

Arts festivals and cultural diversity policy

An insight in the tension fields between cultural policy and arts festivals

Evelien van der Kooi
3908631
MA Arts and Society
University of Utrecht
Supervisor: Toine Minnaert
27-09-2018

Abstract

Arts festivals have become important stakeholders in the current cultural field, and their importance is ever-growing. However, critics from the cultural sector have stated that current cultural policy does not take this specific form of cultural organizations enough and adequately into account and hereby fails to create a healthy, future-proof cultural climate in the Netherlands. This thesis tests this assumption by studying how three Dutch arts festivals implement one specific form of cultural policy and which obstacles they experience with this. The chosen form of policy is cultural diversity policy, a type of policy that has been growing in importance the last 20 years, like the arts festivals themselves. The findings suggests an array of tension fields, and it may indeed be so that current cultural policies are not fully equipped to deal with the dynamic arts festival platform. This makes policy implementation for the arts festivals sometimes difficult and inefficient, and suggests that in the future, a different approach would be welcomed.

Table of contents

Abstract	1
Chapter one – Introduction	3
1.1. General introduction	3
1.2. Relevance: arts festivals	5
1.3. Relevance: cultural policy	6
1.4. Relevance: cultural diversity	8
1.5. Methodology	9
Chapter two – Theoretical Framework	11
2.1. Cultural policy	11
2.2. Cultural diversity in Dutch cultural policy	12
2.3. Cultural diversity policy in Utrecht	15
2.4. Arts festivals and implementing new policy	16
2.5. Critically reflecting on cultural diversity policy in the arts	19
2.6. Reflection	24
Chapter three – Analysis and Discussion	25
3.1. The case studies	25
Festival Tweetakt	25
Nederlands Film Festival	25
Le Guess Who?	26
3.2. Analysis interviews	26
3.2.1. Concrete measures cultural diversity policy	26
3.2.2. Motivation	29
3.2.3. Diversity as a broad concept	31
3.2.4. Interpretation of cultural diversity	33
3.2.5. Artistic profile and cultural diversity	35
3.2.6. Festival as organizational structure	38
3.2.7. Sector specific complications	41
3.2.8. Attitudes towards the cultural diversity policy	42
Chapter four – Conclusion	44
Appendix 1. Explained topic list for the interviews	48
Appendix 2. Example of a coding scheme – 1	51
Appendix 3. Example of a coding scheme – 2	54
Bibliography	57

Chapter one – Introduction

1.1. General introduction

In June 2018, the Verenigde Podiumkunstenfestivals, an informal partnership between forty Dutch performing arts festivals all across the country, presented the pamphlet “Festivals, geen ontkomen meer aan”.¹ This publication was a direct reaction on the announcement of the Dutch national government that it was researching the functioning of the current cultural policy and funding system, which would lead to possible changes from 2021 and onwards.² In the pamphlet, the organization draws attention to the key role arts festivals in the Netherlands have acquired in the functioning of the contemporary hybrid arts sector and society as a whole.³ The publication functions as a call to the government to anchor this importance into the new cultural structure.

The pamphlet describes that in the 1990’s, the phenomenon of the festival grew explosively in the Netherlands.⁴ Starting from 2000, there was a turnaround in the Dutch arts sector, which is described as the “far-reaching democratization of the arts”: the borders between low art and high art faded, as did the borders between the arts disciplines themselves. Festivals are seen as pioneers in this era of interdisciplinary working.⁵ Furthermore, with their programming, festivals bring international productions of high quality to the Netherlands, and very often also (co)produce these big productions.⁶ They attract a large audience, and play an important role in the local economies of the cities in which they are held and thus contribute to a healthy cultural infrastructure in the whole country.⁷ Besides this, festivals have grown to be zones where experiments are encouraged and large steps are made in the areas of, among other things, innovation, circularity, sustainability, accessibility, and marketing. Festivals thus play a big role in societal developments.⁸ All of this together makes festivals an important actor in both the cultural and arts sector, and Dutch society.

However, the organization observes that this still growing importance of (performing arts) festivals is not recognized in the current cultural policy, which they call ‘outdated’.⁹ To follow policy and apply for funding, organizations often have to fit in rigid structures. But: “The existing, rather rigid regulations do not actually fit - because of a lack of possibilities for customization - with the nature of the festivals.”¹⁰ The festival structure is dynamic and experimental by nature, and performing arts festivals are very individual and unique happenings.¹¹ But in policy, there are high and very specific demands, concerning quality for example, which goes against the experimental nature of festivals, and leaves too little space for customization. Furthermore, the cultural policy of the government is still very much pillarized in art disciplines, while festivals are very multidisciplinary.

¹ “De Verenigde Podiumkunstenfestivals,” Podiumkunstenfestivals.nl, last accessed at the 3rd of July 2018 via <https://podiumkunstenfestivals.com/>.

Translation: “Festivals, there is no escaping them.”

² “Cultuurbeleid voor 2021 en verder,” Rijksoverheid.nl, last accessed at the 3rd of July 2018 via <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/kunst-en-cultuur/cultuurbeleid-2021>.

³ “Festivals, geen ontkomen meer aan,” published by the Verenigde Podiumkunstenfestivals, June 2018, 1. Accessible via <https://podiumkunstenfestivals.com/>.

⁴ Idem, 8.

⁵ Idem, 3.

⁶ Ibidem.

⁷ Ibidem.

⁸ Ibidem.

⁹ Idem, 1.

¹⁰ Idem, 11.

¹¹ Idem, 3.

The conditions applicants have to meet also differ on governmental levels and per fund.¹² And not only the policy itself is not in favor of arts festivals: the way in which the sector is financed in its current form works in the disadvantage of the festivals as well. They get little funding from the national government via the Basisinfrastructuur and the Fonds Podiumkunsten.¹³ Local governments support festivals in some cases, but are more likely to invest in more 'traditional' institutions.¹⁴ Moreover, local governments and the national government both appoint each other as the one responsible for the financing of festivals.¹⁵ This makes the festivals very much dependent on the private funds, which is a disadvantage because they distribute their funding per year. Arts festivals are thus always in a position of financial uncertainty and are structurally underfunded.¹⁶ The conclusion of the pamphlet is that because of their fluid, hybrid nature, arts festivals have difficulties to fit in the current cultural policy and funding system and keep falling between two stools. The Verenigde Podiumkunstenfestivals makes the following recommendation:

“Place innovative festival activities at the heart of your policy, where they belong anno 2018 and give the performing arts festivals the (financial) space to continue to develop and to be more successful. Emphasize their importance everywhere in the country and start to think about the cultural sector in 2021 from this starting point.”¹⁷

This pamphlet thus accentuates two points of attention: the importance of the arts festival in the cultural sector in the Netherlands anno 2018, and the frictions the festival sector perceives between the dynamic festival structure and the current way in which cultural policy is conducted. These form the starting point of this thesis, in which the (in)compatibility between policy in its current form and the arts festival are discussed. One specific form of policy and how it is applied by festivals serves as case study: cultural diversity policy. In this thesis, I discuss how arts festivals in the Netherlands implement cultural policy, to see if there are frictions between the, allegedly, rigid and structured policy and the festivals with their dynamic nature.

Cultural diversity policy is carefully chosen. As we will see, the development and growing importance of cultural diversity policy took place over roughly the same period of time as the emerge of the arts festival in the Netherlands. More importantly, the Verenigde Podiumkunstenfestivals sees a link between the far-reaching democratization within the arts, associated with the arts festivals, and the “equally far-reaching internationalization of society, which could be contributed to, among other things, immigration and emigration.”¹⁸ In this line of thought, the organization strongly emphasizes one specific feature of the festivals: accessibility and inclusivity. The pamphlet states:

“Consider the development and necessity of festivals and festivalization from the recent historical perspective of far-reaching democratization. The festivals are not coming out of the blue! Festivals are inclusive and have a low-threshold and reach many new and other visitors in often unsuspected places. Consider the enormous positive influence that the festivals have (had) on a much more creative and inclusive cultural sector as a whole as well.”¹⁹

¹² “Festivals, geen ontkomen meer aan,” published by the Verenigde Podiumkunstenfestivals, June 2018, 12 . Accessible via <https://podiumkunstenfestivals.com/>.

¹³ Idem, 11.

¹⁴ Ibidem.

¹⁵ Ibidem.

¹⁶ Idem, 11, 3.

¹⁷ Idem, 2

¹⁸ Idem, 8.

¹⁹ Idem, 3.

The arts festivals are thus directly linked to stimulating cultural diversity. This link between festivals and accessibility and inclusivity is one of the focal points in the argument of the importance of the arts festival, made in the pamphlet. This makes it relevant to test this assumption, by researching the (application of) policy concerning cultural diversity.

Three festivals in Utrecht are studied: Festival Tweetakt, the Nederlands Film Festival and Le Guess Who?. Festival Tweetakt is a theatre, music and visual arts festival, the Nederlands Film Festival a film festival and Le Guess Who? a music festival. The goal is to find out if this theme of cultural diversity is approached differently by the policy than by the festival organizations, and hereby research if there really are frictions between the way cultural policy is applied in the Netherlands and the way in which the festival structure works and functions. The main question is: *How does cultural diversity policy affect the daily practices of the organizations of three arts festivals in Utrecht, and what does this tell us about the relationship between the specific organizational form of the festivals and cultural policy?* Because as Munira Mirza puts it in “Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts: A Case Study of the Rich Mix Centre in East London”: “Official policy rhetoric can often hide contradictions that are only apparent in practice.”²⁰

This research is thus a combination of the topics of arts festivals, cultural diversity and cultural policy. In the following sections, I will outline the relevance of studying these topics, by showing that all three subjects are at the heart of modern processes like globalization and its effect on identification-processes, the tensions within nation-states, instrumentalism in cultural policy and the intensifying migration patterns. All three subjects are influenced by, as well as influencing these modern processes. This temporal dimension gives urgency to the topic and strongly anchors it in the Dutch society anno 2018. This relevance makes it surprising that the approach of connecting arts festivals to cultural policy and cultural diversity has not had a proper precedent in both academic and policy literature yet. Bringing these factors together, untangling the inner workings and relationships between them and analyzing the results hopefully gives us some insights in the state-of-being of both the Dutch modern cultural field and the society it is a part of, and can perhaps cast a small and speculative light on what direction the developments related to the topic will be taking in the future.

1.2. Relevance: arts festivals

In “Evaluating Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Case of Cultural Festivals” María José del Barrio, María Devesa and Luis César Herrero state that the arts or cultural festival “may be defined as the organisation of a specific event within the cultural domain, and which denotes a significant contribution in terms of originality or innovation in its field, and entails a certain level of organisation, coupled with a minimum duration, and certain stability as well as frequency over time in the organisation thereof.”²¹ They continue: “festivals are a multifaceted cultural phenomenon reflecting an active cultural process and are endowed with their own identity and institutional structure.”²² They “share a common trait, namely intense production and a cultural experience, resulting from a condensed programme which is planned with a specific purpose in mind”.²³ This goal may “include presenting new and innovative work, creating exchange forums amongst professionals and, of course, public entertainment, as well as an enhanced cultural image of the festival venue”.²⁴ They conclude: “Festivals are therefore a complex cultural phenomenon, and not merely an accumulation of cultural manifestations exhibited therein, but rather a cultural good in themselves, a

²⁰ Munira Mirza, “Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts: a Case Study of the Rich Mix Centre in East London,” *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 15.1 (2009): 55.

²¹ María José del Barrio, María Devesa, and Luis César Herrero, “Evaluating Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Case of Cultural Festivals,” *City, Culture and Society* 3 (2012): 236.

²² *Idem*, 236, 237.

²³ *Idem*, 236.

²⁴ *Ibidem*.

cultural expression in their own right, and a cultural process in which culture is consumed, reproduced and created.”²⁵

The Dutch situation regarding arts festivals described above is certainly not unique, but part of a bigger trend. The phenomenon of the festival has been in existence for a long time, but in the past 25 years there has been an incredibly rise in the number of arts festivals in cities throughout whole Europe.²⁶ This is described as a trend of ‘festivalization’. The influence of the festivals is not only felt in the cultural sector, but also society as a whole. For example, festivalization is recognized to have a big influence on the urban environment and city marketing.²⁷ Bernadette Quin attributes this spectacular growth in “Arts Festivals and the City” to “a series of interrelated factors that include changing approaches to urban management, structural changes in economic production, the use of culture as a means of restructuring wealth and job creation, and the unsettling effects of globalization”.²⁸ Festivals thus have a central position in different types of modern processes in society and the arts field, and are both the result of these processes as an important stimulation. This growing importance of arts festivals makes them a relevant research topic.

1.3. Relevance: cultural policy

As Paul Dimaggio formulates it in “Cultural Policy Studies: What They Are and Why We Need Them”: “Cultural policies influence the barriers to entry and the chances of survival and adoption of ideas, values, styles and genres.”²⁹ With this, they have an important function in society. Furthermore, cultural policy and its application give us insight in how the government and the arts sector position their work and inner workings in a changing society. It also tells us something about how they, consciously or not, try to shape the world around them. In the case of arts festival implementing cultural diversity policy, it can give insight in the way in which arts festival are linked to the modern world, in which globalization, changing identity-processes and mass migration have become important factors in the changing way in which people experience themselves and the world around them. Cultural policy is also never neutral: Dimaggio emphasizes that when new values, interests or ideologies rise to challenge the old, these issues of cultural choice are often elaborated on in cultural policy.³⁰ Cultural policy becomes more salient when there is competition in “the marketplace of ideas”, and hereby studying cultural policy can tell us something about cultural conflicts, as well.³¹

Cultural policy has changed significantly in recent times. According to Andy C. Pratt in “Cultural Industries and Public Policy”, we “have currently reached a point of crisis in many nation-states and regions regarding cultural policies”.³² He continues: “Commonly accepted definitions of “culture” have both widened and deepened. Consequentially, the impact of cultural activities is felt more widely throughout society. Whereas, in the past, it seemed possible to base policy on aesthetic judgements; now, we have for many years had the challenge of political judgements, and more recently those of economic judgements.”³³ The latter is part of a more general shift in cultural policy towards ‘instrumentalism’: cultural and arts policy is more and more justified not solely on aesthetic

²⁵ Del Barrio, Devesa, and Herrero, “Evaluating Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Case of Cultural Festivals,” 236, 237.

²⁶ Bernadette Quinn, “Arts Festivals and the City,” *Urban Studies* 42.5-6 (2005): 927.

²⁷ Del Barrio, Devesa, and Herrero, “Evaluating Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Case of Cultural Festivals,” 237

²⁸ Quinn, “Arts Festivals and the City,” 927.

²⁹ Paul Dimaggio, “Cultural Policy Studies: What They Are and Why We Need Them,” *The Journal of Arts, Management and Law* 13.1 (1983): 242.

³⁰ Idem, 245.

³¹ Ibidem.

³² Andy C. Pratt, “Cultural Industries and Public Policy,” *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11:1 (2005): 39.

³³ Ibidem.

judgements, but on the effects it has in other areas. As David Bell and Kate Oakley put it in *Cultural Policy*: “In short, culture is required to help fix problems identified as priority areas for state action. So the cultural sector might be asked to assist in schemes tackling anti-social behaviour, or social exclusion, or obesity, or poverty.”³⁴

Not only the cultural policy mechanics are changing: the world in which they are applied is changing as well, as are the people whom the policy concerns, which in turn also has an impact on cultural policy and how it is used. Globalization has swept the globe, spreading, according to John Tomlinson in “Globalization and Cultural Identity”, modernity all over the world. Modernity, as “the abstraction of social and cultural practices from contexts of local particularity, and their institutionalization and regulation across time and space”, has, among other things, changed our conception of ‘cultural identity’.³⁵ More fluid, tacit understandings of ‘identity’ are replaced with clear-cut axes, like gender, sexuality, and nationality.³⁶ At the same time, identity is lifted out of its traditional anchoring in particular localities, since our daily lives are now ‘penetrated’ by the connectivity of globalization.³⁷ In “Globalization and Hybridity”, Jan Nederveen Pieterse sums up the range of organizational options that can influence people’s identification processes and cultural preferences in the 21st century: the local, national, global, transnational, international, macroregional, microregional, municipal, and institutional level.³⁸ No single mode has a necessary overall priority or monopoly, which he sees as “one of the salient differences between the present phase of globalization and the preceding era from the 1840s to the 1960s, the great age of nationalism when by and large the nation-state itself was the single dominant organizational option”.³⁹ That is why Pieterse views globalization as “the framework for the diversification and amplification of ‘sources of the self’”.⁴⁰ Tomlinson draws attention to the emergence of ‘hybrid’ cultural identities, which can both be attributed to “the multicultural constitution of modern nationstates” and “the emergence of transnational forms of popular culture.”⁴¹ Tomlinson thinks this proliferation of identity positions may be producing challenges to the dominance of national identity and national policy processes.⁴² As Tomlinson states:

“All nation-states now contain and seek to govern populations whose identities are both multiple and complex. ... Political subjects can now experience and express, without contradiction, both attachments to the nation, multi-ethnic allegiances and cosmopolitan sensibilities. The really interesting cultural-political question that emerges is of how nimble and reflexively attuned state apparatuses are capable of becoming in response to these changes.”⁴³

One such responses of the Dutch government and cultural sector appears to be the cultural diversity policy, researched in this thesis. In the second chapter, I go into detail about how cultural diversity policy came into being and how it is given substance to. For now, it suffices to say that starting from

³⁴ David Bell and Kate Oakley, *Cultural Policy* (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), 58.

³⁵ John Tomlinson, “Globalization and Cultural Identity,” in Lene Arnett Jensen, Jeffrey Jensen Arnett, and Jessica McKenzie, *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research* (New York: Springer, 2011), 272.

³⁶ *Idem*, 273.

³⁷ *Ibidem*.

³⁸ Jan Nederveen Pieterse, “Globalization as Hybridization,” *ISS Working Paper Series/General Series* 152 (1993): 7.

³⁹ *Idem*, 6.

⁴⁰ *Idem*, 7.

⁴¹ Tomlinson, “Globalization and Cultural Identity,” 275.

⁴² *Idem*, 274.

⁴³ *Idem*, 275.

the late 1980's, cultural diversity slowly but steadily gained momentum in Dutch policy. In the 2011, the Code Cultural Diversity was developed, which was a new impulse for the anchoring of cultural diversity and inclusivity in the cultural sector in the Netherlands. In recent years, the Utrecht municipality also firmly put the subject on the local agenda of the subsidized cultural sector.

1.4. Relevance: cultural diversity

As seen in the previous section, identity processes have been and still are heavily influenced by globalization. One of the features of the globalization-process is an intensified migration process. This is clearly visible in the Netherlands. The composition of the Dutch population has significantly changed in the 20th century. Although migration is not a new phenomenon for the Dutch society, the numbers greatly intensified in the 20th century. In 1899, only 2% of the population was born in another country. Almost 80% of these people were born in Belgium or Germany.⁴⁴ These numbers changed dramatically in the second part of the 20th century, due to a series of migration waves.

After the Second World War, there was a large group of people from the Dutch colony of the Dutch Indies who migrated to the Netherlands. In 1945-1962, around 400.000 people settled in the Netherlands, of which 240.000 stayed permanently.⁴⁵ At the end of the 1950's, workers from other countries, specifically the countries around the Mediterranean Sea, were attracted. This led to the arrival of 225.000 migrants in the period of 1964-1973.⁴⁶ The Turks and Moroccans mostly settled in the Netherlands. In the 1970's, a lot of their families followed them to the Netherlands, which was an important factor for the migration pattern then.⁴⁷ At that same time, a lot of Surinamese people came to the Netherlands, as a result of the independence of Surinam and the better economic circumstances in the Netherlands.⁴⁸ In the second half of the 1980's, refugees started to be an important factor for the migration balance of the Netherlands, with the wars in former-Yugoslavia and political unrest in countries like Somalia as causes. This continued in the 1990's, adding refugees from Iraq and Afghanistan as important migration groups as well.⁴⁹ In the 2010's, the war in Syria led to a large stream of refugees arriving. In 2016, there were around 64.000 Syrians living in the Netherlands.⁵⁰ All these migration-waves, in combination with a continued stream of migration from countries around the world, have led to a great diversity of nationalities and cultures in Dutch society. In 2015, people from 200 countries were represented in the population of the Netherlands.⁵¹ In 2016, 9,8% of the people living in the Netherlands had a western (non-Dutch) background, mostly Indonesian, German, Polish or Belgian. 12,3% had a non-western background, mostly Turkish, Moroccan, Surinam and Antilleans. These numbers include both the so-called first- and second-generation immigrants, of which the second-generation are born in the Netherlands. The second-generation now makes up half of the people with a non-western background.⁵²

We see roughly the same pattern in Utrecht. The fourth biggest city in the Netherlands measured by number of inhabitants (349.234 in 2018) has a large, and growing, cultural diversity

⁴⁴ Han Nicolaas and Arno Sprangers, "Buitenlandse Migratie in Nederland 1795–2006: de Invloed op de Bevolkingssamenstelling," research report, published by the CBS, 7th of January 2007, 35.

