

Chapter 13

Cultural Creativity and Social Inclusion in Creative Cities: Preliminary Indicators

Rehab Abdelwahab Askar

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3287-4178>

Independent Researcher, Egypt

ABSTRACT

According to the theoretical framework, this chapter examines the role of cultural capital in achieving social inclusion in creative cities and discussing the impact of creative cultural economy and cultural diversity in achieving knowledge-based urban development requirements. The author relies on showing the tangible and intangible forms of cultural capital represented by the urban and cultural assets possessed by the new administrative capital of Egypt (study model). The author then submits an analysis of the strategic urban cultural policies in an attempt to predict a set of preliminary indicators related to the possible forms of social and cultural inclusion and the anticipation of the social, cultural, and economic impacts of cultural creativity on the quality of life and Human security in creative cities.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of “cultural capital” in theory and practice is at the core of this chapter. It refers to mobilizing the “creativity” inherent in art and culture to create new industries and jobs, to enhance the economic capital of creative cities, thus to addressing discrimination issues, and exclusion in the urban environment.

Bourdieu (1979b) distinguished between three forms of cultural capital: embodied cultural capital (in dispositions) referred to one’s tastes, ways of speaking, and general knowledge of the culture valued by the dominant classes; institutionalized cultural capital or formally accredited learning (in degrees and diplomas), often in the form of educational credentials; and objectified cultural capital (in cultural goods and cultural expression that are symbolically transmissible to others) referred to works of art or literature in the objectified state in the form of cultural goods in a material way. Reich (2018) pointed out that objectified cultural capital is accumulated in different forms. These forms can appear in the form

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-4948-3.ch013

of books, paintings, musical instruments, collections, and antiques, as well as villas, luxury homes, and good places to live. This objectified cultural capital is generally handed down in the form of material. Bourdieu (1986) pointed out in his book, “The Forms of Capital”, cultural capital is a major source of social inequality and discrimination, and can help or hinder one’s social mobility as much as income or wealth. In Addition, Bourdieu defined capital as “accumulated human labor” which can potentially produce different forms of profit. This means that all forms of capital can always be converted into economic capital, which is made possible by “a conceptual break with,” the economics’ practice of “artificially isolating an economical economy from a cultural economy.”(Bourdieu, 1990a; Lash, 1993).

There are numerous theoretical reflections on the concept of cultural capital that can be meaningfully used in analyses of contemporary cities. Landry (1997) referred to cultural capital as the summation of all the creative assets of the city, in the arts, media, and design, including cultural assets such as festivals and distinctive customs and conventions. Richard Florida’s (2001, 2004) high-profile work on cultural diversity, creativity, and quality of life looks at these issues on the metropolitan scale. Florida derives an index of cultural diversity, tolerance, and a measure of bohemia to suggest that cities with such characteristics are more productive and successful. In this lifestyle approach, cultural capital is treated as a resource that can be deployed communally. This approach also informed Landry et al. (1996) exploring the role of cultural activity in urban regeneration, based on studies of 15 European cities (Landry et al., 1996; Landry, 1997). Also, the creative city as a planning paradigm supports creativity and culture by design, providing a direct link between cultural amenities, quality of life, and economic development (Glaeser, 2011; Jacobs, 1969; Yencken, 1988). Also, (Hartley et. al., 2012) presents a checklist of the dimensions and indicators covered by the various creative city, which take as key analytic points of decomposition: culture, recreation & tourism- creative output & employment- cultural capital & participation- venues, resources & facilities- livability & amenities- transportation & accessibility- globalization, networks & exchange- openness, tolerance & diversity- human capital, talent & education- social capital, engagement & support- government & regulations, business activity & economy, entrepreneurship, innovation & r&d, technology & ICT, environment & ecology.

Besides the socio-cultural pillar of the Knowledge-based Urban Development Paradigm, seeks to develop a knowledge-based society, with the main characteristics of strong human and social capital, acceptance of diversity, and social equality. Additionally, knowledge Cities foundations include quality of life and place, urban diversity and tolerance, accessibility and connectivity, cohesion, and social equity. (Yigitcanlar, T., Lönnqvist, A.:2013; Carrillo: 2015).

Therefore, the justification for choosing this topic for research and analysis stems from the attempt to understand the discourse of cultural capital and social inclusion in creative cities. In recent years; “culture” has come to be seen as a decisive feature of Sustainable urban development and a means to address issues of globalization, technological change, and international competition between cities of marginalization, exclusion, and discrimination among the population. Creative cities are increasingly investing in cultural infrastructure and promoting creative and cultural industries as a means of achieving social cohesion, inclusion into urban societies, to strike a balance between creativity and economic competitiveness.

This chapter aims to shed light on the role of cultural creativity and the urban cultural assets of creative cities in achieving social inclusion, and identifying the potential indicators of social and cultural inclusion. Social inclusion represents one of the dynamic functions upon which the creative cities’ urban planning is based, and is one of the important factors in achieving sustainable urban development. In this contribution, the author seeks to achieve four main goals:

17 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/cultural-creativity-and-social-inclusion-in-creative-cities/266643

Related Content

Supporting Proximate Communities with P3-Systems: Technology for Connecting People-to-People-to-Geographical-Places

Quentin Jones and Sukeshini A. Grandhi (2005). *The Interaction Society: Practice, Theories and Supportive Technologies* (pp. 215-250).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/supporting-proximate-communities-systems/30365

Strengthening and Enriching Audit Practice: The Socio-Technical Relevance of "Decision Leaders"

Peter A. C. Smith (2013). *Knowledge and Technological Development Effects on Organizational and Social Structures* (pp. 97-108).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/strengthening-enriching-audit-practice/70564

Information Urbanistic Perspective in the Context of Blue Economy: Analysis of Setúbal and Cartagena Tourism Offer

Pedro Fernandes da Anunciação and Antonio Juan Briones Peñalver (2017). *International Journal of Sociotechnology and Knowledge Development* (pp. 65-83).

www.irma-international.org/article/information-urbanistic-perspective-in-the-context-of-blue-economy/198452

An Overview on Effectiveness of Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL)

Linda Daniela, Daiga Kalnia and Raimonds Strods (2017). *International Journal of Knowledge Society Research* (pp. 79-91).

www.irma-international.org/article/an-overview-on-effectiveness-of-technology-enhanced-learning-tel/181263

Structure and Functions of Cosmopolitan as a Symbol of Creative Cities: Cities in Europe During the Middle Ages

Galal Zanaty (2021). *Handbook of Research on Creative Cities and Advanced Models for Knowledge-Based Urban Development* (pp. 323-341).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/structure-and-functions-of-cosmopolitan-as-a-symbol-of-creative-cities/266646