

1. Why Cultural Diversity in Performing Arts?

The scope of this research are the responses of cultural policy to immigration-related diversity in the German performing arts field. The focus is particularly on theatre practice and public theatres, mainly *Stadttheater* (municipal theatre) and *Staatstheater* (state theatre) since they are the backbone of the cultural identity of the nation-state. These traditional institutions are still conceived as the vehicle of ideas, cultural values, and aesthetical reflections of the 20th-century notion of *Kulturnation* (cultural nation) and are almost entirely publicly funded. German high culture, however, speaks primarily to the *Abiturpublikum* (well-educated audience); it fails to reach 50% of the population (German Commission for UNESCO, 2010, p. 6). There has been a decrease in audience numbers despite the expanding range of offers; in the last three seasons alone, German theatres have lost a total of one million viewers (Schmidt, 2013, p. 194).¹

The research precisely places migration into focus to think the role of cultural policy and performing arts anew in the 21st century, in which the transition of society is understood as a continual process. In addition to present-day immigration, with the arrival of people seeking refuge from war-torn countries since the peak of the so-called “refugee crisis” in 2015 and 2016, the demographic structure of Germany will undoubtedly continue to change. The current society in its diversity can no longer be described or experienced collectively in the usual manner of traditional high culture; the dissolution of the boundaries between high culture and cultural education or socio-culture² is inevitable (Heinicke, 2019, p. 193). The performing arts field cannot remain indifferent to the fact that processes of societal transformation are dynamic and have been reshaping the cultural fabric of the country. It is vital for theatre to be a cultural nexus that embodies a profound perception of performing arts in order to break down obsolete barriers between theatre, performance, theatre pedagogy, and participation-oriented social work. Thus, the explicit emphasis of the study on municipal and state theatres is

1 Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from German to English were done by the researcher.

2 The concept of socio-culture emerged in the 1970s, opposing the elitist character of the arts and promising culture for all. The socio-culture practice is introduced in detail in Section 5.3.

twofold. Firstly, these institutions mainly adhere to dissolved categories, bourgeois aesthetics, and classical drama tradition. Secondly, most of them insist on perpetuating their exclusionary structures regarding staff composition, audience profile, and repertoire/programming.

The future of performing arts is linked to their contemporary relevance, resilience and capacity to adapt to a world marked by growing uncertainty and intricacies. The COVID-19 pandemic unveiled what was already known: people did not claim for theatres to be reopened even after the pandemic measures gradually loosened. Policymakers at all levels have been introducing additional financial packages for theatres so that they can survive the pandemic. However, rescuing the theatrical landscape calls for a broader, structural framework. Cultural-political actors today should ponder over the steps that would ensure a demand for theatre because of its substance, relevance, and function (Leucht & Schneider, 2020). Regaining its social relevance and function entails strengthening artistic development (Schmidt, 2013, p. 210), which could be the source of new energy needed for the survival of theatre practice. To that end, the concept of theatre should be more broadly defined, and its narrow and rigid 200-year-old meaning should be expanded (Schneider, 2019b, p. 71). In this context, capturing societal reality cannot be disassociated from supporting the framework conditions for an equality-based performing arts field, nurtured by a novel discourse in which a diverse array of artistic ideas, expressions, experiences, and aesthetics can flourish and be instrumental in the transformation of the performing arts realm. Thus, the reformation of the theatre landscape hinges on an interdisciplinary, intergenerational, and intercultural perspective on performing arts (Schneider, 2020).

From a different standpoint, it should be noted that, under the threat of the COVID-19 pandemic, the “survival” of the performing arts gains a new meaning that entails forgetting the pre-pandemic canons and relentlessly searching for new ways of creating, producing, and sharing art (Ada, 2020). Unquestionably, plans for accommodating diversity should take this reality into account, considering the existing production and dissemination methods in the performing arts field promoted by cultural policies. Hence, an area that urgently requires the engagement of cultural policy research is exploring the requirements of a policy framework that offers not solely recovery subsidy arrangements for performing arts institutions and initiatives in precarious situations; more importantly, cultural policy must adopt an extensive understanding of how to strengthen the ability of a diversified performing arts canon to respond to the fragility of the field so that it can do justice to an intercultural society.

1.1 The Relevance of the Research Subject and Objectives

After decades of political reluctance, in the early 2000s, it was acknowledged that Germany is a country of immigration (Council of Europe [CoE] & ERICarts, 2016). This research argues that although Germany is an immigrant society per se, immigration is to a great degree understood as labour migration of the late 1950s and onwards, resulting in the transmission of the figure of *Gastarbeiter* (guest worker) to the “culturally distant” immigrant in contemporary Germany.

With the accelerated pace of forced migration in the 2010s, today, the integration/inclusion framework of cultural policy also applies to people seeking refuge. According to the Federal Statistical Office, in 2019, 1.36 million people seeking protection obtained the right to live in Germany (Destatis, 2020a).³ However, on account of a lack of comprehensive and coordinated public policies, immigration is still seen as a threat to social cohesion and national identity. Parallel to this, the general public has had the tendency of taking a negative view on immigration, and the discourse on immigration has revolved around foreignness (Yildiz & Hill, 2014, p.10). Given that the growing disapproval for the open-door refugee policy of the central government started to weaken the *CDU/CSU*⁴ coalition, and the fact that right-wing extremism, xenophobia, and racism are on the rise, in addition to social, economic, and integration policy, cultural policy has also been searching for new ways to reinforce community cohesion by means of canonised arts.

Despite the White, male, heterosexual domination in the German performing arts scene, the form of diversity investigated in this research is limited to migration⁵, and the main focus is on the unequal access conditions (including both the performing arts field and funding policy instruments) for the so-called

3 A total of 1.839 million people seeking protection were registered in the *Ausländerzentralregister* (AZR; Central Register of Foreigners) on December 31, 2019; the status of 266,770 applicants has been pending, and 212,575 applications have been rejected, but the applicants have not yet been deported (Destatis, 2020a).

4 *CDU/CSU* is the centre-right Christian-democratic political alliance of two political parties in Germany, namely the Christian Democratic Union of Germany (*CDU*) and Christian Social Union in Bavaria (*CSU*). Although the conservative bloc secured the leading position in the last federal election in 2017, it had its worst election result in almost 70 years.