⁴⁵ Idem, 38.

⁴⁶ Idem, 36, 37.

⁴⁷ Idem, 39, 40.

⁴⁸ Idem, 40, 41.

⁴⁹ Idem, 41.

⁵⁰ "Syrische immigranten wonen verspreid over Nederland," CBS.nl, last accessed at the 25th of April 2018, via <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2016/39/syrische-immigranten-wonen-verspreid-over-nederland>.

⁵¹ "Tweehonderd nationaliteiten in Nederland," Thepostonline.nl, last accessed at the 25th of April 2018, via <http://nieuws.tpo.nl/2015/04/24/tweehonderd-nationaliteiten-nederland/>.

⁵² "Bevolking naar migratieachtergrond," CBS.nl, last accessed at the 25th of April 2018, via <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/achtergrond/2016/47/bevolking-naar-migratieachtergrond>.

among its population. 166 nationalities are represented in Utrecht in 2018. In 2018, 34,6% of the population has a migration background. 23,1% of the population has a non-western background. There are 62.218 people that are first generation migrants, and 57.981 that are second generation migrants.⁵³ The biggest groups of migrants have a Moroccan, Turkish or Surinam background.⁵⁴

The growing cultural diversity led to society debate. In *Culturele Diversiteit, Nederlandse Identiteit en Democratisch Burgerschap* Halleh Ghorashi points to the hardening of the debate surrounding integration and cultural diversity, starting around 2000. The focus on integration had become much stronger, a trend that continues until today.⁵⁵ Ghorashi states that the current debate about multiculturalism and integration shows signs of a specific definition of culture: a static one, which states that cultures have a clear, single content and that cultures exclude each other by definition and are incompatible, with clear borders between them. This way of looking at culture is called the 'essentialist' definition of culture. This way of defining culture leads to the thought that one can explain someone's individual actions, by solely looking at their cultural background.⁵⁶ 'Polarization' has become a hot topic: the term refers to the deepening of differences between two groups and is often used to describe the growing differences between migrants and non-migrants.⁵⁷ According to Ghorashi, this goes together with what she describes as the trend of 'culturalization': a tendency in which the cultural difference between various ethnic groups is seen as the decisive factor in explaining social problems.⁵⁸ At the same time, there is a growing resistance against culturalization. Critique is that when culture is used as an explanation for difference, it is more likely that the borders between different ethnicities will be kept in place, than that both groups will get closer together.⁵⁹ According to Ghorashi, this has led to a paradox: the Dutch (civilians and politicians alike) do want to make space and create acknowledgment for cultural diversity, but at the same time are against reducing people to solely their cultural background.⁶⁰

1.5. Methodology

Three festivals in Utrecht serve as case studies: Festival Tweetakt, a theater, music and visual arts festival, the Nederlands Film Festival, a film festival, and Le Guess Who?, a music festival. These festivals were chosen because of a few factors. They are all located in Utrecht, which means they have to operate under the same circumstances in the sense of locality. Utrecht is a city with a rapidly growing cultural diversity in its population, which gives this topic some urgency for these festivals. All festivals are also subsidized by the municipality, which means, following the policy of the municipality, that the festivals have to have attention for cultural diversity in their policy. These uniting factors make a comparison between the festivals and their policy possible. I chose different arts disciplines to make sure the focus was on the arts festival as a platform, instead of one particular kind of festival that focusses on a specific discipline.

⁵³ "Samenstelling naar groepen," utrechtmonitor.nl, last accessed at the 26th of May 2018, via <http://www.utrecht-monitor.nl/bevolking-bestuur/bevolking/samenstelling-naar-groepen>.

⁵⁴ "Alle Cijfers gemeente Utrecht," allecijfers.nl, last accessed at the 26th of May 2018, via <https://allecijfers.nl/gemeente/utrecht/>.

⁵⁵ Halleh Ghorashi, *Culturele Diversiteit, Nederlandse Identiteit en Democratisch Burgerschap* (Den Haag: SDU Uitgevers, 2010), 15.

⁵⁶ Idem, 6, 7.

⁵⁷ Idem, 31-36.

⁵⁸ Idem, 1.

⁵⁹ Ibidem.

⁶⁰ Ibidem.

It is acknowledged that with studying cultural policy processes, there is an important role for case studies and 'thick description'.⁶¹ Using case studies allows a rich empirical study of the policy process. This approach is regarded as a suitable tool for explorative, open-ended research.⁶² Information about cultural diversity policy was collected in several ways.

First, by interviewing people of three festival organizations. The organization itself chose who represented them. The interviews were semi-structured, which meant the most important questions were set and a topic list was used, but there was room for probing.⁶³ Since this research is an explorative research, I found this method of interviewing best-suitable.⁶⁴ Afterwards, the interviews were transcribed and coded.⁶⁵ For the coding I used the method described by Herbert J. Rubin and Irene S. Rubin in *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. They analyze transcripts in such a way that discerning codes, themes and concepts which give insight in the sub-questions, is possible.⁶⁶

Second, I combined this thesis with an internship at the Publicity-department of Festival Tweetakt. I took on the role of the participant-observer, associated with the field of anthropological research.⁶⁷ This added an ethnographic dimension to the research. With ethnography, the researcher is concerned with understanding the world from the point of view of those studied.⁶⁸ Other authors, like Cris Shore and Susan Wright in *Anthropology of Policy: Perspectives on Governance and Power* and Alex Stevens in "Telling Policy Stories: an Ethnographic Study of the Use of Evidence in Policy-making in the UK" have used ethnographic approaches for policy-processes as well and pointed out the benefits of this.⁶⁹ The ethnographic approach gave me an opportunity to gain first-hand knowledge of how policy was applied, and a sense of how the topic was discussed in the daily setting of the arts festival. It showed me which direction to take for this thesis, helped me with asking the right questions during the interviews and guided me during the analysing of the data. Another key factor was that the internship provided me with an opportunity to gain access to the organizations and gain their trust. This was necessary, since the topic of cultural diversity has become a sensitive issue in the cultural sector. Without immersing myself into the cultural field with the internship, I do not think that doing this research would have been possible.

Third, I went to several meetings of cultural institutions, in which the topic was discussed. Examples were 'Utrecht Culturele Metropool in ontwikkeling!' and 'Saluti presents "Spiegels en ramen voor een inclusief Utrecht"'. These meetings helped me shape my research, because they gave insights in the obstacles and opportunities cultural institutions experienced with implementing cultural diversity policies, and the sentiments that were experienced about the topic.

Furthermore, the analyzing of policy documents, like annual reports and applications for subsidy, was used to gain more insight in the policy of the three festivals.

⁶¹ Bell and Oakley, *Cultural Policy*, 45.

⁶² Mirza, "Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts," 56.

⁶³ Kristen G. Esterberg, *Qualitative Methods in Social Research* (New York: McGrawHill, 2002), 150.

⁶⁴ Idem, 87, 88.

⁶⁵ See appendices for interview topic list and coding scheme.

⁶⁶ Herbert J. Rubin and Irene S. Rubin, "10. What did you hear? Data Analysis," in *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* (London: Sage, 2011), 228-245.

⁶⁷ Catherine Palmer, "Ethnography: a Research Method in Practice," *International Journal of Tourism Research* 3.4 (2001): 301.

⁶⁸ Ibidem.

⁶⁹ Cris Shore and Susan Wright, eds. *Anthropology of Policy: Perspectives on Governance and Power* (London: Routledge, 2003).

Alex Stevens, "Telling Policy Stories: an Ethnographic Study of the Use of Evidence in Policy-making in the UK," *Journal of Social Policy* 40.2 (2011): 237-255.

Chapter two – Theoretical Framework

2.1. Cultural policy

Cultural policy and how it is applied by arts festivals is the central tension field of this thesis. To research this, I first have to establish a framework of what is meant by the central concepts of the thesis. In this section, the concept of ‘cultural policy’ and the possibilities and limitations of studying it are discussed.

Cultural policy has been defined in many ways. David Bell and Kate Oakley define it in *Cultural Policy* as ‘the branch of public policy concerned with the administration of culture.’⁷⁰ Cultural policy is concerned with either the regulation of culture, the promotion of culture, or a mix of these two.⁷¹ In “Cultural Policy-making: Negotiations in an Overlapping Zone Between Culture, Politics and Money”, Geir Vestheim highlights four key groups concerned with cultural policy: elected politicians, bureaucrats/civil servants working in public administration, professionals working in cultural institutions or voluntary organizations in the cultural field, and professional artists and their interest organizations.⁷² Authors like Paul Cairney have tried to break down the complicated cultural policy process in comprehensible steps. In “Policy Concepts in 1000 Words: The Policy Cycle and its Stages” he discerns the following stages in the lifecycle of a policy: agenda setting, policy formulation, legitimation, implementation, evaluation, and policy maintenance, succession or termination.⁷³ Although it needs to be kept in mind that the reality of policy making is often not as linear as this model suggests, this lifecycle gives insight in the process and allows us to consider the role of different stakeholders at different moments in the process.⁷⁴

Studying cultural policy means diving into a complex subject. Bell and Oakley describe cultural policy as a ‘messy world of actors acting (or not) within specific contexts, with particular outcomes in mind, and whose actions produce effects (some intended, some not).’⁷⁵ It is important to understand the many different internal actors that contribute, in diverse ways, to policymaking.⁷⁶ At the same time, the impact of various external, structural forces needs to be kept in mind. Complex processes like for example globalization, geopolitical pressures, and migration issues all influence cultural policy.⁷⁷ Because cultural policy is part of government policy, it is easy to appoint the government as the most important actor in policymaking. However, cultural policy is not made in a simple top-down hierarch. Instead, there is a dense network of ‘policy circuits’ across and between the scales and levels, ranging from the local to the global.⁷⁸ Another important factor influencing cultural policy is the market, that shapes cultural policy in myriad ways.⁷⁹ Furthermore, it is hard to discern where cultural policy begins and ends. Jeremy Ahearne in “Cultural Policy Explicit and Implicit: A Distinction and Some Uses” makes a distinction between explicit and implicit cultural

⁷⁰ David Bell and Kate Oakley, *Cultural Policy* (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), 45.

⁷¹ *Idem*, 47.

⁷² Geir Vestheim, “Cultural Policy-making: Negotiations in an Overlapping Zone Between Culture, Politics and Money,” *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 18.5 (2012): 537.

⁷³ Paul Cairney, “Policy Concepts in 1000 Words: The Policy Cycle and its Stages,” last accessed at the 27th of May 2018 via <https://paulcairney.wordpress.com/2013/11/11/policy-concepts-in-1000-words-the-policy-cycle-and-its-stages/>.

⁷⁴ Bell and Oakley, *Cultural Policy*, 48.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁶ *Idem*, 53.

⁷⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁸ *Idem*, 46.

⁷⁹ *Idem*, 48, 49.

policy.⁸⁰ Explicit cultural policy is policy in a 'pure' form, that is specifically aimed at the cultural sector and the production, distribution, and consumption of cultural goods. Implicit cultural policy is described as "the unintended cultural side effects of various kinds of policy and those deliberate courses of action intended to shape cultures but which are not expressly thematized as such" and can be found in, for example, social and economic policy.⁸¹

2.2. Cultural diversity in Dutch cultural policy

This research focusses on a specific type of cultural policy: cultural diversity policy. Policy interest in cultural diversity increased steadily over the last decades, on multiple political and practical levels.⁸² Both nation-states and international institutions like UNESCO have since the 1980's and 1990's specifically involved cultural and identity policies in their overall policy.⁸³ With globalization and mass-migration, it is no surprise that the Dutch government also started implementing cultural diversity themes in their cultural policy. In this section, I describe the policy starting from when it first became a major topic at the end of the 1980's, until the implementation of the Code Cultural Diversity (CCD) in 2011.

From the end of the 1980's, the emerging cultural diversity in Dutch society for the first time resulted in cultural diversity being a major, explicitly-formulated point on the agenda of governmental cultural policy. From 1989 to 1998, Hedy d'Anacona and Aad Nuis followed a 'target groups policy' ('doelgroepenbeleid'). Groups from migrant-backgrounds were specifically targeted to be more invested in the arts and culture.⁸⁴ The policy shifted away from this focus in 1999, when the Dutch ministry of Education, Culture and Science launched the research report "Ruim Baan voor Culturele Diversiteit".⁸⁵ In this report, minister Rick van der Ploeg stated that the cultural sector was not diverse enough in the areas of the programming and audiences. He posed that 'allochtonen' (minorities) did not participate in the network of established subsidized cultural activities, but had their own lively cultural activities, under the radar.⁸⁶ He was critical of the Dutch cultural diversity policy up to that point, which he characterizes as an 'intercultural approach', that focused on encounters and exchanges of cultures. This had, according to Van der Ploeg, led to a situation in which the singularity of cultures did not receive enough attention.⁸⁷ That is why Van der Ploeg in "Ruim Baan voor Culturele Diversiteit" formulated a policy based on three pillars: singularity, meetings, and accessibility.⁸⁸ He proposed to get a substantial budget for this policy.⁸⁹ This policy document formed the basis of the cultural policy on cultural diversity from 2001 until 2004.⁹⁰

⁸⁰ Jeremy Ahearne, "Cultural Policy Explicit and Implicit: a Distinction and Some Uses," *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15(2): 141-153.

⁸¹ Idem, 144.

⁸² Charles David Throsby, *The Economics of Cultural Policy 9* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 174.

⁸³ Mirza, "Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts," 55. Throsby, *The Economics of Cultural Policy 9*, 174.

⁸⁴ Carmelita Serkei, "Strategische Posities Bezetten. Cultuurpoliek en Culturele Diversiteit," *Zicht op actieve cultuurparticipatie 2016: Thema's en trends in praktijk en beleid* (2016): 36-43.

⁸⁵ Rick van der Ploeg, "Ruim Baan voor Culturele Diversiteit," Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, May 1999.

⁸⁶ Idem, 1-8.

⁸⁷ Idem, 13.

⁸⁸ Idem, 14.

⁸⁹ Idem, 21,22.

⁹⁰ Ronald Plasterk, letter from the minister of Education, Culture and Science, Ronald Plasterk, to the chairman of the House of Representatives. The Hague, 24th of April 2009.

From 2005 until 2008, ‘intercultural programming’ was the central topic in the cultural policy of Secretary of State Medy van der Laan. She wanted to stimulate the collaboration between regular and multicultural circuits. The practical effectuation was put in the hands of cultural institutions themselves.⁹¹ Van der Laan gave funding to several cultural organizations that were focused on stimulating cultural diversity: for example Netwerk CS, that was founded in 2001 to spread knowledge and expertise about cultural diversity.⁹² This organization stopped its activities in 2009, but presented the new Education, Culture and Science minister Ronald Plasterk with an extensive research report on the state-of-being of cultural diversity in the cultural sector and a list of recommendations: “De olifant in de kamer. Staalkaart culturele diversiteit in de basisinfrastructuur”.⁹³ In this document, Netwerk CS formulated the recommendation of establishing a CCD. Minister Plasterk agreed with this and suggested the implementation of such a Code to stakeholders in the cultural field.⁹⁴

The suggestion of Netwerk CS and Plasterk’s agreement with this resulted in the founding of the ‘Stuurgroep Code Culturele Diversiteit’. This organization consisted of the managing board of three branch organizations and four sector institutions and had as its goal to make a Code Cultural Diversity (after this, called ‘CCD’). This code was deemed necessary by the sector itself, because “cultural diversity was still not anchored in the (publicly funded) cultural sector”.⁹⁵ The Stuurgroep Code Culturele Diversiteit stated that they saw the emergence of two cultural worlds at the horizon: one with culturally diverse activities and a diverse audience, and one with ‘regular’ activities and a ‘regular’ audience. This was deemed undesirable.⁹⁶ Although there was pressure from the government to create a CCD, an important feature of the Code that came into being was thus that the content and form were determined by the sector itself. The document states: “Rather than waiting and having something imposed top-down, the sector itself has taken the lead to develop a code that it deems workable.”⁹⁷ The CCD was launched in 2011.⁹⁸

The CCD states that cultural diversity refers to a specific characteristic: ethnic-cultural background.⁹⁹ It uses the term ‘allochtonen’ to specify which group the Code is aimed at involving in cultural life. This term has become a standard term in Dutch language, but can have negative connotations. The definition that is used, comes from the Centraal Bureau Statistiek, which states that an ‘allochtoon’ is someone with at least one parent who was born outside of the Netherlands. There is a distinction made between western allochtonen and non-western allochtonen. The Code justifies the choice for this term as “a pragmatic one”:

“Although the term “allochtoon” is unmistakable socially and politically charged, the definition applies as (policy and research) standard as well. Using this definition makes it possible to establish a relationship between the personal and/or administrative composition of the cultural organization and demographic developments in its service area, as well as benchmarking in and outside the sector. A disadvantage of this definition is that the

⁹¹ Ronald Plasterk, letter from the minister of Education, Culture and Science, Ronald Plasterk, to the chairman of the House of Representatives. The Hague, 24th of April 2009.

⁹² “Netwerk CS stopt na 2008,” mediamatic.net, last accessed at the 29th of April 2018, via <https://www.mediamatic.net/nl/page/286581/netwerk-cs-stopt-na-2008>.

⁹³ Ronald Plasterk, letter from the minister of Education, Culture and Science, Ronald Plasterk, to the chairman of the House of Representatives. The Hague, 24th of April 2009.

⁹⁴ Ibidem.

⁹⁵ “Code Culturele Diversiteit”, 4.

⁹⁶ Ibidem.

⁹⁷ Idem, 5.

⁹⁸ Ibidem.

⁹⁹ Idem, 4.

third generation non-western immigrants belongs to the autochthonous population and thus disappears from sight.”¹⁰⁰

The goal of the CCD is “that cultural organizations start working with cultural diversity not incidentally and fragmented, but sustainable and with an integral approach”.¹⁰¹ The CCD states that diversity policy is not only confined to making interventions meant to stimulate the participation of a specific target audience, but strives to create an inclusive organization strategy and culture, in which difference is appreciated and the organization has gotten rid of old routines. The concept of diversity, according to the CCD, works from the universal belief that different backgrounds can have an added value on all levels in an organization, which is crucial for optimal functioning in a globalized world.¹⁰² The CCD has four P’s as pillars for implementing cultural diversity: Programming, Public, Personnel and Partners.¹⁰³ Besides the four P’s, the Code is formed by principles and provisions. “The principles indicate the principles for adequately shaping diversity in the cultural institution”, “can be understood as broad supported views on a proper diversity policy and are generally applicable to all cultural institutions” and have been elaborated in concrete provisions. The provisions describe the behavior through which diversity in the practice of cultural institutions can be promoted.¹⁰⁴ The principles are Vision, Policy, Learning Capacity and Supervision and Responsibility, and these are accompanied by a range of specific supervisions.¹⁰⁵

In 2016, an action plan titled ‘Actieplan Cultuur en Creatief Inclusief’, was developed by the ‘Federatie Cultuur’, an organization which unites eight branch organizations in the cultural sector.¹⁰⁶ This plan has four pillars: renewing the CCD, especially with regard to the definition of ‘cultural diversity’; campaigning, to give the CCD more publicity; monitoring the cultural diversity in the sector; and giving clear guidelines and trainings to institutions.¹⁰⁷ The fact that five years after the implementation of the CCD there was an action plan developed by a different organization, signals some of the intricacies and frictions surrounding the CCD and the issue of implementing cultural diversity in the cultural field. As its primary goal of the action plan, the document states:

“The definition of cultural diversity is under discussion. Moreover, other forms of diversity are the subject of debate. How broad or narrow should we take cultural diversity and is it not better to speak of inclusiveness? We are starting this discussion, in the cultural sector, but also with other sectors where this broad social issue plays a role. Think of the media, education, science. We come up with a revised definition and adapt the code accordingly.”¹⁰⁸

As to 2018, the Federatie Cultuur has not yet published any results or news about the progress of this process yet.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁰ “Code Culturele Diversiteit”, 4.

