

Valuing cultural diversity? A plea for a receptive cultural policy

Özlem Canyürek
University of Hildesheim, Germany
oezlemcanyuerek@gmail.com

DOI: 10.3389/ejcmp.2023.v11iss2-article-5

ABSTRACT

The promotion of immigration-generated diversity has been on the agenda of the cultural policy in Germany for an extended period. Integration-oriented objectives primarily determine the policy discourse on cultural diversity, often supported through intercultural funding programmes. Parallel to this, the long-standing debate on improving access conditions to publicly funded cultural institutions for immigrants compels cultural policy to introduce measures to accommodate cultural diversity in the cultural sphere. In this article, I explore the interplay between the values, reflexes and habits of cultural policymaking on the lack of immigration-related diversity in the cultural landscape. Through dispositive strategy as a methodical tool of discourse analysis, I first examine the conduct, motives and concepts of cultural policy shaping the discourse on immigration-generated diversity. Then, I introduce a constructive policy approach for reducing access imbalances to the cultural scene, and, lastly, I propose an equality-based cultural policy framework.

Keywords:

Migration

Diversity

Interculturality

Integration

Germany

Introduction

Since the mid-2000s, enhancing the inclusion of citizens with a *migrant background*¹ into the cultural sphere and responding to the absence of cultural diversity within public cultural institutions are among the main objectives of cultural policy in Germany. These goals are mainly carried out through various additional funding programmes oriented towards the cultural integration of immigrants² and, lately, refugees.

In the last decade, cultural diversity debates on the diversification of the personnel and audience structure and programming of the public cultural institutions have accelerated as their social role increasingly put into question, given that they are almost entirely publicly funded. In 2015, the public sector provided a total of 10.4 billion euros for culture, and 35.4% of the total federal, state, and municipal cultural expenditure was in the theatre landscape (Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder, 2018: 29)³. Parallel to these discussions, cultural policies at three levels of government have been introducing numerous funding programmes concerning diversity development in cultural institutions, albeit with varying diversity-related concepts and approaches. Interculturality is the most employed concept in this context and is often used synonymously with intercultural dialogue.

In 2019, 21.2 million people with a *migrant background* were living in Germany, representing 26% of the total population, while 52% of them were German citizens (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2020). Although one in four people have a *migrant background* as described by the Federal Statistical Office, immigrants as artistic workforce as well as audiences are underrepresented in the cultural field. Despite the lack of sufficient cultural statistics on the different facets of diversity, by observation, Whiteness, masculinity, heterosexuality, and able-bodiedness are known to be the dominating

features in the German cultural landscape, particularly in municipal and state theatres. A recent study, which surveyed the federally funded 67 cultural establishments and institutions for the first time on diversity between 2018 and 2020 in terms of staff, programming and the audience, indicates that people with a migrant background and disabled people are the most underrepresented groups as employees (Zimmermann, 2021)⁴.

One of the hypotheses put forward in this paper is that the focus of German cultural policy is to strengthen social cohesion through intercultural-focused subsidiary incentives to deal with the problem-defined immigration than to create framework conditions for the diversification of the staff composition, programming and audience profile of cultural institutions. I argue further that the ideas, values, habits and aesthetical perceptions of cultural policymaking are firmly effective in the absence of immigration-related diversity in the cultural landscape. There has been a relationality between the systematic exclusion of immigrants from the cultural sphere and the concept of *Kulturnation* (cultural nation), where the ideals of cultural politics are crystallised.

In the subsequent sections, first, I examine the concept of *Kulturnation*, to shed light on the role of the underlying "normative ideals, values and beliefs" (Béland, 2009) of cultural politics, implemented through policy, for confining the position of people with a *migrant background* to a cultural integration framework. Then, I outline the interplay between intercultural policy approaches and the objective of cultural integration. In this exploration, I employ the dispositive strategy of discourse analysis (Bühmann & Schneider, 2008, 2012; Caborn, 2007; Jäger, 2001; Keller, 2005; Schneider, 2015). Dispositive is understood as a strategically linked, heterogeneous ensemble of discursive and non-discursive practices, norms, measures, power

¹ Since the 2005 Microcensus, the Federal Statistical Office (Statistisches Bundesamt) defines people with a migrant background (Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund) as all immigrants who came to Germany after 1949 as well as foreigners, born in Germany from immigrant parents. The following groups have a migrant background according to this definition: Foreigners, naturalised people, (late) resettlers and the children of these three groups (Statistisches Bundesamt, n.d.). This term is widely used in the cultural field by policymakers in Germany. The article applies this problematic term in order to refer to the German cultural policy and use it in italics to identify it as a stigmatising and discriminating category: a) it silences the war-related immigration of Germans; b) it is exclusionary; even if these people are Germans, their belonging to Germany is questioned by an official category, and they are othered through their separation from the German natio-ethno-cultural mainstream; c) it is bound to "inherited citizenship" which values German descent over other descent (Will, 2019: 553).