5 Although there are no empirical data on the lack of the different facets of diversity, by observation, Whiteness, masculinity, and heterosexuality are known to be the dominating features, particularly in municipal and state theatres. In addition to the unfair representation of artists with various intersecting labels, gender inequality is also undeniable in the German theatre realm. A *BKM*-commissioned study, *Frauen in Kultur und Medien* (Women in Culture and the Media), conducted by the *Deutscher Kulturrat* in 2016 demonstrated the male domination in the theatre landscape. From 1994/95 to 2014/15, only 22% of the directorships were held by women, and 30% of the productions (mostly in youth and children theatre)

people with a “migrant background”⁶. In order to underscore Whiteness as a major signifier of a hegemonic structure in German cultural politics and policy, this analysis deals with the construction of difference through the politically and culturally formulated othering category of “migrant background”.

Admittedly, the modes of othering vary, and both individuals and social groups face discrimination and racism based on the intersecting categories of race, gender, sexual orientation, class, age, physical abilities, education, and so on. However, in the hierarchical coding of difference, the researcher asserts that “migrant background”, in practice, only refers to “devalued immigrants” (Fernandes Sequeira, 2015) as an overarching label for “the other” in the German context. The author claims that this label not only signifies migrant family histories or personal migration experiences but also denotes the intersecting identities of the “devalued” immigrant (i.e., non-European, non-Western, non-Christian, Black people, POC

were made by women (Schulz et al., 2016). For the discussion on the Whiteness of the theatre landscape, see Chapter 2.

- 6 Since the 2005 Microcensus, the Federal Statistical Office defines people with a “migrant background” (*Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund*) as immigrant and non-immigrant foreigners, immigrant and non-immigrant naturalised people, (late) resettlers, and the children of these groups who were born as Germans (Destatis, n.d.). The displaced persons of World War II hold a special status (according to the Federal Displaced Persons Act); they and their descendants, therefore, are not part of the population with a “migrant background” (Destatis, n.d.). The term is widely used in German politics and cultural policy. There is a clear-cut distinction between European/Western and non-European/non-Western immigrants. Although both groups, according to the description provided by *Destatis*, have a “migrant background”, inclusion, integration, education, and diversity policies address only the latter group of people. The research uses this highly problematic, severely categorising definition in quotation marks to refer to and emphasise othering in German policy discourse. In Section 2.5, “Structural and Institutional Racism”, the researcher discusses how the marking of “particular” citizens with a “migrant background” operates as a form of cultural racism. Throughout the research, the author employs the term “immigrant” in the cases where “migrant background” is not used by cultural-political actors, scholars, or performing arts practitioners. Further, the author uses “migrant background” instead of “migration background”, to emphasise the labelling of human beings rather than the action of migratory movement. According to the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, a “long-term immigrant is a person who moves into a country other than that of her/his usual residence for a period of at least a year so that the country of destination effectively becomes her/his new country of usual residence” (1998, p. 10). However, Germans who are born in Germany to immigrant parents are still conceived as immigrants, and they are not referred to as minorities. The Sorbs, Danes, Frisians, Roma, and Sinti are considered national minorities, whose ancestors had been living in various regions for centuries. This research uses the phrase “immigrant”, aware of the fact that it is not a neutral term, since it designates a distance between German and non-German descents. Similarly, here the terms “Black” or “POC” refer to the categorisation of discriminated and racialised individuals and groups in the German context.

[people of colour], and recently refugees). The category of “migrant background” contains dimensions of stigmatisation and discrimination. Anne-Kathrin Will, from the *Deutsche Zentrum für Integrations- und Migrationsforschung* (DeZIM; German Centre for Integration and Migration Research), elaborately pinpoints these aspects of the term: a) it silences the war-related immigration of Germans; b) it is exclusionary: even if these people are Germans, their belonging to Germany is questioned by an official category, and they are othered through their separation from the German natio-ethno-cultural mainstream; c) it is bound to “inherited citizenship” which values German descent over other descent (2019, p. 553). In this categorisation, German origin is localised “here”, while the immigrant is always equated with foreignness localised “there”, in comparison to an “us” based on the dichotomous premise that there are people without a “migrant background” (Lutz, 2011, p. 100).

The language in use is tremendously powerful in the construction of reality. A biased terminology such as “migrant background” puts the negotiation of “Germanness” at risk not only in political terms but also in the fields of art and culture in a society characterised by immigration. In 2019, 21.2 million people with a “migrant background” were living in Germany, representing 26% of the total population, while 52% of them were German citizens (Destatis, 2020b). In 2050, it is estimated that around 30% of the population will have a “migrant background”, and already approximately 50% of people under the age of 25 in conurbations in Germany are people with a “migrant background” (German Commission for UNESCO, 2010, p. 6).

Today, although one in four people have a “migrant background” as described by Destatis, access to and participation in the performing arts realm for immigrants as artists and culture professionals as well as audiences is far from satisfactory. Notably, since the mid-2000s, the low levels of access and participation of immigrants compelled cultural policy to consider them as potential target audiences and identify the barriers for their participation (Allmanritter, 2009; Allmanritter & Siebenhaar, 2010; Föhl & Lutz, 2010; Graser, 2005; Mandel, 2008, 2013; Mandel & Renz, 2010; Renz, 2015). Questioning the social role of performing arts in a culturally diverse society and the insufficient number of immigrant professionals and diversity-related disparities in the field have also been the central topics of cultural policy discussions (Bicker, 2009; Keuchel, 2012; Mundel & Mackert, 2010; Regnus, 2009; Schneider, 2011; Sharifi, 2011a, 2017; Terkessidis, 2010). Debates about a theatre reform and the corresponding demand for the intercultural opening of public performing arts institutions have urged the *Länder* (federal states) and local cultural policies to introduce an intercultural discourse and corresponding financial support for “diversity/intercultural/transcultural” projects (see Section 3.3).

Within the last five years, there has been a considerable increase in the number of programmes that subsidise outreach projects specifically with refugees⁷. Since a large amount of funding is available for projects realised with refugees, many performing arts initiatives engage with subjects related to displacement. This significant engagement gives the impression of the arts and culture as the ideal playground for the integration of refugees; hence, they are sometimes treated like miracle remedies for refugee policy (Helling & Stoffers, 2016, p. 239). These are mainly participatory projects of the socio-culture field, which are often designed and implemented for and with refugees by the White German artistic workforce but seldom by refugees (Helling & Stoffers, 2016). In most productions, refugees are part of the projects as amateur actors, but they are not involved in the creative process.

Considering the latest developments on the involvement of immigrants and refugees in the cultural sphere, the study is aimed towards a robust equality-based cultural policy perspective for the theatrical landscape. As addressed by cultural policy scholar Wolfgang Schneider, while there is plenty of theatre critique on productions, there is no such critique for theatre policy; the theatre system usually remains unquestioned (2013b, p. 10). The research seeks to embrace the efforts taken in this direction and further investigate the exclusionary structure of the German theatre system and cultural-political decision-making.

