Diversity in the cultural sector of Rotterdam

The dynamic relationship between cultural policy and cultural institutions

Student Name: Damini Bhugwansing

Student Number: 413724

Supervisor: Prof.dr. K. van Eijck

Arts, Culture and Society

Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master Thesis

12 June 2020

Diversity in the cultural sector of Rotterdam

The dynamic relationship between cultural policy and cultural institutions

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to investigate to what extent the objectives of the cultural policy framework of Rotterdam's municipality match the objectives and practices of the city's cultural institutions. This research specifically focuses on diversity in cultural institutions' programming and audience. The impetus for researching this topic is the debates in the Netherlands that have been centering around diversity in the cultural sector and policy making since the second half of the twentieth century.

The data set of this thesis consists, first, of the cultural policy framework of 2017 – 2020 of Rotterdam's municipality. In addition, the annual reports of 2016 and 2018 of 18 cultural institutions in the city are analyzed. Two cultural institutions per discipline, as determined by the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture, were selected based on the highest amount of subsidy received. The nine different disciplines are architecture, design and e-culture, visual arts and photography, cultural education and social cohesion, dance, film, municipal collection and heritage, literature and debate, music, and theater. The research is conducted by means of qualitative content analysis.

The main findings of this thesis show that the focus of the municipality's cultural policy framework is on the diversification of the audiences and audience research. However, it seems that the municipality's recommendations are non-binding. The focus in most of the annual reports of the cultural institutions is on programming rather than audience composition. But even in the discussion of programming, it remains unclear how diverse the programming is. In most cases the discussion of programming is limited to a description of the storyline without specifying which audience segments the cultural institutions are trying to reach. With regard to audiences, cultural institutions provide limited information on their audience reach and audience composition. If information is provided, this is limited to visitor numbers in most cases. Another remarkable finding is that some cultural institutions implicitly discuss diversity. They often remain vague and speculative. As a result, is it not clear what exactly is meant by certain statements. Moreover, the majority of cultural institutions has not started to conduct audience research at all. Therefore, the overall picture of how a broad and diverse audience is going to be reached and attracted by the cultural sector as a whole – a wish expressed by Rotterdam's municipality – is missing.

KEYWORDS: *Cultural policy, Cultural institutions, Diversity, Programming, Audience*

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Diversity in the cultural sector is a much discussed topic. In the second half of the twentieth century, arts and culture became a distinguished field of public policy in Western Europe and the focus of cultural policy shifted from highbrow culture to popular culture. Since the 1970s, the discussion on diversity in the cultural sector has been omnipresent. In 1999, former State Secretary Rick van der Ploeg gave it an additional boost by specifically focusing in Dutch cultural policy on cultural diversity with a focus on minority culture.

This research focuses on diversity in the cultural sector of Rotterdam more specifically. According to statistics published by the municipality of the city, more than half of Rotterdam's inhabitants have a migration background. However, if we take a look at the audience that is reached by the city's cultural institutions, the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture notes that the cultural institutions do not succeed in reaching a broad and diverse audience. A study conducted by Berkers, Van Eijck, Gillis-Burleson, Zoutman, and Chin-A-Fat in 2018 shows that a structural form of cultural policy making in Rotterdam is absent and a diversity policy is still not seen as a priority. This has led to the questions whether the municipality's cultural policy framework is putting diversity on the agenda enough and whether cultural institutions follow the municipality's key focus points sufficiently. These questions are summed up in the research question of this thesis, which is:

To what extent do the objectives of the cultural policy framework of Rotterdam's municipality match the objectives and practices of the city's cultural institutions regarding diversity in programming and audience?

The goal of this research is to see whether the objectives of the municipality's cultural policy framework resonate with the objectives and practices of the city's cultural institutions when it comes to diversity in programming and audience. Therefore, the focus of this research is on the content of the cultural policy framework, the objectives put into practice according to the cultural institutions' annual reports and an explanation of the possible discrepancy between these two. The topic of this research is highly relevant from a societal as well as academic perspective. Diversity in the cultural sector has been discussed in societal debates for decades already. This research aims to outline the current situation of recent discussions and objectives regarding diversity matters. At the time of writing, the next cultural policy framework of the municipality of Rotterdam, i.e. the cultural policy framework of 2021 – 2024, is presented and the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture is currently preparing their advice for the subsidy allocations of the next cultural policy plan period. In order to understand and put the upcoming

advice into perspective, it is necessary to know what preceded it. This research aims to contribute to that understanding. From an academic perspective, this research provides insights into the relationship between cultural policy and cultural institutions. We will discuss why it may be difficult for cultural policymakers to make policy focusing on the whole population and their different needs and preferences. Furthermore, we will examine possible challenges cultural policymakers have to overcome and how cultural policy can be evaluated. The societal and academic relevance of this research will be discussed in more detail later on in this research.

In order to provide an answer to the research question, the theoretical framework in Chapter 2 focuses on the relationship between cultural policy and cultural institutions, and cultural diversity and inclusion. The first part of the chapter will start by discussing a short history on cultural policy. We will continue examining arguments in favor of cultural policy and see how cultural policy in the Netherlands has developed. Next, we will look at decentralization and democratization of culture, some of cultural policy's challenges and the different ways in which cultural policy can be evaluated. The second part of Chapter 2 will focus on the Code Diversity & Inclusion, diversity in policy making and policy making in Rotterdam more specifically. The chapter will end with a discussion of cultural diversity in Rotterdam.

Chapter 3 will explain the method applied in this research. This research is conducted by means of a qualitative content analysis. The data set consists of various documents including the municipality's cultural policy framework of the period 2017 – 2020. Furthermore, the annual reports of 2016 and 2018 of different cultural institutions in the city are analyzed. The annual reports are from two cultural institutions per discipline, i.e. architecture, design and e-culture, visual arts and photography, cultural education and social cohesion, dance, film, municipal collection and heritage, literature and debate, music, and theater. Finally, the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture's advisory document on the cultural policy framework is included in the data set as well. Together these documents present different perspectives from different stakeholders on the subject of diversity in the cultural sector.

The results of the data analysis will be discussed in Chapter 4. We will start with the results found in the cultural policy framework. Next, we will discuss the results found in the cultural institutions' annual reports categorized per discipline and accompanied by a discussion of the council's advice. The chapter will be concluded with an overview and discussion of the results. Finally, Chapter 5 will present a conclusion of the research. Furthermore, it will discuss possible points of improvement and it will offer recommendations for future research.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Cultural policy and cultural institutions

2.1.1 A short history of cultural policy

Many countries in Western Europe have a long-standing tradition of supporting and nurturing the arts. However, up until the twentieth century, there were no definite government policies that focused on arts and culture (Toepler & Zimmer, 2002). From this century onward, cultural policy making became more complex. According to Hesmondhalgh and Pratt (2005), this increased complexity can be explained by an inevitable relationship between cultural policy and cultural industries[1]. More specifically, cultural industries influence and shape cultural policy and vice-versa. According to Toepler and Zimmer (2002), it was in the period right after World War II that a lively, vibrant and innovative cultural scene developed in Western Europe. This led to an acceleration in the growth of the cultural industries (Hesmondhalgh & Pratt, 2005). This boost of the vibrant cultural scene asked for definite cultural policy making; the emergence of arts and culture as a new policy objective took place (Hesmondhalgh & Pratt, 2005; Toepler & Zimmer, 2002).

By designing cultural policies, the aim of Western democracies was to improve the production and consumption of arts and culture with a particular emphasis on cultural equality and social equity (Toepler & Zimmer, 2002). The importance of economic, social and cultural equality were the main focus points used in the argumentation in favor of public support for the arts. Low income was seen as the biggest barrier to wider enjoyment of the arts (Toepler & Zimmer, 2002). Without government intervention, cultural participation would be too expensive for most people. As a result, subsidies for the arts were seen as an investment in improving the social environment. Unrestricted participation in the arts across class- and social boundaries became the most important feature of cultural policy in the 1970s.

In addition, we can speak of inequality in support since producers who were engaged with forms of highbrow culture were more likely to receive subsidies than producers who were associated with working-class and ethnic minority groups (Hesmondhalgh & Pratt, 2005). Therefore, in the second half of the twentieth century, the focus of cultural policy shifted from the established highbrow culture to culture produced and consumed by minority groups.

---

[1] When referred to Hesmondhalgh & Pratt's (2005) notion of cultural industries, this includes both highbrow culture and popular culture in cultural institutions. Hesmondhalgh & Pratt's (2005) use the terms cultural industries and cultural institutions interchangeably.

By the late 1970s, public support for the arts had increased significantly in the Western world (Hesmondhalgh & Pratt, 2005). In addition, arts and culture had become an acknowledged and somewhat distinguished field of public policy. Although it was no longer possible for cultural policymakers to ignore the significantly grown and developed cultural industries, Hesmondhalgh and Pratt (2005) state that cultural policy in contrast is "still affected by longstanding assumptions prevalent within traditional cultural policy" (p. 7). Examples of these assumptions include the notion of art for art's sake, the idea that culture is a pure public good and should be available to all in equal terms, the idea that experts determine the true value of art and any monetary value of art is false, and the idealist-humanist notion that culture has a civilizing effect and that it is good for the soul. According to Hesmondhalgh and Pratt (2005), these assumptions are resilient in cultural policy making and debate. As a result, debates often focus on culture versus economy, art versus commerce, and high culture versus popular culture (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt, 2005). It could, therefore, be argued that there is a mismatch between some cultural institutions and the cultural policy that leads them.

2.1.2 Arguments in favor of cultural policy

Although there is a gap between policymakers and the cultural sector, there are several reasons why cultural policy is highly important. Mulcahy (2006) identifies four positive effects that culture has on the attractiveness of a city. First, a city's self-worth may increase with diverse cultural organizations. It would lead to enhancing a city's attractiveness to its residents, visitors and businesses. Second, cultural workers are essential in certain industries such as publishing, advertising, broadcasting and fashion. Third, related to the previous point, is that cities are venues for fashion and cuisine. Fourth, urban homesteaders are attracted to culturally vibrant cities and are usually committed to community improvement. In order to maintain these positive effects, cultural policy is necessary to stimulate the production and consumption of culture.

The positive effects identified above are related to identity and heritage. Some cultural policy objectives can be associated positively with communities, how people define these communities and how they see themselves in the world. Offering the best public culture would mean that cultural policy "would promote a sense of communal continuity and definition while continuing to support aesthetic discourse and artistic creativity" (Mulcahy, 2006, p. 328). Therefore, the positive effects of certain cultural policy objectives can stimulate identity formation and community belonging.

Former Dutch State Secretary of Culture Van der Ploeg (2005) presented some additional arguments for subsidizing culture. First, investing in cultural awareness and cultural education of children can leave a lasting impression in developing a taste for cultural experience goods. It is argued that culture is an acquired taste and cultural education is for

many children their only chance to develop an awareness of- and taste for high culture. Second, subsidies can bring highbrow culture into the public sphere, thereby reaching a new audience instead of solely reaching an aging, white, highly educated audience. Third, it takes time to cultivate an audience. Subsidizing would leave room for success in the longer run. Fourth, public goods are non-rival and/or non-excludable cultural goods. However, the market cannot succeed in delivering the socially optimal level of these goods. Therefore, government intervention can cater to the continuation of these public goods. Finally, avant-garde cultural activities face higher risks in terms of profit. Risky and valuable cultural activities should be stimulated by the government by the provision of risk-bearing capital.