¹⁰¹ *Idem*, 3.

¹⁰² *Ibidem*.

¹⁰³ *Idem*, 4.

¹⁰⁴ *Idem*, 5.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰⁶ “Actieplan Cultuur en Creatief Inclusief,” published by De Federatie Cultuur (FC), 2016.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰⁹ Federratiecultuur.nl, last accessed at the 2nd of July 2018, via <https://federatiecultuur.nl/>.

2.3. Cultural diversity policy in Utrecht

In the previous sections we established the cultural diversity policy of the national government. However, it is important to take the local context in which the festivals have to operate in consideration as well. All three festivals are located in Utrecht and get substantial parts of their funding from the municipality. In recent years, the municipality has firmly put cultural diversity on the agenda in their cultural policy.

In “Open Ruimte. Cultuurvisie 2012 – 2022”, published in November 2011, the municipality mentions that the following of the Code Good Governance and CCD is something that they expect cultural institutions to “take seriously”, if they want to apply for the four-yearly subsidy.¹¹⁰ Although an aim to have a ‘culturally diverse cultural sector’ is mentioned at other places in the document as well, this statement is not specified.¹¹¹ In September 2015, the statement about the CCD is repeated in “Creatieve lijnen. Uitgangspuntennotitie Cultuurnota 2017-2020”: “We also call attention to the Code Cultural Diversity. This code offers guidance on anchoring cultural diversity in the field of programming personnel, public and partners structurally in the organization.” No further attention is given to it in the rest of the document.¹¹² In May 2016, the advisory committee puts greater emphasis on cultural diversity in “Utrecht, Culturele Metropool in Ontwikkeling. Advies Commissie Cultuurnota 2017 – 2022”. They state that cultural institutions “have a big responsibility when it comes to responding to social developments” and “As a committee, we asked ourselves how the cultural sector handles the increasing cultural diversity”. They think there is “really a world to win with the Code Cultural Diversity as a starting point” and “strongly advise the municipality of Utrecht to enter into dialogue with the cultural field about this in the full breadth of programming, public, staff, management and partners.”¹¹³ They elaborate:

“... the committee sees insufficient developments happening that cater to the composition of the population. In the eyes of the committee, both in the audience as on the stage there is too little diversity. The Code Cultural Diversity is part of the requirements for grants, but reflections about the concerning points of attention can be found insufficiently in the policy plans.”¹¹⁴

The committee continues that it has “noticed that in the starting points memorandum, the municipality does ask for attention for the subject of cultural diversity, but that this subject plays no explicit role in the assessment criteria” and advises to “make institutions more aware of this subject by the next advisory cycle and make it a point of attention for committees in next culture notes.”¹¹⁵

The municipality reacts directly on this advice, and the same signal given by the Raad voor Cultuur on a national level, in “Nota Subsidievoorstellen. Cultuurnota 2017–2020”, published in September 2016, in which they state:

“We find this in all its aspects (programming, personnel, participation and audience reach) an important theme. We have already entered a dialogue with the sector and we expect this to be an important point of development the coming years. The aim with this is inclusivity:

¹¹⁰ “Open Ruimte. Cultuurvisie 2012 – 2022,” published by the Gemeente Utrecht, November 2011, 17.

¹¹¹ Idem, 3, 15.

¹¹² “Creatieve lijnen. Uitgangspuntennotitie Cultuurnota 2017-2020,” published by the Gemeente Utrecht, september 2015, 9.

¹¹³ “Utrecht, Culturele Meteropool in Ontwikkeling. Advies Commissie Cultuurnota 2012 – 2022,” published by the Gemeente Utrecht, May 2016, 9.

¹¹⁴ Idem, 15.

¹¹⁵ Idem, 19.

including everyone in society. With this, the focus is not only on ethnicity, but also on age and level of education, and especially the groups that are not reached enough by the current (subsidized) supply. The challenge for strengthening inclusivity is relevant for all cultural institutions. It is important to lower the threshold of what is offered in the area of culture, the whole city can be used as a stage in this and especially the neighborhood culture houses play a key role in this.”¹¹⁶

The municipality gives no clear guidelines to the cultural institutions about how to stimulate inclusivity or what kinds of criteria they will use to judge the institutions.¹¹⁷ This policy is in line with the instrumentalism that is now common in cultural policy, elaborated on in chapter one: policy is no longer only based on aesthetic criteria, but culture is assessed on its influence in other societal areas as well.

2.4. Arts festivals and implementing new policy

After establishing what cultural policy is and describing the cultural diversity policy the festivals have to comply to, the next step is to look at the festival structure: how are festivals theoretically speaking equipped to implement new kinds of policy, like cultural diversity policy as it is elaborated on in the CCD? It has been noted that festival organizations both face unique opportunities and difficulties regarding the implementation of novel ideas in their policy, like cultural diversity, that have to do with how the festival organization functions and how the festival is structured.¹¹⁸ Here, I outline the most important features of festivals, to get a deeper understanding of how this particular form of a cultural organization functions. The characteristics that can both positively and negatively influence the way in which new policy, like the current cultural diversity policy, is applied, are described in detail. These are used in the analysis in the next chapter.

Arts festivals have a structure that is quite different from other actors in the cultural field. Work must be done under time pressure and in a relatively turbulent, dynamic environment.¹¹⁹ The organization changes throughout the year, with most of the time only a very small consistent team working year-round at the festival. When the festival comes closer, the organization quickly grows, adding temporary employees, freelancers, and volunteers.¹²⁰ Furthermore, festival work is a highly cooperative endeavour. Mia Larson states in “Festival Innovation: Complex and Dynamic Network Interaction” that the festival organization can be seen as an inter-organizational network, where everyone works with the event based on different interests.¹²¹ She sums up the different actors who interact in a festival network, as they have been identified in other literature, as following:

¹¹⁶ “Nota Subsidievoorstellen. Cultuurnota 2017–2020,” published by the Gemeente Utrecht, September 2016, 9.

¹¹⁷ There is only a mention of Utrecht Marketing having the aim to use new technological possibilities to better reach now underrepresented audience groups and by this, make the cultural sector more inclusive. The goal is to give institutions the chance to join this initiative when it is fully developed. No further mention of this initiative is made throughout the document.

Idem, 10.

¹¹⁸ Although it is possible that the three organizations have always had cultural diversity as an policy issue and it may thus not be an entirely novel idea to implement, the recent policy changes by the municipality and the establishing of the CCD have undoubtedly affected the interpretation of the term and the execution of the policy. That is why we still speak about cultural diversity as a ‘new idea’.

¹¹⁹ Mia Larson, “Innovation and Creativity in Festival Organizations,” *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 20:3-4 (2011): 303.

¹²⁰ Mia Larson, “Festival Innovation: Complex and Dynamic Network Interaction,” *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 9:2-3 (2009): 299.

¹²¹ Idem, 289.

- “1. The festival organization consisting of management, staff and volunteers
2. The audience
3. The city/municipality
4. The sector connected to the festival theme
5. Restaurants, market vendors and voluntary associations
6. The media
7. Suppliers of goods and services
8. Sponsors
9. Allied festivals
10. The public (made up of the people who live in the community where the festival is held)”¹²²

This already shows the great diversity that festivals embody. All these different actors have, possibly different, utilitarian interests with the investment in the relationship with the festival organizer.¹²³

Larson states that to understand the complexity of the event organization, one must see it as a ‘project network’: “a web of relationships in which no single actor can act as a legitimate authority for the network as a whole”. She continues: “The network is open in that there are no absolute criteria for how the boundaries of the network are identified and controlled. It is also temporary, dynamically mutable and can be partially reconstructed from one project to the next.”¹²⁴

Understanding the festival organization thus means not only understanding the interaction between the festival organizer and the different stakeholders, but also the relations between the stakeholders themselves.¹²⁵

In the introduction, we used the definition of arts festivals used by del Barrio, Devesa and Herrero from “Evaluating Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Case of Cultural Festivals”, which specifically stated that innovation is part of the festival structure.¹²⁶ How this is the case precisely is discussed by Mia Larson in “Innovation and Creativity in Festival Organizations” and “Festival Innovation: Complex and Dynamic Network Interaction”. She asks the question how festival organizations do innovative work and implement new ideas in their policy.¹²⁷

Regarding the motivation of festivals, she states that change can occur in two ways: as a reaction, or in a more proactive manner. In the first sense, innovation is related to the ability to perceive tendencies in the market and society, and adapting the festival, accordingly. In this case, the motivation to change is extrinsic. When change occurs in a proactive manner, the festival has the ambition to be ahead of the market. Instead of adapting the event to the market, a festival has the goal of reconstructing the market itself, by achieving creative, innovative products. There is an intrinsic motivation.¹²⁸

Larson states that “an important challenge for the festival organizer is to foster moderate change dynamics in the festival network, i.e. to balance long-term stability with changes that lead to

¹²² Larson, “Festival Innovation,” 290, 291.

Mia Larson, *Festivalbesökaren – Marknadsföringskanaler och attityder till Storsjöyrans* (Örnsköldsvik: ETOUR, 2000), 3.

Donald Getz, Tommy Andersson and Mia Larson, “Festival Stakeholder Roles: Concepts and Case Studies, *Event Management*, 10.2–3 (2007): 103–122.

¹²³ Larson, “Festival Innovation,” 300.

¹²⁴ Idem, 291.

¹²⁵ Idem, 304.

¹²⁶ Del Barrio, Devesa, and Herrero, “Evaluating Intangible Cultural Heritage,” 236.

¹²⁷ Larson, “Festival Innovation,” 288-307.

Larson, “Innovation and Creativity,” 287-310.

¹²⁸ Larson, “Innovation and Creativity,” 300.

renewal.”¹²⁹ It has been found that festival organizations find it difficult to plan innovation in the complex and dynamic network which they are in. However, they were often ready to rapidly respond to opportunities as they arose.¹³⁰ She concludes that “innovation work in festivals can be characterized as ad hoc, emergent, and more or less improvised”.¹³¹ Although much of the literature on organizing events and festivals treats it as a “series of planned and orchestrated actions”, she concludes from her case studies of music festivals in Sweden that organizing festivals involves a lot of unexpected departures and unforeseeable events, and “can be seen as improvisational by nature”.¹³² Changes are often made in small steps, that respond to emerging possibilities. Processes turn out to be fragmented, development-orientated, and largely intuitive. “Seen from a long-term perspective, the innovation work in the festivals can be understood as largely incremental with elements of occasional major leaps.” These changes tend to take place over time without predetermined time frames.¹³³ Improvisation is an important factor in this. Larson states that improvisation in festival organizations is mostly produced by people with previous experience and knowledge on the subject in question, who are thus equipped with the right skills to deal with unforeseen circumstances.¹³⁴ Improvisation in connection with totally unknown situations or improvisation that is performed by inexperienced individuals, on the other hand, is regarded as risky and discouraged.¹³⁵

Larson points to several advantages and disadvantages of the structure of the festival organization that affect the way in which they deal with implementing new policy actions.

First, that the festival works as a network, with all the partners summed up above involved, offers both opportunities and disadvantages for making change possible. All these actors can help facilitate the process of change in a festival.¹³⁶ On the other hand, having various interests interact in a process of change like this, can generate conflict.¹³⁷ It is also possible that these actors, actively or passively, undermine change. In some cases, change can only be facilitated by teaming up with new partners.¹³⁸ However, festivals often prefer more long-term relationships due to the stability and certainty of this, which makes it more difficult to change policies.¹³⁹ These contradictory interests complicate the implementation of new policy and change-making.

Second, there is the fact that festivals are recurring projects. Recurring projects seem to have the potential for the developing and reinventing of work processes, which leads to the innovation of the product, because each year is a new opportunity to learn from previous experiences and implement these in new settings. However, interestingly enough, this is often not the case. In general, when the team perceives the project as a repetition of tasks performed previously, operational efficiency leads to routinizations, which leads to the work being institutionalized. This way, organizations tend to stick to the methods that worked before.¹⁴⁰ In literature, this has been called ‘the innovation paradox’.¹⁴¹ It has been found to be at least partly applicable to certain

¹²⁹ Larson, “Innovation and Creativity,” 301, 302.

¹³⁰ Idem, 303.

¹³¹ Idem, 307

¹³² Larson, “Festival Innovation,” 293.

¹³³ Larson, “Innovation and Creativity,” 303.

¹³⁴ Idem, 304.

¹³⁵ Ibidem.

¹³⁶ Idem, 296, 297.

¹³⁷ Larson, “Festival Innovation,” 301.

¹³⁸ Idem, 301, 302.

¹³⁹ Idem, 302.

¹⁴⁰ Larson, “Innovation and Creativity,” 288, 290, 295.

¹⁴¹ Idem, 288, 290.

See for example:

festivals.¹⁴² With festivals, it is usually aggravated by the high time pressure to accomplish things in a short period of time, which leaves little time to reflect and implement changes.¹⁴³

Professionalization can form another restraint on the implementation of new policy. Larson states that when festivals exist for a longer period, like in the three case studies discussed here, professionalization takes place and specialized persons are engaged for specific functions. There occurs an institutionalization of the festival: the festival's value and existence no longer need to be justified. When a festival is seen as an institution, its audience and stakeholders have clear notions about what the festival stands for, which means that changing direction becomes more difficult.¹⁴⁴

On the other hand, the implementation of innovative ideas is also dependent on the composition of the team. When new individuals come into the team, they bring with them new expectations and experiences. They can have new solutions to problems, which may yield innovation.¹⁴⁵ The changing composition of the team working on the festival can thus be an advantage for implementing new policy actions.

2.5. Critically reflecting on cultural diversity policy in the arts

In "Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts: A Case Study of the Rich Mix Centre in East London" Munira Mirza comments on the growing emphasis on cultural diversity in cultural policies. She poses that the "increased prominence of diversity as a principle in arts policy discourse is widely regarded as a positive development in the UK and internationally."¹⁴⁶ However: "There is rarely much critical discussion about its problems in the workings of arts institutions amongst either cultural policy academics or cultural professionals."¹⁴⁷ In the previous section, I looked at both the opportunities and disadvantages arts festivals have with implementing new policy, related to their specific organizational structure. To fully grasp the possible discrepancy between this specific type of policy and the practical implementation of it by arts festivals, it is relevant to take Mirza's assertion about critical discussion to heart as well and look at how and why this type of policy has been criticized in academic theory and by the cultural sector itself. In this section, I outline the arguments of different authors with different ideas about intricacies with cultural diversity policy and its practical implementation by arts institutions.

Mirza sees inherent tensions between the objectives of cultural diversity policies and the notion of universalism, which continues to have an influence on the arts by the aspiration to strive for 'excellence'.¹⁴⁸ She states:

"This approach to cultural policy is less explicitly oriented towards promoting a particular kind of culture ('the best'), and more concerned with using culture to engage with people on their own terms and develop their individual subjectivity for social and economic ends.

Diversity is, therefore, seen to have economic or commercial value, as well as a social value

E. Ekstedt, R.A. Lundin, A. Söderholm, and H. Wirdenius, *Neo-industrial Organising, Renewal by Action and Knowledge Formation in a Project-Intensive Economy* (London: Routledge, 2011).

E. Ekstedt, R.A. Lundin, and H. Wirdenius, "Conceptions and Renewal in Swedish Construction Companies," *European Management Journal*, 10, (1992): 202–209.

R.A. Lundin and A. Söderholm, "A Theory of the Temporary Organization," *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 11 (1995): 437–455.

¹⁴² Larson, "Innovation and Creativity," 308.

¹⁴³ Larson, "Festival Innovation," 303.

¹⁴⁴ Larson, "Innovation and Creativity," 288.

¹⁴⁵ Idem, 299.

¹⁴⁶ Mirza, "Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts," 65.

¹⁴⁷ Ibidem.

¹⁴⁸ Mirza, "Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts," 65.

relating to community cohesion and personal development. Above all, the rhetoric of diversity – even when invoked in slightly different ways – is self-avowedly against ‘traditional’ models of cultural policy.”¹⁴⁹

This is the core of Mirza’s argument. Mirza argues that this shift from liberal-humanist ideas about universal value to a focus on diversity has profoundly affected arts organizations in their practice. In her argument, she relies on Len Ang, who argues in “The Predicament of Diversity: Multiculturalism in Practice at the Art Museum” that despite the desire to develop multicultural practice in the art gallery or museum, its adherence to the principle of ‘art for art’s sake’ remains a fundamental barrier to achieving plural perspectives and more accessible exhibitions.¹⁵⁰ Ang states: “The idea of cultural diversity cannot be taken too far, because to do so would destabilize the very purpose of the art museum as a site for universal appreciation of knowledge”.¹⁵¹ Mirza chooses to study a case study to approach this problem, because “Official policy rhetoric can often hide contradictions that are only apparent in practice.”¹⁵² Her case study is Rich Mix, a multi-functional arts center in London’s multi-ethnic East End. Mirza concludes that “Rich Mix is caught between discourses of universalism and diversity, leading to confusion over the project’s rationale and ambivalence amongst artists about how their art is judged.”¹⁵³ Mirza finds that the inherent contradiction between the discourse of universal value and the discourse about diversity in the policy of the project lead to ambiguities in the whole project. Furthermore, she finds that “The aims of Rich Mix reveal a contradictory approach to culture. On the one hand, there is a desire to see culture as something that transcends communities and is accessible to anyone prepared to understand it as a *thing in itself*. Culture is judged in terms of its artistic ‘excellence’. On the other hand, there is an emphasis on culture as identity-based, relative and ‘authentic’ to local people.”¹⁵⁴ With her argument, she shows that even though the concept of cultural diversity is now deeply rooted in policy, we need to stay critical of the implications of policies and keep examining how official policy is translated in practical day-to-day decision-making processes in the cultural sector.

Besides making her argument, Mirza gives an interesting overview of how different groups of thinkers have interpreted cultural diversity policies. I sum these up here, to use these in the analysis of the interviews in the next chapter, to see which one of these stances is (implicitly) used. Mirza’s first group of thinkers are advocates of diversity policies in the urban context, who see this shift to diversity policies as a crucial way to address social questions.¹⁵⁵ An example of such a thinker is Michael Keith, who in *After the Cosmopolitan: Multicultural Cities and the Future of Racism* sees in the ‘romance of the multicultural urbanism’ the potential for physical regeneration but also the restructuring of social relations within the wider city.¹⁵⁶ Mirza also distinguishes a group of authors who have pointed out that the focus on cultural identity is inherently differentiating, and therefore not fit to generate a common political discourse. Examples are Tod Gitlin in “From Universality to Difference: Notes on the Fragmentation of the Idea of the Left”, Kenan Malik in *The Meaning of Race*, Michel Savaric in “Political Corectness Applied: Multiculturalism in Northern Ireland” and Wendy

¹⁴⁹ Mirza, “Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts,” 58.

¹⁵⁰ Idem, 55.

¹⁵¹ Len Ang, “The Predicament of Diversity: Multiculturalism in Practice at the Art Museum,” *Ethnicities*, 5 (3), 305–320.

¹⁵² Mirza, “Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts,” 55.

¹⁵³ Ibidem.

¹⁵⁴ Idem, 64.

¹⁵⁵ Mirza, “Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts,” 55.

¹⁵⁶ Michael Keith, *After the Cosmopolitan: Multicultural Cities and the Future of Racism* (Oxon/New York: Routledge, 2005), 128.