In this context, the study has two primary objectives. First, through analysing different facets of national cultural policy, it explores various dimensions of the cultural diversity dispositive (a network of heterogeneous discursive and non-discursive elements, which are strategically linked, i.e., cultural-political discourse on diversity and the manifestation of this discourse in the form of cultural policy measures). By doing so, it aims to examine the involvement of policymaking in the systematic exclusion of the artistic workforce with a “migrant background” from the theatrical sphere. In other words, the objective of this research is to explore how the ideas, values, and reflexes of cultural-political decision-making bodies ascribe specific meaning to culture and the arts, and to what extent those

7 The UN Refugee Convention defines a “refugee” as a person who is unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion (Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951). The author employs terms such as “refugees”, “people seeking refuge”, or “people in exile” based on their usage by cultural-political actors and performing arts institutions and initiatives, aware of the fact that they are not synonymous. The research seeks to, on the one hand, draw attention to the different applications of the term “refugee” in cultural policy and theatre practice; on the other hand, it aims to underline the difficulty of conceptualising a legislative term without disparaging people to their legal status or contributing to the construction of a collective “refugee identity”.

factors have an impact on the unwillingness and inertia, mainly in the public theatre realm, to accommodate diversity. Second, with the help of a theoretical and methodological framework in addition to empirical findings, the research aims to identify fundamental elements of a paradigm shift in cultural policy towards achieving a fair and accessible performing arts scene for all citizens. To this end, it outlines the conceptualisation, strategic planning, legislative framework, funding structure, implementation measures, and other related areas of action required to reimagine the theatre scene in an interdisciplinary manner across and beyond conventional categories (Schneider, 2017a), emancipated from the rigid mindset and organisational structure.

In order to contribute to the development of cultural policy, this research seeks to delineate the framework conditions of an interculturality-oriented policy that would enable the production of new narratives, artistic forms, and aesthetics created and disseminated by an artistic workforce of diverse cultural affiliations and orientations, knowledge, experiences, and world views that reflect and communicate with the reality of an intercultural society.

1.2 Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Strategy

The empirical section of this book is structured into two main parts, since two different methodological approaches – namely discourse analysis and case study research – are applied. The study examines the programmes of three key funding institutions of the national government concerning the promotion of cultural diversity as well as three independent theatre initiatives working with immigrant and refugee professional and amateur actors, and creating work devoted to immigration-related diversity.

The examined funding institutions and their funding programmes are:

- the *Heimspiel* programme of the German Federal Cultural Foundation (*Kulturstiftung des Bundes [KSB]*; 2006–2012)
- the *Homebase – Theatre for the Coming Society* programme of the Performing Arts Fund (*Fonds Darstellende Künste*; 2016)
- the Socio-Culture Fund (*Fonds Soziokultur*; 2009–2019)

Further, the analysed theatre groups are:

- *boat people projekt* in Göttingen
- *Hajusom* in Hamburg
- *Ruhrorter* in Müllheim an der Ruhr

With the evaluation of the above-mentioned programmes of the funding actors, the research ponders over the relationship between cultural diversity and immigration in German cultural policy by employing a discourse analysis as a qualitative research method. The discourse analysis in this study embraces Michel Foucault's concept of the *dispositif* as an analytical research perspective. Through discourse analysis in several chapters, the cultural diversity *dispositif* is explored from various dimensions to delineate how immigrants are involved in the diversity-oriented⁸ policy framework and to what extent these programmes contribute to a structural change in the theatre system towards a more pluralistic theatre realm. In doing so, the researcher aims to shed light on the underlying frames and structures of public funding cultural institutions that give meaning to cultural diversity and, accordingly, the way diversity is funded by these bodies.

1.2.1 The Framework of Discourse Analysis

There have been numerous approaches to discourse analysis in social sciences depending on the field, context, research perspective, and strategies. In this study, discourse analysis is adopted as a methodological framework; its theoretical ground rests upon the Foucauldian discourse theory. The researcher uses discourse as one of the vital "tools of inquiry" (Gee, 1990) within a particular discursive formation in the attempt to underscore the role and function of the "power and knowledge" (Foucault, 1978, 1980a, 1980b, 1980c, 1980d) retained by public cultural funding institutions in defining and regulating the framework of cultural diversity. By focusing on the interrelation between heterogeneous elements in knowledge production, the discourse analysis in this research is concerned with discursive formations and their materialisation in response to cultural diversity in the German theatre.

Before introducing the discourse analysis methodology, it is necessary to outline the unities of the Foucauldian discourse analysis adopted by this study. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) mentions three concepts: discourse, statement, and discursive formation. These concepts comprise the main elements of discourse analysis. Foucault gives multiple definitions of discourse but does not use the term in a linguistic context; by contrast, he is interested in the mechanisms by which discourses maintain their functions and produce their effects, which are ultimately linked to power relations and the production of knowledge. In

8 In this text, diversity-oriented cultural policy is understood as a cultural policy approach that creates framework conditions for a non-discriminatory performing arts scene, aimed at equal access opportunities and rights for artistic creators regardless of their (intersecting) identities.

other words, Foucault is concerned with the interdependence in what he calls *power/knowledge*, the relation that governs discourses.

Sara Mills states that in the Foucauldian approach, “discourse is regulated by this set of rules which lead to the distribution and circulation of certain utterances and statements” (2004, p. 54). To Foucault, we should look for the rules of formation in discourse. Accordingly, in the analysis of immigration-related diversity discourse, we are not only dealing with groupings of statements but also tracing the regularities of this discursive formation (what is explicitly or implicitly said and what is not said). Moreover, in the Foucauldian sense, “the main reason for conducting an analysis of the structures of discourse is not to uncover the truth or the origin of a statement but rather to discover the support mechanisms which allow it to be said and keep it in place” (Mills, 2004, p. 45).

Following Foucault, the discourse analysis in this research enquires the discursive formation to reveal the historically rooted structures behind the construction of diversity discourse.

1.2.2 Power and Knowledge in the Production of Discourses

In Foucauldian terms, power is not considered a tool of domination and repression that belongs to a specific group, institution, or state. It is neither a negative nor a positive force. Foucault explains that power is productive because it is omnipresent, widely spread, mobile, and that a multiplicity of relations and tactics are connected, since power takes different forms and “it comes from everywhere” (1978, p. 93). Power is an intricate system, a network of forces generated and regulated by multiple entities and social practices in a given society. To him, “power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society” (1978, p. 93).