2.1.3 Cultural policy in the Netherlands

We have discussed how cultural policy changed in Europe in the twentieth century. We now focus on the Netherlands more specifically. De Joop (1998) states that the Netherlands have hardly addressed the country's pluralism in its widest sense for a number of years. The reason for this is that the country would have been too divided and pluralist to be able to realize a shared national culture. As a result, political, religious and moral impartiality was considered normal. During the 1960s and 1970s in the Netherlands, the movement toward secularization and democratization caused more cultural variety. In 1965, a new Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Work was created and during the 1970s, the budget of the ministry increased rapidly (Toepler & Zimmer, 2002). It was during this same period that economic problems of the arts and issues of equality and democracy became apparent. As a result, the Dutch government started to take a very active role in cultural policy (Toepler & Zimmer, 2002). Highbrow culture lost its cultural monopoly and new and experimental art forms were considered as equally valuable as traditionally respected arts and culture (De Joop, 1998).

In the 1980s, the role of the Dutch government was reconsidered. As a result, cultural policy became more selectively aimed at artistic quality and artistic professionalization. In addition, the market mechanism got a more prominent role. The national government should have a more detached role which became apparent from the new focus on decentralization and the more advisory role for the government.

De Joop (1998) states that, at the time of his writing, there was a combination of two principles in Dutch cultural policy with the aim of improving cultural participation of the population. First, Dutch cultural policy tried to do justice to the cultural and geographical diversity of the country, meaning that special funding was given to institutions that foster amateur artistic expression and local culture. This happened under State Secretary Rick van der Ploeg whose cultural policy tried to enhance both accessibility of the arts and entrepreneurship among artists. More specifically, in 1999 Van der Ploeg introduced a new cultural policy plan called 'Culture as confrontation' which was not received well by the cultural

elite. According to Boomkens (1999), in this cultural policy plan Van der Ploeg gave cultural diversity with a focus on minority culture a central role. Opponents of this cultural policy plan argued that the arts are not equal to culture in the broadest sense, rather it is always an elitist matter. Van der Ploeg's aim was to contradict this idea. He wanted to enable all artists from cultural minorities to express themselves. Van der Ploeg focused on participation, education and accessibility in the arts for a broader audience. According to Van der Ploeg (2005), highbrow culture differs from instant entertainment in the sense that highbrow culture is an acquired taste. If someone consumes a cultural good more often, it is more likely that his or her knowledge and appreciation of the cultural good will increase. In addition, culture offers a memorable experience. Experiencing culture at a young age can result in lifelong memories and preferences. Furthermore, Van der Ploeg's cultural policy plan required the cultural elite to reassess their practices instead of automatically receiving their subsidies out of habit.

Second, all other artistic expressions part of the national cultural heritage received subsidies based on the principle of quality or distinction. According to Boomkens (1999), what is defined as quality is new in Van der Ploeg's cultural policy plan. Previously, quality was considered the same as professionalism and elitism (Boomkens, 1999). Van der Ploeg understood quality to be open to multiple interpretations, such as recognition, stimulation of the senses or emotional resemblance. It was no longer a matter of solely professionalism in the traditional artforms. The quality of art could mean other things to other people. It is important to state that in the Netherlands, the government operates at arms' length, meaning that the government relies on experts' advice of the Arts Council. As a result, the government will not judge the artistic quality of different cultural organizations and activities. The government can shape cultural policy without meddling in artistic judgements, which is seen as the main advantage of Dutch cultural policy (Van der Ploeg, 2005).

Van der Ploeg (2005) notes that much of the European cultural elite finds commercial culture suspect. They argue that it is essential that highbrow culture is subsidized. However, many subsidized cultural organizations seem hesitant to realize that they will become less significant when they do not reach out to a new and more diverse audience. The subsidized arts are mostly focused on a white, higher educated audience, thereby ignoring the huge influx of immigrants. Failing to attract this new audience may cause cultural institutions to lose relevance. The critique of culture pessimists is that in this way "market forces dumb down expressions of high culture in order to get mass attention" (Van der Ploeg, 2005, p. 3). In contrast, Van der Ploeg (2005) argues that the market can be seen as a producer of a great variety and quality of culture. It may happen that the production of popular culture will increase, but that is what a great number of people want. As a result, highbrow culture for the elite may become a niche (Van der Ploeg, 2005). Although it can be argued whether highbrow culture

will indeed become a niche, it is clear that it is different from popular culture which, according to many, may be seen as instant entertainment for the masses.

Adding to Van der Ploeg's perspective, Mommaas (2004) notes a similar shift in urban cultural policy making. Previously, local cultural policy was restricted to a redistributive role within a vertically organized public arts sector. Nowadays cultural policy making is more inclusive, operating at a more comprehensive level within horizontally articulated linkages of thinking and acting. The vertical perspective focusing on notions of artistic progress and the refined citizen is complemented by the horizontal, process-oriented perspective focusing on external economic and spatial effects and conditions (Mommaas, 2004). In addition, Mommaas (2004) identifies cultural clustering strategies. He notes that cultural policy has evolved from "organising occasions for spectacular consumption, to a more finetuned policy, also aimed at creating spaces, quarters and milieus for cultural production and creativity" (p. 508). Therefore, cultural policy has become more comprehensive. It is no longer solely involved with the funding of the arts and culture, rather the aim is to focus on the cultural sphere in its totality.

In 2010, Halbe Zijlstra became State Secretary for Culture. His perspective on culture was similar to Van der Ploeg's in the sense that he believed that the cultural sector should be more entrepreneurial and innovative in attracting new audiences (Van Eijck, 2018). However, focusing on this entrepreneurship, Zijlstra cut 20 percent of the national budget for the arts which came as a shock to many. Succeeding Zijlstra, Jet Bussemaker became State Secretary for Culture in 2012 and she became responsible for the outline of the national cultural policy plan for 2017 – 2020. Her focus was on art as part of identity formation, connecting people and solving societal problems. In addition, Bussemaker believed that participation in the arts could stimulate creativity and innovation as skills that are socially and economically relevant (Van Eijck, 2018). Ultimately, Bussemaker aimed at allowing people to make their own decisions about which forms of art appeal to them. Accordingly, the focus in her cultural policy plans for 2017 – 2020 was not limited to attracting a bigger audience but also a more diverse audience in terms of audience composition (Van Eijck, 2018).

2.1.3.1 Cultural diversity in the Netherlands

As measured on 1 January 2019, 4,086,138 inhabitants of the Netherlands have a migration background (Statistics Netherlands (CBS), 2017). As measured on 1 February 2020, 24.3 percent of the Dutch population have a migration background with both first and second generation migrants belonging to this group (Statistics Netherlands (CBS), n.d.). According to De Jong (1998), Dutch society and culture are regarded as diverse and pluralistic in many ways. A significant part of society has an ingrained awareness of differences such as religion, education, age, class, gender, color of skin, etc. It is up to policymakers to determine whether there is an absence of cultural homogeneity because of the presence of various different

groups. More importantly, policymakers decide whether such absence poses a policy problem. Because, as De Jong (1998) states, "diversity is not necessarily identical with heterogeneity, nor does cultural pluralism automatically imply inequality in social opportunities" (p. 363).

Based on statistics from 2016, Van den Broek and Gieles (2018) wrote a report for The Netherlands Institute for Social Research about cultural life in the Netherlands. They found that 50 percent of the Dutch population of 12 years and older have an interest in at least one artform. In addition, 58 percent are satisfied with the cultural offer in their own residential environment and 70 percent of the population think it is justified that the government funds the arts and culture. Moreover, 89 percent of the Dutch population of 6 years and older visited a cultural institution at least once in 2016. The same report shows that people with a higher level of education are more interested in arts and heritage (Van den Broek & Gieles, 2018). With regard to visits and participation, highly educated people with a Western background visit and participate in the arts more (Van den Broek & Gieles, 2018). The report shows that in every category of cultural institutions – museums, theaters, libraries, etc. – people who are highly educated and have a Western background are better represented. These statistics are what Van der Ploeg tried to challenge and what the focus points are of Rotterdam's cultural policy framework, as we will discuss later.

In the same report, Van den Broek and Gieles (2018) state that the information is to some extent incomplete. The public domains where those aspects of cultural life that are less or not at all institutionalized are taking place, are not included in these statistics. This means that small stages, museums, venues and festivals are excluded. With regard to design, there is not much information available on digital culture. The same goes for immaterial heritage with regard to the heritage domains.

As part of another report for The Netherlands Institute for Social Research, Van den Broek (2008) conducted research on participation in the arts focusing on five audience segments, i.e. Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, Antilleans and native Dutch, living in the 50 biggest municipalities in the Netherlands. Van den Broek found that cultural institutions focusing on canonical art reach Turks and Moroccans the least and native Dutch the most. Surinamese and Antilleans are situated somewhere in between. When it comes to participation in popular culture and practicing amateur arts, Turks and Moroccans lag behind whereas Surinamese and Antilleans are close to the reach of native Dutch. These results are found in first generation respondents as well as second generation respondents. Interestingly, Turks, Moroccans and Surinamese participate more than Antilleans and native Dutch in informal culture. This means that they come into contact with music and theater at parties with performances. However, this participation in informal culture does not counterbalance the opposite distinction discussed in canonical and popular culture. This means that the participation in informal culture of Turks, Moroccans and Surinamese does not make up for

the lack of participation in other forms of culture. Therefore, it is safe to say that cultural institutions, both canonical and popular, do not reach Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese and Antilleans as much as they reach native Dutch (Van den Broek, 2008).

2.1.4 Decentralization and democratization of culture

At the core of policy making, policymakers are challenged to boost highbrow culture, including the synergies with popular culture. In addition, they should "strive for a democracy of culture by making sure that more people have the competence to appreciate and understand cultural expressions" (Van der Ploeg, 2005, p. 38). The democracy of culture focuses on making highbrow culture accessible and available to a new and more diverse audience without dumbing down highbrow culture. As a result, the public good character of culture will be enhanced and culture will be more than mere amusement.

The democratization of culture resonates with the decentralization of culture. Mulcahy (2006) states that "high culture" should not be exclusive to a particular social class. Cultural excellence should, rather, be made available and accessible to people regardless of class circumstances, educational attainment or place of habitation. Similarly, cultural decentralization is concerned with the inequality in cultural opportunities among people (Kawashima, 1997). This type of decentralization promotes equal opportunities for the consumption of arts and culture for every citizen regardless of socio-economic status. The next paragraph will expand on decentralization of culture. Cultural democracy, however, may result in cultural elitism (Mulcahy, 2006). In this case the government decides what is superior and should be made available to all. This is a top-down approach that takes for granted that the cultural needs of all society's members are the same while this is hardly the truth. As Borén and Young (2013) state, artists may differ in their ideologies, artistic practices and socio-economic and political goals, making them a very diverse group. The same could be said for art and culture's audiences. In addition, Borén and Young (2013) also sensed that there are tensions between policymakers and the realities of creative practices. They state, therefore, that exploration is needed "between what policymakers think creativity is or can be, and what artists and others involved in creative activity in various ways think it is" (Borén & Young, 2013, p. 1806). This means that it is possible that some people do not see their cultural preferences represented in the subsidized cultural offer.

