and subsequent resource guides, maps, etc. to be created, which have been socialised in different ways and formats, as shown in the text extracted from the presentation of the Carrús Resource and co-existence guide in an on-line format:

Within the framework of the Carrús Social Committee, the Elche Municipal Council, the Gypsy Secretariat Foundation, the Carrús Health Centre, Cáritas Elche, the Elche Shelter Foundation, the Vinalopó Mental Health Unit and the Psycho-Pedagogical Service have prepared this Resource and co-existence guide with the cooperation of other local entities.

The guide endeavours to provide a general vision of Carrús’ procedures, benefits, services and programmes which may be of greater use for professionals, neighbours and visitors, as well as basic information on the neighbourhood, its main celebrations and certain co-existence rules. However, it is only a guide, accordingly, the information included should be verified with the related institution or entity.
Desiring that the work fulfils its objectives, I wish to encourage all the resources to turn up, as well as the professionals and residents of Carrús, to contribute to improving and maintaining this guide up to date, thanking them in advance for their collaboration.

Resources linked directly to health in the neighbourhood of Pueblo Nuevo are identified and described. These resources have been identified through Google Maps with colours and markers, depending on the area, indicating a contact address and telephone number, etc.
2.3.1.3 Participative building of shared knowledge

Since the commencement of the ICI Project, the accent has been placed on the context of complexity in which we move. An element arising from such complexity is the need to favour greater knowledge of the community reality by the three protagonists, since nowadays different relevant knowledge of this reality exists, although it is disperse since it often represents a factor of inequality among them. If such knowledge is different, so are the assessments and the concomitant assumptions to change the reality. This matter complicates or prevents the possibility of a shared vision and of cooperative relationships to improve the existing situation.

The participative construction of the shared knowledge of the community and intercultural reality represented an especially notorious landmark in the process developed in the territories. The involvement of all the protagonists, the suitability of the information, the preparation of materials by all the players, etc., was, in turn, a process which required a rhythm adapted to the different protagonists, but also technical requirements which have meant that the objectives and products were different in each territory. The important thing is that the monographs and assessments were performed in all the territories and were common shared products, through the relationship and involvement of all the protagonists.

The phases of building shared knowledge also involve moments requiring organisation and method and the implementation of diffusible and socialisable products such as the monograph and the assessment.
2.3.1.4 From shared knowledge to the programme

With shared knowledge, the community is in a position to individualise common priority themes, as well as to become more familiar with the existing programmes, services and resources performed therein on a normal basis. As a result of this and of the relationships, the community may now address the improvement of its reality within the framework of co-existence and social cohesion.

This has been performed through the participative construction of the intercultural community programme with a global, interdisciplinary and inter-institutional rapprochement.

The programme has been prepared as a result of the assessment and consensus obtained between authorities and citizens and of the operating proposals contributed by all the technical-professional resources in their organised relationship programme.
Relationships have continued to be the fundamental element of participation, but without having generated shared knowledge – which at the same time is a product and a result – the process could have been ended, since it lacked those elements which actually enabled the joint preparation of improvement and change proposals, that is, the programme.

### 2.3.2 Relationship programmes

A fundamental element in the community process is the fact that the protagonists have granted themselves specific and, to a certain extent, stable, albeit flexible, organisation in order to participate adequately in a sustainable manner. If organisation does not exist, the participation of the protagonists will depend exclusively on the proposal/invitation/request/revitalisation, etc., of the party leading the initiative: in short, the team and the ICI Project’s promoter.

This fact has always involved a drive to ensure the participation of the protagonists, also promoting their community meetings and their relationships, but favouring and fostering their autonomous organisation. Certain theories have arisen with respect to self-organisation:

— It is important that the people participating in the community process do so actively and normally via an activity, area, etc., but knowing that, even through this “partial” participation, they are part of the process as a whole.

— Within each space for collaborative relationships or group in which people participate, it is important to create central nuclei which guarantee the existence of such groups and spaces. Without nuclei, the groups always depend on others and cannot attain self-organisation.
All this requires that someone always ensures the connections between one activity and another, between one space for collaborative relationships and another, that is, the global nature of the community process.

### 2.3.2.1 The institutional relationship programme

An institutional relationship programme within the different public and private authorities which, in some way, are engaged in the community process, has shown itself to be a requirement for the continuity and sustainability thereof. This request is based on the following:

— Providing an **organisational framework for the inter-institutional collaboration and coordination relationships** between the different institutions which work in the territory and thereby guarantee the continuity of the political commitment of the different institutions to the community process.

— Favouring a **rational and coordinated use and assignment of resources**, avoiding possible duplication and thereby improving attention to existing demands in the territory.

— **Sustainability**, that is, boosting the *participation and interaction of all the protagonists* engaged, and the continuity of the intercultural community process as a means to favour living together and intercultural citizenship in the territory.

— **Transferability**, that is, favouring the development of this social intervention model in other areas of the municipality.
2.3.2.2 The technical relationship programme

One of the objectives proposed by the methodology in each one of the territories was that the different technical-professional resources would generate an organisation system enabling socialisation and coordination, thereby granting life to something clearly different to the reality existing at the ICI Project commencement date. The building of this space constituted a process in itself and required time, work and a method. Initially, the team had to define the starting point and the possible involvement of the different technicians in line with their institutional and professional situation.

With respect to this general assumption, four variables were established:

1. Starting from zero, since there was nothing.
2. Starting from something which already existed and helping to strengthen it.
3. Connecting various existing partial or sectoral experiences in a global meeting space.
4. Taking into account the existence of various spaces, the team mixes with each one, but does not attempt any of the foregoing since they are disperse and sometimes competitive realities, etc. Efforts are made to ensure that the proposals envisaged by the ICI Project enable shared initiatives to be developed, without forcing the creation of a common relationship programme.

After having developed different strategies in the territories, on completing the third year (in August 2013), we were able to verify the four variables which have been worked on in the territories.

Graph no. 5. Strategies for the creation of technical relationship programmes

Source: Assessment of intercultural community intervention. 3rd year

- Starting from scratch
- Built from something which already existed, it has been helped to strengthen it
- Connecting various experiences in a common global space
- Through a shared initiative
With these different initial assumptions, the creation of a technical relationship programme (TRS) would involve different phases and would generate different results:

— An exchange of information and mutual knowledge.
— Arrangement of an initial group.
— Cooperation in the implementation of shared knowledge —monograph and assessment— and of community initiatives —global citizen action, community summer school, etc.
— Specific or stable cooperation between two or more entities.
— Cooperation in the preparation of programme proposals.
— Shaping of an adequate structure enabling the participation in the process of the technical-professional resources and their formal acknowledgement by the authorities and entities to which they are accountable.
— Establishment of cooperation protocols between various resources to attend to certain demands or certain groups of people, etc. on an integrated basis.
— Extension of mainstreaming to numerous initiatives as a result of the involvement of resources from a different intervention scope, especially among the health and education sectors.
— Increase in the “collaborative and cooperative culture” among them.
— Increase in the “participative culture” with respect to the need to involve citizens in initiatives which, to date, have been reserved for technical resources.
— Enabling the involvement of other public authorities and private entities.
— Etc.

On completion of the first phase, the existence of a general change in professional culture was noted, from the importance of involving citizens in the social processes to seeing each resource as part of a community asset which, aside from responding to the needs of each service, also contributes collectively to the community. This contribution includes elements of knowledge —monograph, assessment, etc.—, as well as shared moments of participation with citizens and with the authorities. Things which were possibly lacking before the ICI Project, but which the ICI Project has managed to put into practice.
Graph no. 6. Evolution of relationships between technical and professional resources

The new reality of the technical-professional resources in the territory and their participation in the intercultural community process also caused many services, and even certain authorities, to consider internal changes, assuming the assumption of a “community turn” in their work.
2.3.2.3 The citizen relationship programme

The progress of relationships with citizens towards the creation of a citizen space was one of the process’ objectives: a citizen relationship and organisation space, integrated by representatives of existing formal and informal organisations, and by individuals, or other formulas which could have been tested in each one of the territories.

The paths followed were also very different, depending on each reality and taking into account the difficulties and complexity of the work with citizens at the present moment. Accordingly, mediation in general and community and intercultural mediation in particular, activities, revitalisation, training, etc., have had great importance.

On completing the third year, it was possible to verify a series of variables –always with qualifications– to establish certain situations on the basis of which citizen participation spaces have been commenced or developed.

Graph no. 7. Strategies for the development of citizen relationship and participation spaces

In order to create this space, committees, groups, work committees, forums, etc. were set up or revitalised, in order to develop:

— Initiatives related with specific areas –such as education and health– or community initiatives.
— The building of shared knowledge, revitalisation of public spaces, talks, etc.
— Activities with priority groups or taking into account cultural diversity to develop interre-
religious dialogues, intergenerational community meetings, meeting spaces for young people and children, etc.

