

The ENGIME-Network Workshop I:

**SUMMARY REPORT**

MAPPING DIVERSITY

Understanding the dynamics of multicultural cities

*Purpose - Overview - Insights of Workshop I*

By Maddy Janssens, Wim Moesen & Patrizia Zanoni  
Faculty of Economics and Applied Economics  
K.U.Leuven  
Naamsestraat 69  
3000 Leuven, Belgium

## **1. Purpose of Workshop I**

The objective of the ENGIME network is to gain an understanding of the social, cultural and institutional conditions that are favourable to learning and innovation in multicultural cities. To provide a better understanding of the relationship between urban life, cultural diversity and economic growth and innovation, the topic of Workshop I was focused on the ways different disciplines define diversity and conduct research on diversity.

First, defining diversity and differences was discussed using insights from the disciplines of anthropology, biology, economics and organisation theory. These contributions focused on the evolutions in theorising and studying diversity. Second, current research on diversity was being presented from both a quantitative and qualitative approach. From a quantitative perspective, the focus was on operationalizing diversity in terms of indicators of diversity. From a qualitative perspective, casestudies on diversity in cities were presented to increase our understanding of the factors influencing the possibility of diversity.

This summary report provides first an overview of Workshop I. The program with the different contributions and their abstract is included as well as the list of all participants. Second, the main lessons and insights based on the contributions and discussions throughout the 2-day workshop are being presented followed by reflections on interdisciplinary research and future research questions that are pertinent to understanding diversity in multicultural cities.

## 2. Overview of Workshop I

### 2.1. Programme of the Workshop

#### Day One

9.30-10.00	WELCOME with coffee
10.00-10.45	Keynote speaker Arie De Ruijter: Managing Diversity in a Glocalizing World
10.45-11.00	Questions
11.00-11.15	Coffee BREAK
11.15-12.00	Keynote speaker Thierry Verdier: Economic Approaches to Cultural Change and Cultural Diversity: Overview and Prospects
12.00-12.15	Questions
12.15-13.30	Sandwich LUNCH
13.30-14.10	Paper 1: Measuring Diversity in Economics: Insights from Biology and Ecology (Carole Maignan, Dino Pinelli, Francesco Rullani and Gianmarco I.P. Ottaviano)
14.10-14.50	Paper 2: Theories of Diversity within Organisation Studies: Debates and Future Trajectories (Maddy Janssens and Chris Steyaert)
14.50-15.30	Communication by Elena Saraceno: Communicating Diversity Through the European Capital in Brussels
15.30-16.00	Coffee BREAK
16.00-17.00	Panel discussion

#### Day Two

8.30-9.00	WELCOME with coffee
9.00-9.30	Paper 1: A Stage Model of Developing into an Inclusive Community (Billy E. Vaughn and Katarina Mlekov)
9.30-10.00	Paper 2: Post-Communist City on its Way from Grey to Colourful: Case Study from Slovakia (Alexandra Bitusikova)
10.00-10.20	Coffee BREAK
10.20-10.50	Paper 3: Lithuanian Cultural Origins and Transformation of Cultural Values While Transformation to Market Economics (Laura Šalciuviene and Regina Virvilaite)

10.50-11.20	Discussion of morning papers in small groups
11.20-12.00	Plenary discussion
12.00-14.00	LUNCH: seafood buffet
14.00-14.30	Paper 4: San Lorenzo Market Between Diversity and Mutation (Florence, Italy) (David Frantz)
14.30-15.00	Paper 5: Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life (Tuzin Baycan Levent, Enno Masurel and Peter Nijkamp)
15.00-15.20	Coffee BREAK
15.20-15.50	Discussion of afternoon papers in small groups
15.50-16.30	Plenary discussion
16.30	Conclusive word by Dino Pinelli

## 2.2. Summary of invited speakers

### **Managing Diversity in a glocalizing world by Prof. Arie de Ruijter, University of Tilburg, The Netherlands**

Current society embodies ongoing dialectical processes of globalization and localisation. Globalization and localisation constitute and feed each other. The increasing globalisation creates favourable conditions for all sorts of forms of particularisation, localisation and even fragmentation. Distant localities are linked in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and *vice versa*. The emergence of a transnational system also implies the rebirth of nationalism, regionalism and ethnicity. A situation of 'in-betweenness' is created, resulting in the hybridization of institutions, as well as the particularisation, sometimes-even fragmentation, of worldviews and moral frames of reference. As a consequence, individuals and groups, confronted with the uprooting of many existing local identities, feel an increasing need to construe or 'invent' new identities. A result of this is that some group borders are fading, but that others are articulated and defended more strongly. So, although the geographical bond of identities has become less 'natural' because of globalisation processes - it is a case of 'deterritorialisation of identities'.

One of the most remarkable features of today's globalization is rapid urbanisation. Global cities are major sites for the creation of a new global culture. Two features are vital to an understanding of global culture. First, global cities are receivers of both domestic and international migrants. Second, socio-economic polarisation has taken place. Global cities are where the new rich as well as the labour force of the services sector lives.

The shifting pattern of hybridisation in large parts of the world, with a clear concentration in large metropolises, goes together with an increasing loss of control. Society is in the grip of divergent, paradoxical and contradictory forces

and it becomes more and more important to learn how to cope with the uncertainties which people create in and through their own actions. Suggestions to deal with this reality are two-fold: 1) a plea for compatibility instead of communality with regard to cultural values, and 2) a strong emphasis on the interaction model in decision making.