This is where political decentralization of cultural policy comes into play. Political decentralization is concerned with the power balance between different stakeholders such as decision-makers and funding authorities (Kawashima, 1997). This type of decentralization is about the diffusion of political and administrative power with regard to making and implementing cultural policy. It may refer to both vertical – the central, regional and local government – and horizontal – different bodies within the same government – relations.

Kawashima (1997) argues that cultural decentralization and political decentralization are complementary. The latter can be seen as a means for achieving policy objectives since it allows decision-making at a level that is closest to the people who would benefit from the policy most. In addition, political decentralization can contribute to the democratization of culture since it allows for a bottom-up cultural policy instead of a top-down approach. This means that policymakers alone would not be responsible for the development of a cultural policy plan. A bottom-up approach would also mean that more attention would be paid to cultural activities associated with minority groups that do not receive enough subsidies to effectively continue their practices.

Mulcahy (2006) notes a shift from this top-down to a bottom-up policy. The government should not solely focus on making high culture available to the whole society. Rather, the government's responsibility is to facilitate citizens to be culturally active on their own terms. Many artists are critical of elite visions of the city and the urban developments that follow these visions. Artists being politically progressive and theoretically informed clashes with the cultural elitism we discussed earlier (Borén & Young, 2013). This pleads for a pluralistic instead of monocultural concept of cultural policy. Borén and Young (2013) state that the reason that the government is experiencing a barrier to incorporate more nuanced creative practices into policy is because of the gap between policymakers and creative practitioners. Political decentralization would help deal with this problem since this gap between policymakers and creative practitioners would become smaller. The power balance would shift and possibly give more authority to these creative practitioners.

Related to the top-down and bottom-up cultural policy debate, Mulcahy (2006) identifies two perspectives, namely the elitist and the populist perspective. Proponents of the elitist perspective argue that aesthetic quality should be the determining criterion for public subvention. Major cultural organizations and stakeholders in the traditionally defined field of the fine arts are usually supporting this elitist view. In contrast, proponents of the populist perspective argue for "a less traditional and more pluralist notion of artistic merit and consciously seeks to create a policy of cultural diversity" (Mulcahy, 2006, p. 325). The focus of the populists is on personal enhancement, with limited boundaries between professional and amateur arts activities. Therefore, cultural policy needs to find a balance between the goals of excellence versus access, and between the government as a facilitator versus the government as the architect. Political decentralization could diminish the distinction between these two perspectives. As we have discussed, policy making has traditionally been informed by the elitist perspective. However, the goal of making arts and culture equally accessible to all requires the populist perspective to become more apparent.

2.1.5 Cultural policy's challenges

How can policymakers, then, make the right calls in the decision-making process? According to Blokland (2005), the Netherlands has three focus points with regard to cultural policy, namely quality, pluralism and participation. When it comes to increasing participation, policymakers could approach this matter from the supply or demand side. However, policymakers seem to have been unaware about the demand of arts and culture. As Blokland (2005) argues, participation does not only depend on affordability and accessibility. Rather, people should possess a certain level of cultural capital or cultural competence. It is, therefore, necessary that policymakers, with demand in mind, include the development of cultural capital in their cultural policy plans.

With regard to quality, it seems that this concept is commonly understood by policymakers as innovation, authenticity and originality (Blokland, 2005). In this way the notions of craftmanship and cultural tradition are ignored while these notions appeal to a more diverse audience. In addition, coming into contact with craftmanship and cultural traditions could be the foundation for people to build their cultural capital on. The quality criteria of innovation, authenticity and originality are in the way of pluralism. Popular culture and cultural expressions of minority groups do not meet the critical notions of quality focused on shattering taboos and shocking people. As Blokland (2005) states, if policymakers would be willing to accept that quality is concerned with more than innovation, authenticity and originality, popular culture could have a lasting effect on the whole society. This means that if popular culture would be included in cultural policy, popular culture could become eligible for subsidies. As a result, popular culture could reach a bigger and more diverse audience and it could increase the level of participation in culture. An example can be found in pop music, dance and new media (Blokland, 2005). These disciplines are meaningful to youth culture but receive little attention in current cultural policy making.

Matarasso and Landry (1999) defined more concrete challenges policymakers should keep in mind. In commission of the Council of Europe, they presented 21 dilemmas organized around five themes – frameworks, implementation, social development, economic development and management (Matarasso & Landry, 1999). According to Pratt (2005), the list is useful but fails to provide analytical tools to move toward a resolution of the dilemmas. Still, the list is regarded "comprehensive and [it] provides a useful overview of the practical issues associated with cultural policy making" (Pratt, 2005, p. 35). Out of the 21 dilemmas, three are most important in this research.

First, cultural democracy or democratization of culture. This dilemma is concerned with the framework theme and focuses on the debate between the bottom-up or top-down approach of cultural policymakers. The concept of cultural democracy is concerned with increasing access of mass audiences to dominant cultural goods and services by the government (top-

down approach). In contrast, democratization of culture is concerned with increasing access to the production and distribution of cultural goods and services outside of the mainstream canon. The aim of this bottom-up approach is to include cultural expressions and practices in the mainstream canon.

Second, communities or community. This dilemma is centered around the social development theme. It concerns the question whether cultural policy should cater to different communities – for example focusing on ethnic identity, gender, class, disability, sexuality, and so on – or whether cultural policy should focus on one bigger community, part of the democratic whole (Matarasso & Landry, 1999).

Third, cultural diversity or monoculture. Again, this dilemma is centered around the social development theme and is strongly related to the previous dilemma. The dilemma of cultural diversity or monoculture is concerned with the question "to what extent cultural policy should actively promote cultural diversity" (Matarasso & Landry, 1999, p. 37).

In line with these dilemmas, Mangset (2018) argues that contemporary cultural policy is not adapted to the major social transformations that have taken place in Western societies. Therefore, by discussing seven challenges and their counterarguments, Mangset (2018) questions whether we are facing the end of modern cultural policy. Two of these challenges are highly relevant for this research

First, research has shown that the democratization of culture is difficult to achieve. Sociocultural distinctions in cultural participation, such as class, educational level, age and domicile/centrality have not decreased. The new cultural policy introduced in the 1970s and 1980s with the aim of diminishing quality distinctions between high and popular culture did not contribute to removing sociocultural distinction. In contrast, this new cultural policy only broadened the scope of cultural goods and activities recognized and supported by cultural policy (Mangset, 2018). A counterargument is that the democratization of culture has helped to equalize formal opportunities of cultural participation. Many people who previously had been unfamiliar with cultural goods and activities have been encouraged to visit these. Therefore, they have gotten the opportunity to decide, based on at least some experience, whether to participate or not.

Second, Mangset (2018) questions why a substantial part of public subsidies to culture goes to cultural institutions that are obsolete and traditional. Most of these cultural institutions originate from the nineteenth century or earlier. Since then, people's cultural consumption preferences and patterns have changed significantly. However, the counterargument that can be made is that the number of visits to such institutions has not decreased. The changed consumption pattern may be assigned to the concept of cultural omnivores which states that people's cultural consumption pattern includes both high and popular culture.

The challenges posed by Matarasso and Landry (1999) and Mangset (2018) are useful for policymakers to keep in mind. The rapidly changing cultural sector asks for an equally rapid awareness of these changes from the cultural policymakers.

2.1.6 The evaluation of cultural policy

Since we have discussed cultural policy's challenges, it is important to know how to actually evaluate cultural policies and the challenges they managed to overcome or not. Cultural activities and goods can have touching and baffling effects. They are normal economic goods with substitutes and complements and they can be both rival and non-rival goods. According to Van der Ploeg (2005), it is a key challenge to empirically measure the external effects of these cultural goods. For example, a flourishing cultural climate may attract tourism or new businesses as argued in the discussion on the attractiveness of a city.

Nylöf (1997) identifies three fundamental questions that should be answered in every cultural policy evaluation. First, the question "What did we want?" helps to determine the goals, aims and intentions. Second, the question "What did we do?" identifies the efforts, remedies, activities and other input. The final question "What happened?" finds the results, outcomes and other output. The findings of the latter question need to be analyzed in relation to the goals of the cultural policy. In conclusion, "one evaluates input (what we did) in relation to output (what happened) against a background of goals (what we wanted)" (Nylöf, 1997, p. 363). According to Nylöf (1997), a pitfall of cultural policy evaluation is that goals are not always concrete enough to be translated into measurable results. It may be a challenge to identify the relevance of political goals which often contain clichés or generalized expressions without a clear meaning. With the help of indicators, it may become more feasible to find this relevance.

There is a distinction between qualitative and quantitative indicators (Nylöf, 1997). Qualitative indicators point to what is done without mentioning the scope of the activity. For example, "the museum organized activities catered to visitors with disabilities" presents qualitatively the audience group and performance of the institution. Qualitative indicators are often used in annual reports of cultural institutions and are common in evaluation of cultural policy. It is important to note that qualitative indicators should not be mistaken with 'indicators of quality'. Indicators of artistic quality are hard to assess. According to Nielsen (2003), 'quality' claims an authority that involves the right to accord status to one thing over another. A quantitative indicator would mention in the example of the museum how many activities were organized and how many visitors were present. Therefore, quantitative indicators say something about units that can be counted or ranked in order.

Related to these indicators and the concept of 'quality', Nielsen (2003) states that there are three contexts in which quality can be viewed. First, the expert context focuses on the level of artistic skills and professionalism. Second, the context of public sphere and of participation

focuses on the experience of the public. In addition, the development of cultural life and the cultural public debate are other criteria. Third, the economic/political context asks whether cultural goods and activities make enough revenue or have other positive spill-over effects for private and public investors.

Since there are, among other things, different perspectives, indicators and contexts, it is safe to say that all cultural policies differ from each other. The focus of a cultural policy depends on the focus points and stance the policymakers take in the decision-making process. Not only the challenges but also these evaluation methods may lead to different aims, inputs and outputs. As Nylöf (1997) states, the relevance of these inputs and outputs must be assessed according to circumstances. This means that there is no clear, specified procedure for the evaluation of cultural policy that can always be applied in the same manner. In addition, this means that the analysis I aim to conduct in this research is dependent on the data I will use and my interpretation of it. Furthermore, Nylöf (1997) raises the questions of changed efforts and stated changes in outcomes. The first question asks what the effects were, how the effects in reality affected the intended results, and what unintended secondary effects have occurred. By not only analyzing the cultural policy framework of Rotterdam's municipality and the cultural institutions' annual reports but also an advisory document by another stakeholder, this research aims to present a comprehensive analysis of the intended and secondary effects. The second question asks what the causes were and whether outcomes depend on cultural policy efforts. In practical terms it means that it will be difficult to assess to what extent cultural policy objectives bring about change in cultural institutions' activities. As discussed earlier, a pitfall of cultural policy evaluation is that goals are not always concrete enough to be translated into measurable results (Nylöf, 1997). Therefore, it may be possible that achievements of cultural institutions should be ascribed to their own activities rather than to a change in the objectives of a cultural policy framework.