— Initiatives with the individual interests of each protagonist: professional or citizen encounters or institutional symposiums.

In the territories in which formal participation bodies existed –district councils or others– the ICI Project has availed itself of all of them and endeavoured to boost them. The team has also availed itself, in the territories in which they exist, of embryonic plural organisations, representing more general interests, in particular, neighbours’ associations, platforms for associations or federations, parent-teacher associations, etc.–. Accordingly, measures were avoided that generated comparisons or rivalry. These elements enable it to be stated that nowadays the ICI Project has established positive relationships with everybody, whether they participate or otherwise in the intercultural community process.

This is an extremely positive valuable asset vis-à-vis the future which has avoided potential conflicts. The different roads or paths followed to create citizen relationship programmes may be more viable and sustainable if the purposes of the ICI Project are clear, which go beyond formulas and which aim to make visible everything enabling citizen participation to be consolidated as a central element in the intercultural community processes.
Below is the enthralling experience of the Global Citizen Action Line as an example of the joint participation of all the players.

The Global Citizen Action Line constituted a shared landmark among the 17 territories which implemented the first phase of the ICI Project. It involved a campaign comprising a work process to foster the participation of technical and citizen resources as a result of the involvement of authorities—especially municipal councils—and private institutions. Its purpose was to promote local participation and boost the positive identity of all people which materialises both on a local scale—in the process, action and strategy developed in each territory—and at State level—participating in the creation and visibilisation of a proposal to implement participative and significant community actions in the different contexts of significant cultural diversity in which the ICI Project is implemented.

This measure was implemented within the opportunity afforded by the ICI Project making use of the ample varied knowledge of the teams and entities, generating shared experiences among 17 territories, and enabling a collective “production” of knowledge to succeed in boosting relationships and participation among the three protagonists in the territories.
The activity covered an extensive preparation process which enabled relationships to be worked and many people to be engaged. The main methodology used was that of sociocultural activity/revitalisation and such activity consisted of preparing a one-day festive initiative. For further information on this type of measure, consult volume 5 of this collection, focusing on participation.

2.3.3 Community meetings

Aside from the relationships and community meeting spaces from the standpoint of each leading figure, the ICI Project has striven to ensure that community meetings are held in each reality: moments in which the three protagonists meet and share “something” –a common product– to which all three parties have contributed and which constitutes a moment of synthesis of that performed and a base for the process to progress.
The community meetings are "symbolic" moments since they acknowledge the different protagonists and the significant progress or moments of the process. For example: the return of the findings of the participative research and the assumption of future programmes.

They cannot be very frequent. In rough terms, a meeting every six months is more than sufficient. In any case, it depends on the progress of the process.

They may be held both in the Global Intervention Line and in the Specific Intervention Lines.

It is advisable to hold them in different places to generate the plurality of protagonists, entities and organisations, etc.

At the meeting it should be taken into account that:
— The floor should be granted to all protagonists in equal conditions.
— The meetings should not last more than two or two and a half hours.
— It is necessary to provide a lot of preliminary information and ensure that the informative material includes all the logos, etc.
— An information sheet should be subsequently prepared to provide information in this regard.
— Spaces should be avoided in which the chairs cannot be moved nor a circle created.
— Everybody must attend
— It is necessary to take into account who opens and closes the meeting.
— The meeting will end with a leisure/party/food/musical activity, etc.

In the end, they are “political” encounters, in their own sense, without distorting the term, which are highly symbolic and require significant preliminary work—with large doses of mediation—and also a significant information and socialisation campaign with respect to symbolic results, products, decisions, etc. since the different role of each of the leading figures is made visible therein.
One of the indicators of progress made in the process in the territories – taking into account the existing differences – is having held meetings with a high level of participation in general and of the three protagonists in particular. We also highlight the fact that these community meetings have been able to be held without conflict, at a time in which relationships between authorities and citizens are not specifically characterised by harmony and mutual respect.

2.3.4 Monograph and assessment

One of the defining characteristics of the ICI Project is the significant importance it has granted to knowledge.

A community cannot progress in its process of change and improvement without knowing itself. Accordingly, in the intercultural community process, the study and knowledge of reality and of its modifications, problems and potential, etc., constituted an intrinsic need requiring a response. One of the ICI Project’s innovative elements addresses this matter.
Different moments and needs have arisen throughout the process, but it has always been taken into account that:

— Any study serves to ascertain the reality wishing to be modified, and, accordingly, the three protagonists had to be able to have access to the finding of the studies etc., and become engaged in implementing such findings.

— Any study activity had to be carried out in a participative manner.

— The diffusion and socialisation of knowledge –the same for the three protagonists– enables participation on an equal footing and facilitates the most objective debate of the matters or problems to be addressed.

In the participative knowledge building process of the community reality, the contributions of each of the protagonists, as well as the existing objective data were considered to be of equal importance. This series of contributions and data would generate greater understanding and enhanced knowledge of reality.

On talking about knowledge of reality, nothing definitive is ever discussed. Reality changes, accordingly, it will always be necessary to implement update mechanisms of existing knowledge.

In the case of local communities, we can affirm that abundant knowledge exists, albeit disperse and fragmented, although what could be known as a general global community study does not exist. Accordingly, in this phase of the process, we needed to generate basic and global knowledge furnishing us with a comprehensive vision of community reality. We name this instrument and this product a community monograph.
Graph no. 8. Community monograph: defining elements

Based on a common basic structure—extended and integrated by each territory in line with its characteristics—it was endeavoured to provide an integrated vision of all areas, sectors, aspects etc., which enabled the community reality to be visualised, both in global and sectoral and in general and specific terms. Monographs enabled specific interventions, taking into account the global context, to be placed, or sectoral interventions, taking into account other sectors related therewith, etc., to be performed. They also enabled a dynamic and historical vision which contributed fundamental elements to understand the present and to be able to more adequately plan the near future.

Graph no. 9. Community monograph: organisation criteria

As we stated, a monograph has two facets—the objective and subjective, the quantitative and the qualitative—, since these two facets are integrated and mutually complemented. The descriptions objective and subjective do not relate at all to correct and incorrect and, even less so, to true or untrue. What we call the objective part of the monograph refers to the knowledge provided by the existing studies and documents, while what we term to be subjective relates to the representations—ideas, opinions, assessments, etc.—of the players themselves.
Graph no. 10. Sequence of building a monograph and shared knowledge

1. Performance of the objective/quantitative part of the community monograph (assessing everything that exists and demonstrating possible lackings or gaps which it would be important to address immediately).

2. Performance of the subjective/qualitative part of the process narration (or with other participative research methods), transcription and systematisation of the contents of the colloquiums later enabling their processing and the preparation of the text.

3. Publication, return of findings and socialisation of knowledge.

4. Technical work (TRS) to prepare a community evaluation assumption proposal to be verified and possibly modified with the three protagonists.

5. Preparation of a community programme assumption proposal.


If we only relied on the objective part, we would be excluding the three protagonists from the possibility of participating and contributing. If we only used the subjective contributions, we could be accused of demagogy. The process narration –the colloquiums– contributed an infinite number of elements which were confronted and integrated with the objective data and the most quantitative knowledge, enabling obstacles to be seen, problems and attitudes which, in general, the quantitative data did not disclose. It must be taken into account that the quantitative part has also been performed with participative methods, since the team had the participation of the authorities, the resources and of the citizens themselves to obtain documentation, information, data, studies, etc. Participation is explicitly shown in its qualitative facet. It involves a process and the whole process is participative.
Table no. 4. Participation of local players in the shared knowledge process in the ICI territories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authorities</th>
<th>Municipal council (representing institutions)</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical-professional resources</td>
<td>Municipal council (technicians)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning centres</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health centres</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS entities</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Associations (neighbours’ associations, parent-teacher associations, others)</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associations of immigrants and other ethnic minorities</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual citizens</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political parties, trade unions, etc.</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Assessment of intercultural community intervention. 3rd year

The entire information process has always had to carefully consider the distribution capacity of the team and the process. It is not only a case of publishing things, rather of having an organisation and a method ensuring that anything published effectively reaches its intended audience. In this area, it was important to take into account that the information was transmitted through the relationships, accordingly, each person receiving the information in turn transmitted it to other people. The basis for this was the community file and the information plan.

The return of the findings of the studies, process narrations, etc. was separated into three levels:

a. **Individual**: an example of the product for each person who, in a certain way, participated in the process.

b. **Group**: Group listenings, etc.

c. **Community**: in a community meeting and in other always public areas, as well as other process information and communication means.