In the Foucauldian view, we should point our attention to the potency of the tactical function of discourse in which power and knowledge are joined together (1978, p. 100). To understand the role of discourses, it is essential to examine the relations of power from which they derive. In the formation of reality, it is crucial to identify those in the position of producing and disseminating discourses, the context of when and how it is happening, as “discourse shapes relations of power while relations of power shape who influences discourse over time and in what way” (Hardy & Phillips, 2004, p. 300). When observing the functioning of the mechanism of power and knowledge, “it is necessary first to deal in more detail with the relationship between discourse and societal reality and second, to ask precisely how power is anchored in this societal reality, who exercises it, over whom and by what means it is exercised, and as such” (Jäger, 2001, p. 36). For analysing the impact of power/knowledge in its entirety, Siegfried Jäger from the *Duisburger*

Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung (DISS; Duisburg Institute for Language and Social Research) includes the analysis of the dispositive in addition to discourse. Jäger explains why the dispositive should be included in an empirical investigation:

Since knowledge is the basis of action and formative action that shapes reality, the opportunity arises to analyse not only discursive practices but also non-discursive practices and so-called manifestations/materialisations, as well as the relationship between these elements. The interplay of these elements I call, as does Foucault, dispositive. (2001, p. 38)

These non-discursive practices, i.e., non-linguistic elements of discourses, are also part of the discursive formation as “we are not only dealing with spoken and written knowledge (episteme) but also with the entire knowledge apparatus with which a goal is achieved” (Jäger, 2001, p. 41).

1.2.3 The Concept of Dispositive

In *The History of Sexuality* (1978), Foucault explores the processes of discourse production and dissemination in a given field, and how they are regulated not only by power/knowledge but also the interaction of various factors generating power effects. There is an interdependent relationship between power and knowledge, and both notions are connected to certain discursive and non-discursive social and institutional practices in a particular apparatus (Foucault, 1980d). Foucault introduced the term “dispositive” as a conceptual tool to theorise the interconnection between the elements of discursive and non-discursive practices in discourse production, actors involved in this process, and the effects of power/knowledge in the processes of attributing meaning to what is considered common knowledge in a given domain.

Foucault uses the French term *dispositif*, often translated into English as apparatus or dispositive. He describes a dispositive as an ensemble of discursive and non-discursive practices, norms, measures, power relations, and knowledge (1980d, p. 194). In defining the dispositive, Foucault (1980d) states further that these heterogeneous elements are connected to one another. According to sociologist Reiner Keller, with the conceptualisation of dispositive,

Foucault (...) characterises the interwoven bundle of ‘means and measures’ – including persons, objects, organisations, rules, proceedings and the like – that are the basis for the production of a specific discourse and/or for the production of a discourse’s power effects, its interventions into the world. (2013, pp. 52–53)

The concept of dispositive adds another layer to discourse analysis. In discourse production, the assemblage of these interconnected components (discourse, practices, actors, and manifestations) creates a cluster, recognised as a dispositive,

which helps us comprehend how a specific type of discourse is produced and disseminated as societal knowledge in a particular field. The conceptualisation of a dispositive requires an investigation not only of the dispersal of related discourses but, more importantly, of all the dimensions of the power/knowledge relationship along with the strategically interlinked elements of discourse production:

The apparatus is thus always inscribed in a play of power, but it is also always linked to certain coordinates of knowledge which issue from it but, to an equal degree, condition it. This is what the apparatus consists in: strategies of relations of forces supporting, and supported by, types of knowledge. (Foucault, 1980d, p. 196)

The third characteristic of the dispositive, in addition to heterogeneity and connectedness, is that “it must respond to an urgent need at a given historical moment” (Foucault, 1980d, p. 195). The urgency factor prompts the creation of measures which in turn hold the elements of the dispositive together, safeguarding the existing power/knowledge relationship at a particular time and place in a given field.

1.2.4 Investigating a Dispositive as a Research Perspective

The concept of dispositive in discourse analysis enables a comprehensive understanding of how discourses function and what the other factors involved in this functioning are by introducing non-linguistic aspects in the production of social reality. Jäger stresses that, in discourse analysis, discourses cannot be investigated on their own:

Discourses are not phenomena which exist independently; they form the elements and are the prerequisite of the existence of so-called dispositives. A dispositive is the constantly evolving context of items of knowledge which are contained in speaking/thinking, acting and materialisation. (2001, p. 56)

Although Foucault conceptualised the dispositive as part of discourse analysis in context of the power/knowledge relationship, he does not offer an explicit theory on how to examine it; concerned instead with discovering the agencies that attribute meaning in a domain in a particular time and place. Following Foucault, there are various stances on whether discourse analysis could be extended to include the dispositive or should dispositive analysis be treated as a new empirical methodology. In the German-speaking world of discourse analysis, some scholars incorporate the dispositive within discourse theory and analysis (Bührmann & Schneider, 2008, 2012; Caborn, 2007; Jäger, 2001; Keller, 2005; Werner Schneider, 2015).

Andrea Bührmann and Werner Schneider argue that “the dispositive or dispositive analysis does not indicate a specific research methodology that should be carried out in empirical research, nor a canonised methodological-operational programme with individual steps of data collection and evaluation” (2012, p. 14). For Werner Schneider, dispositive analysis is “a research perspective with specific epistemological foundations and conceptual-theoretical components that characterise a ‘style of thinking’ associated with the analytical concept of dispositive” (2015, p. 23).

Joannah Caborn considers dispositive analysis as “a useful extension of discourse analysis” (2007, p. 121); the inclusion of elements of a dispositive into the enquiry makes it possible “to analyse objects and actions as well as text, by doing discourse analysis of the attribution of meaning in their accompanying paratexts” (Caborn, 2007, p. 118).

Similarly, Jäger states that “discourse analysis, extended to include dispositive analysis, aims to identify the knowledge (valid at a certain place, at a certain time) of discourses and/or dispositives, to explore the respective concrete context of knowledge/power and to subject it to critique” (2001, p. 33). Jäger includes the dispositive as a part of discourse analysis to investigate the manifestations of discourses.

Correspondingly, Keller expresses:

In addition to being actualised in the linguistic practices of discourse production, discourses are stabilised by means of dispositives – institutionalised infrastructural elements and assemblages of measures (such as areas of responsibility, formal procedures, objects, technologies, sanctions, educational procedures and as such). (2013, p. 71)

The analytical method described here is influenced by both a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis, and ideas drawn from the type of research analysing the dispositive, enabling us to go “beyond the textual level to be able to analyse the concrete manifestations of discourses” (Keller, 2013). To achieve this goal, the study follows the view of the scholars mentioned above and investigates the dispositive as a research perspective within discourse analysis. Consequently, the research examines cultural diversity as a dispositive. Including the notion of dispositive into the inquiry provides the means of determining the cultural actors occupying the positions entitled to generate, regulate, and disseminate discourse on cultural diversity. Similarly, the dispositive is instrumental in understanding the materialisation of discourse in the forms of institutional measures and norms that exercise power effects, forming a specific cultural diversity framework. In doing so, the research not only analyses the construction of meaning within the diversity frame of cultural policy through discourse but, more importantly, it pinpoints the effects generated by cultural actors, discursive and non-discursive practices,

and the materialisation of this construction of meaning and transmission of knowledge.