One can approach the problem of dealing with uncertainty from at least two different angles: and integrative and a coordinative point of view. In the integrative point of view, uniformity is advocated. Individuals are expected to accept and internalise the dominant form of life. The melting pot idea resembles this model but is either a myth or a failed project. The coordinative model does not deal with communality but with compatibility of views and practices.

The second suggestion is to install an interaction model of decision making. In many cases however the norm is a classical rational model of decision making. Decision-making resembles then the stages of preparation, determination, execution, evaluation and adjustment of policy. These stages call for strong management and rational bureaucratic procedures with obedient actors. The interactive model however assumes that solutions and problems only become relevant in a process of decision making if they are represented by an actor. This implies that the definitions of reality adhered to by the various parties are an important basis for decision making. This model has also a structure and rules, not as stages but as decision rounds.

### **Communicating Diversity through the European Capital in Brussels by Elena Saraceno (EU Policy Advisor)**

At the Nice Summit of December 2000, the ministers of foreign affairs of the EU member states agreed that starting in 2002, Brussels would become the main seat for European Council meetings. Following this decision, the President of the European Commission Romano Prodi and the Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt invited a group of 12 intellectuals to two brainstorming sessions to discuss the expectations, needs and functions of Brussels as the capital of Europe. The group included Michel Crozier (French sociologist and organisation expert), Umberto Eco (Italian semiologist, communication expert and writer), Bronislaw Geremek (Polish social historian and politician), Nicolas Hayek (Lebanese Swiss business entrepreneur), Agnès Jaoui (actress, scriptwriter and scenographer), Rem Koolhaas (Dutch architect, urban planner and professor), Maryon McDonald (British anthropologist), Pasqual Maragall (Spanish lawyer, politician, former mayor of Barcelona), Gerard Mortier (Belgian art manager and opera house manager), François Schuiten (Belgian scenographer, designer, comic strip creator), Geert Van Istendael (Belgian reporter and poet) and Juan Ignacio Vidarte (Spanish economist and business manager).

The first brainstorming session (May 2001) aimed at defining the idea of 'European capital' while the second (September 2001) specifically looked at Brussels as the seat of the capital of Europe. The following ideas emerged from the two sessions:

- ? Brussels should not try to imitate national capitals, centralise decision-making and build monuments, it should rather be a 'light' and 'soft' capital.
- ? Brussels should play the role of a 'server' in a network.
- ? Europe's plural identity should not be erased but should rather co-exist in Brussels. Diversity is a positive and crucial asset for Europe.
- ? There is a need for stronger, modern symbols for Europe.
- ? The relationship between the 'Quartier Européen' and the city of Brussels should be re-thought. There are two main options: either the existing

buildings are improved and better linked with the city or a completely new project in a different location is developed.

- ? Buildings, monuments and urban planning need to become meaningful within the frame of the city. This can only happen if all stakeholders (including the local ones) take part in the decision making process.

The group also made four specific proposals:

- ? The creation of a centre for advanced studies,
- ? The creation of an institute of multi-linguism,
- ? International urban and architectural competitions for a higher quality of life in the 'Quartier Européen,'
- ? A method for addressing areas of concerns arising from the presence of European institutions in Brussels.

### 2.3. Abstracts of the papers

**Bio-ecological diversity versus socio-economic diversity: A comparison of existing measures.** By Carole Maignan, FEEM; Dino Pinelli, FEEM; Gianmarco Ottavioano, Università Bocconi and FEEM; Francesco Rullani, FEEM

The aim of this paper was to propose a set of indices of cultural diversity along those dimensions (e.g., language, race, religion, etc.) that are potentially relevant for economic performance in terms of productivity and innovation. In the first part of the paper, the authors drew from biology and ecology where diversity (and related concepts) plays a central role, the reason being that diversity as such is considered an asset for species and ecosystems. The crucial information that bio-diversity measures must deliver was discussed. Bio-diversity indices were then surveyed and their pros and cons were evaluated in terms of informative content.

In the second part of the paper the authors turned to measures of diversity in economics. They started with presenting the most frequently used indices. Then they discussed whether the informative requirements of economic indices should be (partially) different from those of bio-ecological measures. Since diversity is much less central in economics than in biology and ecology, the existing literature is much patchier. Again, they evaluated pros and cons in the light of the chosen informative requirements.

The authors found that the types (alpha, beta, gamma) and dimensions of diversity (richness and evenness) discussed in bio-ecology are also relevant in socio-economic analyses. With one difference: socio-economic analyses not only deal with qualitative not-rankable variables (such as religions, languages, and races). It often deals with quantitative variables (such as income, wages, and consumption levels), that can be measured and ranked. The possibility of ranking and measuring adds a new dimension of diversity: the distance between each class or type or individual.

**Theories of diversity within organisation studies: Debates and future trajectories.** By Maddy Janssens, K.U.Leuven & Chris Steyaert, University of St. Gallen

Theories on diversity and diversity management within the field of Organisation Studies started to develop in the 80s, mainly under influence of managerial reports pointing towards the increasing diversity of the future workforce. The purpose of this paper was to 1) review the existing studies on diversity identifying their main purposes, 2) identify the current debates in the field, and 3) point towards possible future directions.