² I use the phrase immigrant, aware of the fact that second and third generations are no longer immigrants; they are rather 'migrantised' people by cultural politics. However, cultural integration measures often aim at all generations; thus, within the context of this article accurate and differentiated usage of the terms, 'immigrant' and 'migrantised' is not applicable.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from German to English were done by the author.

⁴ The study analysed the proportion of four diversity characteristics in cultural institutions. These were gender, age, migrant background and disability. According to the survey, Turkish descent employees are significantly underrepresented in cultural institutions, although these are the largest group among people with a migrant background in Germany.

relations, and knowledge in a given field (Foucault, 1980: 194). Following Foucault, the methodology utilised in this article reflects on the question of how the interrelation of discourse, non-discursive practices (actions), the institutional manifestation (outcomes) of immigration-related diversity can be examined as a dispositive. Through dispositive strategy, the article aims to pinpoint the association between the form of discourse concerning immigration-related diversity and the historically grounded embodied system of beliefs, attitudes, and reflexes of cultural-political actors to delineate how decisive this interconnection, leading to structural exclusion in the cultural landscape.

A culture-defined nation

Considering "the intertwinement of policy and the politics of culture in Germany which refers to the production and distribution of policies and their representation of ideas, symbols and values" (Wesner, 2010: 435), an examination of one of the central concepts of cultural politics, *Kulturnation*, is essential as it is substantially reflected in cultural policy.

Culture has always been at the heart of Germany's self-definition (van der Will & Burns, 2015). The notion of *Kulturnation* is a reflection of a culture-defined nation. The concept represents particular ideas and beliefs which stem from a value system belonging to an intellectual, progressive, and democratic society. Even though the substance of *Kulturnation* was revised over time and the term gained new meanings, "values leave traces as finger-prints do; they change but remain recognisable over centuries" (Wesner, 2010: 433).

The manifestation of ideals of cultural politics in cultural policy provides valuable knowledge on the underlying principles of the cultural values implied. German cultural policy acknowledges the arts and culture as progressive instruments that have transformative powers on individuals and society; hence, cultural policy acts as keeper/organiser/developer of cultural values of a certain kind (Wesner, 2010: 434). The *Kulturnation* is one of these prevailing principles firmly emphasised in the key national policy documents.

The *Kulturnation* signifies the German unification, a cultural unity through history, language, and cultural heritage. It is considered a commitment to Germany as it replaces the lack of state unity, and the Federal Republic of Germany adhered to this tradition during its aspirations for reunification (von Beyme, 2012: 107). The

concept of *Kulturnation* -in different forms- signifies cultural unity and is still solidly influential in cultural policymaking in Germany (Bloomfield, 2003; van der Will & Burns, 2015; Wesner, 2010).

The first sentence of Article 35 of the Unification Treaty states that in the years of division, the arts and culture - despite the different development of the two states in Germany - were the basis for the continuing unity of the German nation (Bundesverfassungsgericht, 1991). The arts and culture were foundational to the reconciliation of the two German states before 1990 and also seen as the remedy in the coming decades to overcome difficulties that had emerged from different cultural traditions, cultural politics, and cultural policy approaches in East and West Germany (Canyürek, 2022: 110).

In 2007, the parliamentary working group, *Enquete-Kommission* (Enquiry Commission), published an extensive report, *Kultur in Deutschland* (Culture in Germany), on the cultural landscape. The report is still considered one of the most important documents in the inventory of cultural policy, expressively strengthening the role of federal cultural policy (Council of Europe, 2016; Deutscher Kulturrat, 2017). The spirit of a unified cultural identity as the binding bond of the nation is prevalent in the report. In the introduction of this document, it is underlined that "the Federal Republic of Germany sees itself as a *Kulturnation*" (Enquete-Kommission, 2007: 43). In Germany, 'culture' has historically been a central element of the self-image of the state (Klein, 2018). Although their distinct regional and local cultures and traditions, sixteen federal states are seen as belonging together through the arts and culture that engender *Kulturnation* (Wesner, 2010; Wöhlert, 2009).