2.2 Cultural diversity and inclusion

2.2.1 Code Diversity & Inclusion

Nowadays there is an increasing emphasis on diversity in the cultural sector as illustrated by the Code Cultural Diversity presented in 2011. Initially this Code was focused on bringing more diversity in cultural institutions by highlighting four focus points, namely programming, audience, personnel and partners. More recently, this code changed into the Code Diversity & Inclusion (2019) to promote a more comprehensive view on diversity and inclusion in the cultural sector. The argument is that diversity can only be achieved by becoming more inclusive. This recent change shows that diversity and inclusion are becoming increasingly important in cultural institutions. Still, it is argued that the cultural sector in Rotterdam has a long way to go in terms of diversity, as stated by the chairman of the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture (Van der Goot, 2019). Van der Goot (2019) believes that we are now in an *awkward* period of transition where diversity and inclusion are discussed more and more. There is an increasing emphasis on equality in cultural institutions, however, he feels that the institutions are not ready yet to truly commit to cultural diversity in terms of programming but also in terms of hiring personnel (Van der Goot, 2019).

By using the concept of 'diversity', this research follows the definition presented in the Code Diversity & Inclusion (Code Cultural Diversity, 2019), which indicates that people differ from each other in many ways. These differences between people can be both visible and invisible. In addition, the difference between people is not only focused on ethnic backgrounds but also on gender, physical disabilities, educational level and age, among other things. Therefore, when speaking of cultural diversity, diversity in the broadest sense of the word is meant.

The goal of the code is for the cultural and creative sector to represent this broad diversity of Dutch society (Code Cultural Diversity, 2019). According to emeritus professor in arts and economics Hagoort (2019), is it important to keep stimulating this diversity. Hagoort (2019) comes to the conclusion that – on a national level – the audience of cultural institutions is not considered to be a valuable partner in developing cultural institutions' programming. The emeritus professor found that cultural institutions mostly focus on their own discipline and keep on doing what they know best, meaning that there is not much collaboration with other disciplines and that cultural institutions are hesitant to experiment when it comes to diversity (Hagoort, 2019). However, the aim of the Code Cultural Diversity is to promote and stimulate diversity. As mentioned above, the Code has four important focus points, i.e. programming, audience, personnel and partners. To limit the scope of my thesis, I will mainly focus on programming and audience.

2.2.2 Cultural diversity in policy making

There are several perspectives on why the inclusion of diversity in cultural institutions is crucial. According to Bennett (2001), publicly funded institutions should commit to taking into account the cultural interests and activities of all groups in society. Since the allocation of public cultural resources is aimed at serving society as a whole, what is on offer in cultural institutions should appeal to the whole of society. By including the diverse array of cultural interests, minority groups acquire a 'footprint' into the dominant culture. This means that they are able to enter into dialogue with the dominant or mainstream culture. This can have the effect that minority groups can educate public opinion about the benefits and virtues of cultural diversity.

It is necessary to guard against cultural institutions that are involved with cultural diversity only formalistically. An argument often made by critics is that the process is not only slow and frustrating but also subject to window dressing. This means that cultural institutions might meet diversity requirements in a superficial way just to qualify for the allocation of public subsidies (Bennett, 2001).

This might be illustrated by a study conducted by Berkers, Van Eijck, Gillis-Burleson, Zoutman, and Chin-A-Fat (2018). Upon critical examination, the authors note that in the 1970s, the cultural sector of Rotterdam started discussing cultural diversity. However, a structural form of cultural policy making in Rotterdam is actually absent and a diversity policy is still not seen as a priority. In this study, the authors looked among other sources at the annual reports of 2016 of subsidized cultural institutions in Rotterdam and found that cultural institutions rarely touch upon issues related to diversity in terms of programming and audience. The attention to cultural diversity is often general and referred to implicitly. As a result, the references to cultural diversity leave room for different interpretations. Although the desire to become more diverse and inclusive might exist, the research found that the cultural institutions' intentions and plans are not always transformed into actual programming.

2.2.2.1 Cultural policy making in Rotterdam

How is cultural policy making in Rotterdam established? Cultural policy plans have a duration of four years, i.e. 2013 – 2016, 2017 – 2020 and 2021 – 2024. As previously stated, this research focuses on the cultural policy plan of 2017 – 2020. In this time period, the municipality decided to allocate 80.5 million euros among 86 cultural institutions in the city (Gemeente Rotterdam, n.d.). Before deciding on this amount of subsidies, the municipality published a cultural policy framework in which they presented their most important principles. In response to this framework, the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture published an advisory document. The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture is the official advisory board on art and culture for

the municipality of Rotterdam (Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture, n.d.). The goal of the council is to give independent advice based on the content of the cultural policy framework and the council's expertise. It is important that the council operates independently since their advice cannot be political in nature. With the help of the council's advice, the municipality of Rotterdam establishes their final cultural policy plan.

According to the municipality's website (Gemeente Rotterdam, n.d.), there are several possibilities for cultural institutions to qualify for subsidy. Cultural institutions may be eligible if they want to appoint a culture coach for the purpose of cultural education or if cultural institutions specifically focus on small scale and local cultural projects in the city. Amateur clubs that are involved with performing arts or visual arts and applicants who want to organize a small and local one-time event may also apply for subsidies. In addition, applicants who make a visible contribution to the vibrancy in the city may qualify for subsidies as well. There are also project subsidies available that can contribute to the realization of different projects of artists, makers and cultural institutions. Finally, the municipality organizes twice a year the 'Pitcher Perfect 010' event. During this event, people who do not qualify for the already existing regulations can pitch their idea and possibly receive a subsidy.

2.2.3 Cultural diversity in Rotterdam

In section 2.1.3.1 we discussed cultural diversity in the Netherlands. If we focus on Rotterdam more specifically, we see that 650.597 people live in the municipality of Rotterdam as measured on 1 January 2020 (Gemeente Rotterdam, n.d.). More than half of this population, namely 52.3 percent, has a migration background (Gemeente Rotterdam, n.d.).

In 2019, Rotterdam Festivals published a report in which they studied the population of Rotterdam in relation to the cultural offer in the city. 22 percent of the city's inhabitants considers the participation in arts and culture as self-evident in contrast to 11 percent of the inhabitants who consider participation as an option (Rotterdam Festivals, 2019). The majority, namely 66 percent, are irregular participants in arts and culture. In Rotterdam's Cultural Monitor of 2018, De Vries (2020) found that 86 percent of the population of Rotterdam, between 15 years and 79 years old, participate in the cultural offer. When it comes to cultural institutions that are subsidized by the municipality, 75 percent of the city's population participate in arts and culture (De Vries, 2020).

In the same report, Rotterdam Festivals (2019) discusses that cultural institutions that are included in the city's cultural policy plan since 2017, the newcomers, are increasingly appealing to the irregular participants in arts and culture. It can, therefore, be argued that the new cultural institutions in Rotterdam are trying to appeal to the city's population in the broadest sense. In the study by Berkers et al. (2018), we have seen that there is still a long way to go. However, this finding by Rotterdam Festivals (2019) implies that the newcomers are

performing better when it comes to diversity matters compared to the established cultural institutions. This means that the cultural sector should beware that the responsibility of being inclusive is not only applicable to newcomers but to established cultural institutions as well.

Similarly, Rotterdam Festivals (2019) states that the current cultural offer has aspects that appeal to every target audience. However, this does not necessarily mean that all the different target audiences are reached with regard to marketing and promotion. In practical terms, this means that people might not be aware of the cultural offer in the city although interesting cultural activities and events are organized that might appeal to them. The gap between what is on offer in the cultural institutions and who is represented in the audience is something we will discuss further in the analysis of this research.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture published several advisory documents discussing diversity and inclusion in the cultural sector of the city as well. The council specifically focuses on diversity and different audience groups with the following statement:

"Binnen de verschillende culturele bevolkingsgroepen bestaat een grote verscheidenheid en complexiteit van culturen, sociale posities, opleidingsniveaus en uitdrukkingsvormen; daarbij zijn er in al deze groepen generatieverschillen en uiteenlopende snelheden van ontwikkeling. Deze diversiteit binnen de diversiteit van de Rotterdamse bevolking, ook wel 'superdiversiteit' genoemd, houdt in dat in de stad een veelheid aan culturele smaakvoorkeuren te vinden is."

(2018, p. 4)

This superdiversity suggests that diversity in Rotterdam is certainly going to increase and, therefore, cultural institutions together should represent this superdiversity. Additionally, in 2018, the council made the important statement saying that if we take a closer look at the supply and reach of cultural institutions that receive subsidies, it is striking that their programming is only reaching a limited proportion of the city's inhabitants. The cultural institutions that do reach a young and broad audience are usually new initiatives and representatives of interdisciplinary networks. This is similar to Rotterdam Festival's finding. With regard to established cultural institutions, the council notes that they should relate to the dynamics of the city and that they should make a transition in the coming years. When it comes to audiences, the council argues for more attention to new generations of Rotterdam's residents. The council believes that there is not enough attention to the future audience and its cultural experience and taste preferences. Students and younger people who are not older than 29 years should get a voice when it comes to cultural policy, since they "hebben andere opvattingen over wat cultuur is en ervaren een andere relatie tussen grootstedelijke realiteit en cultuur" (2018, p. 10).

In the sector analysis of 2019, the council specifically focuses on inclusion, innovation and intersectionality. With regard to inclusion, the council started a dialogue with MBO students about their perspectives. In general, these students do not feel represented in established cultural institutions and some of the students even feel excluded compared to smaller cultural initiatives that do reach younger people. Furthermore, the council states that the cultural sector in general does not succeed in presenting an accurate representation of Rotterdam's residents in the cultural sector's existing audience. The council concludes by saying that it is important that "de gemeente het culturele aanbod laat aansluiten op de diversiteit van de stad en zich bewust is van de uitsluitende werking van bepaalde culturele voorzieningen." (p. 22).

3. Method

3.1 Choice of method

This research is conducted by means of qualitative content analysis. According to Bryman (2012), qualitative research is generally more flexible than quantitative research. This flexibility allows me to interpret the relationship between cultural policy and cultural institutions since the data analysis aims to identify concepts explicitly but also implicitly referred to. In contrast, the concrete variables in quantitative research do not leave much room for interpretation when it comes to subtle changes and it is necessary to analyze each document without making generalized conclusions. The relationship between cultural policy and cultural institutions is a delicate one. Prior to conducting the analysis, I could not specifically predict what results I would find. In this case, qualitative research enabled me to conduct a content analysis that focuses on recognizing certain themes and concepts. Furthermore, qualitative content analysis allows longitudinal analysis with short time spans with relative ease (Bryman, 2012). This means that changes in emphasis in the documents are easier to notice and compare by using qualitative research compared to quantitative research.