Studies on diversity seem to have a two-fold purpose. A first purpose is to identify discriminatory practices in the workplace. Several studies have examined the working experiences of minority groups, inducing our attention to phenomena such as the glass-ceiling effect (e.g. Cox & Nkomo, 1990; Wirth, 2001), wage differences (e.g. Ashraf, 1996; Blau & Beller, 1988), segregation (e.g. Anker, 1998; Ibarra, 1995). A second purpose is to examine the effects of diversity on work-related outcomes. For instance, studies (Milliken & Martins, 1996) have examined the relationship between value diversity and conflict, or between cognitive heterogeneity and problem-solving capabilities. The authors discussed these two strands of studies by summarising their main findings and conclusions.

Wanting to achieve one (or both) of the two purposes, the domain has mainly focused on the consequences of diversity and seems to have neglected theoretical reflections on the notions of 'diversity,' 'difference,' or the 'other.' This need for theorising has been indicated by well-known scholars in the field (e.g. Cox, 1995; Nkomo, 1995; 2000; Nkomo & Cox, 1996), concerned about the continuation of the diversity domain. Within these current debates, the authors identified mainly four issues: a narrow or broad definition of diversity, a stable or dynamic conception of identity, the role of power, and the importance of the socio-historical context. With the discussion of these four issues, the authors indicated the implicit 'theoretical' choices prioritising the concept of 'identity', turning the issues of diversity into a managing of individuals and 'their' identities. They concluded by pointing towards possible future directions of theorising and researching diversity.

### **A Stage Model of Developing into an Inclusive Community;** By Billy E.

Vaughn, Alliant International University, San Diego, USA; & Katarina Mlekov, MA, Alliant International University & University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

The Community Inclusion model described in this paper characterises the stages through which a diverse group of people living in the same part of a city develops into an inclusive community. The model is useful for assessing a community's current stage of inclusion and determining the interventions for further development. Examples from cities located in different parts of the world, such as Gothenburg, Sweden (EU) and San Diego, California (USA), were used to demonstrate how the model works. Particular focus was on the relationship between stage of inclusion and collective community action for economic development.

Community inclusion refers to the outcome of actively utilising the wide range of cultural perspectives, knowledge, and skills of different identity groups in the service of collective interests. The model is based on the assumptions that (a) a community of people becomes inclusive by virtue of constructing a shared sense of purpose, (b) inclusion is the result of creating an intentional, goal-directed activity system that capitalises on the rich cultural practices available in a diverse society, and (c) a diverse community goes through a set of developmental stages in achieving inclusion. The stages of Community Inclusion are (a) Monocultural, (b) Symbolic Difference, (c) Critical Mass, (d) Acceptance, and (e) Inclusive.

The remainder of the paper describes how the developmental model of Community Inclusion is used as a framework for understanding the conflicts certain communities experience with increased diversity, and what other communities have gone through in reaching higher stages of inclusion. It concludes with describing general, practical steps that EU countries may find useful in inner city strategic diversity and inclusion planning.

**Post-communist city on its way from grey to colourful: Case study from Slovakia** By Alexandra BITUSIKOVA, Matej Bel University, Institute of Social and Cultural Studies

The paper is a case study of the city of Banska Bystrica in Slovakia in the light of political, socio-economic and cultural changes. It discusses urban diversity and integrity from an anthropological qualitative perspective. On the example of three different historical periods (1918 – 1948: the democratic Czechoslovakia; 1948 – 1989: the communist Czechoslovakia; 1989 up to the present: building new democracy in a new state) the study shows transformations of the city and urban life. The research results show how political systems influence conditions, in which urban diversity and heterogeneity develop. During the democratic period of the first Czechoslovak Republic (1918 – 1948 with the exception of the World War II), Banska Bystrica was a multicultural city with a rich ethnic, religious and social differentiation of the inhabitants who communicated without any problems in three languages: Slovak, German and Hungarian. The small city had almost two hundred associations and clubs where different groups were meeting according to their ethnicity, religion, hobby, profession, age, etc. Diverse social and cultural life was flourishing in tolerance until the World War II. After the communist coup in 1948, the situation dramatically changed. Within a few years the city became a grey, dull place with no or strictly limited social life. Totalitarian regime was systematically suppressing any diversity or pluralism in public spaces for fear of a mass protest against the regime. It tried to break all diversified contacts and networks of the inter-war period. Diversity in public spaces was replaced by homogeneity that does not tolerate any difference. After the 'velvet revolution' in 1989 and the 'velvet divorce' in 1993 dramatic political, economic, social and cultural changes transformed the face of the city completely. Reconstruction of the city centre area revitalised urban life and brought colourful diversity to the streets of the city. For the inhabitants diversity and plurality is a symbol of 'Western' democracy, which is in contrast to uniformity of the communist past. Yet, although the change from homogeneity to diversity has been welcome by most citizens, everyday life in heterogeneous society asks for more tolerance and understanding. After living in grey for fifty years, too much colour, too much diversity is not accepted by everyone. Old ghosts of nationalism and intolerance come hand in hand with diversity and pluralism. The study demonstrates that diversity can grow and flourish only in democracy, which allows differences and pluralism leading to richer and diversified urban life.

**LITHUANIAN CULTURAL ORIGINS AND TRANSFORMATION OF CULTURAL VALUES WHILE TRANSFORMATION TO MARKET ECONOMICS** by LAURA ŠALCIUVIENE, REGINA VIRVILAITE; Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania



Macroeconomic processes of last years, determined by course of economic transformations in post-socialistic countries, had an influence on the culture, people life-styles of these countries. Since 1990, after 50 years being in the command economy system, Lithuania making efforts to create market economy based on principles of democracy, private property and private initiative. Economic reforms and opening doors to the west have not only changed the social landscape, but also reshaped the value system, moral ideals and preferences, structure of relations between people and etc.