In this empirical investigation, the elements of dispositive comprise “institutionalised data production, socio-material infrastructures, networks of articulation and distribution” (Keller, 2005, para. 25). Hence, the methodological framework includes the combined analysis of discursive (discourse in forms such as statements, texts, etc.) and non-discursive (institutions, their measures, norms, and actions) practices. By deliberately involving the dispositive into discourse analysis, the research aims to problematise the interplay between the complex ensemble of discursive and non-discursive elements in knowledge production that form the establishment of public funding programmes with a particular focus on “promoting diversity” through the field of performing arts. By employing the concept of dispositive, this research delves into how the cultural diversity paradigm, in an institutional setting and through specific actions, operates as an inclusion/exclusion mechanism for “particular” immigrants. In short, the dispositive strategy is implemented as a road map for examining the relationship between the discourse on cultural diversity, the actors of this discourse and their actions, the materialisation of power/knowledge relations, and the consequences of these actions.

The study argues that the cultural diversity dispositive consists of a network of heterogeneous strategically linked discursive and non-discursive elements addressing an urgent need. In the first layer of this apprehension, cultural diversity is constructed as a cultural policy paradigm for tackling societal issues through artistic practices. In this construction, cultural diversity is seen as an overarching phenomenon. In the second layer, its contribution to social cohesion depends on a precondition: it requires “the inclusion of the ones, marked as different” (Puwar, 2004).

These two levels – cultural diversity and inclusion/integration – become interrelated through discourse, cultural actors, and specific instruments responding to the “issues/challenges” considered to be results of immigration. In this regard, various cultural funding institutions introduce special incentive programmes and awards for performing arts institutions and initiatives promoting cultural diversity.

The empirical investigation applies the dispositive strategy as a methodological tool of discourse analysis to examine the various aspects of these two levels within the national cultural policy on cultural diversity. Chapter 3 delves into the discourse of cultural policy on diversity and the related concepts employed, to illustrate what the objective of “promoting diversity” means. Chapter 4 analyses the involvement of politics in cultural policy and the role of the political actors’ normative ideas in positioning diversity within an inclusion framework. Chapter 5 investigates special programmes and awards of the policymaking bodies of the federal government

as consequences of the concrete manifestation of diversity discourse. Lastly, in Chapter 6, three theatre initiatives are examined as another dimension of the diversity dispositive.

Drawing on Foucault, the methodology utilised in this work reflects on the question of how the interrelation of discourse, non-discursive practices (actions), and the institutional manifestation/materialisation (outcomes) of cultural diversity can be examined as a dispositive.

The analysis of these interrelated elements of the dispositive primarily deals with the following catalogue of questions:

1. What are the elements of the cultural diversity dispositive concerning immigration in cultural policy?
2. What are the strategically linked cultural policy objectives on cultural diversity regarding immigration?
3. How are political and policy actors involved in the production of discourse on immigration-related diversity?
4. What measures and instruments are introduced as a response to an urgency?
5. What strategies and concepts do national cultural funding institutions employ to promote immigration-generated diversity?
6. Who are the addressees of the discourse on cultural diversity in the programmes of these funding institutions? What roles are ascribed to immigrants and refugees in these programmes?
7. What impact do diversity-oriented cultural policy strategies and measures have on the German performing arts scene?
8. What shortcoming or shortcomings of cultural policy are the reason that although “promoting diversity” is continuously one of the priority objectives, these efforts are not reflected in the programming, staff, and audience composition of most public theatres?
9. How do the funded theatre initiatives address immigration-related diversity in their productions?
10. How do the funded theatre initiatives interpret aesthetics and artistic forms?
11. How are immigration and displacement manifested in the organisational structure of the funded theatre initiatives?
12. How are the strategies, artistic forms, and narratives of the funded theatre initiatives received by their audiences?

1.2.5 Data Sampling and Data Selection

As already emphasised, this empirical study does not focus on linguistic analysis. Instead, it investigates palpable policy processes with the aim of pointing out how

cultural politics and policy influence the shaping, regulation, and transmission of particular knowledge on immigration-generated diversity. It also deals with the question of how this knowledge construction determines the framework of access conditions to the theatre scene for the ones marked as “particular” immigrants and refugees. Therefore, it analyses the documents that are considered as characteristic or exemplary data for the discourse content of the current cultural diversity paradigm.

The scope of the empirical material presented in Chapter 3 includes documents related to interculturalism. Since the second half of the 2000s, policymakers at different levels have been advocating for the intercultural reorganisation of cultural institutions. The research tackles this dialogue-oriented shift to comprehend the correlation between the rejection of a multicultural view and the embrace of an intercultural one in political and policy circles.

The empirical investigation in Chapter 4 mainly consists of an examination of the key national cultural policy documents and concepts that associate immigration-generated diversity with inclusion. In Chapter 5, various data on the funding programmes of selected federal cultural institutions is analysed. Additionally, the data corpus of Chapter 6 comprises participant observations and interviews conducted by the researcher.

This study argues that in the second half of the 2000s, a change in mindset took place in the German political discourse on immigration. After decades of reluctance, only following the enactment of the new immigration law, the Immigration Act of 2005, finally, Germany was publicly acknowledged as a country of immigration (CoE & ERICarts, 2016, p. 7). This cornerstone in the immigration history from the 1970s onwards in the Federal Republic brought forward the realisation of the (cultural) identity aspect of integration. At the end of a long political process, a slow change in perspective started to take place, accentuating the inclusion of diversity in social and cultural life, in addition to its role in the German economy. Since the recognition of culture as a vital pillar for combating the “issues of immigration” after the failed assimilation plans and strategies of immigration and integration policies, cultural policies have become essential instruments for responding to immigration-generated diversity and finding alternative ways for including “particular” immigrants into society through the canonised arts. Secondly, corresponding to this continued progress in acknowledging the immigrant character of the country, the notion of inclusion has been one of the priorities of national cultural policy, pursued through enhancing cultural participation and integration of people with a “migrant background” as well as promoting intercultural dialogue and exchange (CoE & ERICarts, 2016). Recently, after the so-called “refugee crisis” of 2015 and 2016, people seeking refuge in Germany were added to this category of the ones that need to be included in the nation (Puwar, 2004).