The aim of this research is to answer why Rotterdam's cultural policy's objectives may or may not resonate with the objectives and practices of the city's cultural institutions in terms of programming and audience. The data used is collected from several documents, i.e. the cultural policy framework of 2017 – 2020 of Rotterdam's municipality, the annual reports of 2016 and 2018 of different cultural institutions in the city and the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture's advisory document on the cultural policy framework. According to Bryman (2012), documents have a certain status. It is believed that documents offer an insight in social and organizational realities. However, it will be important to keep in mind that documents "should be viewed as a distinct level of 'reality' in their own right" (Bryman, 2012, p. 554). That is why different types of documents are included in this research, i.e. not only the municipality's cultural policy framework and annual reports of cultural institutions but also documents from other stakeholders.

The reason for conducting qualitative content analysis is because this research focuses on what is stated in the cultural policy framework of Rotterdam's municipality with regard to diversity and what is stated in the city's cultural institutions' annual reports with regard to diversity in programming and audience. In addition, these findings will be compared to see to what extent they correspond.

3.2 Sampling

3.2.1 Cultural policy framework 2017 – 2020

One of the most important documents that is analyzed for this research is the municipality's cultural policy framework of 2017 – 2020. Before the final cultural policy plan was published, the municipality published a cultural policy framework. The framework is most important to this research as it presents the municipality's focus points. The final cultural policy plan presents the subsidies allocated to the cultural institutions. Both these documents are included in the data. The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture published an advisory document in response to the framework. This advisory document is also included in the data of this research.

3.2.2 Annual reports of cultural institutions

My initial thought was to interview representatives of cultural institutions in Rotterdam. However, after a critical reexamination of this idea, I wondered how much new information I would obtain by conducting the interviews. Most of the information I would acquire during these interviews, would also be made available in the cultural institutions' annual reports. Furthermore, including documents in the data that are already published and not conducting interviews means that I could spend more time focusing on a bigger number of cultural institutions. Therefore, I decided to shift my focus to the annual reports of the cultural institutions.

This research focuses on cultural institutions with different disciplines, i.e. architecture, design and e-culture, visual arts and photography, cultural education and social cohesion, dance, film, municipal collection and heritage, literature and debate, music, and finally, theater. These disciplines were previously determined by the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture and the cultural institutions were assigned per category by the council (Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture, 2016).

Two cultural institutions per discipline are selected for the analysis. This minimizes the chance of making claims based on coincidence and it enables comparisons to be made. With regard to the time period, the annual reports of 2016 and 2018 are chosen. First, the annual reports of 2016 shed light on the objectives and practices of cultural institutions in the final year of the previous cultural policy plan period, i.e. 2013 – 2016. The annual reports of 2018 reveal something about the situation halfway the current cultural policy plan period. In addition, the annual reports of 2018 are at the time of conducting this research the most recent annual reports that are publicly available. Comparing the annual reports of 2016 and 2018 is important if we want to see whether any change has occurred in the objectives and practices of cultural

institutions throughout time, and whether such change is in line with ambitions put down in the municipality's 2017 – 2020 cultural policy framework.

The institutions included in the analysis all have some sort of 'responsibility' towards the municipality and the city. Thus, only cultural institutions that receive a subsidy from the municipality for the cultural policy plan period of 2017 – 2020 are included in the analysis. To diminish the argument of not having enough monetary sources to invest in diversity, only the cultural institutions that receive the most subsidy per discipline are included in this research. In addition, it can be argued that by receiving the most subsidy, these institutions have the biggest societal responsibility to stimulate diversity and be inclusive. The institutions per discipline whose annual reports are included in the analysis can be found in Table 1.

It is important to note that in 2017, Ro Theater, Rotterdamse Schouwburg and Productiehuis Rotterdam merged to become Theater Rotterdam. For the analysis of the annual reports of 2016, the annual reports of the three theaters individually are included in the data. Concerning 2018, Theater Rotterdam published one annual report discussing the performances of the three theaters together.

Discipline	Institution	Subsidy per year
Architecture, design and e-culture	Architectuur Instituut Rotterdam	€415,000
	International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam	€408,000
Visual arts and photography	Kunsthal Rotterdam	€2,800,000
	Centrum Beeldende Kunst Rotterdam	€1,393,000
Cultural education and social cohesion	Stichting Kunstzinnige Vorming Rotterdam	€7,471,000
	Hofplein Rotterdam	€1,288,000
Dance	Scapino Ballet Rotterdam	€1,138,000
	Conny Janssen Danst	€500,000
Film	LantarenVenster[2]	€1,480,000
	International Film Festival Rotterdam	€1,020,500
Municipal collection and heritage	Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen	€9,211,000
	Wereldmuseum Rotterdam	€5,000,000
Literature and debate	Poetry International	€254,500
	Passionate Bulkboek	€200,00

[2] LantarenVenster offers both film and music programming. However, as decided by the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture, LantarenVenster falls into the film discipline.

Music	Rotterdams Philharmonisch Orkest	€6,733,500
	De Doelen	€4,363,500
Theater	Theater Rotterdam	€8,726,000
	Luxor Theater Rotterdam	€2,496,963

Table 1. Institutions analyzed in this research. (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2016)

3.2.3 Additional advisory document

Besides the city's cultural policy framework and the cultural institutions' annual reports, an advisory document is included in the analysis as well. As briefly mentioned in section 3.2.1, the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture published an advisory document in response to the municipality's cultural policy framework. This document is highly significant since the council reviewed the cultural institutions' policy plans for 2017 – 2020 and advised the municipality on the amount of subsidy that would be best to allocate to the cultural institutions. Among other things, the council's advice specifically focuses on the cultural institutions' audience reach which is included in the analysis of this research. The municipality incorporated the council's advice in their final cultural policy plan.

3.3 Operationalization

Drawing on previous theory and research, this study focuses on concepts of cultural policy, cultural institutions, and diversity and inclusion. More specifically, in the cultural policy framework and annual reports of the cultural institutions, I analyze how often 'diversity' or concepts related to diversity are mentioned. Furthermore, it is important which attitude towards diversity can be identified. With regard to diversity, this research follows the definition presented by the Code Cultural Diversity (2019) in section 2.2.1.

Explicit concepts I was specifically looking for in the data included diversity, inclusion, cultural diversity, migration background, non-Western background, socio-political background, target audience, age, level of education, diverse audience and diverse programming. In addition, I have looked for more implicit references, such as target audiences that were being described in broad terms, audiences that were being attracted from particular neighborhoods in Rotterdam or societal issues that were being discussed in programming. In order to identify these concepts and references I have read all the documents from the beginning to the end. However, I did not pay attention to the annual figures in the reports since this research does not focuses on finances.

The goal of this research is to find out to what extent the same concepts and categories can be identified in the different sources and whether the different stakeholders have the same attitude towards these concepts. More specifically, the aim of this research is to compare the

objectives of the cultural policy framework and the objectives and practices of cultural institutions in terms of diversity in programming and audience. Therefore, this research does not only focus on how often 'diversity' is mentioned but also what can be read between the lines. The combination of what is said and what is meant leads to gaining interesting insights.

3.4 Method of analysis

The method used in this research is a qualitative content analysis. I have used ATLAS.ti, which is a qualitative data analysis and research software, to categorize the documents and my quotations, codes and notes. My aim was to assess to what extent the municipality of Rotterdam and the cultural institutions pay attention to diversity. By using ATLAS.ti, I could categorize the documents of the cultural institutions by their disciplines and the software enabled me to compare data from 2016 and 2018 side by side.

Using ATLAS.ti made it also possible to mark certain words or paragraphs, which is known as quotations in the software. As a next step, I assigned codes and added additional notes to these quotations. One of the most important reasons for using this software was that I wanted to identify the different ways in which diversity was mentioned by the different stakeholders. ATLAS.ti was very valuable in this process as the software is easy to use and it allows you to filter the data from different approaches. For example, data could be filtered by type of discipline the cultural institutions belong to. Another example is filtering data per code. This means that I could select the code "audience" and see all the quotations per document or in general together with my additional notes.

ATLAS.ti proved to be an excellent tool to categorize the different important points identified in the data. In addition, the software was valuable for keeping an overview of the findings which will be discussed in the next chapter.

4. Results

4.1 Cultural policy framework 2017 – 2020

The foreword of the municipality's cultural policy framework introduces five focus points. The first one is the most interesting for this research and aims to cater the cultural offer in the best way to the widest possible audience. In addition, the municipality notes that the arts and culture "moeten een afspiegeling zijn van die kosmopolitische sfeer en er op in spelen." (p. 10). Furthermore, the question is posed how Rotterdam can become more attractive to a broader variety of inhabitants and visitors.

In the cultural policy framework, the municipality makes an important statement saying that "op dit moment worden nog te veel mensen niet bereikt door de gevestigde cultuursector" (p. 10). The municipality focuses on a cultural offer that is interesting for all audience segments. This argument is shared by the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture. In their advisory document in response to the cultural policy framework, the council states: "Instellingen hebben in toenemende mate oog voor het publiek, maar in het algemeen slaagt de sector er nog niet in zijn belofte in te lossen om in gezamenlijkheid een meer en breder publieksbereik te realiseren." (p. 5). The council notes that the cultural institutions pay insufficient attention to cultural diversity. Therefore, the council advices the cultural institutions to implement the Code Cultural Diversity.

Arts and culture can play an important role in reaching large minority groups in the city, according to the municipality. However, in order to successfully reach these minority groups, cultural institutions should be aware of the different audience groups. They state: "Wie zijn doelgroep kent is beter in staat hen te bereiken, over de drempel te halen én van hen te leren." (p. 11). Audience research is essential for identifying these aspects. Therefore, the municipality put three conclusions forward. However, it is not clear whether these conclusions are strict conditions for cultural institutions to meet in order to receive subsidy or whether these conclusions remain being recommendations. As a result, it seems that these conclusions can be freely interpreted.

First, the cultural sector has the joint responsibility to reach a broad audience and will conduct audience research together. It will then become clear where there are gaps in audience reach and the cultural institutions are responsible for deciding on a strategy to be more inclusive and include all the different audience segments. Second, cultural institutions should not only be aware of their own audiences but also the audiences of other cultural institutions. This means that the cultural institutions use each other's information on the audience segments and complement this information with their own data. The goal is for the cultural sector to develop an overview of audience segments reached and gain knowledge of

each other's strengths and qualities. It should then become possible for the cultural sector to set goals collectively. Third, cultural institutions have to clarify in their own reports which audience segments are most important to target and which audience segments they do not want to appeal to necessarily. In a summation of all these reports of the cultural institutions, an overview should emerge of which cultural institutions appeal to which audience segments and to what extent all inhabitants of Rotterdam are catered for.

With regard to programming, the cultural policy framework does not introduce specific requirements that the cultural institutions have to meet. This seems like a lost opportunity since there is an inevitable relationship between programming and audience size and composition. It is my own interpretation that it is only possible to reach a broad and diverse audience if the programming is broad and diverse accordingly. Therefore, the cultural policy framework could have made connections between diverse programming and specific audience groups. Now it seems that the municipality's conclusions can be perceived as mere recommendations, without obligation. It would be valuable if the municipality provides concrete suggestions on how programming can lead to attracting a broader audience. In addition to the recommended audience research, it seems that cultural institutions can use more guidance in making substantive decisions specifically with regard to programming. This suggestion is based on the fact that little attention is paid to programming in the cultural policy framework and the belief that programming and audience reach go together. Furthermore, the lack of clear requirements suggests that performance agreements will be hard to assess since no clear guidance is offered when it comes to diversity in programming.