The objective of this paper was to summarise and analyse dimensions of Lithuanian culture and to discuss about peculiarities and adaptability of Lithuania for the economic development in the market economy system. Various nations live in the territory of Lithuania from the old times. Nowadays it's almost impossible to imagine state that would be homogeneous ethnically. An interaction between ethnic groups is deeply influenced by so-called "ethnic stereotypes". The Lithuanian nation is comprised of four major ethnic groups, who historically had existed within their own areas: the Aukstaiciai (known as "highlanders", living in the south and east), the Dzukai (south-eastern part, influenced by Polish), the Suvalkieciai (south-west, further subdivided into Kapsai and Znavykai) and the Zemaiciai (known as "lowlanders", living in the western parts of Lithuania). The dzukai are the most expressive, the Zemaiciai are the most reserved and most archaic. The pure ethnic culture exists basically in countryside and settlements of Lithuania. In the main cities all the ethnic sub-cultures are melting and reforming.

## **SAN LORENZO MARKET BETWEEN DIVERSITY AND MUTATION**

**(FLORENCE, ITALY), BY** David Frantz, CRESO Maison de la Recherche en Sciences Humaines Université de Caen, France

There are two ways to approach the ethno-cultural question in the spatial dimension: the first, more in general use, is to focus on a particular group and to bring to the fore its characteristics. The second, used here, consists of coming from a public space of labour to study the present groups in terms of their differences and inter-relations. An original inquiry was undertaken in the summer of 1999 in the market of San Lorenzo in Florence with 198 moving stalls, *bancarelle*. 233 persons were approached, of which 183 agreed to respond to a list of questions.

Foreigners represent the two-thirds of the workers, and Florentines comprise three quarters of the Italian third. 43 % of these migrant workers in the Market are Latin-Americans, especially Mexicans and Brazilians. The Middle East is also well represented (30 %) by Iranians and Palestinians. The remaining foreigners show an eclecticism of geographic origins. There are more men than women, except for Mexicans who are all women.

The motivations of coming to the Market are logically linked to economic opportunity. However for the migrants, above all the employees of the stalls, this activity is only temporary. San Lorenzo Market is often the only opportunity of work for foreigners because the possession of a work permit is not required. However their duration of work, shorter or longer, is related to social, economic and historical characteristics of the migrants. The presence of many Latin-Americans is explained above all by their status of students in Florence; the Market provides them with an income. Prized like employees for their English spoken, their arrival has been recent and massive. They stem from the middle and high social classes of their respective countries. Iranians, a group with a higher level of education, distinguish themselves for their will of ingress to stabilise in the Market where they are increasingly important. On the other hand,

Palestinians remove dependant on economic needs that make them migrate more frequently. Their capacity for international mobility is in relation to the diffusion of their trade Diaspora. The presence of Western Europeans and North Americans is more linked to individual questions (study, life choice, travel). The presence of certain groups of national groups is due to the international geopolitical context (Iranians, Palestinians, and Eastern Europeans).

These groups of migrants have a rather precise relation with property and social division of work, and the division of labour in the Market is based on ethno-cultural specialisation with, in some cases, a division of gender. The inquiry shows that one-third of respondents was a business owner and two-thirds were employees. All the Iranians own of their stall while all Mexican women are employees. And some groups count more employees either for Iranian owners (Jordanians) or for Florentine owners (Brazilians). This specialisation is also obvious concerning the sold products: Iranians remove specialised in selling more lucrative leather products, whereas Florentines are more specialised in selling more traditional goods (clothes, Florentine paper) or are more diversified goods (souvenirs, sun glasses, etc).

A long-term analysis on populations working in the San Lorenzo Market would show flows of foreigners of various geographic origins and its stabilisation. For example, before the rush of Brazilians and women Mexican, Romanians were a numerous group of employees. Their substitution took place whereas they were entrusted activities with less precarious, as in the bakery trade or pizzerias. San Lorenzo Market is a multi-cultural public space made so by the workers who animate it. It reproduces to its scale social divisions of labour, which is very important in terms of ethnic, cultural, and gender rift. Florentines and other Italians are among the oldest, and their number is decreasing. Their importance is progressively shifted to other ethnic groups. Processes of mutation (conquest and substitution) are shown at the two levels of social division of labour, both for the owners and the employees. The impacts in terms of complexity of globalization and internationalisation are not only affecting the national and the regional scales (well documented) but also the intra-urban space and in our case the symbol of the San Lorenzo Market.

### **Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban**

**Economic Life** By Tuzin BAYCAN LEVENT\*, Enno Masurel\*\*, Peter Nijkamp\*\*\*

\*Department of Spatial Economics, Free University Amsterdam, \*\*Department of Business Administration, Free University Amsterdam, \*\*\*Department of Spatial Economics, Free University Amsterdam,

The aim of this paper was to investigate ethnic female entrepreneurs who have a dual character, ethnic and female, in urban economic life. Ethnic entrepreneurs and female entrepreneurs which can be identified as having an untapped job-creating potential and, which reflect different cultures and open-ended capacities for economic growth creation in cities, constitute two special groups in urban economic life with their growing numbers and also their contributions to economic diversity. There are many similarities between these two special groups in terms of opportunities; their business features, management styles, networks and associations and niches that they obtained in cities. Both of these groups tend to find opportunities for their creative economic roles in big cities and metropolis and offer different approaches and different management styles to urban economic life, which reflect their cultural diversities. They have also common

specific barriers and problems in setting up and running businesses. On the other hand, there are some differences in terms of the problems and needs, management styles and networks. However, a number of problems and issues that they face are common to both of these groups regardless of the gender or ethnicity. Moreover, ethnic and female entrepreneurs tend to suffer from some problems more intensively than small businesses in general do. The most important common point of these two groups is to be “minority” in urban economic life. While ethnic groups are “minorities” as non-natives, females are another kind of “minorities” with often a lower participation level in urban economic life in a male dominant business world. However, each of the groups is itself heterogeneous, with a wide variety of qualifications, experiences, resources, problems and needs, operating within a variety of social contexts.