The report of the *Enquete-Kommission* repeatedly stresses the significance of culture as a national goal (2007: 148–200–202–209). It particularly mentions the *Kulturnation* in the context of European integration. The *Kulturnation*, the idea of culture as a unifying entity, represented another dimension in 21st century Germany. While many European countries focus on their rich cultural diversity, Germany seeks a unifying European conceptual framework that arises from the concepts of enlightenment, the occidental-Christian tradition, and the humanitarian idea of man (Wesner, 2010: 442). In this ideological construction of European culture, portrayed as a 'culture of cultures', the underlying assumption is that there is a consensus for a 'European model' of society, a model that does not exist in practice (Shore, 2001: 115). Moreover, in this view, the migration history of European countries and

how Europe is culturally impacted by migration are not taken into account.

The tendency of focusing on a European identity and culture is explicit in the *Enquete-Kommission* report. It discusses cultural diversity and identity in terms of the 'roots of European culture' and 'European integration'. In the introduction section, under the sub-heading of 'cultural education', one can find an obscure reference to immigrants in Germany. Cultural education is understood as a key to social development in order to "strengthen awareness towards cultural diversity and cultural differences between regions, milieus, ethnicities and genders" (Enquete-Kommission, 2007: 45).

Norbert Lammert, who served as president of the *German Bundestag* (Parliament) from 2005 to 2017, criticised the consensus of the members of the *Enquete-Kommission* on the declaration of Germany as a *Kulturnation* without having any doubt about its relevance for the future of the country and asked whether it might be a "dusty formula in a globalised world" (2016: 144). Lammert expressed reservations about attaining an 'agreeable' definition of the term, its suitability as a concept or fact that adequately described the frameworks and conditions of our world, given that they have undoubtedly changed quite radically in the last few decades (2016: 143).

The implicit application of the revised concept of *Kulturnation* defines top-down the culture in a disguised manner and operates as a distinctive marker for the construction of hierarchised diversity between Germany after unification (the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic) and Germany after labour migration from the 1950s (Canyürek, 2022: 110). While national, federal state and local cultural policies continuously support the ideals of *Kulturnation*, reflected in the organisational structure and programming of White public cultural institutions, they introduce cultural integration measures in the form of intercultural dialogue programmes for immigrants. Hence, labour migration, this second layer of cultural diversity, is treated otherwise, "being included differently to the nation" (Puwar, 2004).

The notion of *Kulturnation* does not recognise the post-war demographic changes through immigration

and displacement. It disregards various ethnic and religious identities and traditions and fails to consider these citizens as its own. It overlooks the intellectual and artistic contribution of immigrants to German society. In this understanding, perception of the arts and culture is rigid and not open to negotiation. The concept raises doubts about a fair promotion of cultural diversity, particularly concerning the diversification of knowledge production. Without a transparent discussion about and consensus on support through cultural policy with diverse stakeholders, the task of *Kulturnation* carries the risk of turning into "structural conservatism" (Klein, 2009). In such a situation, preserving and supporting a specific culture would endanger cultural pluralism. This is especially true for post-immigrant Germany, in which we witness the rise of right-wing extremism and xenophobia⁵. In its current interpretation, the *Kulturnation* is prone to contributing to the ongoing structural inequalities and exclusions in the cultural field.

Interculturality as a diversity concept for cultural integration

In cultural policy terms, the concept of interculturality started to be discussed in the early 2000s. The *kulturpolitische Gesellschaft (KuPoGe)* (Cultural Policy Association) and its organisation, the *Institut für Kulturpolitik (IfK)* (Institute for Cultural Policy), are actively involved in shaping the discussions around immigration-generated diversity⁶. In 2003, The *KuPoGe*, in its publication, *Cultural Policy Yearbook*, introduced a wide-ranging collection of texts on the concept of interculturality, including promotion of intercultural work as a task of cultural policies at different levels of government and a part of cultural integration strategies (KuPoGe, 2003).