The framework for the preparation of the monograph was strictly community-related and participative, although its execution was not free from problems and difficulties. But it did not exclude either the potential contributed to the process, since its status of participative research enables it to continue towards higher levels of participation.

In conclusion, knowledge of the community reality not only constitutes a useful product for the intercultural community process, but also a symbolic element, since this product has been obtained with the contributions of all the local players and not, for example, with a study performed by an entity outside the process itself.
The building of monographs in the territories

The examples of monographs prepared are extremely varied, but all of them have taken into account the methodological guidelines involved in this work. On the one hand, it was endeavoured to grant a global vision of the ICI Project in 17 territories, accordingly, the common parties have preserved the idea of a global project, since all of them contain formal aspects such as the presentation letter, introduction, etc. under the same criteria as the ICI Project. On the other hand, based on a general, common structure, these were constructed taking into account the characteristics of each territory.

Another significant aspect, in the ICI Project scope, is that all groups have shared information on methodologies, documents prepared, etc., which served to avoid certain subsequent errors and use successful strategies which had already been verified in certain territories. Having a general outline of the monograph, together with the variables and content of each section, facilitated the organisation of the information and the obtainment of an end product better adapted to the needs and objectives pursued by a community document.

Most of the works developed the global general assumption of community monograph (75%), thereby assuming the generality of themes and areas affecting community life; the remainder focused on specific areas for various reasons: territorial difficulties, disagreements among some of the parties, etc. These matters are related with childhood, youth, family and health, without neglecting to pay attention to their structural and more general elements.

A large number of the monographs opted to include in their title, together with the formal title Community monograph and the name of the territory, another title which, in a certain way, defines the process or encourages participation therein (75%). The result is the following titles:
Table no. 5. Specific titles of monographs per territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todos hacemos Las Norias</td>
<td>Las Norias, El Ejido. Almería. Andalusia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conocimiento compartido de la realidad del distrito norte de Granada</td>
<td>North District of Granada. Andalusia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una mirada compartida</td>
<td>Southern Jerez. Andalusia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infancia, juventud y familia. Retos de futuro</td>
<td>Batalla, Centre and San Nicasio neighbourhoods. Leganés, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somos barrio</td>
<td>San José y Madre de Dios. Logroño</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadern de la plaça</td>
<td>Salt. Girona, Cataluña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haciendo pueblo</td>
<td>Playa Honda, San Bartolomé. Lanzarote, Canary Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per la millora de la convivència i la cohesió social</td>
<td>Tortosa. Tarragona, Cataluña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La veu del Clot</td>
<td>El Clot, Distrito de Sant Martí. Barcelona, Cataluña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La salud al Raval, una mirada des del proprio barri</td>
<td>El Raval, Ciutat Vella. Barcelona, Cataluña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Coma, un barrio en positivo</td>
<td>La Coma. Paterna, Valencia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the monographs have images. This resource was of great use, enabling the monograph to be contextualised in the territory, spaces to be acknowledged and text descriptions to become more tangible, etc.

The tables containing data and graphs have also been of great use, since the first enable access to quantitative information, assembled furthermore in a single document; the graphs help to visualise the information contained in the text, in order to be able to observe the trends, degrees of representation, etc., without resorting to the text in this regard. All the monographs have included both techniques. It was also worthwhile including an index for tables and graphs.

The integration of the objective and subjective part was highly enriching, complementing, merging and granting meaning to the different information, thereby contextualising the quantitative part and better understanding the speeches in the daily space.

The qualitative part appears in substantially all the sections. It constitutes a test of discursive heterogeneity and of having accessed a significant sample of colloquiums.

References to the participants, collaborators, entities, etc., as well as the acknowledgement of the people who have participated in their preparation lead it to be understood that the monographs are prepared and owned by everyone.
2.3.4.1 Participative and community research. The process narrations

“... Before even reaching one’s mouth, democracy is in one’s ears. True democracy is not a country of speakers, rather a country of listeners. Of course, for someone to listen, there must also be someone to talk: but sometimes one understands even without others speaking and, on the other hand, one feels annoyance towards the talkative and respect for the untalkative. Accordingly, democracy is, in the first place, colloquiums... The reality is that true democracy consists both of the right to talk and the duty to let others talk...” Calogero, G. (1946)5.

A process narration is a social intervention method to modify a situation based on the interested parties’ knowledge of that situation, also relying on their participation in the subsequent actions. It is a method which, more than asking questions, listens to the interested parties, based on the presumption that the opinions and participation of such people are fundamental for any measure involving a change or modification of this situation.

A process narration is no more than an attempt to build different relationships between the community’s protagonists, relationships of trust, which will then have to converge in the participative action. It is therefore, an integral part of the community intervention process and, in turn, a process.

Process narrations, as a participative research method, are based on the “listening” of the three leading figures of the community processes.

Process narrations are performed through open colloquiums in which the person engaged—or the group—is the one which decides the themes he/she/it wishes to contribute to the knowledge of the community reality, without any pressure by the party revitalising it. Colloquiums are prepared for:

a. People with public responsibility or who perform a professional role related with community life: heads of institutions and authorities, political and trade union leaders, and leaders of their associated movements and associations and informal groups of all types, heads of services, NGOs, companies, cooperatives, etc.

b. People who, due to their physical location, social role or the type of function they perform, may have a vision of the community—or of a specific theme— to take into account.

Accordingly, we cannot talk of interviews or of questionnaires. Another characteristic of the process narration is that it is performed by people who live or work in the community, accordingly, these same people will also be part of the process which will follow the process narration.

The process narration technique through colloquiums favoured the obtainment of diverse key elements in the development of the process: it was not only the application of one research technique or another, rather the fact that the use of this technique boosted the community process as a whole. The listening, applied with the process narration in the construction phase of the community monograph also revealed itself to be a more permanent entity and not a mere useful instrument for a specific purpose. It may be affirmed that the listening forms a permanent part of the methodology and that the community process is something which enables everybody to be listened to.

Table no. 6. Community listening through colloquiums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The manner of performing the colloquiums must be consistent with the methodology and aims of the process. Accordingly, the most significant matters to take into account are:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— Have a reference outline for the transcription and use of findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Carefully avoid the colloquium from turning into an interview, with questions and answers. The person (or group) has to freely choose the conversation subjects and what he/she/it considers important to contribute to community knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— The colloquium is the most important relationship moment in the process narration. It involves generating a climate enabling the person to feel confident to freely express him/herself. Here the elements and instruments of the mediation and of the intercultural relationships acquire great significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— No script exists nor is there any form to be filled in. The colloquium may be prepared on various matters or only on one matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— It is necessary to explain the aim of the colloquiums and the next steps to people very well (return of the information, assessment, programme).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— The register of the colloquiums should remain faithful to the content and to the priorities, but it is also important to respect idiomatic forms or specific expressions used by the person to better express his/her thoughts or ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contents of the colloquiums are anonymous.

The publication of the findings includes a list of all the people who have participated.

The colloquiums may be individual or in groups.


Both the authorities, specifically the municipal council, and the technical-professional resources and the citizens participated in the individual or group colloquiums, which enabled stronger relationships, greater diffusion and knowledge of the intercultural community process and new alliances among the protagonists.

Noteworthy is the enormous opportunity afforded by the participation of ethnoculturally different groups to the exercise of citizenship by all the residents in the territories. This contributes significant strength, not existing previously, which undoubtedly represents an element of robustness with a view to the adoption of future commitments. Also, the group colloquiums affect interaction between groups and generate new spaces of co-existence in the territory, where conflict is positively regulated and full emphasis is placed on common building. Many mediation elements were used with skill to attain the objectives established.
Graph no. 11. Community intervention. Construction phase of the shared knowledge process

**Community Reality**

- Protagonists: Authorities, Technical resources, Citizens
- Structural elements: Territory, Population, Demands, Resources

**GENERAL ANALYSIS AND CONTEXTUALISATION**
1. Structural characteristics of the intervention community
2. Sectors into which society is normally organised, including an analysis of existing resources
3. The community from the perspective of the four phases of human life
4. Aspects, themes and demands requiring specific analysis

**Completed Community Monograph**

- 1st Objective - Quantitative Part (organisation of that already existing)
- 2nd Subjective - Qualitative Part (process narration or other participation method – PAR)

**Community Programme**

**Community Evaluation** (same structure as the community monograph)

To the three protagonists

**Community Monograph Return Phase**

Individual and group

2.3.5 Intercultural community programme

A programme is deemed to be the preparation of a proposal –intervention assumption– to improve the existing reality and which, at the same time, includes the complete table of activities, initiatives, programmes, technical and community resources, services etc., developed in the community area. This process does not arise from an external entity, rather it is a product of the intercultural community process itself.