This paper discussed the entrepreneurial behaviour and processes of ethnic female entrepreneurs while discussing the similarities and differences of two special groups, viz. ethnic entrepreneurs and female entrepreneurs on a comparative basis. The special focus was on ethnic female entrepreneurship that is combined the characteristics or indicators of ethnic entrepreneurship and female entrepreneurship. Are ethnic female entrepreneurs special ethnic entrepreneurs or special female entrepreneurs? This paper aimed to provide an answer to this question while synthesising ethnic entrepreneurship theories on the one hand and female entrepreneurship theories on the other hand. It also aims to identify characteristic indicators of ethnic female entrepreneurship on a conceptual level. Moreover, ethnic female entrepreneurial behaviour and processes were examined on the basis of case study research on Turkish female entrepreneurs in Amsterdam. The paper discussed the “place” of Turkish female entrepreneurs seen from the perspective of the effects of ethnic and gender opportunities and barriers in urban economic life.

### 2.3 Participants' List

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
1	Tuzin	Baycan Levent	Dept. Of Spatial Economics Free University of Amsterdam	tbaycanlevent@econ.vu.nl
2	Leen	Beyers	Hoge Instituut voor de Arbeid KULeuven	<a href="mailto:leen.beyers@hiva.kuleuven.ac.be">leen.beyers@hiva.kuleuven.ac.be</a>
3	Ilze	Bezuidenhout	CETRA en Cultural Studies KULeuven	i@ilze.org
4	Alexandra	Bitusikova	Institute of Social and Cultural Studies Matej Bel University, Slovak Republic	bitusikova@mail.com
5	Kristine	Crane	Psycoanalytic Institute for Social Research (IPRS), Italy	iprs@mclink.it
6	Arie	de Ruijter	University of Tilburg, Nederland	AriedeRUIJTER@kub.nl

7	Nick	Demenagas	CERES, Athens	nde@dias.aueb.gr
8	Patrick	Devlieger	Department of Anthropology KULeuven	patrick.devlieger@ant.kuleuven.ac.be
9	Siegfried	Dewitte	Faculty of Economics KULeuven	<a href="mailto:siegfried.dewitte@econ.kuleuven.ac.be">siegfried.dewitte@econ.kuleuven.ac.be</a>
10	Gerlinde	Doyen	Hoge Instituut voor de Arbeid KULeuven	<a href="mailto:gerlinde.doyen@hiva.kuleuven.ac.be">gerlinde.doyen@hiva.kuleuven.ac.be</a>
11	David	Frantz	CRESO Maison de la Recherche en Sciences Humaines Université de Caen	frantz@mrsh.unicaen.fr
12	Marco	Giovagnoli	Institute of Historical, Sociologica and Linguistic Studies - University of Ancona	giovagnoli@posta.econ.unian.it
13	Manuela	Hernandez	HEBO The Hague Institute for Higher European Studies, Dept. Of Communication Management The Hague University of Professional Education	engime-thehague@sost.hhs.nl
14	Maddy	Janssens	Faculty of Economics KULeuven	<a href="mailto:maddy.janssens@econ.kuleuven.ac.be">maddy.janssens@econ.kuleuven.ac.be</a>
15	Rudi	Janssens	Center for the Multidisciplinary Study of Brussels VUB- BRUT	rudi.janssens@vub.ac.be
16	Paula	Kervennic	LASAR	paula.kervennic@caramail.com
17	Carole	Maignan	Fondazione ENI Enrico Mattei	<a href="mailto:maignan@feem.it">maignan@feem.it</a>
18	Willem	Moesen	Faculty of Economics KULeuven	<a href="mailto:willem.moesen@econ.kuleuven.ac.be">willem.moesen@econ.kuleuven.ac.be</a>
19	Hendrik	Nevejan	Faculty of Economics KULeuven	<a href="mailto:hendrik.nevejan@econ.kuleuven.ac.be">hendrik.nevejan@econ.kuleuven.ac.be</a>
20	Adele	Nieuweboer	HEBO The Hague Institute for Higher European Studies, Dept. Of Communication Management The Hague University of Professional	engime-thehague@sost.hhs.nl