The report of the *Enquete-Kommission* is another illustrative example of linking cultural integration and social cohesion with one another and presenting interculturality as a concept for successful integration. Given that the report was produced around the time when immigration started receiving attention from cultural policy, the document exhibits noticeable

⁵ A survey by the University of Leipzig reveals the severity of the increase in racist views in Germany. According to the study, extremist ideologies have become more acceptable in mainstream German society, leading to growing support for the radical right-wing, the Alternative für Deutschland (Alternative for Germany, AfD) and the anti-immigration and anti-Islam PEGIDA (Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamisation of the Occident) movement (Decker et al, 2016).

⁶ The KuPoGe is a platform for cultural policy discussions in theory and practice. It stands for the principle 'cultural policy is social policy' and partly independent nationwide association and partly subsidised by the federal government. The IfK is entirely funded by the Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and the Media.

ambivalent views regarding immigration-related diversity. Already in the introduction of the report, where culture and identity are discussed, one cannot find a single sentence about immigration from the 1950s onwards or how society was marked by the cultural impact of labour migration. Instead, labour migration was mentioned under a separate subsection where "immigrant cultures" and the concept of interculturality were paired up (Deutscher Bundestag, 2007: 210). The experts of the *Enquete-Kommission* considered that immigration, interculturality, and intercultural education have a cross-sectional character; therefore, they should be handled jointly as areas of particular importance (Deutscher Bundestag, 2007: 210).

Intercultural dialogue was recognised as a key for strengthening social cohesion and a good integration policy concept by the members of the parliamentary working group (Deutscher Bundestag, 2007: 211). The tasks of promoting cultural diversity and integration are intertwined within a discourse that calls for social cohesion and policy measures that respond to the urgency of the 'integration problem' or 'integration deficit' (Deutscher Bundestag, 2007: 211). In this regard, intercultural dialogue is proposed as a remedy for a democratic model of integration and social cohesion to deal with the issues and challenges of immigration (Deutscher Bundestag, 2007: 211–215). The ethnicity and religious dimensions of diversity were continuously highlighted through examples, which were expressed as central parts of the integration problem and deficits in the sub-section where immigration was reviewed separately on six pages in an over 500-pages-long report (Canyürek, 2022; Terkessidis, 2010). Such controversial perspectives on intercultural dialogue are not constructive for dismantling the existing othering approaches that marginalise ethnic and religious differences of some citizens of the German society. Furthermore, it assumes that people hold no individual identities; they are seen solely as members of some communities, in which cultures are perceived static, insulated and impermeable. In this context, intercultural dialogue serves as a reconciliatory concept that allows contact between fundamentally different cultures.

Although the concept has been employed in various modes by different actors of policymaking bodies, it is still employed as a part of an inclusion/integration strategy aimed to be achieved through intercultural dialogue, addressing residents with a *migrant background* and, lately, refugees (Canyürek,

2021). Correspondingly, cultural diversity and interculturality are understood as part of the field of immigration and cultural education, and these programmes are designed for immigrants and refugees within cultural education strategies, frequently interrelated with the socio-culture⁷ practice (Sharifi, 2011; Terkessidis, 2010). For instance, the recently updated national cultural policy document indicates that interculturality remains at the level of discourse as a commitment to intercultural dialogue than a structural intercultural action plan. Intercultural dialogue is understood as a vital element of promoting cultural diversity at the national and international level by the federal government (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020: 28). National intercultural dialogue is referred to conversations with groups of the population who have a *migrant background* (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020: 29). The programmes and activities, listed as examples, not only link intercultural dialogue with ethnicity but also with religion, which is evident in announcing the first German Islam Conference in 2006 as an example of internal intercultural dialogue with Muslims in Germany (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020: 32–33).

In line with this approach, the national government has been introducing intercultural funding programmes or programmes with intercultural features to foster intercultural awareness, dialogue, and exchange. Moreover, federal funding programmes, interconnected with intercultural education, are understood to enhance intercultural dialogue, which enables respecting different cultural traditions and values of other ethnic or religious groups, and contributes to combating racism, xenophobia, and right-wing extremism (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020: 31). Be that as it may, there is still no comprehensive national policy planning to promote internal intercultural dialogue.