This intervention assumption does not superimpose the existing one, rather based on it, it also considers the need to grant life to something which does not exist and which community knowledge has evidenced: community priorities.

The programme was organised into two leading areas:

— The organisation area, which organises what already exists, now improved thanks to the new cooperative and synergic relationships which have been set up between the technical-professional resources thanks to improved global knowledge of the community reality;

— The development area, which endeavours to organise and promote something which does not exist and which enables those priority themes to be addressed to improve co-existence and social cohesion, which require the integrated contribution of the different public and private authorities, of the series of technical resources and a more direct committed participation of citizens.

Graph no. 12. Deployment of the intercultural community programme
In the territories, based on the monograph and on the pooling of different general themes or themes of community interest to be addressed at medium term, different initiatives were implemented enabling themes or lines of work to be developed through the intercultural community programme in the second phase of the ICI Project.

Table no. 7. Initiatives and themes of the intercultural community programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main themes</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly people</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of specific intercultural groups</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious diversity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With groups of women</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social action</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and tourism</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalidity, accessibility and mental health</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban enhancement, use of spaces, cleaning</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen participation and organisation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, adolescents, young people, sport, free time</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-entrepreneurship</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interculturality, conflicts, mediation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-existence</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intercultural community programme enabled a qualitative leap with the three leading figures acquiring a group work focus, implementing projects and services involving multiple socioculturally different players and groups. The programme took into account the needs of most of the groups, while interculturality and co-existence become part of the local policies and social action of the multiple associations and technical-professional resources.
2.3.6 Intercultural community evaluation

In the first phase, the assessment function was granted all the importance it has and deserves, establishing a monitoring and assessment system. We must distinguish between the ICI Project assessment and the process assessment.

ICI Project assessment –compliance with its objectives, promotion of processes, results and impacts– is performed annually, with an assessment protocol by the Assessment Committee, with the participation of the heads of the "la Caixa" Foundation team, the Scientific Department and its Coordination, Advisory and Training Team (DECAF), the general advisor and the advisors of the specific lines of the ICI Project and the Marco Marchioni Institute.
This heading relates to the community process or assessment. The assessment is an integral part of the community process performed at different moments of the process since, by definition, it does not envisage a final definitive moment, rather evolutionary stages or phases.

The community evaluation is performed with participative methods by the same key players, and envisages the measurement, in quantitative and qualitative terms, of the changes which arose in the community from the initial moment; the role of the protagonists and their involvement, difficulties and obstacles found; the role of the ICI team, and all those elements enabling a balance of the experience with respect to the initial starting point.

We will call this assessment an internal community evaluation, since it is an integral part of the process and is performed with players who have participated therein. This internal assessment has not yet been performed, since the ICI projects have continued their work in a second planned stage, in principle, until 2015.

Another thing is the assessment which may be made by other means, as entities specialised in the area, charged with analysing the experience. In this case, we would talk about an external assessment.

In any case, it is necessary to take into account that no internal or external assessment of a participative process is possible if the work performed has not been documented.
What are the main achievements of the intercultural community intervention methodology?
Both from the general standpoint of social action on a local scale and that referring to projects tied to the migration phenomenon, it is possible to affirm the need to renew the intervention types. The welcoming phase of the immigrant population in Spain required a significant review in the mainly local area enabling positive cultural diversity to be managed, which would contribute to the strengthening and development of the intervention territories. Furthermore, the crisis and the cutbacks had negative effects on the complex social reality of the time, but also they revealed the need to review the functioning and action of technical-professional resources in the territory, the role of the local authorities and the involvement of citizens in the processes of improving their reality and of responses to the social consequences of the crisis. The ICI Project therefore could play a key role in considering the need to work “in another way”, community-related and collaborative, in the territory.

Intercultural community intervention would create the framework to generate processes which will enable equal participation and social development in a highly diversified cultural reality, enabling the exercise of shared responsibilities by all the local players.

The application of this intervention model enabled relationship and communication processes to be generated assessing the great potential and knowledge existing in the community. In some cases, in just three years, it contributed to generate a collective and positive image of the territory.

Three key themes arise as the principle issues related with the effectiveness of the assumption envisaged by the ICI Project. In short, they are:

— A single conceptual and methodological approach, but applied on a creative and flexible basis in an ample diversity of territories, placing the local authorities in a central role, entrusting the management and implementation of the intervention to the third sector.

— A project placed clearly and without confusion in the area of participative democracy as an integration and strengthening element of representative democracy.

— Co-existence and social cohesion as the ultimate goal, interculturality and diversity as catalysing elements and the community process and participation as supporting axes of a new social reality in the local area, in which to act vis-à-vis the changes and challenges of the present and the future.

In this section, we refer to the progress and achievements attained to validate intervention strategies and instruments developed over this initial ICI Project execution stage (September 2010 - August 2013).
3.1 Contributions of the methodology to the intercultural community process

In the first stage of the ICI Project, significant local processes and actions encompassed in a shared intervention model were generated in the 16 intervention territories. The ICI Project’s methodological strategy is the fruit of the integration of two social intervention methodologies and approaches, which complement each other: community intervention and intercultural mediation.

Since 2010, when the ICI Project began, a single social intervention strategy was rigorously and creatively developed, which contributed numerous innovative elements thanks to the synergies established between community intervention and intercultural mediation. Both were applied to form a whole: as an intervention assumption which was scientifically validated in practice. This assumption enabled principles, methods, techniques and tools to be applied which have enriched, affected and innovated the social intervention approaches aimed at improving coexistence and social cohesion.

The validation of the assumption envisaged by intercultural community intervention enabled the attainment of one of the general objectives of the ICI Project: transferring the knowledge and learning extracted, following its scientific validation, in order to apply the intervention model proposed to new territories and social contexts. Below some of its principal contributions and achievements are highlighted.

3.1.1 Community intervention and mediation from an intercultural standpoint

Within this work framework, in the first stage of the ICI Project, it was possible to validate the main strategies and instruments to grant a response to the challenges related with social cohesion and the promotion of living together and intercultural citizenship in each territory. These are:

— The creation and/or strengthening of relationship programmes of the technical resources of citizens and of the authorities.
— Participative research and community knowledge.
— Information sheets and other constant information and community communication instruments.
— Community meetings among all the players.
— Intercultural community programme: organisation and development areas.
— Intercultural mediation for the prevention, management of the conflict and adaptation to the demands of the territory’s ethnocultural diversity.
— Revitalisation of participation.
— Sociocultural activity.
— Strengthening of the associative fabric.
— Implementation of shared initiatives.

Three matters were revealed to be strategic in order that the intervention assumption may be adequately applied in each territory:

— The availability of the "la Caixa" Foundation to promote and finance a medium-to-long-term project to: a) assume general goals of public, not individual and private, interest; b) substitute the terms user, recipient or beneficiary with those of citizenship and participants, and c) provide the territories with ICI teams, whose work consists mainly of generating relationships leading to cooperation in the responses to social demands detected and prioritised among authorities, technical resources and citizens.

This is a completely innovative non-specific process vis-à-vis a panorama dominated by specific projects, increasingly sectoral and related with the number of features and users.

— The assumption as a reference and leading player of the ICI Project by the municipal council, that is, the representation of the State in the intervention territory, despite the political and social differences involved, especially in the crisis and with the cutback policies. A road leading in the opposite direction at the current time.

Although based on conceptual and methodological evidence, this reference represented a political choice of the "la Caixa" Foundation which today ensures progress from the standpoint of sustainability in the intercultural community process, also counting on other public and private contributions.

— The possibility of having scientific and technical management, advisory services and monitoring, which enabled intensive and exhaustive relationship, training and assessment moments, etc., of all those people related with the ICI Project.

The drive and availability of the third-sector entities to assume the ICI Project’s methodological approaches, to encompass them within with their enormous heritage and knowledge of the local reality and to apply them creatively.
All of this represented an indispensable guarantee to ensure that the ICI experience has diffusion and extension possibilities and may be convened as a national and international reference.

3.1.1.1 The contributions of community intervention

Community intervention, which the ICI Project has assumed as a method and strategy, was developed positively from different areas, contributing to generate participation and encounter processes and a new manner of relating with and between all the protagonists, and dividing and assessing everything that existed and generating common initiatives.

In summary, the following are elements of progress in the territories:

— The start-up of a global participative process enabled the assessment of many of the contributions which already existed in the community which, however, had been fragmented, without a relationship and without the possibility of integration.

— The building of relationships with and between local players which were evidenced and made public, especially in the community meetings, as relationship and egalitarian participation spaces.