Brown in *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*.¹⁵⁷ These authors make the same argument as Mirza, but lift it out of the contexts of the artistic alone, and instead apply it to society as a whole. Mirza describes the core of these authors' arguments as following:

"The concept of diversity challenges the notion of universality not only in the museum but also in the local community where it operates. According to these arguments, culture is inherently incapable of surpassing the types of solidarity created by more conventional political activity, relying as it does on a particular emphasis on ethnic identity which is bound to specific communities."¹⁵⁸

Brown even goes beyond this and, according to Mirza, argues that the emphasis on difference can actually strengthen the focus on cultural identity, which can actively hinder cultural change or the mixing of cultures. Hereby, she joins authors like Adam Kuper in *Culture: the Anthropologist's Account*, Jean-François Bayart in *The Illusion of Cultural Identity*, and Kwame Anthony Appiah in *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, who all suggest that underlying the demands for cultural relativism and difference are claims for cultural essentialism.¹⁵⁹ In the same line of thought, Mirza cites people from the cultural sector itself, who fear that the focus on cultural diversity actually presents an essentialized, and thus racialized view of artists and audiences. Examples are Rashee Araeen in "A History on the Margins" and Sonya Dyer in "Boxed in: How Cultural Diversity Policies Restrict Black Artists".¹⁶⁰ Talking about an exhibition that was the result of a specific cultural diversity policy effort of the government of the United Kingdom, Dyer asks herself:

"...what is meant by 'culturally diverse' art or artists? Does art made by someone who happens to be non-white automatically count as 'diverse?' Can't we (non-white people) ever just make *art*?"¹⁶¹

Dyer claims that cultural diversity policies are "creating more problems than they solve" by structurally setting black artists apart by creating a separate system of funding and exhibition, patronizing minorities by treating them as if they are incapable of making it into artistic 'mainstream'

¹⁵⁷ Tod Gitlin, "From Universality to Difference: Notes on the Fragmentation of the Idea of the Left," in: Craig Calhoun, ed., *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity* (Cambridge, MA/Oxford: Blackwell, 1994): 150–174.

Kenan Malik, *The Meaning of Race* (Basingstoke/London: Macmillan, 1996).

Michel Savaric, "Political Correctness Applied: Multiculturalism in Northern Ireland," *Contemporary Post-colonial and Post-imperial Literature in English*, 2001, available from: <http://www.thecore.nus.edu.sg/post/poldiscourse/casablanca/savaric2.html>.

Wendy Brown, *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

¹⁵⁸ Mirza, "Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts," 56.

¹⁵⁹ Ibidem.

Adam Kuper, *Culture: the Anthropologist's Account* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1999).

Jean-François Bayart, *The Illusion of Cultural Identity* (London: C. Hurst & Co, 2005).

Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2006).

¹⁶⁰ Mirza, "Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts," 56.

Rasheed Araeen, "A History on the Margins," *Spikedonline*, 26 February 2004, available from: <http://www.spiked-onlin.com/Articles/0000000CA421.html>.

Sonya Dyer, "Boxed In: How Cultural Diversity Policies Restrict Black Artists," (London: Manifesto Club, 2007).

¹⁶¹ Sonya Dyer, "Boxed In: How Cultural Diversity Policies Restrict Black Artists," 1.

and denying the existence of non-white artists, administrators and curators who have already successfully entered this mainstream.¹⁶²

Other authors have drawn attention to other, less artistic, complicating factors regarding cultural diversity policies. They see difficulties with how the government is handling the topic via their policy, or even question if the state is the right party to stimulate this at all. In "Superdiversity and Its Implications" Steven Vertovec problematizes the way in which governments define the term 'diversity' in their policies. He argues that the government and other policy-makers need to change their view on what diversity is, to really do justice to the current situation regarding multiculturalism and cultural diversity. He introduces the term 'super-diversity', for two reasons. The first is to underscore the fact that "in addition to more people now migrating from more places, significant new conjunctions and interactions of variables have arisen through patterns of immigration to the UK over the past decade; their outcomes surpass the ways - in public discourse, policy debates and academic literature - that we usually understand diversity in Britain."¹⁶³ The second is to remind social scientists and policy-makers to "take more sufficient account of the conjunction of ethnicity with a range of other variables when considering the nature of various 'communities', their composition, trajectories, interactions and public service needs."¹⁶⁴ He thus makes a plea for stepping away from the current situation, in which diversity is only observed as ethnicity and country of origin, and those two confusingly enough are also used interchangeably, because this provides a "misleading, one-dimensional appreciation of contemporary diversity".¹⁶⁵ Vertovec states that "there is much to be gained by a multidimensional perspective on diversity, both in terms of moving beyond 'the ethnic group as either the unit of analysis or sole object of study' (Glick Schiller et al . 2006, p. 613) and by appreciating the coalescence of factors which condition people's lives."¹⁶⁶ Vertovec sums up the multiple dimensions of differentiation that characterizes the emergent social patterns and conditions that can be observed since the intensification and diversification of the migration pattern in the early 1990's as following:

"country of origin (comprising a variety of possible subset traits such as ethnicity, language[s], religious tradition, regional and local identities, cultural values and practices), migration channel (often related to highly gendered flows and specific social networks), legal status (determining entitlement to rights), migrants' human capital (particularly educational background), access to employment (which may or may not be in immigrants' hands), locality (related especially to material conditions, but also the nature and extent of other immigrant and ethnic minority presence), transnationalism (emphasizing how migrants' lives are lived with significant reference to places and peoples elsewhere) and the usually chequered responses by local authorities, services providers and local residents (which often tend to function by way of assumptions based on previous experiences with migrants and ethnic minorities)."¹⁶⁷

The complex interplays between these factors shape the experiences, opportunities, constraints and trajectories facing newcomers, as well as the wider set of social and economic relations within the

¹⁶² Dyer, "Boxed In: How Cultural Diversity Policies Restrict Black Artists," 1.

2.

¹⁶³ Steven Vertovec, "Super-diversity and Its Implications," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30:6 (2007): 1024-1054. 1025.

¹⁶⁴ Ibidem.

¹⁶⁵ Ibidem.

¹⁶⁶ Idem, 1026.

¹⁶⁷ Vertovec, "Super-diversity and Its Implications," 1049.

places where they reside.¹⁶⁸ Vertoyec emphasizes: “Fresh and novel ways of understanding and responding to such complex interplays must be fashioned if we are to move beyond the frameworks derived from an earlier, significantly different, social formation. A range of existing frameworks, including those which focus on ethnicity as the predominant or even sole criterion marking social processes, should be reshaped and extended.”¹⁶⁹ For Vertoyec, the recognition, appreciation and implementation of super-diversity in policies is a necessary next step for public policies to be “better suited to the needs and condition of immigrants, ethnic minorities and the wider population of which they are inherently part”.¹⁷⁰ ¹⁷¹ The term ‘super-diversity’ and, more general, the move away from diversity only seen through the paradigm of ethnicity and country of origin, are relevant for the Dutch cultural diversity policy as well. As we have seen when describing the CCD and the policy of Utrecht, although central to the policy, the term ‘cultural diversity’ is filled with ambiguities: it is either vaguely defined or referring to ‘ethnic-cultural background’ only, as in the CCD. As we saw in the last case, these definitions attract critique from the cultural sector itself as well. Vertoyec reminds us that we must not gloss over the problem of the definition of ‘cultural diversity’ and how it is used in (cultural) policy by governments, since this makes up the framework for how arts institutions deal with it.

The core of Vertoyec’s argument is that the governments and sectors should nuance, broaden and specify their definition of cultural diversity. Michael Rushton goes one step further than Vertoyec in “Cultural Diversity and Public Funding of the Arts: A View From Cultural Economics”. Rushton’s article addresses how the economic analysis of public funding of the arts changes in a multicultural setting.¹⁷² He argues that the state is not the correct party to stimulate cultural diversity in the arts sector, for several economic reasons. In addition to this, he addresses one point in particular which is interesting for our topic:

“Even the simple recognition of diverse cultures by a public bureaucracy will carry significant potential for error. If public funding is to become more diverse, the information requirements of government substantially increase. There would need to be assessment of how to divide the total funds among illdefined groups and then the development of some mechanism of allocating funding within those groups. Defining minority cultures is not a small problem. In the first place, most individuals now enjoy experiences from a variety of cultures; we are becoming cultural “omnivores,” in the apt words of Peterson and Kern (1996). In the second place, there is the danger of trying to pigeonhole individuals according to what a public agency might expect to be their cultural group.”¹⁷³

¹⁶⁸ Vertovec, “Super-diversity and Its Implications,” 1049.

¹⁶⁹ Ibidem.

¹⁷⁰ Idem, 1050.

¹⁷¹ Although Vertoyec uses London as a case study, it is important to note that Maurice Crul, Jens Schneider and Frans Lelie have used the term ‘super-diversity’ and Vertoyec’s argument in *Superdiversiteit: een Nieuwe Visie op Integratie* to make the case that the same argument is applicable to the Netherlands, Amsterdam specifically, and that it is necessary to develop a new vision on integration to ensure successful Dutch policy-making.

See: Maurice Crul, Jens Schneider, and Frans Lelie. *Superdiversiteit: een Nieuwe Visie op Integratie* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 2013), 14.

¹⁷² Michael Rushton, “Cultural Diversity and Public Funding of the Arts: A View From Cultural Economics,” *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 33.2 (2003): 86.

¹⁷³ Idem, 94.

What Rushton calls “following the “scripts” of what constitutes the appropriate culture for people” can, although perhaps well-meant, result in “an alternative form of racism”.¹⁷⁴ Rushton emphasizes that with his argument, he is not negative about cultural diversity in society or the acceptance of minority tastes, but about the role of the governmental arts funding system in a multicultural society: “Simply because we concede that cultural opportunities for minority tastes are important does not mean that the state is the best provider of those opportunities.”¹⁷⁵ According to Rushton, “the best policy response to increased cultural diversity is not necessarily increasing levels of public funding or ‘spreading public funding across a wider range of cultural activities’”.¹⁷⁶ Instead, he opts for the “funding of cultural activities through private organizations (especially nonprofit voluntary activity)”.¹⁷⁷ As we have seen, cultural diversity policies tend not to define minority cultures, perhaps to avoid the pitfalls Rushton sees in this. In the next chapter, we shall see what consequences this has for the practical implementation of the policies.

2.6. Reflection

In the introduction, I already summed up why it is important to study cultural diversity policy: cultural policy influences the adaptation of ideas and values, gives insights in how the government and the arts sector position themselves in the world, while at the same time, actively or not, shaping it, and it navigates between cultural conflicts and elaborates on them. In this thesis, the approach of studying cultural policy in relation to cultural diversity is chosen. However, cultural diversity and inclusivity are topics that are not solely a policy issue: these topics go way beyond policy, the cultural sector and the government. As noted earlier, this topic is linked to and touches upon all kinds of processes related to the modern society. These topics are not only the subject of a wide range of (academic) studies, but also the subject of an almost constant societal debate in the Netherlands. This thesis studies how arts festivals handle cultural policy and tries to find if there is a tension field here. Cultural diversity is a subject to answer this question. This topic is thus lifted out of its full context and mostly discussed in the light of policy. A danger with this is that it can look like the topic is not fully appreciated in all its complexity. However, with this approach, in addition to the limited length of this thesis, the topic of cultural diversity cannot be covered in full extent. I thus wish to acknowledge the fact that cultural diversity is a topic that goes beyond the cultural policy-approach and invite my readers to dive into the subject to truly appreciate and understand it, but at the same time, argue that the importance of the goal of the thesis is relevant enough to justify the approach chosen. It is with this focus on the policy-angle in mind that the covering of the subject in this theoretical framework and the analysis in the next chapter should be approached.

¹⁷⁴ Rushton, “Cultural Diversity and Public Funding of the Arts,” 94.

¹⁷⁵ *Idem*, 93.

¹⁷⁶ *Idem*, 95.

¹⁷⁷ *Idem*, 92.

Chapter three – Analysis and Discussion

3.1. The case studies

Festival Tweetakt

Festival Tweetakt is an arts festival that is organized every year in March/April. It has existed in Utrecht since 2003. It hosts theatre performances, dance performances, music performances, visual arts, interactive installations, games, and some cabaret and standup comedy. There is a strong focus on acts from the Netherlands and Belgium. Traditionally, Tweetakt was a festival focused on youth theatre. However, in recent years, the festival has shifted away from this and broadened their artistic profile: although there is still an emphasis on children's theatre, different arts genres are programmed besides this and more performances for all ages are programmed as well. Another change in profile was that visual arts festival Kaap merged into Festival Tweetakt a few years ago, which gave the festival another focus as well. The visual arts program is programmed at Fort Ruigenhoek. For the other performances, a lot of big theatres lend their facilities for Festival Tweetakt, like Stadsschouwburg Utrecht, Theater Kikker, het Akademietheater, Het Huis Utrecht, and Podium Hoge Woerd. The festival also builds its own festival center at the Neude square in the center of Utrecht. Here, two temporarily theaters, a music stage and a restaurant are built especially for the festival. The festival also programs location theatre. In their 2018 edition, Tweetakt for example programmed theatre performances at a football pitch and an asylum seekers center.¹⁷⁸ In the last year, Tweetakt was visited by on average 42.000 visitors per year.¹⁷⁹ Three people working at Festival Tweetakt were interviewed: director Petra Blok, Policy and Communication-manager Rozemarijn Gerritsen and Volunteer Coordinator Judith Borra.

Nederlands Film Festival

The Dutch Film Festival was founded in 1981 by director Jos Stelling as 'the Dutch Film Days'. It got its current name in 1993. The goal of the Nederlands Film Festival is to celebrate the national film culture. Its aim is to "engage a large and diverse audience with the Dutch film culture".¹⁸⁰ The Nederlands Film Festival "operates consciously in the tension field between artistic and commercial, between popular and elitist, the known and the adventurous, the past and present, the local and the global".¹⁸¹ It is organized in Utrecht every year in September/October. Almost all cinemas in Utrecht lend their facilities to the festival to show the newest Dutch film- and television productions. The heart of the festival is at Neude square, where one can find interactive installations, a restaurant and where debates and talks about relevant subjects for the festival are held. The festival also hosts the 'Gouden Kalveren' award show, in which awards for the best Dutch films in multiple categories are given.¹⁸² Besides this public function of the festival, the Nederlands Film Festival is a platform and meeting place for professionals from the film sector, nationally and internationally, as well. Each

¹⁷⁸ "Wat is Tweetakt?" tweetakt.nl, last accessed at the 16th of January 2018, via <https://tweetakt.nl/nl/tweetakt-over/item-22/>.

¹⁷⁹ "ANBI gegevens van Stichting Storm," tweetakt.nl, last accessed at the the 16th of January 2018, via <https://tweetakt.nl/about/anbi>.

¹⁸⁰ "Missie en Visie," filmfestival.nl, last accessed at the 6th of February 2018, via <https://www.filmfestival.nl/publiek/over-nff/missie-visie>.

¹⁸¹ "Missie en Visie," filmfestival.nl, last accessed at the 6th of February 2018, via <https://www.filmfestival.nl/publiek/over-nff/missie-visie>.

¹⁸² "Festivalhistorie," filmfestival.nl, last accessed at the 6th of February 2018, via <https://www.filmfestival.nl/publiek/over-nff/historie>.

year, the Nederlands Film Festival attracts around 150.00 visitors.¹⁸³ For this thesis, one person currently working at the festival was interviewed.

Le Guess Who?

Le Guess Who? is a music festival for “experimental, collaborative, and otherwise out-of-the-box musical thinking”.¹⁸⁴ The festival was founded in 2006, and is traditionally held in November, lasting for four days. During these days, Le Guess Who? programs musical performances in the city center of Utrecht, in traditional performance settings like pop venues and theatres, but also in other locations, like churches, galleries, and bars. There is an extensive side-program, with music, film, art, photography and markets, that takes place in, among others, cafés, hotels, restaurants, wharf cellars, and the Neude square. Le Guess Who? focuses on artists that “feel the urge to explore and expand the boundaries of certain genres”.¹⁸⁵ This includes contemporary and authentic rock music and pop culture, non-western music, folk, ambient, avant-garde, (free)jazz, modern composed, drone, and many other genres that fall somewhere on this spectrum.¹⁸⁶ Le Guess Who? attracts around 16.000 visitors each year. Besides the main event, there are two spin-off festivals: Le Mini Who?, which transforms Utrecht shops and bars into improvised venues for (mainly) Dutch underground bands, and Lombok Festival, a festival aimed to celebrate the cultural diversity of Utrecht and the district of Lombok, which features Dutch artists with a migration background and is organized together with the local community.¹⁸⁷ For this thesis, Le Guess Who? was represented by Johan Gijzen, co-founder and director of the festival.

3.2. Analysis interviews

In this section, the outcomes of the interviews are described and discussed. I start with describing the concrete measures the festival organizations say they have taken to increase their cultural diversity. Then, a set of recurring themes throughout the interviews are discussed. Some are derived from the interview topics which can be found in Appendix 1, while some are contractions of different topics into more general, overarching themes or new topics which were addressed in the interviews. These are combined with findings from the literature from last chapter.

3.2.1. Concrete measures cultural diversity policy

Festival Tweetakt

Festival Tweetakt does not have a specific cultural policy in place, but expresses a strong desire to be more concerned with the topic and anchor it more strongly in their overall policy. Some actions have been undertaken since 2017 with regard to this topic, and before the financial crisis there was also a precedent. In that time, there was a specific program-part in Tweetakt’s programming focused on getting a more culturally diverse audience. Schools with a high percentage of children with a migration background were invited to write a song and set up a performance, together with a well-

¹⁸³ “Festivalhistorie,” filmfestival.nl, last accessed at the 6th of February 2018, via <https://www.filmfestival.nl/publiek/over-nff/historie>.

¹⁸⁴ “About,” leguesswho.nl, last accessed at the 9th of February 2018, via <https://www.leguesswho.nl/about>.

¹⁸⁵ Ibidem.

¹⁸⁶ Ibidem.

¹⁸⁷ “Le Mini Who,” leguesswho.nl, last accessed at the 3rd of June 2018, via <https://www.leguesswho.nl/utrecht/le-mini-who>.

“Lombok Festival,” leguesswho.nl, last accessed at the 3rd of June, via <https://www.leguesswho.nl/utrecht/lombok-festival>.

known artist, to which their network was invited. The attendees got a free ticket to another performance as well. Although the employees stated that it was a nice project that in itself was rewarding, it did not have the desired effect: to get this diverse group to the festival as 'regular' public as well. During the financial crisis, when major cutbacks were made in the subsidy of the festival, the focus shifted away from inclusivity and diversity to cultural entrepreneurship and 'simply surviving' and the project was scrapped. Gerritsen: "All the loose things that you needed think about quietly, were shoved aside, were no longer important, because you just had to keep your head above water."

In 2017, the efforts with regard to cultural diversity were resumed. The CCD served as guideline. First, Blok and Gerritsen talked to one of the initiators of the CCD and others who had more knowledge about the subject to get informed. They founded a workgroup and assigned Volunteer Coordinator Judith Borra as the head of this workgroup. Borra was asked to take a critical look at the organization in the area of diversity. She conducted research into populations in Utrecht that are interested in arts and culture, but do not visit Festival Tweetakt yet. After this, groups that represented these populations were invited to the festival. Employees of the festival accompanied them to performances. Judith and others also actively sought out partnerships that could benefit the cultural diversity of the festival, for example with Jongeren Cultuurhuis Kanaleneiland, Stichting Present, Queridon and Kiwanis. Their contribution to the festival differed: some partnerships recruited refugees or 'status-holders' as volunteers, others led to the programming of young talents. In other cases, the groups visited performances for free in trade for feedback about the festival, or the festival served as a one-time location for meetings the organization had. On top of this, Judith led weekly/bi-weekly meetings with the festival team to create awareness of the issue in the organization. During these meetings, people were encouraged to invite people with a bi-cultural background from their own network to performances at the festival.

Other departments were concerned with cultural diversifying their practice as well. The bar crew tried to get more diverse personnel and Publicity was concerned with making their use of language more approachable and using images which showed the diversity of the public at Festival Tweetakt. All three interviewees cite the education program of Tweetakt as a success story: the Education department has always been concerned with attracting a diverse range of schools with children from different backgrounds.

Nederlands Film Festival

The Nederlands Film Festival does not have a specific cultural diversity policy in place. However, they are concerned with "translating the CCD to concrete measures" and cultural diversity is a point of attention for the organization. There are some steps already made.