Regardless of how well-intentioned, the pathways for cultural integration into German society often present explicit conditionalities based on cultural differences. Furthermore, in most integration-oriented intercultural programmes, the concentration is more on the obligations of immigrants than the requirements of a cultural policy that seeks to tackle structural inequalities for accessing the cultural landscape. Cultural policies at different levels fail to provide an intercultural framework with corresponding action plans and strategies.

⁷ The concept of socio-culture refers to the democratisation of culture, emerged in the 1970s as a part of the new cultural policy objectives of access to and participation in culture for all.

Promoting the diversification of knowledge production

Despite the enormous intercultural experience and knowledge gained within the last two decades, to this date, there is no structured intercultural policy perspective that goes beyond intercultural dialogue with immigrant communities. Efforts related to the migration-focused diversification of cultural institutions run almost parallel to the establishment of dialogue-led intercultural project funding. On the contrary, these objectives are interconnected. Participation in culture does not only refer to the reception of culture by a broader section of society, but more importantly, it denotes having access to the means of cultural production. Hence, consolidated strategies are required to broaden the meaning of culture to envision the *Kulturnation* as an inclusive concept in a migrant society. Such strategies also strengthen both the ability of cultural institutions to internalise and reflect the diversity of society and enable dismantling institutional structural barriers preventing or limiting access conditions for underrepresented artists and other cultural workers, so-called with a *migrant background*.

The *Interkultur Ruhr*, in the state of North Rhine-Westphalia, is a promising example of dedicated work for the pluralisation of the cultural scene in the Ruhr region. It is an initiative of the Ruhr Regional Association and the Ministry of Culture of North Rhine-Westphalia, established in 2016 to support intercultural development. The *Interkultur Ruhr* plays an important intermediary role between intercultural actors, initiatives, organisations and cultural policymakers. The prominent engagement areas of the *Interkultur Ruhr* are managing intercultural funding and supporting networking and cooperation with various cultural actors. The project aims to strengthen the visibility of different intercultural artistic agencies and jointly create a regional cultural and artistic structure in which heterogeneity of perspectives, experiences, and knowledge can be represented.

In 2020, the *Interkultur Ruhr* published a document on cultural policy recommendations based on the committed network meetings with actors of the independent scene in the Ruhr region, concentrating mainly on networking, visibility and funding. First, in 2019, a focus group from artists and other cultural creators was established. The formation of working groups followed this intense exchange with independent actors, cultural practitioners and initiatives, migrant associations, municipal administrations and

politicians to further the discussions on the three main topics of visibility, networks and funding processes (Interkultur Ruhr, 2020: 6). The policy recommendation document firmly recognises the contribution of the extensive expertise and knowledge of immigrants to the development of policy proposals.

The recommendations pinpoint various crucial action areas relevant not only for the Ruhr region but all municipal and federal-state cultural policies. The document stresses that across all genres, existing programmes and formats do not consider the specific needs of immigrant artists (Interkultur Ruhr, 2020: 7). To strengthen the visibility of immigrant artists, a vast set of interrelated aspects were described as areas that must be taken into account. These are focused mainly on data collection, revision of programmes and marketing (Interkultur Ruhr, 2020: 7–8–9):

- Quantitative data to outline the existing independent venues, the number of collectives and their share of municipal funding compared to municipal houses,
- further qualitative data, supported with focus groups involving people exposed to various forms of exclusion,
- promotion of continuing academic research, seeking to generate practice-based knowledge to identify precarious conditions of and structural exclusion mechanisms for particularly immigrant and marginalised actors of the independent scene,
- a needs-based orientation of current formats and programmes,
- a review of funding procedures (e.g., criteria for juries and selection committees, criteria for a broad understanding of artistic quality including non-western canons),
- further development and establishment of residency programmes that engage with the representation of critical artistic positions and perspectives,
- development of an intercultural festival,
- introduction of a trade fair with diverse curatorial perspectives to make the region's different artistic work contexts and production visible,
- marketing support for small associations, collectives and initiatives that have limited public relations resources of their own.