— The consolidation of stable spaces for collaborative relationships acknowledged by the protagonists that contributed to generate a culture and a practice of collaborative work, fundamental to sustain the process.

— The participative building of the knowledge of the community reality, the assessment and everything which has favoured the global understanding and the agreed-upon identification of shared priorities, that is, the community programme.

— Community information and the socialisation of knowledge—something more than informing upon what is done—based on the concept of intervention with “public” and general ends. All of this, as a result of the documentation and systematisation of everything performed and its ongoing assessment.

— The possibility of participating and, therefore, of contributing in equal conditions as citizens of all people residing in the territory. Beyond their place of origin, all residents have highlighted their interest in contributing to the strengthening and development of the territory.

In the intervention performed in the territory, the “symbolic” elements of the methodology were of great significance to make the manner of doing things visible and understandable to everybody, closely related with the purposes and values wishing to be extended. All of this is of high self-educational value since it is capable of affecting attitudes and behaviour without the need for teachers. In this regard, we can state that generally the initiatives, the measures and the community meetings and spaces for collaborative relationships generated by the ICI Pro-
ject were characterised for being democratic, egalitarian and intercultural. That is, community meetings and spaces of intercultural co-existence, participative democracy and social cohesion.

3.1.1.2 The contributions of interculturality and mediation

Significant contributions were made from an intercultural and mediation standpoint, highlighting the following:

— The application of the intercultural perspective to the entire community process, penetrating all the strategic, methodological and operating elements with their approaches and principles: 1) equal treatment, opportunities and interlocution; 2) respect and positive assessment of diversity, and 3) emphasis on common points and on positive interaction, facilitating the deployment of all potential inherent in community intervention to improve co-existence and social cohesion in the territories.

— The significance of intercultural mediation, which has made it possible at community level to apply the theoretical-practical approaches developed by it over the years in various areas related with:
  — Access of the foreign population or of ethnic minorities to public services–health, education, employment, social services– and the adaptation thereof to social and cultural diversity.
  — Interpersonal and group conflicts whose significant factors are the cultural differences and the different manners of interpreting social relationships and co-existence.
  — The use of public spaces by different groups and the tensions and conflicts associated with these uses.
  — Promotion and social participation of the foreign population and ethnic minorities.
  — Fostering of the mediation function of the ICI teams, providing them with a useful theoretical and practical body to mediate in the transformation of relationships and affront situations of hostility and conflict.

— Change in perception in relation with the migratory trend and the addressing of public policies: immigration has ceased to be considered as a specific sectoral event –exclusive-ly addressed with specific resources– to evidence the need to make co-existence and social cohesion a fundamental objective of public policies and an explicit priority of local reality. The public signing of the Declaration of intercultural co-existence and social cohesion signed in Madrid in November 2013, by the municipal councils participating in the ICI Project to conclude the first stage of the ICI Project led to the public recognition of this need.
3.1.2 Intercultural community intervention as a widespread assumption

The assumption of intercultural community intervention must be assumable and viable in any reality and must break the “prejudice” of being exclusively associated with marginal realities or characterised by grave social needs.

The ICI Project has broken away from a traditional element: “Everything defined as community has always been related with marginalisation, poverty and exclusion.” The ICI Project affirms and demonstrates in its approach and praxis, respectively, that community is related to normality and to any reality, since any reality is improvable. Accordingly, the community processes are non-specific, since specific will be characteristic and different from each reality.

The ICI Project states and acknowledges that the fundamental thing is the process and that if exclusion, poverty and marginalisation exist in a community, it will be a matter/problem which must be addressed by this community, from a global and supportive vision, as a matter/problem affecting the whole and not only “the marginalised, the poor and the excluded”. This is a Copernican turn with respect to that which we have defined as a community tradition.
Sociologically, cultural diversity is not distributed uniformly within a given territory and tends generally, for evident reasons, to be concentrated in only certain parts of such territory. This phenomenon is common or similar in all countries receiving migrants, and this fact generalises the experience of the ICI Project.

The ICI Project has a lot to do with all this, affronting the theme of the structural and permanent change contributed by multiculturality and the various sociocultural diversification processes to our local communities and to society in general. The ICI Project has faced this challenge through global and non-specific processes, which engaged all the protagonists, without isolating “diversity” in separate areas or ghettos.

Moreover, the diversity of the territories in the first stage of the ICI Project enables this assumption to be validated, since 47% of the autonomous communities have been represented in this ICI stage, and approximately 80% of the territories, although urban, respond to the type of different local contexts initially established: outlying districts and historical centre (29% each one), urban neighbourhood (24%). Within the rural category (18%), territories related with agroindustry, the holiday coast or inland areas have been represented.

Graph no. 13. Type of territories. Intercultural Community Intervention Project (2010-2013)
3.1.3 The Intercultural Community Intervention Project is not just another project

The ICI Project should not intervene as another project which will complicate the already existing involvement and “should not be just another project” in the already fragmented community panorama. It should be a community resource, that is, a resource for all that which already existed and for the series of players which were already intervening in the territory.

The ICI Project had to “land” in the territory as something different and necessary, since it was not just another project. The ICI team needed to know how to explain this difference from the outset: a project which wished to contribute to assessing and boosting the existing situation, promoting the participation and mutual acknowledgement of all the protagonists, in a shared process to improve the population’s living standards, co-existence and respect for all diversities existing in the new multicultural reality. All in the context of highly complex social conditions, not only due to the economic crisis.

From an institutional and social standpoint, the ICI Project began to be implemented in the territories with clearly defined general objectives, but without specific pre-determined objectives, defining itself as a resource to promote and improve the existing situation. The ICI Project focused on what already existed, connecting with the existing initiatives and promoting the practically non-existent community work, except in certain experiences with community focus.

This methodological principle was applied appropriately and differently to each of the prominent figures.

Citizens:
— Reinforcing the existing formal and informal associative fabric. For example: parent-teacher associations, health commissions, education committees, citizen initiatives or platforms, associations, etc.
— Working to ensure that participative moments generate self-regulation and autonomous organisation.
— Connecting the different associative realities, formal, informal, groups of equals, immigrant associations, etc.– in common initiatives and themes.
— Also involving citizens on an individual level in the initiatives and moments of the process, ensuring that foreign people or new residents also join the programmes.

Certain examples of how this task was performed are as follows:
— Community talks or the Commerce + Culture initiative (Logroño).
— The Neighbourhood Committee or Associative Strengthening and Social Organisation (Getafe).
— The Common Education Centre Project implemented by the Local Education Committee or the School of Associations Workshop (Ejido).
— The Entities Exhibition or the Time Bank (Salt).
— The Social Circus or base work to promote the participation of children (Zaragoza).

Technical-professional resources:
— Mixing with all the existing municipal and non-municipal public and private resources; presenting the ICI Project in a non-invasive manner, underlining its desire for cooperation.
— Favouring community meetings, relationships and exchanges among all the resources, boosting and assessing, when appropriate, the presence –albeit highly minority– of professionals or technicians of different origins and nationalities.
— Contributing to the building of a permanent meeting place, fundamental to carry out initiatives, activities and common products.

Certain examples of how this task was performed are as follows:
— CCPro Technical Network (Leganés, Madrid)
— Community Summer School (Jerez)
— In summer, travel around el Clot (El Clot)
— Pharmacies promoting health or Health School (el Carrús, Elche)
— Meeting of professionals (Nou Barris, Barcelona)

Local authorities:
— Involving the Municipal Council from the beginning, both at an institutional and a technical level, in assuming joint responsibility for the ICI Project, with the strategies and initiatives implemented, although sometimes with difficulties and misunderstandings.
— Including in the technical spaces the professionals or one or more general and specific councils or municipal departments of the social area, directly related with integration, citizen, interculturality and co-existence programmes, etc.
— Relying specifically on the contributions and participation of the local authorities in all the strategic and symbolic phases and moments of the community process –monograph, diag-
nosis, programme, community meetings.

— Promoting the leadership of the local authorities in involving other public authorities and also private entities in the process.
— Initiating, although not in all the territories, the process of the institutional inclusion of representatives of other authorities in a relationship programme.

Certain results which could be indicated as examples are as follows:
— Influence of the ICI Project on the contents and methodology of certain institutional plans, such as the Comprehensive Historical Centre Plan or the Zaragoza Social Services Plan.
— Progress of integrating and collaborative objectives with certain public institutions and their own plans and programmes such as the Socially Responsible Territory in Zaragoza or in el Raval.
— Cooperation request to contribute ICI methodology to different public programmes and services in practically all the territories.
— Technical cooperation and institutional agreement in the preparation of the monographs and their subsequent diffusion and socialisation in all territories.
— Inter-institutional meetings for inter-sectoral cooperation in different initiatives promoted by the ICI Project in all the territories, especially with the educational or health authorities.
— Preliminary inter-institutional meetings for the creation of institutional relationship programmes for the sustainability of the intercultural community process in the territory. For example: Granada, Jerez, Elche, Pueblo Nuevo, San Bartolomé de Lanzarote, Paterna and Tortosa.