In 2016, 'diversity' was the red thread of the festival. The direct reason for this was the refugee crisis in 2015. "We got the idea that, of course, among these refugees there are also film professionals, whom we could help by using our Dutch network and coupling these makers with Dutch film professionals." In that year, with the films shown, the talks held and other program parts, there was a big focus on (cultural) diversity. This was only temporary: in the next edition, there was another red thread, which meant that most programs done in the context of cultural diversity in 2016 were not repeated.

Another program mentioned with regard to cultural diversity is the neighborhood program of the festival, which was set up recently. The festival has a program all year long, in which Dutch films are shown at locations in several neighborhoods. The interviewee views this as a good opportunity to introduce people to the festival and Dutch film in general, and to attract a wider audience. This program is set in the neighborhoods of Oog in Al, Kanaleneiland, Zuilen, Lombok, and Overvecht.

The interviewee also mentions a collaboration with Jongeren Cultuurhuis Kanaleneiland. The festival is helping this meeting point for youngsters to set up a cinema-programming. Furthermore, the festival funds and oversees a project that brings together professionals and young people from the Cultuurhuis. Together with these professionals, the youngsters make their own movies, which are shown at the festival. This partnership has existed “for about two or three years”.

The Nederlands Film Festival has a function outside of the public one as well. It serves as a platform for Dutch film and professionals in the sector and is in this regard seen as a connector of the film sector as a whole. The interviewee states that the festival has actively been putting the issue of cultural diversity on the agenda of the film sector, by using its influence as a connecting platform. In 2016, the festival hosted several discussions about cultural diversity in the film sector between professionals. And in January of this year, the Nederlands Film Festival organized the Nationale Filmconverentie Extended, a gettogether of the film sector in the EYE Museum, in which the topic was discussed. Awareness is also raised in the festival organization itself. At the upcoming team day of 2018, one of the people from PACT Utrecht, an organization that does a lot for putting cultural diversity and the CCD on the agenda for institutions in Utrecht, will give a presentation, for example.

Le Guess Who?

Le Guess Who?, like the other festivals, does not have a specific cultural diversity policy in place. But a difference between Le Guess Who? and the other festivals is that Le Guess Who? expresses no interest in making such a policy. According to Johan Gijsen, cultural diversity is in the DNA of the festival. The kind of music they program is by definition culturally diverse, because it is focused on showcasing international artists that are obscure in the Netherlands. Gijsen: “I think we had 34 different nationalities on stage last year. But we do that because we think the media landscape is very monotonous... When you turn on the radio you almost exclusively hear English or Dutch music. It is very American/English oriented. We think that there are also many interesting sounds coming from other corners of the world. We just want to make people aware of this music as well. And by doing that, you automatically get inclusive. I think that if your audience comes from 58 countries, you can call yourself inclusive.” The ideals of Le Guess Who?, as reflected in the subtitle of last year’s festival program, ‘Presenting the Underrepresented’, are in line with the ideals of the cultural diversity policy. That is what Gijsen means when he states that cultural diversity is in the DNA of Le Guess Who?.

Le Guess Who? only applies for municipal subsidy since a few years, which means they only since some years have to comply to municipal (cultural diversity) policy as well. The fact that the topic was put on the agenda in recent years and is now ever more strongly enforced via policy, did not change anything for Le Guess Who?. Gijsen states that the festival was always already concerned with this topic and according to Gijsen getting funding from the municipality and province “did not have any influence at all. We just continued in our own, same way as before.”

That there is no desire to have a specific cultural diversity policy, does not mean that there is no room for improvement. Gijsen signals that their personnel and their Dutch audience are still largely highly-educated and white. This is a point of attention. At the same time, Gijsen emphasizes that attracting a culturally diverse audience is not the core mission of the festival. “My goal is that my audience also listens to classical Iraqi music for once, instead of always to that American singer-songwriter. So, I am reaching my goal. But my primary goal is not to, for example, address the Iraqi constituency in the Netherlands, even if I would like to do so in the coming years.” In recent years, efforts have been made to attract a more diverse audience, both regarding culture as class. Gijsen emphasizes that it is important that the focus is not on changing the festival itself. Instead, the organization organizes free side-events to reach these goals. Gijsen cites Lombok Festival, a free festival in the neighborhood of Lombok, as one of the efforts to let a more diverse audience get

acquainted with Le Guess Who?, in the hopes of them feeling welcome at Le Guess Who? in a few years.

3.2.1. Concluding remarks

What immediately becomes clear is that for two of the three festivals (Festival Tweetakt and The Nederlands Film Festival), cultural diversity has only in recent years become a point of attention. All the actions they have taken in this area, were in the last few years. This is striking: these festivals have existed since quite a long period of time, and although in the previous chapter, we established that Dutch society has been changing since the last half of the previous century and that explicit cultural diversity policy has been around since the 1980's, it seems like the festivals do not relate the topic of cultural diversity in these timeframes at all. They explicitly refer to the CCD as starting point, and this seems an important point of reference throughout the whole process. However, the Code was established in 2011, so if this is the case, it took quite some time for the festivals to respond to the CCD. Given the timeframe, it seems more likely that the focus of the municipality on the CCD in the last years is a more accurate starting point to think about cultural diversity. This suggests that the topic is seen as a policy-topic, not as something that is inherent to the festival or the arts sector in some way.

Furthermore, the way in which implementing the policy is done, is clearly in line with Larson's assertion about how change is facilitated in festivals. There is no clear predetermined time-frame or plan made to implement cultural diversity measures. As in Larson's research, these festivals find it hard to plan innovation in the complex and dynamic network they are in.¹⁸⁸ Instead, the festivals use an improvisational, hands-on approach of practical experimentation and improvisation, to see what works in practice and what not.¹⁸⁹ As Larson mentions, the process of implementing this policy is "fragmented, development-orientated, and largely intuitive."¹⁹⁰

3.2.2. Motivation

The festival organizations mention different reasons for the growing importance of cultural diversity in their policies. Some of these are shared by all the festivals, but some are festival-specific.

The link between culture and society is mentioned as one reason: cultural diversity is seen as an important factor in Dutch society these days, which cannot be ignored. According to Gerritsen: "Society asks you to be engaged in this. And of course, culture always has an interaction with society." Both Tweetakt and the Nederlands Film Festival see a strong link with the refugee crisis in the Netherlands in recent years as well, which they think has intensified the debate about cultural diversity and given the topic more urgency. Gijsen from Le Guess Who? agrees on the link between modern society and cultural diversity, but relates it to a bigger scale. He sees the future of the world as being less Western-orientated, but instead "very much located in Africa and Asia". That other cultures are becoming increasingly important for our future is a reason for a festival and society to be engaged with cultural diversity. Gijsen states: "We are trying to be a festival with urgency, so what we are doing now, trying to inspire with different sounds, is something that is closely related to how society nowadays must operate."

Related to this is another reason festivals are engaged with cultural diversity, only expressed by Le Guess Who?: creating a positive image of other cultures. Gijsen finds it important that Dutch people get in touch with positive things from countries that are mostly shown in a bad light in the

¹⁸⁸ Larson, "Innovation and Creativity," 303.

¹⁸⁹ Ibidem.

¹⁹⁰ Ibidem.

current media landscape: “I think that when you give this music a stage, you will maybe create some more understanding, and that we humans will get to understand each other a bit better.”

Blok from Tweetakt expresses a belief that art can have a positive effect on people and that that is why it is important to let as many people as possible get in contact with it. She says: “It is such a shame. When you look at the school classes that visit performances in the education trajectory and see how incredibly fantastic children can find things... While actually knowing that that they will not quickly find that same path outside of this education collaboration. And that while art can play such an important role in your life.”

Furthermore, all festivals express a broader desire to attract an audience that is as diverse as possible, on all kinds of levels. Cultural diversity policy is seen as a part of this broader diversity policy, which is discussed in more detail in the next section. An extra incentive for the Nederlands Film Festival is that the organization thinks that the audio-visual sector is important for the development of Dutch culture and democracy, as was pointed out by the Raad van Cultuur in a recent report. This means that the ‘product’ of the festival should be connected to society, “to be a mirror”.

The stimulation of (local) politics to apply the CCD and be concerned with the topic is felt as well, although the extent to how strongly this is felt, varies. Overall, we can say that Le Guess Who? feels the least pressure and the Nederlands Film Festival the most.

All interviewees from Tweetakt and the Nederlands Film Festival express a sense of responsibility and duty as a subsidized festival, that uses public money, to include as many people as possible. Le Guess Who? shares this sentiment, but also nuances it, by acknowledging that we must be realistic. Even though the platform of the festival has a low threshold, Gijsen thinks we should acknowledge that just not everyone is interested in arts and culture, that that is totally fine and that we should not try to force people to like something just because we think it is important that they like it.

Furthermore, a stimulant for all festivals is the fact that there has been more awareness in the network of the organization. Because everyone is so concerned with cultural diversity, the festivals have extra motivation to be concerned with it as well. The interviewee at the Nederlands Film Festival for example states that she feels that both the film sector and the cultural sector as a whole has put the issue on their agenda. This means the organization cannot stay behind on the matter.

Another important motivation to change the current state of being regarding cultural diversity is the connection to the local dimension. Although festivals are perceived as flexible in all aspects, also location, at the same time there is a strong desire to be anchored in the local context, namely the city they are in. All festivals express some sort of desire concerning a strong bond between the festival and the city. For example, Tweetakt is clearly seen as a festival that has a strong connection to Utrecht. Blok states that because Tweetakt has a focus on youth theater, it attracts mostly families from the region, because for large families it is quite expensive to travel to Utrecht and buy all the tickets. As is acknowledged that Utrecht is a culturally diverse city, the festivals feel it is important to relate to this as well. Festivals have a desire to not exist in their private bubble, but engage with their surroundings. Gijsen shares this sentiment very deeply, when talking about the free side-events of Le Guess Who?, Le Mini Who and Lombok Festival: “I just want to give something back to the city. We have these ideals. It costs quite a lot of time, energy and money to organize these events for free. But I just find it such a good and necessary thing to do. At one hand, because even more people get to know Le Guess Who? because something is happening at the streets. But also, yes, it is about giving something back to the local people.”

Gijsen mentions that he finds it important to have a culturally diverse team working at the festival, because it is stimulating to have as many different visions as possible. Both interviewees

from Festival Tweekt and the Nederlands Film Festival endorse the importance of a culturally diverse team as well, but do not necessarily bring it in relation to a better performance of the organization.

Some interviewees express personal motivations as well. From interviewees at Tweekt for example, we hear: “I do not like it. It does not feel good to have such a white and highly educated audience.” and “You do not want to work somewhere where people are excluded, even though it is unconsciously.” Gijsen expresses strong ideals and personal motivations to change the current situation as well.

We thus see that the motivations of the festival are a complex interplay of factors: implementing cultural diversity policy is seen as beneficial on personal, organizational, local, political and societal levels. However, as we saw in the previous section, based on the timeframe, political pressure was the motivation that set the rest in motion for two festivals. Getting back to Larson’s distinction between change happening proactively or reactively, we can say that both Tweekt and the Nederlands Film Festival are changing reactively, while Le Guess Who? works proactively. Le Guess Who? is the only festival already concerned with the topic before it became a policy issue in the last few years and the only festival expressing ambition to actively change society and the arts sector in the Netherlands.

It is striking that from all the motivations, artistic motivations are mentioned the least. Festival Tweekt and the Nederlands Film Festival paint the picture of a changing society and the cultural sector responding to this, but they do not seem to relate these changes to any change in the arts or the artistic field. This idea can be traced back to the previous section as well, in which we established that these festivals saw cultural diversity mostly as a policy issue. It is an important observation that the issue of cultural diversity is completely set apart from artistic concerns. The organization of Le Guess Who? sees artistic merits in programming internationally renowned artists, that Dutch people are not yet familiar with. But the other festivals do not relate diversity to artistic improvement: moreover, as we will see below, they see the relation between cultural diversity and artistic quality solely in a negative light.

3.2.3. Diversity as a broad concept

It is noteworthy that in all the interviews the issue of cultural diversity is very much seen as an issue of accessibility, and cultural diversity is perceived as part of diversity as a broader concept. All festivals keep referring to the ‘low threshold’ they think the festival as a platform has, which attracts a more diverse group of people on all levels, but especially regarding audience, than is common in the cultural sector. But although it seems as the festival employees perceive the festival as an already accessible platform, there is always a desire to be more diverse, specifically in the area of audience. These opinions keep getting referred to in the interviews and seem very much interwoven with the topic of cultural diversity. All interviewees express a clear ambition to be a festival that is for ‘everyone’. The Tweekt-employees talk about diversity not only based on cultural background, but also concerning age, gender, class, and physical state. Gerritsen: “It is good to attract an audience that is as diverse as possible. Not just culturally diverse but also disabled people, children, adults...” Borra also emphasizes that she is concerned with diversity on all levels, and that cultural diversity is only a part of this. “In our team meetings, we really dove into intersectionality and how we should look at this to really achieve that goal of having a low threshold.” The other festivals express the same sentiments about a desire to attract a diverse audience along the same axes and the fact that festivals as a form are very much able to do so. Although all of these are regarded as important, gender seems to hold a special place in this, since all three festivals mention and emphasize it. An interesting, nuancing comment about this perceived low threshold of festivals is made by Gijsen, in which he differentiates between the form and content of the festival regarding

the low threshold. He states: "I am very much aware that we are elitist. Because I think that we offer something that has a low threshold, but with what we are programming, we offer this in a very elitist corner."

Diversity is not only regarded important for the audience of the festival, but also a point of attention with the personnel. Both Gerritsen and Blok express the desire to have an equal balance between men and women in the organization, despite, or because of, the fact that this is currently not the case at Tweeakt. The Netherlands Film Festival also mentions the men/women ratio in the organization as a point of attention and expresses a desire to attract more male personnel. "We want to have a more diverse team. And with that, I am not only talking about cultural diversity, but diversity in general. Also men/women ratio for example, because we have a lot of women in our team." The situation at Le Guess Who? is the exact opposite: Gijsen starts the interview by stating that he finds it such a shame that the Le Guess Who? organization is for such a big part made up of men. His co-founder and the first marketeer they hired are all men, which makes the core-organization 100% male. "Then you are already 3-0 behind when it comes to men/women ration. And it's hard to get that even." But this is something that Gijsen finds important. "You need those other visions! Your organization gets way fresher when it's not just men."

Diversity in the programming is also regarded important. In this regard, men/women ratio is again a big point of attention. Gijsen: "Traditionally, this part of the music-scene is very nerdy and mostly for men. However, the last years we have really tried to break this open. ... Last year, 36% of our performers were female. That is about twice as much as average for music festivals. ... We are very much aware of this issue and consciously seek out a 50-50 balance with our curators, and program a lot of influential female performers and put these in the spotlights." Blok is also aware of men/women ration and is making conscious choices in her programming. "It's already special that we had so many women in our programming last year. ... In our visual arts program, I'm always paying attention to this. And also when we are doing a talk show, I want to make sure that it's not only men up there." She cites an interesting tension field, when talking about the men/women ratio regarding music programming. The male programmer of the music performances very much wants to program as many women as possible. However, his female co-worker, who is also a musician herself, is more careful about this, since she does not want to judge people based on their gender and just want to look at artistic quality. Blok understands both positions and emphasizes the importance of finding a balance in this. Although Blok's remark is short, it eludes to an important tension field in the artistic field, which is also applicable to cultural diversity: the question if when programming, you should make the artistic quality less important and instead focus on other factors which will stimulate representation, and if this is fair to the artists.

We thus see that when talking about cultural diversity, the conversation naturally moves to diversity and inclusivity as broader concepts and how this is a central part of the festival as cultural form. This results in an interesting dichotomy: although the organizations see the festivals as an inclusive and diverse platform, at the same time, they are not satisfied with the way they are 'performing' in these areas at the moment. None of the interviewees seem aware of this apparent contradiction, and it does not make them question the assumption that festivals in themselves are diverse. Only Gijsen nuances this point of view.

Furthermore, it is striking that in the actions taken related to the broad diversity concept, all organizations already employed the P's of Programming, Personnel and Public, without them specifically being asked to do so. The concerns from the CCD were thus already (unconsciously) employed before the Code, but with a broader definition of diversity. And for the festival organizations, it seems unnatural to set their ambitions and concerns about diversity apart from the topic from cultural diversity, although the specific policy seems to ask this from them. For example, two of the interviewees at Tweeakt structurally talk about their 'white and highly-educated'

audience that they want to diversify. These two factors seem so intertwined for the interviewees that they find it hard to even detach the two. This raises questions about the compatibility of the festival structure with the policy in this regard, since the policy about cultural diversity is very much aimed at detaching one of these axes of differentiation, cultural diversity, from the broader spectrum of 'diversity' as a concept.

3.2.4. Interpretation of cultural diversity

In the previous section, I concluded that festivals have a very broad concept of diversity that they find important. However, when talking about cultural diversity specifically, the organizations have a different focus. Earlier, we concluded that the concept of 'cultural diversity' is both ambiguously and loosely defined in policy. The CCD talks about ethnic-cultural background, and the policy of the municipality seems aimed at this as well, or perhaps nationality; it is not really clear from the policy documents. Rushton showed us that the government defining 'illdefined groups' can result in an 'alternative form of racism'.¹⁹¹ The policy seems to be wanting to avoid this issue by keeping the exact definition and interpretation of 'cultural diversity' vague. However, by being this vague and not using the 'superdiversity' proposed by Vertoyec, lots is left open for interpretation for the festivals. In this section, we outline how the policy definition is translated into practice and who exactly the festival organizations are trying to reach when they use the broad category of 'culturally diverse audience'.

The Tweetakt organization does not specifically state who they want to reach with their new cultural diversity measures, but conclusions can be drawn from the way in which the interviewees talk about cultural diversity. One interviewee from Tweetakt very much emphasizes the intersectionality of the concept. However, the other two interviewees have a more limited conception of the concept. They seem to be mainly focused on people with a migration background from Turkey or Morocco, who came to the Netherlands with the migration wave in the 1970's. The focus for Tweetakt seems to be on the second- and third-generation children, which stems from the focus of the festival on children's theatre. Blok: "There are so many children here with an, for example, Turkish or Moroccan background. You need to look for ways and do your best to include them as well." There seems to be a spatial dimension to the target audience of the policy, because neighborhoods like Zuilen, Overvecht, Kanaleneiland and Lombok, with a traditionally high percentage of first- and second-generation migrants, are mentioned as areas of attention.¹⁹²

The Netherlands Film Festival does not specify the exact target audience they would like to reach with their cultural diversity policy. However, it is striking that the organization talks about the cultural diversity and their actions related to this almost exclusively in the light of youth and youngsters, even more than the interviewees at Festival Tweetakt. When asked about motivations or concrete measures regarding this topic, 'children' or 'youngsters' keep getting mentioned in the answers. Examples are, when asked about why making more culturally diverse movies is important, the answer: "Children should be able to identify themselves with someone on screen." and, when asked who the festival wants to reach with the policy: "We want to show that the festival is also interesting to youngsters from Kanaleneiland." Noteworthy is that the neighborhood program is mentioned as a 'good practice' in the area of cultural diversity, and that there is a large overlap in the targeted neighborhoods with Tweetakt: Zuilen, Overvecht, Kanaleneiland and Lombok are mentioned, just like Tweetakt, but the Nederlands Film Festival adds the area of Oog in Al.

¹⁹¹ Rushton, "Cultural Diversity and Public Funding of the Arts," 94.

¹⁹² "Hoogste percentage allochtonen van wijken in Utrecht," allecijfers.nl, accessed at the 18th of July 2018, via <https://allecijfers.nl/ranglijst/hoogste-percentage-allochtonen-van-wijken-in-utrecht/>.

As mentioned before, Le Guess Who? does not have the ambition to make an elaborate cultural diversity policy, but takes some steps to diversify their organization and events, specifically regarding the Dutch audience, which is perceived as being very 'white'. As the Nederlands Film Festival and Festival Tweekt, Lombok is a neighborhood of attention. This is where Le Guess Who? organizes their Lombok Festival event. The traditional migration countries of Turkey and Morocco are again mentioned.