The development of networking opportunities was identified as a vital cultural policy instrument, on the one hand, to empower marginalised immigrant artists and create solitary spaces. On the other hand, it

was understood as partaking in the formation of cultural policy plans and measures. The networking approach was also firmly linked to the objective of improving visibility. Recommendations related to networking are (Interkultur Ruhr, 2020: 10–11):

- Peer-to-peer counselling, offered by and for independent immigrant artists and cultural workers,
- a mentoring programme for marginalised art and culture professionals,
- sectoral meetings for the exchange of ideas between associations, groups, initiatives and individuals,
- thematically-focused working groups to generate impulses, concrete proposals and demands for cultural policymaking,
- actively being involved in cultural decision-making processes and representing concerns and needs of the independent intercultural scene in the region.

Lastly, the suggestions concerning funding processes draw attention to the lack of transparency, fairness and marginalised perspectives in the funding structure. In this context, the *Interkultur Ruhr* demands the followings (Interkultur Ruhr, 2020: 12–13):

- Diversity in jury appointments and committees through a quota system,
- an inclusive and sensible language in calls for tender (e.g., redefinition of the term intercultural, colonial-critical reflection on the usage of concepts and terms, sensitive interaction with each other at eye level),
- optimisation of highly bureaucratic application processes (e.g., introducing a counselling service, bundling funding offers, establishing multi-year and structural funding programmes, expanding the current intercultural funding formats).

The list of recommendations reads like a cultural policy manifestation revealing several essential points. First of all, it shows the necessity of a committed engagement to build, maintain and nurture communication channels with groups of artists, initiatives, associations, etc., who are members of this society and have the right to co-shape the cultural landscape of the region. Second, it acknowledges that cultural policy plans and strategies cannot be formulated top-down in the offices of cultural administrations; they must hinge on local problems and needs and sufficiently respond to these demands. Third,

it indicates that a neutral cultural policy is responsible not only for creating dialogue and exchange spaces for excluded artists, groups and organisations but also should listen and benefit from the experiences and knowledge of these marginalised positions for an inclusive cultural sphere.

Conclusions

In 2019, cultural institutions funded by the state of North Rhine-Westphalia were surveyed on the relevance and implementation of diversity. Among 262 institutions, 64% participated in the survey, while performing arts institutions had the highest response rate of 56% (Zukunftsakademie NRW, 2019: 5). Evaluation report of the study indicates that diversity plays an important role for more than three-quarters of the respondents, and changes that have already taken place are most visible in the field of cultural education, followed by audience diversity but rather at a low level when it comes to measures related to the diversity of personnel (Zukunftsakademie NRW, 2019: 2–3). Similarly, a new federal funding program, 360° – Fund for New City Cultures, promotes immigration-related diversity in public cultural institutions shows that audience development and programming measures are more easily implemented than those concerning staff appointments (Kulturstiftung des Bundes, 2020). Conversely, diversity in programming and audience profile are mutually dependent on the diversity of cultural creators.

This article reiterates that “diversity discourse has to address the aspect of inequality in order not to remain a depoliticised management technique; for that, it needs to be grounded in both civil society, as a set of socio-moral resources of citizenship, and citizenship rights to become a politically legitimate approach” (Faist, 2009: 173). A pluralistic cultural sphere entails democratic equality, which aims “to create impartial institutions in the public sphere and civil society where this struggle for the recognition of cultural differences and the contestation for cultural narratives can take place without domination” (Benhabib, 2002: 8). To this end, cultural policy has the responsibility to generate framework conditions that advocate for an inclusive cultural landscape. As Klein questions, “where, if not within the framework of the arts and culture - and accordingly within the framework of a committed cultural policy, can a society enter into a permanent dialogue with itself, ‘reconsider’ itself again and again?” (2009: 245).

For cultural diversity to lead the way to the pluralisation of the cultural field, policy should deal with the conservative conception of the historically rooted idea of *Kulturnation* and the static and monolithic perception of "the Culture". In this regard, cultural policy requires a change in mindset to catalyse processes for supporting accessible cultural institutions so that bottom-up diversity-led approaches can be the driving force of change in cultural institutions. However, dismantling exclusionary structures in cultural institutions cannot be thought of separately from the transformation of the ideals, values, and habits of decision-making cultural-political bodies. A paradigm shift in cultural policy entails taking diversity as a departure point and a cross-cutting theme in all policy planning and funding decisions. For this to happen, first and foremost, political will, commitment, and cooperation between all levels of policymaking actors, partnership with civil society organisations, and flexibility in decision-making processes are required. Thus, coordinated and connected approaches between decision-makers are essential for shaping a forward-thinking, receptive, and dynamic cultural policy. Interconnected governance between different levels of policymaking involves an explicit definition of the conditions and scope of cross-divisional cooperation and coordination of action areas, as well as the distribution of competences between cultural-political actors and funding institutions.