			Education	
21	Anne	Pellissier	LASAR	apellissier@mrsh.unicaen.fr
22	Dino	Pinelli	Fondazione ENI Enrico Mattei	<a href="mailto:pinelli@feem.it">pinelli@feem.it</a>
23	Dafne	Reymen	IDEA Consult Brussels	Dafne.Reymen@ideaconsult.be
24	Francesco	Rullani	Fondazione ENI Enrico Mattei	<a href="mailto:rullani@feem.it">rullani@feem.it</a>
25	Elena	Saraceno	EU Advisor	Elena.Saraceno@cec.eu.int
26	Laura	Salciuviene	Kaunas University of Technology Economics and Management Faculty Marketing Department, Lithuania	<a href="mailto:laura.salciuviene@vf.ktu.lt">laura.salciuviene@vf.ktu.lt</a>
27	Marco	Swingedouw	Dep. of Sociology ISPO KULeuven	<a href="mailto:marc.swyngedouw@soc.kuleuven.ac.be">marc.swyngedouw@soc.kuleuven.ac.be</a>
28	Billy	Vaughn	Alliant International University, USA	<a href="mailto:billy@diversityuintl.com">billy@diversityuintl.com</a>
29	Thierry	Verdier	DELTA Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris	tv@java.ens.fr
30	Georg	Von Graevenitz	ELSE - University College London	gvgraevenitz@gmx.net
31	Patrizia	Zanoni	Faculty of Economics KULeuven	patrizia.zanoni@econ.kuleuven.ac.be

### **3. Main Lessons and Insights**

From the discussions, five main topics emerged that seem to be crucial in understanding the dynamics of diversity in multicultural cities. A first topic addresses the difficulty of defining diversity and points to the importance of the relational construction of diversity and the need to contextualize diversity in terms of socio-economic power. A second topic introduces the notion of space as an important condition of diversity. The following two topics then address ways of 'managing' diversity. The distinction is made between an integrative and coordinative model where differences are either approached in a hierarchical versus non-hierarchical way. The other topic relates to the role of institutions in achieving a non-hierarchical way of dealing with differences. Finally, a fifth topic puts forward the question and need to find new ways of experiencing differences that are less threatening. Besides these five topics, reflections on how to conduct interdisciplinary research as well as future research questions emerged. These seven issues will now be discussed in-depth.

#### **1. Defining diversity**

Diversity is a complex notion and can refer to different dimensions and layers of reality. We present here insights from the discipline of organisation studies in which diversity is mainly defined in terms of group characteristics. From biology, we remember the distinction between alpha, beta and gamma indicators of diversity. The danger however of defining and operationalizing diversity in these terms is a static definition and a de-contextualized approach of diversity. Two reflections on defining diversity therefore refer to a relational construction of diversity and incorporating the relationship of diversity with the socio-economic position of people.

##### **1.1. Diversity as different group characteristics**

Within the discipline of organisation studies, diversity is mainly defined in terms of different categories that refer to group characteristics with the purpose of further examining the effects of these characteristics on work-related outcomes. An important categorisation is the distinction between primary and secondary characteristics. This distinction refers to the central versus the acquired elements that can influence the way people perceive themselves and their environment. The *primary* dimensions include gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, race and physical condition, while education, religion, geographical origin, income, marital status and profession fall under the *secondary* dimensions. Other

categorisations refer to variable (education, religion) versus invariable (gender, ethnicity) dimensions and observable (gender, race) versus non-observable (education, sexual orientation) diversity dimensions.

While these types of categorisations refer to demographic and representative differences, other types of categorisations relate to functional differences. Functional differences refer to the differences in the way we learn, think, process information and deal with authority. For instance, task-related knowledge, skills and capacities; values, views and attitudes; cognitive and attitudinal styles; and status in the organisation such as one's hierarchical position, professional domain, departmental affiliation and seniority. These ways of defining and operationalizing differences is emphasised by researchers who are interested in examining the economic effects of diversity. In contrast, researchers who are more interested in diversity because of a moral-ethical perspective (examining social injustice) seem to focus more on the demographic and representative differences.

### **1.2. Alpha, beta and gamma indicators of diversity**

Ecologists recognise three types of diversity: alpha, beta and gamma diversity. *Alpha* diversity refers to diversity within a particular sample: within-habitat diversity. It refers to the number of species that live in a homogeneous habitat. This measurement is the simplest of all measures since it implies simply counting the species found in a community. It does not take into account how the population is distributed across those particular species. This is also called species richness.

*Beta* diversity refers to diversity associated with changes in sample composition along an environmental gradient: between-habitat diversity. Beta diversity is difficult to measure but it can be estimated by dividing gamma by alpha diversity.

*Gamma* diversity refers to differences across samples when they are combined into a single sample. Gamma diversity measures landscape diversity: the total number of species observed in all habitats within a geographical area.

In general, ecologists often ignore beta diversity because it reflects something about how samples were collected, not something about communities in nature. Thus, the focus is on alpha and gamma diversity. It conveys information on how diversity is spatially organised.

### **1.3. A relational construction of diversity**

A first important reflection on the notion of diversity is its relational nature. 'Who you are' is being constructed in relationship to other people. For instance, you will experience a more local identity (I am a person from Leuven) when coming in contact with people from another city (a person from Bruges); you will construct a more regional identity (I am a Flemish person) when in contact with a person from another region (a Walloon person); a national identity (I am a Belgian) will arise when being in another country (The Netherlands); and a European identity will be constructed when being in another continent like the U.S.A. So, diversity and identity are constructed in relationship to others. And it seems the more distant the relationship is, the broader the identity is being constructed.