Another significant aspect of the change in mindset towards favouring the promotion of diversity is connected to the ratification of the UNESCO 2005 Convention for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions by Germany in 2007. Since then, cultural diversity has been the primary cultural policy paradigm in Germany. Both the *Enquete-Kommission* (Commission of Enquiry) and national cultural policy advocate fostering cultural diversity in line with the UNESCO 2005 Convention.

This research assesses the above as cultural policy measures essential for the reconstruction of discourse on immigration-related diversity. Furthermore, these measures provide a broad array of insights into the discursive formation of cultural diversity as a dispositive.

1.2.6 Data Evaluation

In his discourse theory, Foucault did not develop an empirical method for implementing a discourse analysis. As Keller expresses, although Foucault's theoretical approach to discourse has been very influential for researchers, a coherent strategy is almost nonexistent regarding how one should conduct an empirical discourse analysis research:

In the secondary and research literature that relates to Foucault, we may find, with regard to methodological implementations, predominantly terminological and theoretical explanations for conceptualisation, but almost no hints – at least from the perspective of qualitative social research, nothing satisfactory – about concrete strategies for the processing of the material. (2013, p. 55)

In conducting discourse analysis, this work follows the proposal of Keller. Hence, in the first stage, “the analytical technique consists of simple reading and ‘evaluation’ of the information that seems to be of importance (...), then specific, controlled analytical and interpretative techniques are utilised” (Keller, 2013, p. 98) to establish the validity of underpinning discourse processes. For the interpretative analysis of the selected data, “triangulation” (Denzin, 1978; Flick, 2009) is employed to combine various materials and methods in order to maintain a multidimensional view on the production of a particular discourse structure in cultural policy regarding the involvement of immigration into the cultural diversity framework.

In the next stage, a structural analysis as suggested by Jäger is carried out as a general guideline for processing data (2001, pp. 54–56). However, the inquiry does not follow all the proposed steps, instead, the method is adjusted to the theoretical approach of the study and is aimed at providing an adequate degree of verification for the research questions. The investigation consists of:

- a brief characterisation of national cultural policy texts and related concepts regarding the promotion of cultural diversity,
- a description of the objectives of the selected funding institutions on immigration in context of addressing cultural diversity,
- an overview of the funding programmes promoting diversity and an evaluation of the conveyed subjects and topics concerning immigration (see Chapter 5 for the justification of programme selection),
- a sample analysis of several theatre projects subsidised by these programmes to illustrate the discourse positions from which the programmes approach cultural diversity (see Chapter 6 for the criteria of case selection),
- an overall analysis of the discourse structure on immigration-related diversity,
- an examination of other elements (e.g., cultural politics) of the cultural diversity dispositive responding to an urgency, and
- an investigation of three theatre initiatives funded by various public institutions as the materialisation of the cultural diversity discourse.

Finally, the analysis culminates in a summarisation of the concluding interpretation and processing of the empirical findings, providing a snapshot of the cultural diversity dispositive.

1.3 Case Study Analysis

In Chapter 6, in addition to the dispositive-oriented discourse analysis, a qualitative case study research is also conducted to investigate three independent theatre initiatives. This decision is closely related to three factors. First, case study provides a distinctive advantage over other research methods in instances where “a how or why the question is being asked about a contemporary set of events over which the investigator has little or no control” (Yin, 1994, p. 9). Second, the researcher considers case study analysis “a research strategy that comprises an all-encompassing method with the logic of design incorporating specific approaches to data collection and data analysis” (Yin, 1994, p. 13). The specificity of case study research is suitable for the questions raised in this study, as it instructs the researcher to analyse a few cases intensively and describe and explain them in detail from various dimensions with the help of diverse empirical evidence including interviews, participant observation, direct observation, artefacts, documents, and so on (Gerring, 2007; Hancock & Algozzine, 2006; Ragin & Becker, 1992; Vennesson, 2008; Yin, 1994, 2018). Finally, the applicability of case study research in different disciplines and subfields for developing a theory or a concept, its usefulness in performing an empirical inquiry on numerous subjects rigorously in order to understand a case or cases, and its relevance “to use theory to make sense of

evidence and to use evidence to sharpen and refine theory” (Ragin & Becker, 1992, p. 225) allow the researcher to become actively involved in the subject in question.

1.3.1 Case Study Research Design

Case studies commonly involve the examination of “persons, processes, institutions, social groups, and other contemporary phenomena (e.g., a particular event, situation, programme, or activity)” (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006, p. 15). The purpose of such a wide range of engagement is having “diverse objectives, characteristics and results” (Vennesson, 2008, p. 225). For this reason, there have been various approaches to research design in case studies; hence, “the classification of a research design always depends upon the particular proposition that a researcher intends to prove” (Gerring, 2007, p. 29). Consequently, case studies are distinguished from one another depending on the focus of research and the interest of the researcher. In terms of the intent of the analysis, commonly, there are three categories: intrinsic, instrumental, or collective (multiple) case studies (Creswell, 2007; Hancock & Algozzine, 2006; Stake, 1995). The research design of this case study can be classified as a collective case study, as the subject of concern is embodied in three cases – three independent theatre initiatives: *boat people projekt*, *Hajusom*, and *Ruhrorter*. In the design of this research, these theatre groups are conceived “as several instrumental cases to allow an enhanced ability to theorise about some larger collection of cases” (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006, p. 35). The research examines how these theatres approach matters of immigration, displacement, identity, and otherness. Through empirical evidence from the investigated cases and a conceptual proposition, the research explores a feasible cultural policy concept that advocates a pluralist theatre landscape in Germany.

To retain a broader perspective when describing and explaining the cases, the investigation deploys several case study strategies. Hence, the case study part of this research entails a triangulation between three forms of research design “to compensate for the limitations of each method” (George & Bennett, 2005). According to Sharan Merriam (2001), case study research may also adopt a disciplinary method such as ethnographic, historical, psychological, or sociological. Following this line of thought, the research design of this work rests upon a sociological perspective with the aim of achieving a comprehensive investigation of the empirical evidence and hopefully finding answers to the research questions via the conceptual foundation explaining the findings.

Theory-building plays an integral part in case studies, and “developing a theory prior to the conduct of any data collection distinguishes case studies from other related methods such as ethnography and grounded theory” (Yin, 1994, p. 27). The design of this research is concerned with concept creation. In this regard, the proposition of the concept of thinking interculturality (McDonald, 2011) is further

developed to *thinking and acting interculturally* in performing arts. Conceptualisation is designated as the basis for identifying the main features of a future-oriented performing arts scene, one that views diversity as the norm of society. *Thinking and acting interculturally* is derived as a viable concept for formulating the preconditions of involving immigrant and displaced artists, new narratives, artistic forms, and aesthetics in the German performing arts scene.