Furthermore, generating impulses for a progressive cultural sphere call for diversity planning with clearly defined objectives, priorities, strategies, and corresponding funding criteria to reduce access barriers. Efficient structural measures concerning diversity planning include the introduction of all-encompassing diversity guidelines, transparent jury selection procedures and diversity-reflected jury panels to offer equal access opportunities both to cultural institutions and funding mechanism.

REFERENCES

- ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPENDIUM OF CULTURAL POLICIES AND TRENDS (2020) *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe (20th ed.)*. Country Profiles. Available at: <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/database/search-by-country/country-profile/?id=15>
- BÉLAND, D. (2009) Ideas, Institutions, and Policy Change. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16(5), 701–718. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501760902983382>
- BENHABIB, S. (2002) *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv346pnd>
- BLOOMFIELD, J. (2003) Made in Berlin. Multicultural Conceptual Confusion and Intercultural Reality. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 9(2), 167–183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1028663032000119215>
- BUNDESVERFASSUNGSGERICHT (1991) *Headnotes to the judgment of the First Senate of 24 April 1991 (1 BvR 1341/90, paras. 1–101)*. Available at: https://www.bverfg.de/e/rs19910424_1bvr134190en.htm
- BÜHRMANN, D. A., SCHNEIDER, W. (2008) Mehr als nur diskursive Praxis? Konzeptionelle Grundlagen und methodische Aspekte der Dispositivanalyse. *Historical Social Research*, 33(1), 108–141.
- BÜHRMANN, D. A., SCHNEIDER, W. (2012) *Vom Diskurs zum Dispositiv. Eine Einführung in die Dispositivanalyse*. 2. Aufl. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839408186>
- CABORN, J. (2007) On the Methodology of Dispositive Analysis. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines* 1(1), 115–123.
- CANYÜREK, ÖZLEM (2021) Promoting cultural diversity in the German theatre landscape. In Letunić, A., Karaulić, J. (eds.). *Performing Arts between Politics and Policies: Implications and Challenges* (pp. 38–50) Belgrade: Faculty of Dramatic Arts; Zagreb: Academy of Dramatic Art.

- CANYÜREK, ÖZLEM (2022) *Cultural Diversity in Motion: Rethinking Cultural Policy and Performing Arts in an Intercultural Society*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2016) *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe. Country Profiles*. Available at: <http://www.culturalpolicies.net>
- DECKER, O., KIESS, J., & BRÄHLER, E. (eds.) (2016) *Die enthemmte Mitte: Autoritäre und rechtsextreme Einstellung in Deutschland* (2. Aufl.). Psychosozial Verlag.
- DEUTSCHER BUNDESTAG (2007) *Kultur in Deutschland. Schlussbericht*. Deutscher Bundestag 16. Wahlperiode. Drucksache 16/7000. Available at: <https://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/16/070/1607000.pdf>
- DEUTSCHER KULTURRAT (2017) *Enquete Bericht „Kultur in Deutschland“: Zehn Jahre Referenzdokument*. Available at: <https://www.kulturrat.de/presse/pressemitteilung/enquete-bericht-kultur-in-deutschland-zehn-jahre-referenzdokument/>
- FAIST, T. (2009) Diversity - A New Mode of Incorporation? *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32(1), 171–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870802483650>
- FOUCAULT, M. (1980) The Confession of the Flesh. In Gordon, C. (ed.). *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977* (pp.194–228). Brighton: Harvester.
- JÄGER, S. (2001) Discourse and Knowledge: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of a Critical Discourse and Dispositive Analysis. In Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 32–62). London: Sage.
- KUPOGE (Ed.) 2003 *Jahrbuch für Kulturpolitik 2002/03, Band 3, Thema: Interkultur*. Essen: Klartext Verlag.
- INTERKULTUR RUHR (2020) *Kulturpolitische Handlungsempfehlungen. Interkulturelle Arbeit in Ruhr Gebiet*. Available at: https://interkultur.ruhr/sites/default/files/public/uploads/IKR_Handlungsempfehlung_web.pdf
- KELLER, R. (2005) Analysing Discourse. An Approach from the Sociology of Knowledge [33 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6(3), Art. 32. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473957640>
- KLEIN, A. (2009) *Kulturpolitik. Eine Einführung*. 3. Aktualisierte Auflage. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-91677-4>
- KLEIN, A. (2018) Kulturstaat. In Voigt, R. (ed.). *Handbuch Staat* (pp.329–338). Wiesbaden: Springer VS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-20744-1_29
- KULTURSTIFTUNG DES BUNDES (2020) *360°-Akademie 2020: Session I. Reise ins Innere: Diversitätsprozesse in Kultureinrichtungen*. Available at: https://www.kulturstiftung-des-bundes.de/de/projekte/transformation_und_zukunft/detail/360_akademie_2020_session_i.html
- LAMMERT, N. (2016) Kulturnationen in einer globalisierten Welt. In Institut für Kulturpolitik der Kulturpolitischen Gesellschaft (ed.). *Jahrbuch für Kulturpolitik 2015/16, Band 15, Transformatorische Kulturpolitik* (pp. 143–148). Bielefeld: transcript Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839435120-018>
- PUWAR, N. (2004) *Space Invaders. Race, Gender and Bodies Out of Place*. Oxford and NY: Berg Publishers.
- SCHNEIDER, W. (2015) Dispositive ... - überall (und nirgendwo)? Anmerkungen zur Theorie und methodischen Praxis der Dispositivforschung. In Othmer, J., Weich, A. (eds.). *Medien-Bildung-Dispositive: Beiträge zu einer interdisziplinären Medienbildungsforschung* (pp. 21–40). Wiesbaden: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-07186-8_2
- SHARIFI, A. (2011) *Theater für Alle?: Partizipation von Postmigranten am Beispiel der Bühnen der Stadt Köln*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-01216-3>