An important observation here is that all the interviewees have trouble with the terminology related to cultural diversity. It is noteworthy that people use a wide range of terms to refer to the culturally diverse audience they are trying to reach, while often being lost for words or apologizing for terms that they deem politically incorrect. Noteworthy is that the word 'allochtoon', used in the CCD, is not used at all. The term seems to indeed have the negative connotation talked about in the CCD, and the festival organizations do not make the pragmatic choice to use this term.¹⁹³ However, a good alternative is apparently not found. Although the content of the message is often clear, the interviewees still seem to struggle to find the right form to tell it.

Furthermore, it is striking that the topic of cultural diversity is approached in a rather straightforward, perhaps even superficial manner. With the exception of Le Guess Who?, the festivals see cultural diversity as mainly an issue of migration: not even migration in a broad sense, but a conception of migration which only seems to refer to refugees and the 'traditional' migration countries of Turkey and Morocco. Blok's denying reaction on my question if Tweekt is interested in attracting expats, is only one example of this. In the theoretical framework, I noted that the subject of implementing cultural diversity policy is linked to modern processes like globalization and its effect on identification processes, intensifying migration patterns, growing instrumentalism in cultural policy and the tensions within nation-states about setting up policy in this changing environment. However, two of the three festivals do not see the issue in this frame at all, but instead, seem to approach it as solely a policy issue, fueled by societal debate about migration. Furthermore, there is no acknowledgement that cultural preferences and identification-processes have changed due to globalization, or that this has perhaps changed artistic preferences and artistic products as well. The cultural diversity topic is completely set apart from artistic issues. On top of this, it is important to mention that the policy never explicitly states that cultural diversity is seen as only non-western diversity. The CCD mentions that 'allochtoon' is divided in non-western and western allochtonen, but does not specify that one kind on which the Code is focused. However, the festival organizations clearly interpret it as non-western 'allochtonen'. There is no recognition for the fact that western culture is also a complex culture, with a lot of different ways in which it is perceived. Poland, The United States and Japan, all western in the definition used in the CCD, cannot possibly be said to have the same culture. And even inside the nation borders, we must take regional and local differences into account. However, this is completely glossed over in the practical implementation of the code by the festival organizations. No festival expresses the desire to attract more Europeans or North-Americans. Instead, all efforts are focused on non-western cultures, specifically Turkish and Moroccan. This strong focus on non-western cultures while talking about cultural diversity, while at the same time glossing over differences in western culture, creates an 'us'- 'them' feeling throughout the interviews.

The question is if this notion of 'cultural diversity' is the one aimed at in the CCD and the policy of the municipality. Instead of creating an "inclusive organization strategy and culture, in which difference is appreciated and the organization has gotten rid of old routines", this approach perhaps comes closer to "making interventions meant to stimulate the participation of a specific

¹⁹³ "Code Culturele Diversiteit", 4.

target audience".¹⁹⁴ This is specifically mentioned as being a part of the 'doelgroepenbeleid' from the 1980's, when groups from migrant-backgrounds were specifically targeted to be more invested in the arts and culture, and this approach is even explicitly warned against in the CCD.¹⁹⁵ It is thus noteworthy that the new cultural diversity policy seems to inspire actions linked to older policy. The risk of being so focused on these migrants groups is twofold. First, organizations could be falling into the trap that Rushton called the danger of pigeonholing individuals according to what an organizations might expect to be their cultural group.¹⁹⁶ Furthermore, by aiming the practical effectuation of the policy so specifically at migrants, there is the risk of (unconsciously) copying the logics of behind polarization: migrants and non-migrants are seen as opposite of each other.¹⁹⁷

In addition to the strong focus on non-western migrants, we see that all three festivals connect the application of cultural diversity policy to a distinct spatial dimension, with a focus on specific neighborhoods, mentioned above. It is noteworthy that this view is so omnipresent. This can partly be explained by the municipal policy, that puts a focus on moving beyond the city center, 'into the neighborhoods'. However, it also almost seems like the festival organizations are (unconsciously) recreating national borders, on a very local level, in which the city center is seen as western, and the respective neighborhoods like Overvecht and Lombok as 'foreign countries' like Turkey or Morocco. Although there may be some truth in the observation that these neighborhoods are home to a large percentage of people with a migration background, one must wonder if this approach is not too much black and white. The polarization between non-migrants (the visitors of the festival) and migrants (the new, potential visitors of the festival) is deepened even further by adding a spatial dimension. This views could be nuanced if a subtler view of identity would be used, instead of this strong focus on nationality and country of origin.

3.2.5. Artistic profile and cultural diversity

In the previous sections, we saw that the artistic angle was not important in the motivations to implement cultural diversity for most of the festival organizations. In this section, we dive deeper into this relation between the artistic and cultural diversity. This topic relates to two subjects. The first is the relation between art and cultural diversity, as problematized by Munira Mirza. The second is how the organizations think their artistic profile matches or clashes with cultural diversity. I also discuss the specific art forms each festival programmes and how this is perceived to relate to the topic of cultural diversity.

An interesting remark about art's and culture's relation to cultural diversity is made by Blok, in which two different ideas about art and culture are apparently used alongside each other, although at first glance they seem to contradict each other. At one point during the interview, she says:

"I think art an sich is accessible to a large, diverse audience ... Because I think that artists are always concerned with telling something universal. So also to a large audience ... Good artists do not exclude people, but want to tell something to a large, diverse audience ... This is inherent to the expressivity and authenticity, integrity, of good artists."

¹⁹⁴ "Code Culturele Diversiteit", 4.

¹⁹⁵ Carmelita Serkei, "Strategische Posities Bezetten. Cultuurpoliek en Culturele Diversiteit," *Zicht op actieve cultuurparticipatie 2016: Thema's en trends in praktijk en beleid* (2016): 36-43.

¹⁹⁶ Rushton, "Cultural Diversity and Public Funding of the Arts," 94.

¹⁹⁷ Idem, 31-36.

When I in response asked what was then the cause that Tweetakt is not a very culturally diverse festival, she answered:

“I think that the cultural sector does not attract a very diverse audience, because it is very far removed from people with a different background. I think that makes it very complicated in the base. They come with a different background, from a different culture, of course, which also has very different characteristics and traditions and customs. I think it is already complicated to adapt to the dominant culture, let alone for something that you do not immediately understand and that on top of that costs a lot of money as well.”

These ideas form an interesting dichotomy. The first idea is that art is universal, and hereby is inherently capable to transcend cultural differences. The second idea is that cultural is specific, with different traditions and customs, which makes it difficult to truly understand cultural products, like artworks, from other cultures. With this second idea, we are reminded of the ‘essentialist’ notion of culture. It is noteworthy that these ideas are apparently used alongside each other. The interviewee at the Nederlands Film Festival does not go into detail about this topic. Gijsen states the opposite of Blok: “Art is definitely not universal”, but from the context, we can see that he uses ‘art’ in the sense that Blok used ‘culture’, and that it is thus not a real contradiction. The fact that ‘art’ and ‘culture’ are thus confusingly enough used interchangeable, although other values seem to be attached to them, is already an interesting observation. Further on, Gijsen says that you actively have to make people aware of other cultures and their cultural (art) products and acknowledges cultural differences which influence the ‘consumption’ of art products. For example, he thinks that people from different cultures are not so acquainted with the pop stage culture as is the norm in the Netherlands, because it has its roots in the squatting culture of the 1970’s and 1980’s and is very culturally specific. That is why Gijsen can imagine that people with a different cultural background will not be the first to visit these places, not even for a festival. All of this suggests that interviewees perceive cultural differences to some extent as a barrier for their festivals to become culturally diverse. The related question is whether the cultural western norms, for example the quality norms, should be changed to include everyone and become culturally diverse, or that this goes too far and is undesirable.

The festival organizations also describe how cultural diversity fits with their specific artistic profile. The artistic profile of Tweetakt is described as following: an open, broad and accessible festival, that has a focus on innovative youth theatre of high quality. The aim is to program performances that leave room for children’s own imagination and interpretation. This imaginative, open character of the performances makes them interesting for both children and adults. In this regard, the festival is internationally orientated and has a pioneering role. There seems to be some tension between the artistic profile and quality norms of Tweetakt, and their desire to become more culturally diverse, that have to do with prioritizing one of these two. Borra states that the quality criteria are based on western norms. If the festival wants to be truly inclusive, she thinks it needs to re-examine whether these norms are still applicable and valid. Gerritsen and Blok are more mindful about this. They state that they find cultural diversity important, also in the programming, but that there are boundaries to this: the programming must still meet quality standards. This is, in the end, more important than having a culturally diverse programming. Gerritsen states that it is important to do something about cultural diversity, but: “You have to stick to what you are doing. You shouldn’t totally adjust your festival to all kinds of things, because then you lose your identity. I think there is definitely a tension field there.” At Tweetakt, there is a reluctance to program things that have cultural diversity as a subject. Blok says this often does not fit in the profile of Tweetakt, since these pieces tend to be dogmatic or didactic, while good art “asks questions or make nuances”. Gerritsen

adds that when cultural diversity is the subject of performances, it often emphasizes difference, which she thinks only adds to the problem instead of making it better.

The situation is different at Le Guess Who?. As mentioned before, cultural diversity is a core part of the programming of Le Guess Who?. That is why Gijzen does not see a specific tension field between its artistic profile and cultural diversity. Their quality norms are not anchored in western tradition, but specifically aimed at different traditions, and establishing a crossover between these traditions and quality norms and people with a Western background.

The interviewee at the Nederlands Film Festival does not see a tension field between their specific artistic profile and cultural diversity, or at least is not aware of it. This is partly because the festival is aimed at a broad audience, “even the whole Dutch society.” At the same time: “It is not about getting everyone to our festival, but to get that part of society to our festival that is interested. That we make the threshold low enough for people that are interested in Dutch film, that they will also visit the festival, regardless of their background.” Her remark that a tension field between programming for quality and programming for cultural diversity is “something you should try to stay away from”, suggests that there can be some frictions, but that the festival is actively trying to keep clear of these. The interviewee does not go into detail about the difference between western and non-western quality norm. And although the Nederlands Film Festival does have certain quality standards, these are not viewed as being necessarily important in all programs: some parts of the programming have a different goal than showcasing high artistic quality. The interviewee states that for some programmes mentioned, that are related to cultural diversity and youth participation, the goal is not producing high quality products. For example, in the case of the collaboration with Jongeren Cultuurhuis Kanaleneiland, the goal is not to produce films that have the same quality as the movies normally shown at the festival, although this could be the case. The goal is to engage the youngsters with filmmaking and the festival itself. Because the approach of this program is so different, it is thus not perceived as a clash between cultural diversity programming and the artistic profile of the festival.

There seems to be a perceived relation between specific art forms and challenges with becoming culturally diverse, which is often referred to in interviews. For Festival Tweetakt for example, a perceived obstacle of becoming culturally diverse are the programmed genres. The festival programs theater, dance, music, and visual arts. Theatre is seen as a difficult artform to make more accessible to a culturally diverse audience, for different reasons. Borra states: “Theatre is not as accessible as we think. We in the organization are of course all big fans, but for another person, going to the theatre is not as easy as going to the movies. And that is something that we shouldn’t underestimate. It’s a nice goal to offer the arts with a low threshold, but in doing so, you have to realize that not everything is suited for everyone.” All interviewees cite the ‘high threshold’ theatre has. This is not only specific for a culturally diverse audience, but also has a class-aspect to it. Different reasons are mentioned for the incompatibility of theatre and cultural diversity, among which the high-quality standards and western norms of the theatre performances mentioned before. Gerritsen thinks the linguistic aspect of theatre makes it inaccessible for a culturally diverse audience. The lack of performances that show cultural diversity the way Tweetakt wants, makes it hard to find programming that suits the festival and its ambitions. Although dance does not have the linguistic aspect to it, the interviewees cite the same complications for this genre. In contrast, the music program is seen as ‘easier’ to make culturally diverse, both in content and in audience. The reason for this is that music is already very internationally orientated, with roots in different cultures, and thus not culture-specific. This makes it a genre which easily attracts a diverse audience. About the visual arts program, the opinions are divided. An advantage is that the visual arts program is presented in a playful context at Fort Ruigenhoek, with lots of opportunities for children to play and explore the surroundings. This playful element is seen as universal and an opportunity to attract a

diverse audience. At the same time, Blok admits that for the funding of the program, international quality in the programming is seen as very important. “For the financing, it is very much about international quality and prestige, so you are mostly concerned with seeing if artists have enough quality to get financing for them.” This often results in the programming of artists already acknowledged by the status quo, which are often white men.

Regarding the case of the Nederlands Film Festival, the interviewee thinks that the artistic products shown at the festival all have a relatively low threshold. The interactive-program is seen as being very accessible for young people. Television and film both have a low threshold in form, but the content has to change to attract a more diverse audience. However, this is perceived as being easier than an artform like theatre, which, she thinks, has a high threshold in both form and content. Gijsen states that he does not know how cultural diversity relates to different artforms, but adds that he can imagine that some festivals, who program Dutch film or classical music for example, have more difficulties with becoming culturally diverse, because it is not part of their core-business as with Le Guess Who?.

Although the festivals are thus praised for their inclusivity and actively feed this image, inside the broad umbrella-term of ‘arts festivals’, the extent to which they are and can be inclusive is, according to the organizations, also dependent on what kind of arts forms the festival focusses on. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to test this assumption, but it is important that it is a sentiment shared widely and not questioned among the interviewees. Which genre the arts festival programs is thus an important differentiating factor when talking about festivals and their link to inclusivity and diversity.

It is striking that when talking about art and cultural diversity, besides Le Guess Who?, no festival organizations seems to actively promote the thought that being culturally diverse can actually strengthen the quality of an artistic profile. Again, we see that cultural diversity is set apart from the artistic. The organizations are sometimes even overwhelmingly negative in the sense that they see cultural diversity more as an obstacle than as an enrichment. In this theme, we see a lot of what Mirza discussed and which was elaborated on in the previous chapter, surfacing. For these organizations, there certainly is a clash between artistic ambition and cultural diversity. The notion of artistic universalism, aiming for excellence, is very much present at the festivals. At the same time, with the cultural diversity policies, there is a desire to “engage with people on their own terms”.¹⁹⁸ We see the same contradictory approach to culture as Mirza found in her Rich Mix case study: “On the one hand, there is a desire to see culture as something that transcends communities and is accessible to anyone prepared to understand it as a *thing it itself*. Culture is judged in terms of its artistic ‘excellence’. On the other hand, there is an emphasis on culture as identity-based, relative and ‘authentic’ to local people.”¹⁹⁹ There is a certain resistance to taking the latter all the way by throwing the western-based quality norms overboard, even if this would mean becoming fully inclusive. These case studies thus seem to confirm Mirza’s assertion that there is an inherent contradiction between the discourse of universal value and the discourse of cultural diversity and that the tension between these only becomes visible when studying the cultural practice, instead of only studying cultural policy.

3.2.6. Festival as organizational structure

In the previous chapter, we established that theoretically speaking, the organizational structure of a festival offers both opportunities and disadvantages for implementing change and cultural diversity

¹⁹⁸ Mirza, “Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts,” 58.

¹⁹⁹ Idem, 64.

policy. In this section, we summarize how the interviewees describe these opportunities and disadvantages in practice, and sum their findings up.

The festival structure is perceived as having several advantages. Gijsen is a strong believer in the festivals as platform where people can get to know new things, the festival as a “modern playground”. “In a festival setting, you can guide people towards things that they would normally not go to that easily.” He sees this as a big chance for festivals regarding cultural diversity, since they can introduce people to new cultures by showcasing their cultural and artistic products, as is done at Le Guess Who?.

Flexibility in different aspect of the festival is also seen as a big plus. Gijsen: “A festival can function as Barbapapa, a kind of a chameleon. ... You can very easily move or change things. It can be different each year.” The Nederlands Film Festival states that the flexibility in programming is an asset. “We are a lot more flexible in our programming than other institutions. That is the power of a festival.” There are also chances for the programming by working with partners. The interviewee thinks that collaborations with other parties are a great and relatively easy way to make the programming more diverse. Gijsen sees an advantage in the flexibility of the use of different locations, which can easily change, as well. A festival can literally get closer to the audience, by programming on exciting, new locations outside of the existing arts infrastructure.

Gijsen also emphasizes the fact that festivals have the compacity to become brands. This means that people buy tickets based on the brand of a festival, because they know what the festival stands for, and not necessarily for the programming. This gives the festival the freedom to program new things that the public is not already acquainted with but gets to know under the header of the festival-brand.

There are also disadvantages mentioned. The lack of continuity on different levels, time-pressure and financial restrictions that go hand in hand with a festival proved a restriction on multiple levels.

The fact that the festival is once a year, makes the organization of it very time-bound. Because the activities of all the employees during the festival are very much centered on the execution of everything that was set up before the festival, measures must be taken before the festival. There is the risk that this time-pressure shifts away the focus from things that seem ‘extra’, not part of the core business, like cultural diversity. Prioritizing is inevitable, especially when the festival draws closer. And this not only got to do with the time-pressure, but also the amount of work that has to be done in this short period of time. Organizing a festival is perceived as hard work. A Borra says: “It is a tough job and we are all fighting to make this happen in the way we envision it to be.”

With regard of this topic, the importance of having authentic, durable partnerships is deeply acknowledged. Borra says: “First, you really must gain trust and reach a consensus about whether it is an authentic collaboration. You are really spending a long time to get to know each other.” At the same time, the lack of time and uncertainty of continuity makes it difficult to achieve these deep bonds. Time investments into potential new partnerships are risky, as is mentioned by several interviewees. Borra: “Every time you enter a partnership or if you want to involve public or organizations, there is always the chance that this disappears again.” The lack of continuity in personnel and the changing policy also make it hard to sustain partnerships. For example, Gerritsen says that she thinks that when Borra leaves the organization, a lot of the partnerships she created will just stop existing.

Time is also mentioned as a restriction. Implementing new policy takes time. However, time is very limited in the organization of festivals. These concerns are shared by all the festivals. Furthermore, the time dimension of the festival, once a year, also means that there is only one moment of contact with the public. This means that it is harder to build a connection with a new

target group and show that the festival has changed. That is why it can take longer for festivals than for other, more permanent institutions to reach goals regarding cultural diversity.

As we saw in the previous chapter, Larson stated in “Festival Innovation: Complex and Dynamic Network Interaction” that festivals are made possible by an inter-organizational network, a project network, containing many different stakeholders.²⁰⁰ The festival being a large network is acknowledged by the festival organizations as a restricting factor: it makes it hard to keep track of what everyone is doing and whether or not they are contributing to the change. Although the core organization is concerned with the issue, others, like the sponsors, press, designers, do not necessarily have the same ideas. Interviewees mention that there is no consensus on the best way to deal with this topic, or even a consensus on whether it is important.

Another disadvantage that is mentioned often is the coming and going of personnel. All festivals mostly work with freelancers and temporary personnel. The interviewees think that this makes it harder to make everyone aware of issues like cultural diversity: the employees feel less attached or sometimes only come during the festival, which is too short a period to make them aware and make them implement changes. As the Nederlands Film Festival states: “At the team day Thursday, we are with 32 people. Of course, there will be a part of this that return for next year. But there will also be a big part that does not return. That makes it difficult to make the topic stick.” However, the interviewee states that if the whole sector keeps pushing the importance of the topic, in the end, everyone will end up being aware of it. Furthermore, although recognized as key, it is regarded as a difficulty to attract personnel with a bi-cultural background. The Nederlands Film Festival is very concerned about this, stating repeatedly: “We do not yet know the best way to launch a vacancy in a way that it will attract a culturally diverse group of applicants.” The result is that all festival organizations think they could have a more diverse group of people working for them. However, it is mentioned that it is more important to select personnel based on quality than on cultural background, and there is a reluctance to hire people based on other grounds than their professional background.

The limited funding of festivals also causes another problem. Due to the necessity to keep applying for different funds and the other obligations connected with receiving funding, it is possible to lose sight of other issues, Blok states. And as the interviewee at the Nederlands Film Festival cites, the financial restriction also means that organizations always have to make choices about where to invest. This limits the possibilities for implementing cultural diversity, because it is hard to invest in new possibilities. For example, she thinks that to recruit culturally diverse personnel, making use of a specialized recruiting agency could help, but also states that this is simply too expensive. And for maintaining existing relationships and collaborations, financing is also key, but festival simply cannot guarantee this continuity. This is especially pressing since partnerships are such a good way to make the programming more diverse.