Finally, case study research strategies can also be classified as exploratory, descriptive, and explanatory (Yin, 1994, 2018). The design and conduct of this case study have an exploratory motive as the examination of three theatre groups as cases entails “illustrating certain themes within an evaluation in a descriptive manner” (Yin, 2018). Additionally, the exploratory design is instrumental here, as “it seeks to define research questions of a subsequent study or to determine the feasibility of research procedures” (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006, p. 33). The exploratory strategy also enables us to underscore various features of the conceptual proposition.

1.3.2 Cases and the Casing

The term “case” can be understood and described from different viewpoints, and it has been continuously discussed and questioned (Ragin & Becker, 1992; Vennesson, 2008; Yin, 1994). Various applications of the term include “data categories, theoretical categories, historically specific categories, substantive categories, and as such” (Ragin & Becker, 1992, p. 217). Hence, it is essential to clarify what this empirical analysis refers to when using the term “case”.

According to Gerring, “case connotes a spatially delimited phenomenon (a unit) observed at a single point in time or over some period of time; comprising the type of phenomenon that an inference attempts to explain” (2007, p. 19). An investigator should retain a critical position in determining the borders of the case or cases (Bennett, 2004; Vennesson, 2008; Yin, 1994). Creating cases demands the interest and active involvement of the researcher in data collecting and the conceptualisation of the research design; cases are “the product of theory and conceptualisation – as when we ask what something is a case of, set the boundaries of the case or use conceptual tools to understand it” (della Porta & Keating, 2008, p. 13). The investigator decides which class of events, which facets of the phenomenon, and which variables to focus upon (Bennett, 2004). More importantly, the role of the researcher in limiting the cases is critical since “case study does not presuppose a relatively bounded phenomenon, nor is it based on the need to select such a phenomenon; the boundaries of the phenomenon are defined by the investigator” (Vennesson, 2008, p. 230).

This research design of case study aims to bridge the gap between the conceptual framework and the empirical data. To link these two strands together,

Ragin and Becker suggest the alternative phrase *casing*, “as a research tactic to resolve difficult issues in linking ideas and evidence” (1992, p. 217). They consider casing “an essential part of the process of producing theoretically structured descriptions of social life and of using empirical evidence to articulate theories” (1992, p. 225). Considering this suggestion, the enquiry views casing “as a methodological step” (Ragin & Becker, 1992) taken to integrate the theoretical ground and empirical data, but more importantly “to avoid manipulating the empirical research in favour of verifying the theoretical framework” (Platt, 1992; Ragin & Becker, 1992).

Furthermore, the way researchers are involved in the creation of cases is an essential attribute of the qualitative methodology as “researchers are not passive; they engage in casing” (Vennesson, 2008, p. 229). The interest of the investigator delimits the boundaries of the cases; thus, the construction of the theoretical framework and collecting the matching empirical evidence to exercise the relevance of the conceptual proposition is characterised more appropriately by casing. Evidently, the casing in this work is stimulated by concept formation and it “involves not selection on a random basis or the basis of typicality, but on the basis of theoretical interests in cases” (Ragin & Becker, 1992, p. 222).

1.3.3 Data Collection for the Casing

One of the defining features of case study is an in-depth evaluation of various empirical data through which the researcher seeks to determine the components of the concept formulation. The data in this research includes interviews, participant observation, and document analysis. The cases are selected through purposeful sampling since the researcher believes they are illustrative of different dimensions of the concept of *thinking and acting interculturally*. Purposeful sampling is also applied in determining the range of the empirical material, as the researcher has assessed that the selected data is relevant for conceiving, observing, and envisaging a performing arts field that matches the requirements of this concept. Thus, cases are chosen “according to the intensity with which the interesting features, processes, experiences, and as such are given or assumed in them” (Patton, 2002, as cited in Flick, 2009, p. 122).

The case study design of this research is based on different methods and procedures of data-gathering. The central part of the data analysis consists of participant observation and interviews with the members of the mentioned theatre groups.

Additionally, participant observation was chosen as a data collection technique as it combines document analysis and interviews with direct participation and self-observation (Denzin, 1989). Here, the aim of participant observation is twofold: first, to gain knowledge on the theatres’ artistic forms chosen for constructing

the casing on immigration and displacement; and second, to discern the theatres' methods of working with professionals and amateurs labelled as immigrant and refugee artists. To attain this goal, the researcher took part in the rehearsals of some of the productions of these theatre groups.

In this research, participant observation includes three phases:

- Descriptive observation: To provide an orientation at the beginning to the field under study. It consists of nonspecific descriptions and is used to grasp the complexity of the field as far as possible and to develop (at the same time) more concrete research questions and lines of vision.
- Focused observation: To narrow the perspective on those processes and problems, which are most essential for the research questions.
- Selective observation: To find further evidence and examples towards the end of the data collection. (Spradley, 1980, p. 34)

In terms of pursuing the objective of developing the concept of *thinking and acting interculturally*, participant observation provides “methodological flexibility and appropriateness” (Flick, 2009) needed to uncover the specific aspects of the concept supported by consistent and additional empirical evidence.

1.3.4 Content Review

As part of introducing a triangulation of diverse perspectives into the case study, in the last phase, the casing is evaluated based on a set of criteria developed by the researcher, comprising the core elements of a theatre that *thinks and acts interculturally*⁹. Developing “method-appropriate criteria” (Flick, 2009) can prove beneficial in overcoming the challenges of gaining validity and reliability. In this study, attaining validity is achieved through demonstrating “credibility” (Eisner, 1991). By providing the criteria of credibility, the researcher seeks to meet the condition of bringing together evidence in a meaningful way to support the conceptual formulation. According to Eisner, “the confluence of evidence that breeds credibility allows us to feel confident about our observations, interpretations and conclusions” (1991, p. 110).

Since the case study presented in this research is concept-oriented, in the first step of the analysis, the data is arranged into relevant components of category formation, to generate a standpoint that signifies the theoretical framework (Madison, 2005). These categories are seen as supporting evidence displaying multiple characteristics of the concept of *thinking and acting interculturally*. Based

9 See Section 7.1. for the concept of *thinking and acting interculturally* and the indicators of interculturality in Section 7.1.1.

on the categories, the empirical data is continuously examined and interpreted in a processual cycle “in order to reach tentative conclusions and to refine the research questions” (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006, p. 56).

Reviewing the data concerning the formation of categories consists of describing the cases in detail, developing subjects or dimensions using a classification system, and providing an interpretation of the theoretical and conceptual perspective (Creswell, 2007). Although the aim of this research design is not plainly to describe the cases, description is unavoidable as all types of case studies are, to a certain extent, descriptive by nature (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006, p. 16).