The final cultural policy plan supported the objectives presented in the cultural policy framework and did not introduce new objectives with regard to diversity in programming or audience.

4.2 Annual reports of cultural institutions

In this section, we will discuss the cultural institutions per discipline. We will start with the findings from the annual reports of 2016. Next, we will briefly discuss the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture's comments on the cultural institutions' subsidy application for the cultural policy plan period of 2017 – 2020. In the council's advisory document, a summary of the cultural institutions' subsidy application is presented after which the council discusses its feedback and advise. Finally, we will discuss findings from the annual reports of 2018 to see whether something has changed compared to the findings of 2016. This section will conclude with an overview of the cultural institutions' results and a discussion.

4.2.1 Architecture, design and e-culture

<u>Architectuur Instituut Rotterdam</u>

Architectuur Instituut Rotterdam's (AIR) annual report of 2016 was rather short and presented some highlighted activities. The description of these activities included some examples of events that were organized and the cooperation with other institutions. A description of the audience groups is lacking and the concept of diversity or statements related to this concept were not mentioned once. Therefore, the annual report of 2016 shows that AIR did not pay specific attention to diversity.

According to the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture, AIR's plans for 2017 – 2020 present a rich and diverse programming for a broad audience. AIR aims to attract "een groter en breder samengesteld publiek" (p. 52). However, the council states that the expected results of attracting a broader audience vary somewhat, which leads the council to question the realization of the plans. Further explanation is not provided, therefore, it remains unclear what the expected results are.

AIR's annual report of 2018 is only slightly more elaborate and mentions diversity once with regard to the connection between culture, design and diversity, by stating: "De memorabele ontmoeting tussen [de wereldberoemde Brits-Ghanese architect Sir David] Adjaye en de burgemeester maakte het belang van het verder doordenken van de verbinding tussen cultuur, ontwerp en diversiteit op bijzonder wijze invoelbaar. In het vorm en expressie geven aan de inclusieve samenleving kan de Rotterdamse architectuurcultuur haar vermogen om te vernieuwen productief maken." (p. 2). In this statement, AIR expresses the architecture sector's potential of contributing to diversity and making society more inclusive. Unfortunately, the annual report of 2018 does not go any further than mentioning this potential.

<u>International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam</u>

International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam's (IABR) annual report of 2016 discussed the different projects IABR organized in 2016. One of the projects was located in the neighborhood Katendrecht in the South of Rotterdam. According to their annual report, "De IABR wilde niet als een ruimteschip landen in Katendrecht, een gebied waar de huidige bewoners niet zonder reden vrezen voor de effecten van *gentrification*." (p. 15). IABR tried as much as possible to cooperate with local residents and organizations in Katendrecht to add value to the neighborhood where they were located just temporarily. In addition, IABR noted that they focus on activating people and "daarom ontwikkelt de IABR narratieven waarmee verschillende groepen aangesproken worden" (p. 18). However, a specification of these audience groups is lacking in the annual report. With regard to audience research, IABR reports about the audience's gender (60 percent is female and 40 percent is male) and place of residency (inside or outside of Rotterdam, or international visitors). In addition, more and more visitors (80

percent in 2016 compared to 48 percent in 2014) participated out of professional interest. This increase of visitors participating out of professional interest does not allow for much diversity in the audience, but quite the contrary.

As reported by the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture, IABR's plans for 2017 – 2020 do not present an accurate picture of the size, form and process with regard to the programming. Therefore, the programming plans remain vague. With regard to the audience, the council notes that IABR attracts a lot of visitors. However, IABR does not present additional information about the composition of the audience and the council feels that the ambition to increase the audience reach is poor.

If we look at IABR's annual report of 2018, the different projects IABR worked on are described extensively. However, the projects are described in terms of the goals and realizations per project, not so much in terms of the audience groups IABR had in mind per project. The biennale of 2018 was particularly focused on attracting professionals, experts and policymakers rather than the general public. This implies that diversity in the sense of attracting an accurate representation of Rotterdam's inhabitants is not seen as an urgent matter. Moreover, an important finding in the annual report of 2018 is that IABR has decided to no longer conduct audience research: "Er is voor gekozen om in 2018, in tegenstelling tot vorige keren, geen publieksonderzoek te doen. Niet alleen omdat het een werk-biennale betrof maar ook omdat we met deelnemers liever kennis en ideeën delen dan postcodes." (p. 25). Their reason would be that they are critical towards the way in which data is collected and "het lijkt er immers niet op dat dat tot de gewenste sociale inclusiviteit leidt die wij als IABR nastreven, integendeel." (p. 25). This is an interesting statement since the municipality specifically focused on audience research in their cultural policy framework. Furthermore, IABR does not explain why collecting their audience's postal codes cannot go together with sharing ideas. Additionally, by saying "integendeel" in the last statement, IABR implies that doing this type of audience research is actually countering social inclusion. However, further explanation is not provided and IABR's reasoning remains unclear.

4.2.2 Visual arts and photography

Kunsthal Rotterdam

The annual report of 2016 of Kunsthal Rotterdam is extensive when it comes to providing information on exhibitions and activities organized. As they state, their programming is "divers, met vele invalshoeken, disciplines en van hoge kwaliteit." (p. 2). However, the description of the different exhibitions and activities does not include which audience segments were specifically targeted. Nevertheless, according to Kunsthal, numerous audience segments "ontmoetten elkaar afgelopen jaar in het entreegebied van de Kunsthal: van 'outsider artists',

fotografieliefhebbers en fashionista's tot illustratoren, kunstliefhebbers, designfans, Rotterdammers, scholieren, vriendinnenclubs en getalenteerde jongeren." (p. 5). Furthermore, Kunsthal states that a lot of events were organized "om nieuw en bestaand publiek te 'entertainen', te laten leren en verrijking aan te bieden." (p. 8). Their programming indeed shows diversity in exhibitions, activities and events. With regard to their audience, Kunsthal provides information on visitor numbers with regard to first-time visitors (33 percent), gender (61 percent is female and 39 percent is male) and education level ("het opleidingsniveau 29% WO, 44% HBO, 11% MBO en 16% voortgezet onderwijs en overig." (p. 11)). In the case of audience research, Kunsthal makes a distinction between their national and international audience. This implies that Kunsthal may have other aims and objectives for their national and international audiences. Focusing on their national audience, Kunsthal may have the goal to attract different audience segments whereas this might be more difficult focusing on tourists. In addition, Kunsthal started asking their national audience for their postal codes and whether they visited Kunsthal for a specific exhibition.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture is largely positive about Kunsthal's programming and audience, stating that they present "bijzondere, veelzijdige tentoonstellingen die een breed en nieuw publiek aanspreken. De meer toegankelijke presentaties kunnen het publiek ook aansporen om eveneens wat meer artistiek-inhoudelijke tentoonstellingen te bezoeken. Juist deze combinatie maakt de Kunsthal zo bijzonder." (p. 187). However, in Kunsthal's plans for 2017 – 2020 to attract a broader audience, the council "mist wel een duidelijke uitwerking van dit voornemen." (p. 188).

Kunsthal's programming in 2018 needs to be viewed in light of their 25th anniversary. According to their annual report of 2018, "diversiteit en inclusiviteit stonden dit jaar hoog op de agenda" (p. 2) which has led Kunsthal to win two awards. One of them, the &Award, Kunsthal won for their project with Instituto Buena Bista "voor het betrekken en verbinden van mensen door middel van kunst." (p. 4). Some people that were introduced to the arts in this project were reached in cooperation with other institutions, such as "Stichting Laurens (ouderenzorg), Antes (daklozen- en verslavingszorg) en Het Zuiderpark College (VMBO)" (p. 9). A new aspect to Kunsthal's diverse programming is the organization of activities in Museumpark with the aim of "verlevendigen en nieuw publiek te betrekken" (p. 3). However, this new approach is characterized by a focus on "bezoekersmotivaties zoals leren, vermaken en verrijken, waarbij het meer klassieke doelgroepenmodel wordt losgelaten." (p. 5). This means that the traditional way of attracting certain audience groups is let go of by Kunsthal. With regard to the audience, Kunsthal presents the same information on its visitors as in 2016, i.e. gender, place of residence, level of education and reason for visiting. If we look at level of education more specifically, "het opleidingsniveau is 64% hoog-, 31% middelbaar en 5% praktisch opgeleid." (p. 22) This classification differs from the annual report of 2016 where specific education levels

were clarified. In addition, these numbers are an average from the audience that visited the programming inside the building and the audience that visited the programming in Museumpark. More information on when and how (in the case of the Museumpark visitors) audience research was conducted is not shared. With regard to better accessibility, Kunsthal reports to have improved certain aspects of its building "om de toegankelijkheid voor mensen met een beperking te verbeteren" (p. 10).

Centrum Beeldende Kunst Rotterdam

The programming of Centrum Beeldende Kunst Rotterdam (CBK Rotterdam) consists of the activities of Art Office, BKOR, Sculpture International Rotterdam and TENT taken together. Accordingly, CBK Rotterdam's annual report of 2016 consists of the exhibitions, activities and events organized by the four institutions together. In essence, the annual report can be seen as an overview of the programming which is very diverse in nature. Projects include a social sculpture "met de Syrische kunstenaar en vluchteling Mosab Anzo, dat ook gaat over gelijkwaardigheid en je openstellen voor de ander." (p. 7) or an exhibition focusing on identity in which artist Navin Thakoer among other things invited "schoolklassen […] om samen na te denken over wat identiteit is in een wereld van multiculturele grootstedelijkheid." (p. 7) to name a few. With regard to audience, CBK wants "kunstliefhebbers en Rotterdammers in het algemeen bedienen" (p. 7). In addition, CBK states that they are aware of how to attract a bigger and more diverse audience. However, information on the audience is not shared in the annual report of 2016.

Nevertheless, the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture is positive about CBK Rotterdam's performances when it comes to the audience. The council evaluates "het publieksbereik van CBK Rotterdam als goed: de instelling is open en toegankelijk voor een divers publiek." (p. 74). With regard to specific audience segments, the council states: "De lijn missie, visie, strategie, activiteiten vindt de Raad steekhoudend, coherent en duidelijk uitgesplitst naar de verschillende doelgroepen." (p. 74).

The annual report of 2018 of CBK Rotterdam is largely similar to the annual report of 2016. Both annual reports present an overview of the different programs organized by Art Office, BKOR, Sculpture International Rotterdam and TENT without providing additional information on audiences. With regard to programming, it becomes clear that diversity is still an important topic. This is, for example, expressed by TENT's statement that "verschuivingen in de manier van programmeren van TENT zien we ook terug in een veranderend publiek, dat jonger en meer divers wordt." (p. 7). However, this statement is not elaborated on and it remains unclear to what extent the audience composition has changed.