All in all, although there seem to be good intentions, the urgency of the topic can be easily forgotten for the festival organizations, especially under such hectic circumstances. Intrinsic motivation is seen as key. Borra: “To really make this happen, everyone will really have to do this from their own, intrinsic motivations.” The observations about the advantages and disadvantages of the festival structure for applying new policy are in line with Larson’s findings in the previous chapter, like the importance of the festival network, the time factor and the flexibility. However, these findings are more elaborate than Larson’s findings, who for example does not mention branding and funding factors. This suggests that the existing literature on festivals and how they implement policy changes could maybe be expanded by additional research, or be specifically tailored to arts festivals instead of ‘regular’ music festivals.

²⁰⁰ Larson, “Festival Innovation,” 289, 304.

3.2.7. Sector specific complications

Two of the three festival specifically relate themselves to the cultural sector as a whole: the Nederlands Film Festival and Festival Tweekakt. The interviewee perceives Le Guess Who? as first being a part of the music sector, and only secondary the cultural sector. The former mention certain factors that complicate the application of the cultural diversity policy, which are not directly related to the festival structure, but have to do with the situation in the cultural sector as it is in the Netherlands.

The interviewee at the Nederlands Film Festival states that the cultural sector finds the topic important but does not practically know how to deal with it: "I think people feel the necessity of it, but do not have the feeling they have the right tools to make good and quick steps." This sentiment is shared among the other festivals as well. Gerritsen draws attention to the fact that there is not yet consensus in the sector about what is the right approach towards cultural diversity, which makes it difficult to deal with the theme constructively and makes organizations insecure. There is not yet a 'standard' to adhere to. She cites the example of a PACT meeting, where she and a co-worker were ambiguous about the white audience dancing on the African music. "That's exactly what it's not about. It's about making what you offer to your audience more diverse. And when we are talking about this, white people are always dancing to an African band, is this a one-time thing and everyone goes home with a raised awareness, like: we need to get more diverse. And then that's about it..."

A complicating factor for the Nederlands Film Festival is that the NFF is dependent on what the film sector makes: if the Dutch films do not reflect cultural diversity, it is harder for the festival to show that as well. The interviewee thinks that multicultural filmmakers can make better films about multicultural stories. That is why she finds it important to get multicultural students in film schools. At Festival Tweekakt, this dependence on what is produced in the cultural field is also felt.

In the previous section we already covered disadvantages related to limited funding for festivals. The interviewee at the Nederlands Film Festival also sees a problem with the financial restrictions in the cultural sector as a whole as well, which impact the way festivals are able to handle the implementation of cultural diversity policy, especially regarding the P of Personnel. She thinks the financial restrictions in the cultural sector mean that this sector is not an attractive sector to work in for migrants and their children. She says: "The cultural sector should be made more appealing as a career perspective. Right now, it is just not an attractive sector to work in when you are new in the Netherlands. I think that for the first generation of migrants, surviving is their main priority. They will thus rather choose a career in a sector where it is possible to make a lot of money, what is just not the case in the cultural sector." She thinks these people will also stimulate their children to do the same. After a few generations, this will disappear, but for now, this is a pressing issue, which makes the recruiting of culturally diverse personnel difficult.

As last obstacle mentioned is the relatively high price of cultural activities. There is the idea that people will be more willing to pay for entertainment, which is cheaper than culture and art. This makes it harder to attract a group of people with a more low-income background, under which migrants are also strongly represented. This sentiment is shared among multiple interviewees.

The fact that these complications connected to the cultural sector are so importance to the arts festivals, are exemplary of the network festivals are, as described by Larson in the previous chapter.²⁰¹ She already pointed out that the network could either facilitate or slow down change. In this case, the role of the network is ambiguous: the awareness in the network is a stimulant for the festivals, but the dependence on the production-side of the network, financial factors and different opinions about the subject complicate matters. This shows us that when studying festivals, it is

²⁰¹ Larson, "Festival Innovation," 301.

Larson, "Innovation and Creativity," 296, 297.

necessary to always look at the network surrounding the festival, since they have a big influence on the festivals and how they implement policy.

3.2.8. Attitudes towards the cultural diversity policy

During the interviews, some remarks were made about the current policy, both positively and negatively. In this section, the attitudes towards the policy in its current form that were expressed during the interviews are covered into more detail, which gives us a better insight in a possible discrepancy between cultural policy and the festival structure.

First, it is striking that all festivals talk about ‘translating’ the policy to practice. This already shows that there are frictions between policy as it is described in documents and applied policy. The cultural diversity policy from the municipality is praised for raising awareness. Interviewees state that the theme has been put on the agenda by the cultural sector and institutions are now questioning things they took for granted before. All interviewees agree that this is a very strong suit of the fact that the cultural diversity policy has been made. However, they also see some troubles with it.

One interviewee questions to what extent cultural diversity can really be a policy issue. Borra states that it is in the core an ambiguous thing to implement cultural diversity because of policy. It is something that is important and essential, but at the same time, something that does not feel like it can be forced. “There is no good work form for it. It is weird to have a work form at all. And there is no good way to navigate all of this. I just find it such a precious thing that we started this change. But we do need to find a correct way.”

In the same line of thought, different interviewees refer to the limitations of policy, or even the limitations of the cultural sector, in really changing anything big regarding the topics of cultural diversity and inclusivity. Although responsibility is widely acknowledged and taken, and people do find it important to change, in the end, cultural diversity and inclusivity are subjects that the whole of society must relate to. Respondents suggest that even if the cultural sector becomes totally inclusive, this is only a small top of the iceberg. In reality, society as a whole needs to change in their attitudes. The important critical note here is that we can ask the cultural sector to become more inclusive via policy, but this does not fix the structural issues about racism that underly current day society. It draws attention to the limited influence of cultural policy or festivals to fix these issues.

Gijsen sees another obstacle: the risk of becoming “a white person that is pigeonholing minorities”. There is a danger of including people, but only based on their appearance, while you are putting them apart of the rest, and most importantly, impose your idea about who they are and what they are doing on them. He cites the example of festivals programming ‘world music’, somewhere in a corner of the festival terrain. “When you go to an Ethiopian artist and tell him: ‘What you’re making, is world music.’, he will just look at you and tell you: ‘Why am I making world music? Screw you. That is just your perspective on the world.’” This links back to the arguments of authors like Rushton, covered in last chapter, who claim that the focus on ‘defining’ minority-cultures can lead to ‘an alternative form of racism’, in which one group defines what the other is doing from their own perspective.²⁰²

Furthermore, some interviewees are afraid that people think that policy offers some sort of ‘universal cure’, which is not the case. Attention is drawn to the fact that each organization and each festival is different, with a distinctive identity and goal. How cultural diversity is implemented needs a specific approach for each organization, and policy in its current form might be too restricting in this. Interviewees also state that cultural diversity cannot and perhaps should not be implemented in all festivals: Festival Oude Muziek is often mentioned as example of a festival for which it makes little sense to implement cultural diversity. The interviewee at the Nederlands Film Festival states: “It is

²⁰² Rushton, “Cultural Diversity and Public Funding of the Arts,” 94.

key to see what cultural diversity means for every organization. You must have a specific approach for every organization. It doesn't work to tell everyone to program more things in specific neighborhoods, instead of the city center. You have to look at every organization specifically to determine the best approach." Gijsen believes that in the end, festivals should not be forced by policy to change their identity and goals; it is their own choice to see if policy fits with what the festival stands for and whether and in what form to implement policies like cultural diversity policy. As an alternative, Gijsen suggest that it could also be a positive development if the municipality starts funding initiatives that come from people with a bi-cultural background, instead of making the existing cultural infrastructure more diverse. He thinks it would be good to have a cultural sector that is overall culturally diverse, instead of focusing on making the institutions already in place more diverse. However, he acknowledges difficulties with this, like how to get these people and initiatives aware of the existence of governmental support for their initiatives.

There is also the shared realization that implementing policy costs a lot of time. As Gijsen puts it: "You need ten years to really change these things. You can't do that in a timespan of three years." The interviewees fear that policymakers want too many results, too fast. Furthermore, for change to truly happen, this theme should be an important pillar for the local policies for a long period of time. If the policy of the municipality shifts to another issue within a few years, the sector does not have enough time to make real change in the area of cultural diversity happen, before already having to change in other areas. But some interviewees fear that exactly this will happen.

Although all interviewees see the merit of the CCD, some limitations of the Code and the four P-structure are also mentioned. It is noteworthy that during the interviews, several other possible P's were explicitly mentioned as areas of attention for cultural diversity, by different interviewees: Publicity, Promotion and Price. Although these are seen as being highly relevant, their importance is not fully reflected in the current CCD.

Almost all concerns about (the current) cultural diversity policy, are thus of a practical nature. In the theoretical framework, I covered Mirza's overview of how different groups of thinkers have interpreted cultural diversity policies, with the aim of analyzing with which one the festival organizations agree. Different points of view were that cultural diversity policies are a crucial way to address social questions, that the focus on cultural identity is differentiating and not fit to generate a common political discourse, that the emphasis on difference can hinder cultural change or the mixing of cultures, and that the focus on cultural diversity presents and essentialized and racialize view of artists and audiences. However, it becomes clear that the organizations do not critically reflect on the policy in the same manner as these thinkers. There are critical voices, like Gijsen and Borra, but overall concerns about the policy are of a practical nature. The fact that the festivals do not address certain concerns or advantages mentioned in the previous chapter does not mean they do not agree with them or take them for granted: in the context of the interviews, it became clear that the festival context is not fit to reflect on these manners. These organizations use a non-planned, hands-on, practical approach when implementing policy. Time-restrictions give them less time to think about manners like these. Perhaps this non-reflection is also related to the fact that most of the organizations see cultural diversity as a clear policy issue, instead of a bigger issue related to society and the place of their organization in is, which can hinder reflection on the rightness of the policy or how the policy fits with the philosophy of the organization.

Chapter four – Conclusion

This thesis set out to answer the question: *How does cultural diversity policy affect the daily organizational practices of the organizations of three arts festivals in Utrecht, and what does this tell us about the relationship between the specific organizational form of the festivals and cultural policy?*

First of all, it is important to add some side notes and limitations to this research. The access to some of the researched festivals was greater than others, which can give a distorted image of the comparison between festivals. I was not allowed to record and transcribe one of the interviews, which can mean some nuance was lost or statements were too much colored by my own interpretation. Furthermore, using an ethnographic approach comes with the risk of being too involved in the subject and not being able to have the appropriate amount of distance for a researcher. This could result in giving my internship-festival (Festival Tweetakt) a more prominent position in the thesis. However, overall the research was conducted in an appropriate way, and the conclusion can add something to our understanding about the discrepancy between the arts festival-structure and cultural policy.

I can conclude that all festivals are concerned with implementing cultural diversity policy and are working to implement the policy, in their own manner. Especially the municipal policy has created consciousness and a feeling of urgency about the subject. The motivation for the festivals to change this issue is an interplay of complex factors: among other things, the fact that whole society is concerned with it, spreading a positive image of other cultures, the importance of spreading art among everyone, pressures from (local) politics, sense of responsibility due to receiving subsidy, connections to the local dimension, and personal motivations. We can say that the Nederlands Film Festival and Festival Tweetakt are forming a vision on cultural diversity for their festival, while at the same time making and testing out practical steps. Le Guess Who? already has a clear vision on the topic and is experimenting with organizing side-events that celebrate cultural diversity. As Larson predicted, all the festivals use a hands-on, practical approach to make changes and apply policy. With arts festivals, change is not something that is planned, it is something that is done.

No festival is the same. The history, goal and philosophy, programmed arts forms, network are among an wide array of axes of differentiation which shape the festival, and hereby naturally affect the way in which cultural diversity policy is seen and applied. In this thesis, the distinction between the Nederlands Film Festival and Festival Tweetakt at one hand, and Le Guess Who? at the other, kept coming back in different manners. We can say that the Nederlands Film Festival and Festival Tweetakt are older, perhaps more 'traditional' festival, with its roots in the cultural sector and strongly focused on showcasing art of high quality, while Le Guess Who? is a younger festival, rooted in the music scene, with a strong focus on social reformation and innovation. There were some striking observations in the way in which the policy was implemented by the three festivals. In the thesis, I approached the subject from a policy-approach. However, the topic is much larger and more complex, and linked to an array of other, highly debated societal issues. It is thus surprising that two of the three festivals (the Nederlands Film Festival and Festival Tweetakt) approached the topic mainly from a policy point of view as well. Furthermore, all festivals seem to use a quite narrow conception of 'cultural diversity', linked to non-western migrants. With this approach, the effectuation of the current cultural diversity policy bears striking resemblances with the target group policy of the 1980's. Furthermore, artistic considerations were largely left out of the picture as well, setting the topic of cultural diversity even further apart from the core business of the festivals.

In the leaflet quoted in the introduction, the Verenigde Podiumkunstenfestivals saw a link between the far-reaching democratization within the arts, associated with the arts festivals, and the "equally far-reaching internationalization of society, which could be contributed to, among other

things, immigration and emigration.”²⁰³ The organization makes the claim that festivals have had an “enormous positive influence ... on a much more creative and inclusive cultural sector as a whole”.²⁰⁴ In other literature in chapter two, we saw the belief that festivals embody great diversity and innovation in their very core, as well. Also in practice, I found the belief in the low-threshold of the festival platform and the belief in the ability to attract a broad, diverse audience to be omnipresent. However, this assumption does not seem to be based on any concrete numbers or other proof. This research found no evidence that supports the claim that arts festivals have a pioneering role with regard to cultural diversity and inclusivity, or do a significantly better job than other cultural institutions, as well. With applying the policy, the festivals say they encounter the same obstacles as they perceive the rest of the sector to have: for example, no consensus about the right approach, too many white people in the sector itself, not enough interesting products reflecting cultural diversity to program, financial restrictions, and the high price of cultural activities. Besides these general obstacles, they see factors that can be contributed to the specific structure of a festival. Festival organizations experience both unique chances as well as unique disadvantages related to their organizational structure with implementing new policy like cultural diversity policy. The organizations name as opportunities that the festival is a good platform for people to get to know new things, there is a lot of flexibility (with programming, partnerships and locations), and that festivals can become brands. Disadvantages are a lack of continuity on different levels (partnerships, personnel), the high time-pressure and small visibility throughout the year, financial restrictions, and the fact that the festival organization is made up of such an extensive network.

We should thus not take this belief that festivals are inherently more culturally diverse or inclusive too literally. However, what I can conclude, is that festival organizations have a strong, unquestioned belief that the festival form is a unique platform to stimulate diversity and inclusivity. The aim of having a low-threshold is apparently inherent to the festival structure. This line of thought is omnipresent at the festival organizations, and to truly understand the phenomenon of arts festivals in relation to the application of cultural policy and specifically cultural diversity policy, it is important to keep in mind that festival organizations (unconsciously or not) seem to work from this starting thought.

This belief is nuanced in some way, by making the distinction between form and content. There is a belief that the festival *form* is very accessible, which creates opportunities for attracting a diverse audience. However, there is some leeway: festival organizations state that the *content* of festivals can have a higher threshold. Because of the programmed art form, for example: theatre is perceived to have a higher threshold than music and only attract a limited audience. And also because of the used quality norms, which tend to be western and thus exclusive. This difference between form and content is essential to understand the discourse surrounding festivals and inclusivity policies.

What does all of this tell us about a discrepancy between cultural diversity policy and the specific organizational form of the festivals? First, festival organizations structurally talk about ‘translating’ policy to practice, which signals that the policy in itself is not fit for direct application, and express some explicit critique on the cultural diversity policy. They ask themselves if cultural diversity can really be a policy issue, because it feels like something that cannot be forced and is related to such big structural issues in the whole Dutch society, which also need to change. Furthermore, the festivals signal the risk of pigeonholing minorities, which recreates the very power-structures this policy is trying to turn around. The topic also needs to be on the agenda for a long

²⁰³ “Festivals, geen ontkomen meer aan,” published by the Verenigde Podiumkunstenfestivals, June 2018, 8. Accessible via <https://podiumkunstenfestivals.com/>.

²⁰⁴ Idem, 3.

time before some real change can be structurally anchored in the festivals, but there is a fear that the focus in policy will shift away from cultural diversity in a few years. The CCD is seen as being too narrow with regard to the four P's. Most importantly, the organizations criticize the fact that there is no room for customization: policy is seen as a 'universal cure' without enough room to change according to the specific identity of the festival.

Second, there are larger, more overarching processes at play to suggest incompatibility between the festival structure and policy. As we saw, the implementation of policy and new ideas in the festival structure is very ad hoc: there is not a lot of room for planning, but so much more room for improvised solutions. This is at odds with cultural policies regarding cultural diversity, which ask organizations for clear visions and plans. As the Verenigde Podiumkunstenfestivals concluded in their leaflet, cultural policy is in this case indeed stricter than the festival practice, which signals that their claim that changes need to be made to do arts festivals justice are legitimate.

Furthermore, with the arts festivals, we saw that the aim for having a low-threshold goes hand-in-hand with an inherent aim for diversity. All three festival organizations see diversity as a broad concept encompassing among others gender, age, level of education, cultural background and physical state. When doing their business, they always have this diversity in the back of their head. It is unnatural for the festival organization to split this broad concept of diversity up in smaller axes, like cultural background. However, the policy now asks them to do this. It is questionable whether this is the best and most efficient approach for the festival structure, and if this will lead to the best results. I would argue that splitting up the diversity concept in axes is not only inefficient, but in its current form also potentially defeating its own purpose. The definition of cultural diversity in the policy is at the same time narrow, as vague. This leads to the situation that the organizations following the policy have a lot of room for own interpretation, which, in the case of the studies festivals, seems to lead to a limited, undifferentiated view on cultural diversity. 'Cultural diversity' is only seen at the level of migration, and not linked to processes like globalizations and its effects on identification-processes. There also seems to be an unwritten law that cultural diversity only applies to non-western cultures, although this is not specified in the policy. Subtlety, nuance and intersectionality get lost in the translation of the policy to practice. With this comes the risk that the focus on migration and non-western background can actually mean that for applied cultural diversity policy, people can never integrate and become 'Dutch', as the discontent in the CCD with 'losing sight of the third generation' shows. By being asked to see diversity as one axe, instead of a fluid spectrum, the festivals are unable to get the best out of their natural beliefs. This is a clear point where we see that the current cultural diversity policies do not optimally match with the festival structure.

Additionally, the festivals are constantly walking a very fine line between wanting to take someone's background in account, while at the same time not reducing someone to their background. The organizations find it important to program and hire bi-cultural people and women, for example, but are at the same time reluctant to reduce them to solely this, which they think does not benefit the festival and these people themselves. This struggle is brought very much to the foreground with the implementation of cultural diversity policy, and can even be seen as a red threat in the practical side of the policy. This struggle is something that touches upon the very core of the cultural diversity policy, but at the same time, is not expanded upon in the policy itself. With this, the struggle is, as it were, shifted from theory to practice. This question is closely related to another tension field between cultural diversity policy and the practice of arts festivals: the clash of the discourses of universal artistic quality and specific festival identity, versus inclusivity and diversity. Cultural diversity policy, and the way in which it is formulated, suggests, in truly instrumentalist fashion, that being inclusive is just as much important as artistic excellence. This is a break with traditional cultural policy. However, the traditional view on art, which strives for a common standard of quality and excellence, is still present in the practice of people. In practice, this leads to tensions

about which is more important: being true to your festival's identity, even if that includes excluding western quality norms, or being inclusive and culturally diverse?

The fact that the practical implementation of cultural policy gives rise to so many tension fields, discrepancies and underlying ideas that are not covered in the policy itself, shows us that it is important to look beyond what is written on paper, and pay attention to the practical side of policies as well. Mirza's assertion that we need to stay critical of the implications of policies and keep examining how official policy is translated in practical day-to-day decision-making processes in the cultural sector turns out to be a very important one. Although both the intentions of the cultural diversity policy and the festivals implementing these are well, all of this together make you indeed wonder whether cultural diversity is a topic that can be effectively and successfully be accomplished via cultural policy, at least in the way it is now, and specifically for the specific institutional structure of the dynamic, flexible arts festival. It suggests that the Verenigde Podiumkunstenfestival may be right when claiming that the cultural policy system in the Netherlands is not (yet) fully able to effectively handle and appreciate the booming arts festival phenomenon. This could become a serious issue in the future, since there is no reason to suspect that festivalization and the importance of arts festivals will decline, that instrumentalism in cultural policy will disappear, taking cultural diversity policy with it, or that globalization and its effects on identification-processes and migration numbers in the Netherlands will drop. The issues researched in this thesis will thus remain relevant for the foreseeable future.