- SHORE, C. (2001) The Cultural Policies of the European Union and Cultural Diversity. In Bennett, T. (ed.). *Differing Diversities. Transversal Study on the Theme of Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity* (pp.107–122). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- STATISTISCHE ÄMTER DES BUNDES UND DER LÄNDER (2018) *Kulturfinanzbericht 2018*. Available at: https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bildung-Forschung-Kultur/Kultur/Publikationen/Downloads-Kultur/kulturfinanzbericht-1023002189004.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=4
- STATISTISCHES BUNDESAMT (n.d.). *Migration und Integration: Migrationshintergrund*. Available at: <https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bevoelkerung/Migration-Integration/Glossar/migrationshintergrund.html>
- STATISTISCHES BUNDESAMT (2020) *Population with a migrant background up 2.1% in 2019: lowest increase since 2011*. Available at: https://www.destatis.de/EN/Press/2020/07/PE20_279_12511.html
- TERKESSIDIS, M. (2010) *Interkultur*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- VAN DER WILL, W., BURNS, R. (2015) Germany as Kulturation: Identity in Diversity? In Colvin, S. (ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of German Politics & Culture* (pp. 198–217). New York: Routledge.
- VON BEYME, K. (2012) *Kulturpolitik in Deutschland. Von der Staatsförderung zur Kreativwirtschaft*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-19403-5>
- WESNER, S. (2010) Cultural Fingerprints - the Legacy of Cultural Values in the Current Cultural Policy Agenda in Germany. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 433–448. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630903302758>
- WILL, A.-K. (2019) The German Statistical Category "Migration Background": Historical Roots, Revisions and Shortcomings. *Ethnicities*, 19(3), 535–557. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796819833437>
- WÖHLERT, T. (2009) *Particularly in Berlin. Cultural Policy in the Unified Capital*. The American Institute for Contemporary German Studies (AICGS). Available at: <https://www.aicgs.org/site/wpcontent/uploads/2011/10/woehlert.atp09.pdf>
- ZIMMERMANN, O. (2021) *Diversität in Kultur-institutionen 2018-2020*. Berlin: Initiative kulturelle Integration.
- ZUKUNFTSAKADEMIE NRW (2019) *Vielfalt im Blick: Diversität in Kultureinrichtungen*. Available at: http://www.miz.org/downloads/dokumente/961/2019_zak_nrw_vielfalt_im_blick.pdf

To cite this article:

CANYÜREK, Ö. (2021). Valuing cultural diversity? A plea for a receptive cultural policy *European Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, 11 (2), pp. 74-85.