3.1.4 The intercultural community intervention team as a facilitator of the intercultural community process

The ICI Project would contribute the ICI team, whose function does not consist in making specific provisions, rather in contributing methodology and capacity to build assertive cooperative relationships with and among protagonists in the community, in the interests of co-existence and social cohesion.

The team “landed” in the community as a non-specific mediation resource, to support and strengthen everything that already existed, and it worked not only with the technical resources but also with the social organisations.
As a result of this approach, the team was able to exercise a key role in the relationship and cooperation between fragmented initiatives, among organisations and resources which, generally or frequently each acted for their own account. The fact of having been able to “waste time” connecting what existed in the territory enabled the team to be accepted as a community resource.

Before executing the ICI Project, during the proposal selection phase (second quarter of 2010), it was ensured and highly valued not only that the entity had a long history in the area, but also that it formed a multidisciplinary and multicultural team.

It could be said that the team had developed “maieutic” functions, in the sense that it contributed methodological elements which have enabled the protagonists to mix more adequately and better develop their own role in the framework of the intercultural community process.

In these three years, the team has obtained the acknowledgement and recognition of all the protagonists. As a result of the initiatives and proposals involved, it has also managed to transfer the ICI methodology to the technical and citizen areas. The relationships built by the team in these three years and the self-education process involved in the development of the process of these characteristics grants it—and it has been hereby stated—in-depth knowledge of the local reality.

The role of the team has been modified based of the progress of the community process and on the progressive increasing involvement of the players therein. The team has gradually ceded its decision-making role, increasingly assuming that of co-operation, co-promotion, support, integration, etc., to the group of players. The team has engaged and related numerous resources, services and citizens—in groups, in spaces for collaborative relationships, in commissions and committees, on an individual basis etc.—, not only to boost participation in different initiatives but also to ensure that the players engaged in the process form part of the organisation and management thereof.

The experience of the ICI Project clearly shows that without the existence of the ICI team it would have not been possible to promote—in so many and different territories—intercultural community processes which have helped to determine a new more organised situation to meet the challenges of co-existence and social cohesion, in an extremely complex socioeconomic context.

Progress and enhanced organisation and, above all, greater and improved integration in the process of numerous public and private resources enable a future to be discerned in which the ICI team may add other contributions. In this case, ICI teams could be mentioned. The integration
of other resources in the ICI team guarantees sustainability vis-à-vis the future. This matter will have to be formally ensured via agreements or protocols on the part of the institutions engaged.

The elements previously demonstrated explain and summarise at the same time the necessary evolution of the role of the teams to ensure the existence of the intercultural community process. Without this evolution, it would be impossible to talk of continuity and even less so of sustaining the process. If the teams had not worked to make participation a central element of their work, this possibility would not exist today.

3.1.5 Relationship among all players in the territory

It would be necessary to develop an intervention strategy which would enable participation and relationships with and between all players in the territory.

The economic crisis or recent years contributed to accentuate fragmented practices to meet social demands, but at the same time it evidenced the need to join forces. It was necessary to rethink intervention strategies in order to make better use of existing resources. This critical look had a direct effect on the type of approach adopted, closely linked to interculturalism, understood to be a sociopolitical and ethical project (see volume 1 of the collection), combining local and global and other matters addressed to date on a temporary or contingent basis. The situation evidenced the need to finally consider these matters in a structural permanent manner, which required changes in depth and not only the deployment of specific measures and responses.

The process implemented in the first stage enabled a new social reality to be built on a participative basis, with the support of the three protagonists, in which elements of general interest and the need to overcome sectoralisms prevailed.

Another element underlies the whole methodological process: a single initiative, action or programme, etc. in real life constitutes a very significant result and landmark, since it means surpassing a reality supposed or believed to be unmodifiable. The same initiative in another community does not have the same effect since it does not represent any change with respect to the existing one. This and other similar methodological approaches reveal the significant importance of the qualitative assessment, since each community is a reality different to any other and since the ICI assumption is applicable to any reality.
The methodological assessment of the ICI Project has worked from the scope of the social relationships producing meeting places and the participation of citizens in the decisions affecting its reality, favouring joint responses of the three prominent figures governing, working or living in the territory. This has therefore prevented an increase in discriminatory attitudes, establishing positive conflict resolution mechanisms and favouring co-existence.

The methodological instruments employed –community monographs, colloquiums, information sheets, community meetings, intercultural community programmes, mediation, revitalisation, sociocultural activities, etc.– reveal their use to effectively respond to the enormous challenges of the work due to the social cohesion and the promotion of interculturality in the context described.

Work with the intercultural community programme demonstrates how collaboration –based on a vision built jointly with the participation of the players– generates more effective and efficient mechanisms in a time in which social demands are increasing, problems are becoming more complex and budgets are being reduced.

The development of mediation, ethnic monitoring and a diversity map, etc., on a parallel and integrated basis with the essential elements of the community methodology, have enabled a social intervention which succeeded in generating new and positive processes of relationship and communication, evidencing the great potential and knowledge existing in the community, in many cases generating a collective positive image of the territory.

The first phase of the ICI Project implemented a series of procedures encompassed in the Specific Action Lines in relation to health and education. These areas implemented activities which effectively responded to problems detected in the territories and which have demonstrated their use in accelerating the community process and strengthening the relationships between the protagonists, not only from a technical standpoint (see volumes 3 and 4 of the collection).

The contribution of these action lines was crucial and strategic since they were not contributed as a sectoral work, separated and isolated from the Global Action Line rather, since from the beginning, they were conceived as action lines tied to general lines. The Specific Action Lines have endeavoured to contribute to the global community process. Noteworthy is the work performed in many territories by the Community Summer School –an educational leisure and free-time proposal for the summer holidays–, envisaged in an open, mainstream, participative manner with an intercultural approach. The activity was repeated in various territories and over
various years and was consolidated as a revitalisation, participation and cooperation strategy among the different social resources and organisation, breaking with the existing situation in the territory prior to the ICI Project.

The analysis of the participation data over the first three years also emphasises the positive tendency to favour mainstreaming among these two specific lines.

In short, the contribution of the Specific Action Lines has been of great value during the first stage. a) since it enabled support to be identified and generated among the three leading figures, to provide a specific response to particular problems in these areas, and b) since it enabled specific operating elements to be contributed, from health to education, to the work performed in the Global Action Line –community meetings, intercultural community programme, community monographs, etc.

The methodology developed now enables the new stage to be affronted in better conditions to generate a series of strategic alliances which enable, in a sustainable manner over time, the development of a social intervention model which favours and strengthens social cohesion and intercultural co-existence.

3.1.6 Essential community organisation for co-existence and social development

The organisation and participation of all the players in a specific territory was required to find endogenous responses to living together and intercultural citizenship and the prospect of equal social development.

The participation of the three protagonists became a fundamental symbolic element of the community process, to affront the intercultural issue and the new community reality and to contribute and keep alive –despite the dichotomistic tendencies accentuated by the crisis– the principle of equality for all.

The ICI Project, in its different territorial variables, demonstrated that the definition of community, the institutional centrality of the municipal council and the reinforcement of the role of all the local players proved essential to contribute specifically to improving the existing situation, having the support of the three protagonists in their different roles at all times.
All this, without triumphalism, since the path has been full of obstacles, restrictions, errors and failures which have been carefully assessed so that they can be taken into account in the work to be performed from now onwards, with a view to extending the ICI Project to other territories.

Increasing and improving not only participation but also the organisation of the players was one of the ICI Project’s methodological objectives. If participation does not lead to new organisations and new relationships, in the end, it is reduced or stagnates. Accordingly, it was essential to promote places and dates for community meetings, exchanges and cooperation:

a. On the part of each of the protagonists: the institutional relationship programme, the technical relationship programme, the relationship programme and the participation of citizens.

b. And among them: community meetings.

**Institutional relationship programme**

As a result of the explicit, formal and full involvement of the municipal council in the process, it was possible to involve other public authorities and private entities. At the end of the first phase, the appropriate conditions arose to progress more decisively towards the building of an institutional relationship programme (IRS) enabling efforts and resources to be contributed to the intercultural community processes implemented. The different local contexts did not enable a single precision to assess these conditions and progress, but it may be stated that in 88% of the territories, a potential IRS exists or the conditions exist to build such space.