This reflection is grounded in the discussion whether identity and diversity is a static or dynamic conception. Several diversity studies link individuals' identity directly to the social category they belong to on the basis of their individual characteristics. For instance, a person is being identified as 'a woman' if she belongs to the social category of women. According to this perspective, a person's identity is conceived as stable, fixed, unitary and internally consistent. It is an objective set of characteristics, which leads to a specific identity. Other researchers however favour a reframing of identity toward relational embeddedness, where the concept of identity is not one of cross-time and cross-situational coherence but one of multiphrenic embeddedness. From this perspective, identity is best seen as a set of contradictory, fluid, contextual constrained positions within which people are capable of exercising choice. Questions like 'Who am I?' or 'What kind of person am I?' are not answered once and for all, but are being constructed as social interactions and experiences change, not only over time, but also during the work day as one encounters a variety of people and situations. Important in this relational perspective is the fluid, processual nature of identity that is contingent upon social relations (Alvesson & Billing, 1997). Behaviour that was formerly attributed to the individual alone is now seen as arising out of the negotiated relationship with other individuals. Even if people belong to the same social category, the meaning of their identity is not necessarily the same because they develop their identity in close interaction with other people who confirm, support or disrupt different identity claims.

#### **1.4. The socio-economic and historical context of diversity**

A second reflection refers to the importance of the socio-economic and historical context to fully understand the dynamics of diversity. Given the importance of



intergroup dynamics for diversity, contemporary interactions are considered to be influenced by the legacy of prior interactions among members of those groups. It is the economic power and the history of intergroup relations, which is the social-cultural background on which the effects of diversity are constructed. Diversity can therefore not be fully understood when one approaches this notion as only an individual or group phenomenon, a trait of an individual or of a group. What is needed is a more holistic approach incorporating an socio-economic and historical perspective to understand how, for instance, segregation and oppressed mechanisms function in society.

## **2. Space as (im)possibility for diversity**

The notion of 'space' or 'spatial structure' emerged throughout the presentation of the case studies and discussions as an important factor to understand where and when diversity is allowed.

Diversity and differences need space so it can express itself. For instance, the case study of Banska Bystrica in Slovakia taught us that public spaces are crucial in the way they stimulate diversity and pluralism. For instance, a square with restaurants and pubs where people can meet; walking promenades; cultural festivities that attract people to a square are specific examples of urban planning that allows diversity in the streets of the city. In contrast, a square that is a traffic junction of public transport or social and cultural activities that are only allowed in private homes are practices that seem to support a totalitarian regime. The case study further shows that diversity seems to flourish only in democratic conditions and that it needs instruments and tools like planned and organised public spaces.

The ideas of space and democracy bring us to the notion of public and private spheres and its links to diversity. Often the conviction is that in public domains, commonality of values and beliefs is necessary (see integrative model). Cultural conformity becomes then a condition and a vehicle for obtaining full citizenship. At the same time, one recognises however the right of minorities to experience their own culture. The solution then is to allow the expression of cultural differences in the private domain. So, democracy is here perceived as a combination of public domains where everybody is equal with private domains where diversity is allowed. A first remark towards this way of conceiving democracy is the contestable distinction between public and private domains. In daily practice, these two domains are interchangeable. A second, more

important, reflection is that democracy may mean that differences are also allowed in the public domains. Consequently, public spaces need to be organised and planned in such a way that diversity is made possible.

Space seems to be also closely linked to the notion of segregation. In a segregated society, groups cluster together, living in separate neighbourhoods where they can create their own space in which they can express their differences. So, again it is spatial structure and the way space is being used that provide researchers and policy makers with a lens and tools to understand and manage diversity.

### **3. Managing differences: the integrative model and coordinative model**

Diversity and dealing with diversity implies the ability to deal with uncertainty, unknown situations, limited means and one's own shortcomings. This problem of dealing with uncertainty can be approached from at least two different angles: an integrative and a coordinative point of view.

In the integrative point of view, uniformity is advocated. The advocates of this view adhere to the conviction that society will disintegrate if its members don't have common motives, cognitions and values. They think that a plural society can only function adequately if there is commonality of fundamental values and standards between the various groups in society. The ultimate goal however seems to be the abolition of differences. It is the dominant segment of society that will define other segments and features as 'foreign', as misplaced, as illegitimate. In addition it is a confirmation and reinforcement of the social hierarchy. Within this integrative model, the various assimilation programmes focus on breaking down and transforming ethnic identity. They intend to build up and mobilise a link with an 'imagined community'. The ideal of this community is an ethnic, religious, linguistic and cultural homogeneity.

A second way of approaching differences is according the principles of a coordinative model. This model does not deal with commonality (as is the case in the integrative model) but with compatibility of views, and in particular, practices. From a normative point of view this model places less stringent and hence more realistic demands on the groups living together within the nation-state.

Another criteria to think about the difference between an integrative and coordinative model is the way in which differences are being structured. In an integrative model, one assumes a culture that overarches other cultural differences. Consequently, one creates a hierarchy of differences. It is likely that this hierarchy is leading to resistance of minority groups because their values are

considered of less important. Therefore, trying to establish an 'European' culture that incorporates all other national cultures may lead to negative feelings and rejections from these national cultures. In contrast, in a coordinative model, the idea is to structure the differences in a non-hierarchical way. Structuring means here coordinating in the form of a network instead of creating a hierarchical order. An example of such a coordinative model is circular networking like the Erasmus exchange program within Europe.

The difference between the integrative and coordinative model further refers to the underlying assumption of the existence of one best practice versus several 'best' practices. The belief in one best practice reflects a more homogeneous assumption where one approach can be considered the only and best approach. In contrast, the belief in several 'best' practices reflects a heterogeneous assumption. The notion of equifinality - there are many culturally distinct ways of reaching an objective - is here accepted.