Description is one of the early steps of the analytical strategy along with database classification and interpretation. This work uses “direct interpretation” (Stake, 1995) as a form of data evaluation, with which the researcher aims to establish patterns and search for correspondence between the categories (Creswell, 2007). Through the interpretative processing of interviews, observations, and other related documentation, the goal is to comprehend each case (Flick, 2009, p. 374) and delineate the main features of the conceptualisation of *thinking and acting interculturally* for the performing arts scene.

1.4 The Structure of the Study

The research investigates, from various dimensions, how German cultural policy frames immigration-related diversity in performing arts. Striving for a comprehensive portrayal of cultural policy approaches to cultural diversity and how the objective of “promoting diversity” is embodied in the performing arts scene, this study analyses cultural diversity as a dispositive. Moreover, to gain multiperspectivity, it also adopts an interdisciplinary research analysis methodology, drawing perspectives from sociology, cultural studies, and political science.

Chapter 1 of this study delineates why the reformation of the German performing arts field should be accompanied by accommodating immigration-related diversity. Then, it introduces the methodological framework, namely dispositive-oriented discourse analysis and case study research. The discourse analysis of this research employs Michel Foucault’s concept, the dispositive as an analytical research perspective. It examines the cultural diversity dispositive to identify the cluster of heterogeneous but interrelated discursive and non-discursive elements in the functioning of immigration-related diversity discourse and how this discourse is produced and maintained by policymakers and disseminated as societal knowledge. It also describes how the chosen data corpus is conducive to underscoring the power effects of the cultural diversity dispositive

in terms of motivation, objectives, utterances (not only what is said, but also what is implicit) of cultural policy documents, statements of policy actors, funding programmes, and funded theatre initiatives. The second part of this chapter explains the case study research perspective for the investigation of the chosen cases of independent theatre collectives. The case study is designed to outline the main components of forming a concept for a pluralistic performing arts scene. Using casing to bridge the gap between the conceptual framework and empirical data (Ragin & Becker, 1992), the research seeks to reify the concept of *thinking and acting interculturally* as a cognitive tool to think diversity anew in the performing arts field.

Chapter 2, firstly, describes the theoretical background of the research, which focuses on the interrelation between cultural policy and systematic exclusion of immigrant artistic workforce from the performing arts field. It argues that the normative ideals, values, and aesthetical conventions of policymaking bodies play a crucial role in the maintenance and regulation of inequality, particularly in the public theatre domain, as well as between the institutionalised and the independent and amateur theatres. It makes use of historical institutionalism and Pierre Bourdieu's field theory for a coherent comprehension of the power of policymaking in perpetuating the inert organisational structure of public theatres and engendering resistance to change in these institutions (Béland, 2009; Bourdieu, 1989, 1993a, 1993b). In other words, it analyses the association between a historically grounded embodied system of beliefs, attitudes, and reflexes of cultural-political actors and the habitus of the agents in the theatre field to determine how decisive this interplay is for the lack of equal opportunities for cultural professionals with a "particular migrant background". Then, the second section shortly outlines what cultural diversity means for municipal and state theatres where a lack of diversity is most present, and whose legitimacy has been questioned, especially in the last two decades. Next, it discusses the crucial role of the mutual relationship between the independent scene and post-migrant theatre in the development and proliferation of the notion of pluralistic diversity in German theatre.

Lastly, in the following subsection, the research claims that people with a "particular migrant background" with intersecting identities (i.e., non-European, non-Western, non-Christian, Black, POC) and lately refugees are subjected to othering. It attempts to illustrate how the culturalisation of politics after the post-war period in Europe replaced the concept of race with culture, and that culture has become a category for establishing differences as binary oppositions (Balibar, 1991a; Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1992b; Hesse, 2007; Goldberg, 2006; Lentin, 2005). The section discusses the role of Eurocentric perspectives and the stigmatisation of cultural differences of "the other" in generating structural exclusion. Next, it investigates the reflection of the arbitrary category of "migrant background", which

is recognised in this work as a hierarchical coding that negates difference and operates as a form of racism manifested in spaces. These are namely national space (cultural-political policymaking) and cultural space (public theatre). The research argues that national space being constructed by cultural politics has a profound impact on the exclusion of “the other” from the domain of public theatre.

Chapter 3 critically interrogates the vague language of diversity discourse (Vertovec, 2012) in German cultural policy. Through analysing concepts related to the goal of “promoting diversity”, namely multiculturalism and interculturalism, the research examines the relationality between cultural integration and diversity. Furthermore, it probes various conceptualisations of interculturalism and intercultural dialogue employed by the *Länder* and local cultural policies, to illustrate what “promoting diversity” means and if or to what extent these perceptions and strategies might be beneficial to the federal cultural policy in offering an intercultural perspective for the pluralistic structuring of the performing arts scene.

Chapter 4 explores the political dimension of the cultural diversity dispositive. It analyses the impact of specific values and ideals of cultural-political actors in the construction of hierarchised diversity, comparing Germany after labour migration from the 1950s onwards with Germany after the unification. It illustrates how political manifestations are involved in the regulation of the binary division between “us” and the “culturally distant” immigrants (“them”) and how those ideologically overloaded cultural-political concepts define the policy objectives of “promoting diversity” and creating a conditional inclusion framework for “particular” immigrants.

After debating different discourse dimensions of the cultural diversity dispositive, in Chapter 5, the research assesses some incentive and subsidy programmes of primary cultural funding institutions of the federal government, to comprehend how the discourse on immigration-related diversity is implemented through varying actions supporting different segments of the German performing arts scene. The inquiry is also concerned with whether or to what extent these funding programmes can contribute to an equality-based renewal of the performing arts field.

By conducting a dispositive analysis and case study research, Chapter 6 evaluates three independent theatre initiatives funded by the very same policy institutions that constitute the second layer of materialisation of immigration-related diversity discourse. The aim of the analysis is, on the one hand, to obtain an extensive insight into how cultural diversity is put into practice. On the other hand, the aim is to explore to what extent these examples might be gainful in underpinning the main components of the conceptualisation of *thinking and acting interculturally* in order to envision the performing arts realm as a democratic space in which knowledge production can be diversified, and how the presence of various

artistic articulations can support the future relevance of the field and fulfil the expectations of an intercultural society.

Finally, Chapter 7 summarises the findings of the theoretical and empirical analysis; then, it introduces the concept of *thinking and acting interculturally* and outlines the preconditions of the conceptualisation. Lastly, it offers a precise intercultural vision and an accompanying strategic planning perspective that seeks to stimulate a change in mindset towards policymaking for the pluralisation of the performing arts scene. It also identifies the core elements of an interculturally-oriented cultural policy framework for dismantling segments of structural inequality and achieving equal opportunities for all in the realm of performing arts.