4.2.3 Cultural education and social cohesion

<u>Stichting Kunstzinnige Vorming Rotterdam</u>

Stichting Kunstzinnige Vorming Rotterdam (SKVR) starts its annual report of 2016 with expressing their strategic mission of 2016 which is the same for the period 2017 – 2020, namely: "Deze behelst de participatie van alle Rotterdamse kinderen en jongeren aan kunst." (p. 4). One of the ways developed for achieving this goal is the program *SKVR Dichtbij*, which focuses on "kunsteducatie aan Rotterdammers die daar niet vanzelfsprekend mee in aanraking komen, met name kinderen en jongeren tot 25 jaar." (p. 8). The activities on offer in *SKVR Dichtbij* are social in nature. This program is organized from the perspective of seven disciplines, i.e. music, dance, theater, visual arts, fashion and design, photography and media, and writing. Per discipline, SKVR describes which activities the program *SKVR Dichtbij* organized and which audience groups were reached with those activities. For example, in 2016 SKVR organized in cooperation with other institutions "een muziekproject om deelnemers met een verstandelijke beperking/of psychiatrische patiënten muziekonderwijs te geven met als resultaat een concert in De Doelen." (p. 11). With regard to dance, SKVR organized the program "Time to Dance voor kwetsbare ouderen vanaf 50 jaar in de wijken en in woonzorgcentra." (p. 13). In the examples we see two distinct audience segments that are specifically targeted with SKVR's programming. Because of these descriptions, it seems that SKVR has a good overview of the nature of their programming and the audiences they reach with their programming.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture is predominantly positive about SKVR. However, in their plans for 2017 – 2020, SKVR expressed the ambition to only focus on children and young people up to 24 years old. Adults are no longer included in the target audience. The council is positive about "de ambitie van de SKVR om in diverse wijken en met oog op diverse doelgroepen in Rotterdam te willen investeren" (p. 350.), however, the council has some reservations towards this ambition, since SKVR is traditional in character. This is supported by the following statement: "Een organisatie als SKVR is door haar omvang en manier van werken niet in staat om in te spelen op de snelle veranderingen in de wensen van de doelgroep of het publiek." (p. 350).

The annual report of 2018 shows that the council was right and that the new ambition of SKVR – to only focus on people not older than 24 years – did not succeed in 2017. What was left of the programming did not meet the demand of the public. Therefore, SKVR decided to shift their aim in 2018 again towards a focus on "alle Rotterdammers, voor iedere leeftijd en ieder niveau" (p. 8). The disciplines discussed with regard to the annual report of 2016 are still the main disciplines SKVR focuses on. SKVR continued to offer programs specifically focused on audiences for whom participation in the arts in not self-evident. An example can be found in the discipline visual arts, fashion and design, where a project focused on "kinderen met

beperkingen in de brede zin van het woord en die het in het leven moeilijker hebben dan leeftijdsgenootjes" (p. 10) or a dance project focused on "kinderen, jongeren en bijzondere groepen, waarvoor deelname aan dansactiviteiten in hun vrije tijd niet vanzelfsprekend is. Het vindt plaats in wijken die laag scoren op de sociale index" (p. 9). Therefore, it can be argued that SKVR has a strong programming that is specifically focused on attracting certain audience segments and that SKVR is knowledgeable about its audience groups. SKVR's *raison d'etre* is to introduce and involve all inhabitants of Rotterdam in the arts. Therefore, it is logical that they pay a lot of attention to this mission. After trying to change their direction, they were able to admit their failure and continue to improve the practices that they know best, i.e. to include all the people from Rotterdam in the participation in the arts, regardless of age or level of skills.

Hofplein Rotterdam

Hofplein Rotterdam's annual report of 2016 mentions the relationship with the audience right from the start. With regard to this audience, Hofplein focuses on "het publiek dat actief de voorstellingen bezoekt, maar ook het jonge publiek dat niet vanzelfsprekend in aanraking komt met theater." (p. 3). In addition, the annual report provides an overview of the programming. Every performance is accompanied by a description of the story and number of visitors. With regard to the audience, however, there is no information presented about the audience's characteristics, which makes it impossible to make claims about the audience's diversity or the specific audience groups targeted per performance.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture has the impression that the audience of Hofplein mostly consists of the parents and family members of the participants in the performances. The council states that the audience seems to be a uniform group, saying that "De theaterschool, noch het toneel, noch in de zaal laat een grote diversiteit zien." (p. 156). Additionally, Hofplein's plans to attract a broader audience "wekken onvoldoende vertrouwen; deze zijn niet voldoende of duidelijk uitgewerkt." (p. 156) which means that Hofplein should become more clear in terms of reporting on their audience composition.

In their annual report of 2018, Hofplein makes an interesting statement with regard to programming. They state that they have attracted new makers. The result is "een solide basis van divers aanbod met coaches en makers die in een breder waaier van aanbod ieder kind willen en weten te bereiken." (p. 4). This implies that there has occurred a change in programming which results in reaching a broader audience. However, a specification is missing and it remains unclear how the programming has become broader and which children are now reached that were not reached before. In addition, Hofplein states to part with locations outside of Rotterdam and increase its focus on residents of Rotterdam, saying that they "meer de wijken van Rotterdam in zullen trekken, o.a. op Zuid, om de verhalen van onze jonge stadsgenoten op te halen, te delen en te tonen." (p. 4). With regard to its audience, Hofplein

aims to attract a broader and bigger audience. Audience research has shown that the average age of the audience is between 13 and 34 years. According to the annual report, the most important reason to visit was the programming. Only a third of the audience visited because they knew someone taking part in the performance. Although this is the only information shared in the annual report, Hofplein states to increase their cooperation with other cultural institutions in order to "samen ons publieksbereik te vergroten" (p. 9).

4.2.4 Dance

Scapino Ballet Rotterdam

The annual report of 2016 of Scapino Ballet Rotterdam is rather concise. Scapino Ballet expressed the ambition to attract a new audience and aims to perform for as large an audience as possible. However, the information provided with regard to the audience did not include more than the number of visitors. With regard to the programming, the annual report includes a couple of performances and the description of these performances. Information about diversity in programming and audience is not shared in the annual report of 2016.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture makes some interesting statements about Scapino Ballet's policy plans. With regard to their audience, the council notes that Scapino Ballet "in staat moet zijn de verbinding te leggen tussen 'artistiek uitdagend' en 'een breed publiek'." (p. 340). Furthermore, the council notes that "het publieksprofiel is niet eenduidig" (p. 341) and audience research is essential.

Scapino Ballet's annual report of 2018 is similar to the annual report of 2016. Besides stating that they "proberen […] nieuw publiek voor dans te interesseren. En met succes." (p. 2), Scapino Ballet does not provide any information about their new audience. Again, they only present visitor numbers. With regard to programming, the information in the annual report of 2018 is similar to the information in the annual report of 2016. A description of the performances is presented, without any information about the audience groups the performances were trying to attract. It is interesting to see that Scapino Ballet did not include information in the annual report of 2018 about their audience research despite the statements made by the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture.

Conny Janssen Danst

In Conny Janssen Danst's (CJD) annual report of 2016, the institution states that CJD "investeert consequent in het publiek en is voortdurend op zoek naar nieuwe doelgroepen en manieren om bestaand publiek aan zich te binden." (p. 7). However, additional information about their existing audience is not provided. Therefore, it is not clear which audience groups CJD reaches with their performances. With regard to programming, CJD provides a bit more information. However, this information is limited to a description of the performances and the

visitor numbers per performance. CJD could provide more information about their existing audience and the audience groups they are trying to attract.

With regard to programming, the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture believes that CJD "zich niet moet overstrekken qua ambities. Conny Jansen wil naast nieuwe producties ook bewezen producties hernemen die goed aansluiten bij het publiek. De beschrijving van maatschappelijk georiënteerde projecten overtuigen de RRKC niet. Een concrete aanpak ontbreekt vooralsnog." (p. 89). Therefore, when it comes to programming, there are some points for improvement. With regard to audience, the council is more positive. The council "spreekt voor het ondernemerschap in de benadering van het publiek haar waardering uit. In het toekomstige huis kan nog nieuw publiek worden bereikt. Voor de komende periode verwoordt CJD realistische ambities om het publiek te verbreden en te verdiepen." (p. 90). In recent years, the institution managed to increase its visitor number with 60 percent. However, since information about audience research is not shared, it remains unclear which audience segments became bigger in terms of visitor numbers and which audience groups are not (yet) reached.

The annual report of 2018 can be distinguished from the annual report of 2016, since the 2018 report included a section on the institutions' audience research. CJD reported about the proportion of men (24 percent) and women (76 percent), age (32 percent is between 41 and 55 years, 20 percent between 55 and 65 years) and level of education (76 percent are highly educated, 21 percent are middle educated and 3 percent are low educated). In addition, the audience research reports about the audience's valuation (on average an 8,5 out of 10), whether the audience members are new visitors or repeated visitors (12 percent of the audience were new visitors) and which other cultural activities the audience like to participate in. Hence, there is a big improvement in the information provided about CJD's audience in the annual reports. With regard to the information about programming, the annual report only provides a description of the performances. This information could be more valuable if CJD would identify the specific audience groups that they are trying to reach with their performances.

4.2.5 Film

LantarenVenster

In the annual report of 2016, LantarenVenster (LV) expresses that a new competitor entered the market with the opening of Kino. However, LV hopes "dat door dit nieuwe initiatief vooral een breder filmpubliek in Rotterdam wordt bereikt met een divers filmaanbod." (p. 2). Hence, LV declares that their main objective is reaching a broad audience. In addition, the newly introduced discount card is seen as "een goede ontwikkeling, die de drempel voor een bezoek aan ons theater nog lager maakt" (p. 5). In this way, LV tries to lower the boundary for the

potential audience to visit LV. Furthermore, LV focuses on specific audience groups, such as "De samenwerking met Stichting Vier het Leven, waar we een bijdrage leveren om ouderen te stimuleren naar de film te gaan" (p. 11) and "een grote groep expats in Rotterdam, waar we ons filmaanbod onder de aandacht brengen." (p. 11). These statements suggest that LV actively tries to attract a new audience, which makes it all the more unfortunate that there is no audience research included in the annual report.

With regard to programming in 2016, LV focuses on films as well as music. Film specials organized by LV, sometimes in cooperation with other partners, include "Festival Cinéma Arabe (voor Arabische cinema) en het Turkse Rode Tulp Film Festival. De resultaten hiervan waren beter dan in 2015, door extra personele inzet. De tiende editie van het jaarlijkse Camera Japan was wederom een succes." (p. 9). Additionally, "2016 was ook het eerste jaar van het door ons zelf geproduceerde Festival Latino Americano Rotterdam, een vierdaags film- en muziekfestival met ruim 5.800 bezoekers." (p. 9). With regard to music, LV has "met vol enthousiasme breed geprogrammeerd. Natuurlijk met de nadruk op jazz, maar ook pop, singer-songwriter en niet-Westerse (wereld)muziek." (p. 10). Both in film and music, LV has a broad programming, focusing on diverse audiences and different genres.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture has interesting feedback for LV. The council believes that LV "formuleert ambities om nieuwe doelgroepen te bereiken niet stevig genoeg, terwijl de ontwikkelingen op het gebied van de beeldcultuur daar voldoende aanleiding voor geven." (p. 193). The council notes that LV's audience predominantly exists of "hoogopgeleide autochtone 45+" (p. 195). In the policy plans for 2017 – 2020, the council feels concrete plans on how to attract a more diverse audience are lacking. With regard to music programming, the council is positive about the quality of programming, however, "LantarenVenster leunt nog te veel op andere aanbieders die van het podium gebruikmaken." (p. 194). This means that LV should become more independent from collaborations with other institutions in their music programming. When it comes to LV's film programming, the council believes that they offer "een breed spectrum binnen de Arthousefilm, zowel qua genres als herkomst." (p. 194).