However, the problems are not solved by advocating this coordinative model. After all, integration and coordination have one common element: the demand of non-conflict of principles, criteria and (legal) rules. Incompatibilities should be banned. The conditions, however, under which and the way in which the 'process of banning' should occur are not easy to indicate. Choices are inevitable when it concerns conflicting views, for example equal rights of men and women, the integrity of the human body and the relation between the citizen and the state. While answers are difficult here, one necessary precondition is to promote dialogue between groups with different identities though without asking these groups to develop a shared system of basic values, or a common worldview.

A final important issue in the coordinative model is the way objectives and goals are being defined and formulated. While the formulation of a common goal seems to be necessary to achieve an inclusive community, the danger exists that the 'common' goal favours the dominant groups in society and therefore already creates a hierarchy. Defining the common goal is therefore in itself a coordinative action with attention to the needs of all parties involved. A common goal cannot be imposed by an external party but needs to be created in a bottom-up way. This process of goal definition is crucial to ensure that future goal-oriented actions can be evaluated in terms of their compatibility.

#### **4. Role of institutions and local action**

Traditionally, institutions have tried to govern a society by rules and procedures that create regular patterns of behaviour and stable institutions. Actors however

learn to anticipate the demands of the system. The problem is that it is often only a superficial adjustment. People behave in accordance with the rules, but this does not mean that they believe in the purpose, effectiveness or legitimacy of the rules. The rules may not be internalised as a compass for future action. Moreover, the process of globalisation and localisation create a reality that seems to become too complex, too pluralistic, too open, too unpredictable and thus too unmanageable. Governments and their apparatuses can not operate like a society's control room. Their policy measures have insufficient effect; they have a shorter life span and lead to a stream of new measures intended to correct the previous ones. Such more and more partial adjustments can be characterised as detailed elaborations, additional rules and intensified control. So, a review and reassessment of institutions seems to be called for.

One suggestion that emerged is to perceive the role of institutions and government more as an enabler for local action than that of a decision-maker deciding what the local actions will be. Governments act then as a facilitator. They do not direct, but they inform and mediate, they bring parties together by articulating and co-ordinating their well-understood proper interests, they supervise the process and check to see whether the agreements made by the parties are observed and carried out. Confidence from the actors and citizens is here not won by cultivating an idealised image of consensus (cf. the integrative model) but by recognising the antagonistic character of the cooperation between the actors. It requires learning to handle uncertainty and diversity.

### **5. Need to search for other ways of experiencing differences**

Contact with differences often seems to lead to confrontation and the question which difference is the best. This hierarchical way of thinking and evaluating seems to be inherent to dealing with diversity. Considering the negative consequences of this hierarchical way of thinking, the need arises to look for other ways of experiencing differences. A suggestion that emerged is to think about art as a possible form in which people from different cultures can meet. Art may stimulate a non-hierarchical way of experiencing differences, in which different expressions and values are put next to each other instead of above/under each other.

### **6. Interdisciplinary research**

The different contributions in this workshop were coming from different disciplines leading to reflections on the way interdisciplinary research can and needs to be done.

A very important learning point was that an interdisciplinary discussion should not start with methodological issues. Methodology is the most 'fixed' part of each discipline. It is grounded in assumptions and paradigms with important implications for types of publications and consequently professional evaluation within the own discipline. Therefore, discussion on methodological issues is likely to lead to debate and evaluative reactions on each other's method instead of cooperation.

Consequently, interdisciplinary research should start from problems that need to be solved. When framing the research question in a problem-driven way (instead of interest-driven), it will emphasise the need for insights from different disciplines. In addition, the idea of a balanced methodology emerged where models try to incorporate as much as context as possible. When using models, the challenge is to reduce complexity so it is manageable but without losing all context.

Another notion that was being stressed is 'story telling'. Story telling is often considered to be a 'qualitative' method which encourages a social validation of 'objective' data that cannot be obtained through the orthodox processes of survey and fieldwork. The underlying idea of presenting a consistent and appealing account was however also appreciated by researchers with a quantitative perspective. It implies that a research account addresses the following issues or steps: 1) what is the issue at stake? (research question); 2) is it relevant in other contexts? (theoretical background/hypothesis formulating); 3) data collection; 4) analysing and interpreting the data (hypothesis testing); and 5) organising the interpretations and conclusion in a transferable way.

## **7. Research questions**

To conclude, we present here the main research questions that emerged throughout the plenary and small group discussions.

Questions related to the economic effects of diversity:

- ? In organisation studies, the assumption (based on a few studies) is that diversity leads to more innovation and creativity because diversity means different framing of problems, more alternatives, and therefore a higher quality decision. Taking this assumption to the societal level, the question is:

to what extent is there a relationship between diversity and creativity/innovation at the societal level and why?

- ? We assume that there is a relationship between diversity and growth but the question is through which processes. One possible reason may be the emergence of entrepreneurship as driver between diversity and growth. The question is then to what extent are diversity and entrepreneurship related and how does this influence economic growth?
- ? What are the spillover-effects when managing diversity effectively?

Questions related to space and public domain:

- ? How can urban planning create spatial structure so that diversity and democracy emerge?
- ? Which places create space for 'integration' or 'compatible actions'?
- ? How can the media, a public forum, create space for diversity?

Questions related to diversity and identities:

- ? In multicultural cities, we see that people act and develop identities while being embedded in networks of relationships that bind them with two or more nation states simultaneously. The question is how do people deal with this 'hybrid' identity?
- ? What are the factors and processes through which different dimensions of diversity become salient (national versus class versus education)?