In conclusion, public authorities and private entities are now a part of the intercultural community process in all the territories, with different levels of involvement, despite the difficult times in which we live. In particular, with respect to the municipal councils, the relationship was reinforced –both from an institutional and a technical standpoint– and nowadays the municipal government better understands and assumes the intercultural community intervention challenge and the need to share it with other authorities on a more devoted and public basis.

**Technical relationship programme**

The general assumption of the ICI Project in this area is that organised relationships arose among the resources, although on a flexible basis and adapted to each reality. After these three years, 75% of the territories have organised and operated this space in line with the methodology envisaged. The remaining territories have not yet obtained a new organisation or operating system as such, but they have worked through common spaces for collaborative relationships which have enabled the performance of monographs, assessments, programmes or other shared initiatives.
All the existing resources saw the need to overcome barriers, obstacles and sectoral situations, attaining a system of organisation or producing initiatives and mainstream and inter-sectoral procedures, essential to provide themselves with a process and a community programme.

The challenge is to progress towards a more permanent organisation of resources, which may be acknowledged by the different authorities and which has its axis in the development of the community programme.

**Relationship programme and participation of citizens**

The complexity of the context and the same theme of citizen participation at this time means that it is not possible to talk exactly about a permanent organised space for this prominent figure. However, it may be verified that assertive positive relationships have been established with citizens, either with the existing formal organisations or informal groups, or with many citizens who have participated individually through work in the areas of health and education, the preparation of monographs, assessments and programmes, community initiatives, etc.

**Community meetings** are symbolic, important and significant moments, both with respect to the relationship and participation of all the protagonists and the integration of the different lines, initiatives, products and results of the intercultural community work. Community meetings were envisaged as a scenario from which to make visible three aspects of special significance: a) how the protagonists organise themselves and mix, b) the strategic lines of shared progress and c) the products built through the participation and cooperation of the players.

We may note that the community meetings were crucial at certain moments of the process to present the monograph/assessment, establish the programme priorities, inform on and socialise common products or initiatives, etc. As a positive indicator, it should be highlighted that in the third year alone, 29 community meetings took place with a high level of participation.

Numerous diverse community meetings were also registered during the first phase of the process. A sign of vitality and of the richness of the process and, at the same time, of community participation characterised by interculturality, diversity of participants –young people, adults, the elderly, families, technical resources, political heads, institutional representatives, etc.– and the ample diversity of themes, etc.– and the extensive diversity of themes, motives, areas, activity, premises and spaces for collaborative relationships, etc.
3.1.7 The sustainability of the process

The ICI Project would have to help to guarantee the sustainability of the process implemented. Sustainability would not be possible without a strategy and work shared among all the players assumed by the community as a whole.

The work performed consolidates local collaborative and cooperative work dynamics in all territories, which significantly modifies and improves that which existed on commencement of the intervention in 2010. The development of a participative, innovative and collective social practice with a solid base is favouring the sustainability of all the work performed in favour of a positive, effective and efficient management of cultural diversity for co-existence and social cohesion. The development of the ICI Project enabled the assessment of the methodology applied as a contribution to the integrated management of social policies.

In the first three years, new conditions and situations were generated which shaped a new scenario. Although it may be partly premature, certain signs may be identified which, at long term, may ensure the sustainability of the intercultural community process.

An element of special interest is the important work performed with and by the three protagonists in the framework of the programme. This collective effort was made in all the territories and was specified in agreed-upon documents of a strategic nature which will constitute the road map for the future.

Progress is also being made thanks to the involvement of the three protagonists, and the tendency of the teams to develop their work and their role more on a cooperative rather than a promotional front, both in the Global Action Line and the Specific Action Lines.

Lastly, the consolidation of the stable acknowledged organised spaces for collaborative relationships of the three protagonists contributed to generate a culture and a more cooperative practice favouring sustainability. Currently, these relationship programmes operate in a different but active manner in all the territories and have a notable effect on the coordination and generation of synergies.

Examples of the progress or consolidation of these spaces for collaborative relationships, specifically, the technical and institutional spaces, are news with respect to these landmarks at the end of the first stage in Logroño.
After the summer, community activity commenced for the technicians of San José and Madre de Dios. A total of 14 technicians attended the facilities of the La Rioja Association for Intellectually Disabled Persons (ARPS) on 18 September 2013 to hold the X Plenary Meeting of the TRS in the San José and Madre de Dios neighbourhoods in Logroño. The succulent breakfast offered by the hosts guaranteed a warm welcome, required to commence the work after the summer shutdown, generating one of the most participative areas ever in the two years of functioning of this technical space. The meeting was organised by the TRS nucleus, which met last week, and which is assuming increasing prominence. After summarising the achievements obtained and recalling the challenges under way, the meeting centred on the reactivation of the work of the five committees charged with developing the intercultural community programme and with anticipating certain novelties for this second phase. One of the main results was the approval of a contents draft for a technical seminar which will take place at the beginning of November and the work strategy which will be developed by these committees in relation with the authorities related with the community programme and the progress thereof.

First Inter-Institutional meeting at San José and Madre de Dios. On 28 November 2013, the Logroño municipal council held the first meeting at which certain public heads engaged, in one way or another, in the intercultural community intervention process in the San José and Madre de Dios neighbourhoods, shared a preliminary vision on the role of the ICI Project, as a preliminary step towards the constitution of an institutional relationship programme.

The councillor and municipal technicians engaged in the ICI Project attended the meeting on the part of the Logroño municipal council. The chairman of the La Rioja Acoge (La Rioja Shelter) and the coordinator of the ICI Project attended the meeting. Lastly, the La Rioja Government was represented via the general deputy head of Social Action, the general head of Welfare, Benefits and Pharmacy and the general head of Town Planning and Housing. It reinforced its attendance with the presence of the deputy head of the Social Integration Area of the “la Caixa” Foundation.

The meeting served to re-assess the work of the ICI Project’s first phase and to open a panorama of the possibilities of joint action offered by the community programme. All of this set the base required for subsequent meetings, enabling a channelling of the contribution of the different authorities and the gestation of an institutional structure providing support and sustainability to the process under way.

Two elements clearly emerge on concluding the first phase:
— The ICI Project represents innovation and a future pledge, within a framework of local and
global complexity, in order to grant a response to the demand for co-existence and social cohesion in developed societies. The three years’ work of the ICI Project show that on a local scale it is necessary to promote intercultural community processes—evidently aware that it cannot be the only intervention level to solve these problems.

— In most territories in which the ICI Project intervened, the intercultural community process already represents an essential reference for all the protagonists. That performed in the last three years marks a turning point in community reality. Many things have changed, some on an evident basis, which have generally been understood by most people who have been players in the process: citizens, social leaders, administrators of public affairs of different party options, and technicians and professionals from the social area.

Too many independent variables over which the ICI Project has no influence and which therefore cannot be controlled, weigh over the element of sustainability—which is the fundamental objective of the second phase of the ICI Project. However, what has been done and the manner in which it has been done already constitute future references. Especially with a view to the actual danger of marginalisation and the exclusion and deepening of the social dichotomy.

The documentation which summarises the experiences in the southern area of Jerez and the northern district of Granada in the period 2010-2013 may be of great interest to understand the results and the community process performed in these territories.

**Southern Jerez.** The video *Southern area, a community process under way* explains the process followed in these last three years involving authorities, technical-professional resources and citizens in the performance of shared initiatives, a participative assessment of the area through process narrations and a community programme to be jointly developed.

Link: https://picasaweb.google.com/106336548145792391291/ProyectoICIJerezZonaSur?authkey=DwgiQ1fqXyw#5979852151119371250

**Northern district – Granada.** Document summarising the community process in the northern district of Granada: *On the Intercultural Community Intervention Project*. This Project provides a synthesis of the procedures implemented and the relationship programme built in the period 2010-2013: technical relationship programme and technical community meetings, shared knowledge, contributions of the entities at mainstream meetings, work group entities for shared knowledge, information sheet summaries; etc.

Link: http://www.fundaciongranadaeduca.org/incorporacion-al-proyecto-ici-granada
What methodological recommendations may be made to boost intercultural community intervention?
The first stage of the ICI Project –assessed year by year over three years– on the one hand, contributes a series of teachings of great political interest –this term always being applied to the framework of interventions and social policies– and, on the other hand, a series of empirical and operative elements which may be useful and opportune for all those with the possibility of intervening in the territories with mediation community projects, and of addressing the work with a socioculturally diversified population.