There are a lot of interesting options to expand upon this research in the future. This research showed that the existing literature on festivals and how they implement policy changes is quite limited and could be expanded upon, or be more specifically tailored to the case of arts festivals. Research with more and different case studies could give a more representative view of this topic and add interesting observations. It could also be thought-provoking to do a comparative research, in which festivals are compared to other institutions in how they apply new policy, to shed a better light on the specificities of the arts festival structure.

Appendix 1. Explained topic list for the interviews

● **Concrete measures cultural diversity policy**

This is the most straightforward, descriptive topic. It serves to map what specific measures the festival organization has taken with regard to the topic of cultural diversity in their activities. **CCD and the four P's (Programming, Public, Partners, Personnel)** is a subtopic of this topic. These specific pillars gave me and the organizations a good common ground for describing the specific activities they were doing in the area of cultural diversity, in all its diversity. However, during my internship I already noticed that the four P's were seen as too narrow and that a lot of other activities and ideas regarding cultural diversity could not neatly fit in one of the P's. That is why I expanded the topic to 'concrete measures cultural diversity policy'.

● **Festival organization as structure**

This topic arose from Mia Larson's work on festivals. She showed that festivals are a highly specific organizational structure, which influences the way (new) policy like cultural diversity policy is applied. With this topic, I wanted to see how the organizations themselves viewed this relation between the festival structure and implementing cultural diversity policy. This gives us insights in both the opportunities and challenges for festivals, and the outcomes can possibly add something about organizational structure specifics to the existing theoretical and policy literature about implementing cultural diversity policy, and arts festivals.

● **Reasons to implement cultural diversity**

I described how Mia Larson poses there are two sorts of motivations to implement new policy ideas: intrinsic and extrinsic. With this topic, I wanted to see in which category the three festivals fell. Their motivations to implement cultural diversity policy (or not) also reveals something about how the organization views the festival itself and sees its connection to, among others, their sector, local governments, their audience, and society, which are important features for this research. This topic also tells us something about how cultural diversity is perceived: is it seen as a policy concept, needing to be implemented? Or does the organization relate it to other developments, like globalization, as well?

● **Cultural diversity as broad issue in society**

In the literature in the previous chapters, we have seen that cultural diversity as a policy concept relates to questions about culture, globalization, identity, cultural policy and the nation-state. With this topic, the goal was to see on which level the organization perceives cultural diversity and they link it to the society and world they operate in.

● **Definition of cultural diversity**

In chapter two, we saw problems with the definition of 'cultural diversity', which was both expanded upon in literature (as Vertoyec did with his approach of 'super-diversity'), as was visible in policy documents. This topic concerns those issues and is aimed at finding out how organizations define cultural diversity. This gives us an insight in the group they are trying to reach with their policy, and their motivations for choosing this specific group. This topic also adds the interesting dimension whether or not organizations follow the definition of the policies they follow or have individual views on this topic as well.

● **Artistic profile and cultural diversity**

This topic rises from Mirza's assertion about the inherent contradictions between the discourse of universal artistic value and cultural diversity policies. With this topic, we can find out if organizations agree with this assertion or not, and, more general, how the organizations see the relation between the artistic profile of their festival and implementing cultural diversity policies specifically, and whether or not there is a tension field between the two and where this possible tension resides in.

- **Link cultural diversity and art forms**

This topic was not derived from the literature, but from my experiences in practice. At my internship at one of the studied festivals and at several meetings in which the sector discussed cultural diversity, mentions were often made which advocated a medium-specific approach to cultural diversity policy. Some art forms were perceived to be 'easier' to make culturally diverse than others. I found this an interesting notion and wanted to explore the assumptions about the precise how and why further, especially given the fact that this thesis researches art festivals focused on different art forms.

- **Support network and attitude**

Mia Larson showed us that arts festivals are not only part of a dense network, but can in themselves also be seen as a network. This resulted in the belief that not only the attitude towards cultural diversity of the festival network is important, but that the support network is crucial for implementing policy as well. As Larson points out, the attitude of the network surrounding the festival can either be a big stimulant for new policy, or the exact opposite. I consciously did not specify or define the term 'support network' and let the interviewees fill this in themselves, to see how they perceive their own network.

- **A subsidized organization**

The literature about festivals in the previous chapter, focused on the organizational structure. How the festival got its financing and how this influenced the festival structure, was not explicitly mentioned. However, I make a distinction between subsidized versus non-subsidized festivals, which partially arose from my experience in the cultural field, where, from my perspective, this distinction was made. Subsidy is public money, and getting subsidy affects the festivals in several ways. Not only are festivals in this case dependent on the support of the government for the arts and their festivals, and do they have to follow governmental policy, my experience in the field showed that they are also more likely to feel certain responsibilities that come with spending money that is public. Because this can be an important factor for how and why policy is applied, it was used as an interview topic.

- **Local context**

Utrecht is a multicultural city. It is thus in the line of expectation that the local context of the festival will one way or another influence the festival policy and how the governmental policy is applied. From my experience in the field, I found out that festivals (and maybe cultural organizations in general) experience a strong desire to somehow be 'anchored' in their local context as well, opposite to being in their own bubble. This topic served to make clear how and why the festivals relate to their local, municipal context and how this influences how they apply policy.

- **Personal dimension and attitudes**

This topic was not an explicit, but a subtler one. Interviewees are representatives for their festival and its organization. But at the same time, it is important not to lose sight of their individuality. I think it is relevant to map their personal attitudes towards the topic as well. Not only can this give insights in perhaps one of the reasons to be occupied with cultural diversity, perhaps related to

Larson's distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation discussed in the last chapter, it will also help us perhaps distinguish discrepancy between individual opinions and the opinions of the organization as a whole.

- **Ideas about art and culture**

This topic may sound very broad, but it is important to keep in mind that underlying every festival policy, is a sometimes-explicit idea about what art or culture should be or do. This topic draws attention to the fact that everything that the respondents said, should be studied very carefully to see what vision or arts or culture is (implicitly) used and promoted by the festival organization and the festival event.

Appendix 2. Example of a coding scheme – 1

Reasons to implement cultural diversity

- Personal motivation
- Do not feel pressure from municipality
- Diversity in team is good for performance
- Letting people here positive things from countries that are normally only talked about negatively will create understanding
- As subsidized festival, it is your responsibility to be aware of equality issues

Cultural diversity as broad issue in society

- Society is operating on an international level
- The future is international: in Africa and Asia as well
- Cultural sector already way ahead of rest of society on issues of equality

Definition of cultural diversity

- Broad definition of diversity: men/women ratio important
- Risk that you become the white person that is pigeonholing people
- Difficulties with finding right terminology

Artistic profile and cultural diversity

- Festival does not adjust to subsidizers
- 'Representing the Underrepresented' is undertitel
- Goal is to bring new genres to the public, not necessarily addressing minorities
→ However, addressing minorities is a new goal for the next years
- Festival is elitist: low threshold, but in an elite niche
- Cultural diversity and inclusivity in DNA of Le Guess Who
- Cultural diversity should be approached differently for each organization; must fit in artistic profile

Link cultural diversity and art forms

- In pop world more men, theatre world more women
- How you deal with cultural diversity is also dependent on your product

Concrete measures cultural diversity policy

- Inclusivity is in DNA Le Guess Who?
- Inclusivity stems from artistic mission of Le Guess Who?
- Organization started with Lombok Festival to attract minorities
- Education projects
- Partnerships with local partners
- Satellite events
- Getting aware of position and then becoming more culturally diverse takes time

Code Cultural Diversity and the four P's

→ Programming

- Aware of men/women ratio
- Very international

→ Public

- Dutch public is very white
- Now: highly-educated, left, artist or from art world
- International audience: high income
- Hope is that the public from Lombok Festival will feel welcome at Le Guess Who in a few years
- Difficult to reach all the nationalities represented on stage
- Strategy to attract new audience: satellite events
- High price is factor of importance

→ Partners

- Very international
- Local partners: hospital, pop venues
- Partnerships with international curators

→ Personnel

- Mostly white
- Trying to get an equal men/women ratio

Festival organization as structure

- Festival as modern 'playground' where people can get to know things they didn't know before
- A festival can make use of a range of different locations
- The festival is more flexible than other institutions
- Festivals have the compacity to become brands, which is a strong suit

Support network and attitude

- Festival is perceived as performing well on these issues
- Pop venues like Tivoli are more aware of the fact that their personnel is not diverse
- Pop venues like Tivoli are doing partnerships with culturally diverse organizations
- Pop venues like Tivoli are trying to reach a diverse audience
- Pop venues in the Netherlands have a squatter's background, with which a lot of minorities have no affinity, which makes them less attracted to the sector
- Municipality should subsidize initiatives from people with a different cultural background, instead of only trying to make existing cultural sector more inclusive
- Cultural sector is now aware of topic of cultural diversity, also because of municipality

Subsidized organization

- Municipality content with the festival
- Because the festival performs well on these issues, they get funding
- Festival does not adjust to subsidizers
- Municipality should subsidize initiatives from people with a different cultural background, instead of only trying to make existing cultural sector more inclusive

Local context

- Giving something back to the city with free satellite events
- Dichotomy of local and international context is strong suit of festival

- Center of Utrecht is also very white

Personal attitudes and ideas about art and culture

- Art is not universal
- Would be better to have a cultural sector that is in total more diverse, instead of making the institutions now in existence more diverse
- Funding is limited in cultural sector
- There is a risk that you become the white person that is pigeonholing people
- Lower educated people are less interested in art; who are we to tell people what to like?
- Making something that is about minorities does not necessarily attract minorities
- To let people get to know something, it is best to offer it to them alongside good things that they already know

Timeline:

12 years ago founded

First: guitar bands, indie, focus on Canada

In the third year there came a focus on culturally diverse bands

Since two years: cultural sector aware of cultural diversity issues

Appendix 3. Example of a coding scheme – 2

Reasons to implement cultural diversity

- Link culture and society: society is concerned with it, so the festival is as well
- Stimulation by politics
- Sense of responsibility
- Sense of making things better for everyone

Cultural diversity as broad issue in society

- Cultural diversity as a sudden “wave” in culture and whole society
- Relation with refugee crisis
- Problem in society as a whole, so responsibility lies with whole society
- Importance of the education system
- Link with racism

Definition of cultural diversity

- State of being cultural sector: bad
- Current situation: too ‘white’ and ‘highly educated’
- Accessibility
- Interest in broad definition of diversity: also disabled people, children, adults, sexes
- Big relation to society, not specifically artistic issue

Artistic profile and cultural diversity

- Tweetakt as open, broad, accessible
- Programming gives room for own imagination and translation, youth theater but also for adults
- Tension field between programming in own profile, while being mindful of cultural diversity

Link cultural diversity and art forms

- Theater is linguistic and has a high threshold, thus difficult to become culturally diverse
- International music attracts international audience
- Music as a more accessible genre

Concrete measures cultural diversity policy

- Cultural diversity is extra, not part of core business
- Talking to people with knowledge of issues
- Founding of work group
- Appointing someone responsible for the work group
- Talking about the issue with team
- Trying to find an audience that is close to the white/highly educated audience
- Working with partners to make volunteering and bar crew more diverse
- Trying to make the communicated image more diverse
- Writing texts as accessible as possible, not too difficult use of language
- Education program as a success story
- Incapability to translate the awareness of the issue to concrete measures

Code Cultural Diversity and the four P's

→ Programming

- Cultural diversity as topic of programming is unwanted
- Programming has to fit in artistic profile festival

→ Public

- Trying to find an audience that is close to the white/high educated audience

→ Partners

- Sponsors are not interested in cultural diversity
- Festival is not looking for sponsors that care about this

→ Personnel

- Working with partners to make volunteer and bar crew more diverse
- No diversity in current team
 - hiring people on skills, not ethnicity
- Consensus about importance of topic, but not on practical implementation
- Lack of continuity in personnel, which makes policy not stick

Festival organization as structure

- Festival as a big process with all kinds of people doing their own task, which makes it hard to keep track off
- Lack of continuity on different levels: personnel, communication
- Time-bound, centered around specific period

Support network and attitude

- Overall: no consensus on importance
 - Campaign designer: not mindful of it
 - Press: not interested
 - Sponsors: not interested
- Overall: no consensus on how to do it
 - Local meeting with professionals: festival was critical of policy propagated here

Subsidized organization

- Financially restricted
- Responsibility to reach diverse audience
- Dependency on local politics

Local context

- The influence of local politics
- Contact with other local festival and arts institutions about cultural diversity

Personal dimension and attitudes

- Acknowledging own position as white and highly educated and not being able to really feel this issue
- Shame

- Talking with team counterproductive
- Taking for granted measures that have been in place for years, like education
- Frustration with people who keep bringing up the subject
- Despondency as a result of awareness, combined with the incapability to translate this to concrete measures

Timeline:

- issue before the economic crisis
- during crisis no time or money for it
- 2018 first edition to actively work on cultural diversity
- starting point in thinking process was talk with Mavis Carrilho

Bibliography

- Ahearne, Jeremy. "Cultural Policy Explicit and Implicit: a Distinction and Some Uses." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15(2): 141-153.
- Ang, Ien. "The Predicament of Diversity: Multiculturalism in Practice at the Art Museum." *Ethnicities*, 5 (3): 305–320.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2006.
- Araeen, Rasheed. "A History on the Margins." *Spikedonline*, 26 February 2004, available from: <http://www.spiked-onlin.com/Articles/0000000CA421.html>.
- Barrio, María José del, María Devesa, and Luis César Herrero. "Evaluating Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Case of Cultural Festivals." *City, Culture and Society* 3 (2012): 235-244.
- Bayart, Jean-François. *The Illusion of Cultural Identity*. London: C. Hurst & Co, 2005.
- Bell, David and Kate Oakley. *Cultural Policy*. London and New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Brown, Wendy. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Cairney, Paul. "Policy Concepts in 1000 Words: The Policy Cycle and its Stages." Last accessed at the 27th of May 2018, via <https://paulcairney.wordpress.com/2013/11/11/policy-concepts-in-1000-words-the-policy-cycle-and-its-stages/>.
- Crul, Maurice, Jens Schneider, and Frans Lelie. *Superdiversiteit: een Nieuwe Visie op Integratie*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 2013.
- Dimaggio, Paul. "Cultural Policy Studies: What They Are and Why We Need Them." *The Journal of Arts, Management and Law* 13.1 (1983): 241-248.
- Dyer, Sonya. "Boxed in: How Cultural Diversity Policies Restrict Black Artists." London: Manifesto Club, 2007.
- Esterberg, Kristen G. *Qualitative Methods in Social Research*. New York: McGrawHill, 2002.
- Getz, Donald, Tommy Andersson, and Mia Larson. "Festival Stakeholder Roles: Concepts and Case Studies." *Event Management*, 10.2–3 (2007): 103–122.
- Ghorashi, Halleh. *Culturele Diversiteit, Nederlandse Identiteit en Democratisch Burgerschap*. Den Haag: SDU Uitgevers, 2010.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Gitlin, Tod. "From Universality to Difference: Notes on the Fragmentation of the Idea of the Left." In: Craig Calhoun, ed., *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity* (Cambridge, MA/Oxford: Blackwell, 1994): 150–174.

Gray, Clive. *The Politics of the Art in Britain*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.

Keith, Michael. *After the Cosmopolitan: Multicultural Cities and the Future of Racism*. Oxon/New York: Routledge, 2005.

Kuper, Adam. *Culture: the Anthropologist's Account*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Larson, Mia. *Festivalbesökaren – Marknadsföringskanaler och attityder till Storsjöyan*. Örnsköldsvik: ETOUR, 2000.

Larson, Mia. "Festival Innovation: Complex and Dynamic Network Interaction." *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 9:2-3 (2009): 288-307.

Larson, Mia. "Innovation and Creativity in Festival Organizations." *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 20:3-4 (2011): 287-310.

Malik, Kenan. *The Meaning of Race*. Basingstoke/London: Macmillan, 1996.

March, J.G. "The Future, Disposable Organizations and the Rigidities of Imagination." *Organization*, 2, (1995): 427–440.

Mirza, Munira. "Aims and Contradictions of Cultural Diversity Policies in the Arts: a Case Study of the Rich Mix Centre in East London." *International Journal of Cultural policy* 15.1 (2009): 53-69.

Palmer, Catherine. "Ethnography: a Research Method in Practice." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 3.4 (2001): 301-312.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. "Globalization as Hybridization." *ISS Working Paper Series/General Series* 152 (1993): 1-18.

Pratt, Andy C. "Cultural industries and Public Policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11.1 (2005): 31-44.

Quinn, Bernadette. "Arts Festivals and the City." *Urban studies* 42.5-6 (2005): 927-943.

Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin, "10. What did you hear? Data Analysis." In *Qualitative interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* (London: Sage, 2011).

Rushton, Michael. "Cultural Diversity and Public Funding of the Arts: A View From Cultural Economics." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 33.2 (2003): 85-97.

Savaric, Michel. "Political Correctness Applied: Multiculturalism in Northern Ireland." *Contemporary Post-colonial and Post-imperial Literature in English*, 2001, available from: <http://www.thecore.nus.edu.sg/post/poldiscourse/casablanca/savaric2.html>.

Shore, Cris and Susan Wright, eds. *Anthropology of Policy: Perspectives on Governance and Power* London: Routledge, 2003.

Stevens, Alex. "Telling Policy Stories: an Ethnographic Study of the Use of Evidence in Policy-making in the UK." *Journal of Social Policy* 40.2 (2011): 237-255.

Tomlinson, John. "Globalization and Cultural Identity," in *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*, edited by Lene Arnett Jensen, Jeffrey Jensen Arnett, and Jessica McKenzie, 269-277. New York: Springer, 2011.

Vasta, Ellie. "From Ethnic Minorities to Ethnic Majority Policy: Multiculturalism and the Shift to Assimilationism in the Netherlands." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30:5 (2007): 713-740.

Vertovec, Steven. "Super-diversity and Its Implications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30:6 (2007): 1024-1054.

Vestheim, Geir. "Cultural Policy-making: Negotiations in an Overlapping Zone Between Culture, Politics and Money." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 18.5 (2012): 530-544.

Research reports and Policy documents

"ANBI Status and annual report 2017 Le Guess Who?."

"ANBI gegevens van Stichting Storm, 2016."

"Annual report Nederlands Film Festival 2016."

"Annual report Nederlands Film Festival 2017."

"Actieplan Cultuur en Creatief Inclusief." Published by De Federatie Cultuur (FC). 2016.

"Code Culturele Diversiteit."

"Creatieve lijnen. Uitgangspuntennotitie Cultuurnota 2017-2020." Published by the Gemeente Utrecht. September 2015.

"De olifant in de kamer. Staalkaart culturele diversiteit in de basisinfrastructuur." Research report, published by Netwerk CS, 17th of December 2008.

Nicolaas, Han and Arno Sprangers. "Buitenlandse migratie in Nederland 1795–2006: de invloed op de bevolkingssamenstelling." Research report, published by the CBS, 7th of January 2007.

Plasterk, Ronald. Letter from the minister of Education, Culture and Science, to the chairman of the House of Representatives. The Hague, 24th of April 2009.

Ploeg, Rick van der. "Ruim Baan voor Culturele Diversiteit." Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. May 1999.

Serkei, Carmelita. "Strategische Posities Bezetten. Cultuurpoliek en Culturele Diversiteit." *Zicht op actieve cultuurparticipatie 2016: Thema's en trends in praktijk en beleid* (2016): 36- 43.

Websites

allecijfers.nl

cbs.nl

devolkskrant.nl

directorsguild.nl

duic.nl

filmfestival.nl

filmfonds.nl

filmkrant.nl

hpdetijd.nl

leguesswho.nl

mediamatic.net

nos.nl

parool.nl

thepostonline.nl

tweetakt.nl

utrechtmonitor.nl