Beforehand, it endeavours to indicate that in the application and development of the methodological elements there has been—and we consider that this will always be the case,— not only difficulties, but also errors and, sometimes, a slow or bureaucratic management thereof, which has been able not only to delay but also to hinder the progress of community processes. Accordingly, the informative task of the teams at significant moments had failings and, sometimes, one had the impression that the teams themselves undervalued the importance of this element; or the unnecessary agility in managing institutional relationships with public authorities or private entities, always complex, and which required a careful and constant mediation which, due to the ICI Project’s size—in terms of dimension and nature—was not always possible.

Accordingly, the ICI Project enjoyed the expert advice and monitoring of the work in the territories, as well as significant assessment work, year after year, and then at the end of the first phase. Aside from the attainment of the ICI Project’s objectives, results and impacts, this work analysed the determining aspects of the intercultural community process, which are as follows:

— The intercultural community process: from the starting point until a new community reality.
— Relationships with and between the three protagonists.
— The ICI team.
— The methodology around which the intercultural community process is organised.
— The relationship of the Global Line with the Specific Lines.
— Accompaniment, monitoring and training.
— Community meetings and spaces for collaborative relationships.

This same assessment work enables us to centre today on the most clearly defined elements of general interest.

From the “political” dimension, we can highlight and emphasise the following elements:

— Despite the economic crisis and the cutback policies, numerous qualified technical-professional resources still exist in the territory which, as is known, does not depend on a single administrative source, rather on a group of public authorities—mainly the municipal
council and the autonomous authorities— and also private entities, mainly non-governmental organisations, which intervene thanks to public grants. This data is fundamental for different reasons:

— The territory already has professional resources which, generally, have attempted to do things in another way and have found obstacles and resistance which, in the long-term, was demotivating and generated a certain ebb towards more internal, welfare-related and bureaucratic work. But these resources are still available for more community-related work when conditions exist which so permit it. This must be an element to take into account. In the case of community intervention, we would talk about all the existing resources; in the case of sectoral or specific intervention, the matter would be limited to those resources related to a certain extent with the sector or theme.

— Building assertive and non-invasive relationships with these resources without initially requesting anything in return constitutes an element of respect for the work performed and which is being performed, avoiding the risk of presenting "your intervention project" as the only important one and thereby colliding not only with the professionals, but also with the authority or entity to which one is accountable.

— With any intervention project, in this reality, it is important to be aware that if it does not relate correctly with what is already in the territory, it runs the risk of increasing the already dominant fragmentation, which represents an obstacle and barrier to any innovative attempt.

— The matter of the participation of citizens represents an element of significant political relevance in community intervention which must be treated with prudence and with great methodological attention to avoid making a mistake, increasing potential or latent conflicts or creating problems with the different authorities.

In this connection, it seems fundamental:
— To make contact and establish a relationship with that already existing—formal or informal— with regard to the participation of the citizens in the related territory—including the "invisibilised groups"—, presenting the ICI Project, its goals, etc. clearly.

— If formal participation spaces, areas or bodies exist—although we later discover that they do not work or are scantly representative— it is necessary to count on them and that they be the ones, in the event of problems and conflicts, which reject, if any, the relationship; that they do not feel excluded by those intervening or that they can never say that they have been excluded. When we say formal we basically refer to: a) institutional space and bodies—district councils, participation regulations on citizen boards, etc.—, and b) bodies formed and integrated by citizen associations and groups—sometimes confronted against insti-
tutional bodies—such as citizen committee platforms, coordinators, etc., which, in general, are the fruit of participation processes prior to the intervention, which were unlikely to be general and which, when they have not worked, usually leave a trail of controversy, personal or political enemies—even competitiveness for municipal grants and clients—which it is advisable to avoid, although it is wise to be as familiar as possible with them.

— The community dimension of social intervention cannot be related with specific projects, since community matters require methodologically developed work and free time to devote it to building and maintaining relationships with all the territory’s players. Specific intervention cannot deal with all of this. Accordingly, we state that **without an ICI team, there is no process**. The ICI Project contributes an experience and a fundamental and decisive theoretical-practical conceptual reflection of the ICI team, clarifying, we think on a definitive basis, that the intercultural community process requires methodologically defined and operatively organised work devoted, on a non-specific basis, to the process itself. Having “loaded” this non-specific work onto specific interventions—sectoral projects or predefined programmes, etc.—meant that many of these interventions have, on the one hand, failed in their attempt to promote the participation of citizens and, on the other, have raised expectations which could then not be met.

— We have been able to verify and confirm the need to acknowledge and recognise the centrality of a municipal institution with respect to social policies and interventions, regardless of the party which is in government. To ignore the local government and work for participation with citizens reinforces the de-recognition of the most important State cell in the territory and a fundamental dimension for the participation of citizens in public life. A correct and respectful relationship with local government—not clientelist or dependent—constitutes a fundamental premise to promote participative processes in the territory. Experience tells us that it is necessary to extend this correct relationship not only with the party which has the majority and which governs, but also with the group of political forces present in the municipal council—the plenary meeting—and also with the political forces present in the municipality, even if they are not represented at the plenary meeting. The relationship with the whole political world represents an element of continuity of the intervention, contributing to positively overcoming, for example, the changes generated by elections.

From the **operating and methodological dimension**, experience suggests basically taking into account the following elements, which we present in synthesis:
— The need to have a defined methodological assumption with its necessary adaptability and flexibility, since each reality is different from each other.

— The importance of real territorial knowledge and of “everything” which is in the territory.

— Whatever the territory chosen, it will always form part of a municipality and this municipality will always have a municipal government.

— The need to establish a defined starting point for intervention since, otherwise, it would be impossible to assess the work performed and measure possible results and impacts.

— Any intervention –global or sectoral– requires information, and any information requires documentation. And documentation requires someone to document –in a scientific and objective manner– everything that is done. All social intervention, even that promoted by private entities has, however, a “public” nature. In a double sense: public because it is performed in the “daylight” and is open to everybody, and public because whoever promotes it makes it public, that is, it informs upon everything related to it.

— When we invite people to participate, we have to be aware that this information includes being taken into account in everything referring to the motive of the participation. Participating is not attending, consuming or enjoying an activity or an initiative, rather being present and engaged, that is, being taken into account when deciding the activity itself, etc. Naturally, this cannot be the starting point, but it has to be the arrival point. And this requires the work to produce autonomous self-organisation capacity and not to permanently depend upon the intervention promoters.

— Any intervention –although no-one requests or asks for it– must be assessed, at different moments or phases and at the end. It would be advisable for there to be two types of evaluation: an external assessment performed by a qualified person who has not participated in the intervention; and another, internal, performed with all those people, groups, entities, authorities etc., which were engaged in the intervention at any time.

— Attention must be drawn to the possible communicative difficulties which may exist in seeking strategies to overcome the idiomatic or interpretation barriers. The different cultural visions of reality of each of the players should be taken into account, to make a translation and mediation effort favouring the establishment of collaboration ties and the promotion of common matters, avoiding going into detail in divergent situations and promoting the importance of centring the work on everything that can be done together. The eminently mediating methodology will be useful for preventing and resolving the conflicts arising from communication and regulating them within the community process.

— Work should be performed to ensure that all the social and cultural groups are integrated into the different relationship programmes –technical, citizen, institutional, etc.– created in the intercultural community process, and participate actively in the community meetings.
and in the different activities promoted. Work will also be performed to ensure that the different groups are re-assessed within the different relationship programmes, especially the most disadvantaged, and acquire prominence through the generation of the adequate conditions—removing possible information, psychological, socioeconomic, legal and culture barriers, balancing the asymmetry of technical resources between groups and associations, etc.

Based on experience, in general terms, the following recommendations may be of use:

— If we consider that comparing one territory to another is not of scientific interest—since each territory prepares its own itinerary—it is clear that knowing/detecting the starting point is a fundamental element to subsequently assess and measure changes, progress, setbacks, results, products, etc., of each reality. What may be highly significant in a certain territory, may not be so in another, and vice versa.

— The breakdown of the ICI team—gender, multiculturality, and the choice of its members—profile and past experience—were also an element of great importance, together with the ability to work in a team, with a clear definition of roles and functions.

— The establishment and maintenance of assertive relationships and mediation capacity, taking into account the existing context, with and between players in the territory—beyond the initial moment of the work—also demonstrated over the three years not only its technical validity but also its permanent need.

— Sometimes contradictory elements appear between the necessary planning of phases or moments of the intercultural community process and local “rhythms”. Without forcing these rhythms, sometimes it is effective and adequate to introduce “special” initiatives enabling it to be proven that this contradiction may be overcome and that the local rhythm may be modified without problems.
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Links of interest (Intercultural Community Intervention Projects 2010-2013)
— San José y Madre de Dios. Logroño.
  http://etsanJoseymadrededios.blogspot.com.es
  https://es-es.facebook.com/pages/Proyecto-ICI-Logroño/716174255088137
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.
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.