The annual report of 2018 can be seen as an improvement of the annual report of 2016. LV refers to the council's feedback of distinguishing themselves more in their programming "onder andere om nieuwe doelgroepen te bereiken" (p. 2). Specifically in relation to their film programming, LV states to have offered "een diversiteit aan titels" (p. 2) as well as making a start with "verdiepingsprogramma's aan te bieden" (p. 5). Another interesting point made in the annual report is that LV "wil graag de jongere concert- en filmbezoeker (leeftijd 18-45 jaar) aantrekken en meer diversiteit terugzien in bezoekers" (p. 5). This is also in line with the council's feedback. Furthermore, LV sees opportunities in attracting people who are "25-44 jaar, cultureel geïnteresseerd, hoogopgeleid, avontuurlijk (14% van de Rotterdammers)" and "18-44 jaar, laag tot middelbaar opgeleid en een andere culturele achtergrond (34% van de

Rotterdammers)" (p. 5). Although this may imply that LV has a better overview of who to their potential audience are, LV does not specify how they want to succeed in attracting these audience segments. Therefore, it remains unclear whether LV has a specific strategy and how feasible this potential strategy may be.

International Film Festival Rotterdam

The International Film Festival Rotterdam's (IFFR) annual reports of both 2016 and 2018 have an inclusive character since interviews with various participants are included in the reports. As a result, the annual reports do not just offer a summation of the objectives and practices of IFFR, but also insights shared by participants.

IFFR's annual report of 2016 specifically pays a lot of attention to the programming which is divided into four sections, i.e. "Bright Future biedt onderdak aan films van makers die met eigenzinnig en vernieuwend werk het cinematografische landschap kleuren of opschudden." (p. 10), "De sectie Voices bevat films die zich onderscheiden door hun volwassen kwaliteit en krachtige, actuele geluid." (p. 11), "Deep Focus gaat uitgebreid in op het werk van makers met een geheel eigen oeuvre. In deze sectie is aandacht voor individuele en verzamelde werken van filmauteurs die daarmee een brug slaan tussen het oude en het nieuwe." (p. 11) and "Perspectives, daagt de filmkijker nadrukkelijk uit om verder te kijken dan het filmdoek breed is, en na te denken over het medium en de boodschap, maar ook over wat de blik van de waarnemer erover zegt." (p. 11). IFFR's programming consists of films made by filmmakers who all have a different approach. For example, the section Bright Future consisted of a component called *gender.net*, which paid attention to "blurred genderlines van de post-internetgeneratie, die de eigen identiteit zelf vormgeeft." (p. 10). Although the programming might offer a wide selection, it is questionable how diverse the programming really is since the four sections seem quite intellectual. This may be reflected in IFFR's audience as well. IFFR notes that "zo'n 88,7% van de bezoekers dit jaar was hoogopgeleid, met een vaak warme belangstelling voor kunst en cultuur." (p. 25). The majority of the audience consists of the same audience group.

The uniformity in IFFR's audience did not go unnoticed by the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture either. Especially in relation to the demographics of the city's residents, the council advices IFFR to pay more attention to its audience, since "Het festival moet inzetten op het trekken van een diverser publiek." (p. 169). With regard to programming, the council believes IFFR's programming is innovative.

A big difference between IFFR's annual reports of 2016 and 2018 is that the annual report of 2018 is written in English, whereas the annual report of 2016 is written in Dutch. It is not clear why the language has changed, but it could have something to do with the festival being an international festival. The four sections discussed before in relation to programming

(Bright Future, Voices, Deep Focus, Perspectives) are featured in the annual report of 2018 again. As IFFR states, "the film programme is wide and diverse" (p. 9). With regard to audience, IFFR does not provide information about their audience besides visitor numbers. This is a highly interesting choice considering the council's advice.

4.2.6 Municipal collection and heritage

<u>Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen</u>

The annual report of 2016 of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen (MBVB) is in many respects elaborate. With regard to programming and audience, MBVB states the following: "Het activiteitenprogramma is er voor een breed publiek, van expert tot algemeen geïnteresseerde, van peuter tot volwassene." (p. 13). If we focus on the audience more specifically, MBVB attracted 23,687 children visiting the museum with their parents – which means that they were not visiting as part of their education – that is 31 percent more than a year before. In addition, MBVB started conducting audience research in October of 2016. Preliminary results show that 34.2 percent of the audience is living in the province South-Holland and 84.8 percent of the audience is (very) satisfied with their last visit to MBVB. Although this may be a step in the right direction, more information on the audience is needed if we want to say something about diversity. With regard to programming, MBVB provides extensive descriptions, however, more information on audience groups is not made available.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture notes that they are "enthousiast over de activiteiten van het museum" (p. 229). However, when it comes to attention to a diverse audience, the council notes that "publieksdiversiteit vraagt extra aandacht." (p. 231). In addition, the council points out that the majority of MBVB's audience consist of a uniform group and the council feels that MBVB "zou als een van de grootste culturele instellingen in Rotterdam meer moeten ondernemen om meer bezoekers uit deze overige doelgroepen binnen te halen." (p. 231).

MBVB's annual report of 2018 is similar to the annual report of 2016. Perhaps the biggest improvement with regard to diversity can be found in the introduction of the guided tours *Ongehoord Boijmans* and *Ongezien Boijmans* "die de toegankelijkheid vergroten voor specifieke doelgroepen." (p. 15). The first guided tour focuses on deaf and hearing-impaired visitors whereas the latter focuses on blind and visually impaired visitors. As mentioned before, MBVB started conducting audience research in 2016. Therefore, it could be expected that MBVB would include information on the audience's characteristics in the annual report of 2018. Unfortunately, information on the audience is limited to place of residency and level of audience's appreciation of the exhibitions. With regard to programming, and similar to 2016, MBVB provides descriptions on the different exhibitions, activities and events.

Wereldmuseum Rotterdam

The annual report of 2016 of Wereldmuseum Rotterdam (WMR) is for the greatest part focused on the financial statements since the museum had a rough financial year and was facing closure. Some attention in the annual report is paid to *Afrika 010*, WMR's biggest exhibition of that year and "een tentoonstelling die het Wereldmuseum Rotterdam weer verbond met de stad. Dat kwam tot uiting in de tentoonstelling zelf en in versterkte mate in het magazine Afrika 010, waarin aspecten van de veelzijdige Afrikaanse cultuur in de stad werden belicht." (p. 6). With regard to the audience, visitor numbers are shared in the appendix of the annual report but additional information remains absent.

According to the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture, WMR "zoekt actief de verbinding met de stad, bewoners en bezoekers, waarbij de nadruk ligt op culturele uitwisseling." (p. 407). In addition, WMR wants to increase its visitor number with 40 percent compared to 2015. WMR received 42,398 visitors in 2015 and 43,615 visitors in 2016. The council questions the feasibility of this ambition.

The annual report of 2018 shows that WMR received 30,628 visitors in 2018. According to WMR, this decrease is the result of the closing of a section of the building for renovation. What is striking in the annual report of 2018 compared to the annual report of 2016 is the increased attention to programming and audience. With regard to programming, WMR provides a description of the programs organized and states that "de belangrijkste doelgroep van de publieksprogramma's zijn de 'young urban citizens'." (p. 6). More attention is paid to the impact of their programming. An example can be found in the program "*010 Says It All x Wereldmuseum*. Met dit programma zochten we de stedelijke samenwerking op met het thema 'Mijn Verhaal' en opnieuw trokken we veel young urban citizens." (p. 6). With regard to its audience, WMR states that they did not conduct audience research because of the ongoing renovation. However, it became apparent that 50 percent of WMR's audience consists of people "voor wie cultuur ongebruikelijk is" (p. 10). Starting from 2019, WMR wants to conduct audience research again.

4.2.7 Literature and debate

Poetry International

In the annual report of 2016, Poetry International (PI) describes the different focus points of Poetry International Festival. At the same time, attention is given to activities organized or participated in outside of the festival. Therefore, the annual report presents an overview of the whole programming with diverse perspectives. With regard to the audience, PI aims at the following: "aantrekken van een veelzijdig publiek voor poëzie: jong en oud, nieuwe poëziebestormers en diehards, analogen en digitalen, liefhebbers, amateurdichters en

professionals." (p. 1). PI states that offering "programma's over poëzie, waarbij dichters en liefhebbers van poëzie op een persoonlijke wijze hun passie met een publiek delen, blijken goed aan te slaan bij een bestaand publiek en verlagen de drempel naar een nieuw publiek." (p. 3). However, additional information on the existing and new audience is not provided.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture is positive about PI and states: "Poetry International is een sterk merk, dankzij de reputatie van hoge internationale kwaliteit." (p. 279). When it comes to the audience, the council notes that PI has "een vrij klein, specifiek publiek." (p. 280). However, PI is ambitious to increase and broaden its audience in the next years.

The annual report of 2018 describes the programming of Poetry International Festival and activities organized outside of the festival. In their programming, PI tried to focus on other genres as well such as hip-hop, rap and spoken word. However, it is not clear whether this happened with the aim of attracting a broader audience. PI only reports that the inclusion of these genres enriches their programming. When it comes to the audience, it remains unclear whether PI attracted a new audience, since information on audience characteristics is not shared in the annual report.

Passionate Bulkboek

In their annual report of 2016, Passionate Bulkboek seems inconsistent when it comes to describing their programming with specifying their audience groups. For example, the description of the program *Dag van het Literatuuronderwijs* is accompanied by a description of the audience group "docenten, schrijvers, letterkundigen en media- en bibliothecarissen" (p. 7) but in the case of the program *Geen Daden Maar Woorden Festival*, Passionate Bulkboek only mentions "zeer specifieke doelgroepen" (p. 11). Therefore, a clear overview of the different audience groups reached by Passionate Bulkboek is missing. With regard to the audience in general, no information about audience composition is provided.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture is particularly enthusiastic about Passionate Bulkboek's practices and states: "Divers en breed georiënteerd bereikt de organisatie heel veel jongeren." (p. 275). In addition, the council feels that the programming of Passionate Bulkboek fits "de verschillende doelgroepen" (p. 276) perfectly.

The annual report of 2018 is to a great extent similar to the annual report of 2016. However, in the annual report of 2018, there seems to be a bit more attention to audience groups. 33 percent of the audience consist of people "voor wie cultuur ongebruikelijk is" (p. 7). Passionate Bulkboek states that this shows that they focus on "een inclusief publieksbeleid" (p. 7). However, what this exactly means remains unclear and no other specific information on audience composition is shared. With regard to programming, Passionate Bulkboek provides a description of every program, which is similar to the annual report of 2016.

Rotterdams Philharmonisch Orkest

In their annual report of 2016, Rotterdams Philharmonisch Orkest (RPhO) is very clear in expressing their ambition of attracting a new audience. This is for example expressed by the following statement: "Bovendien telt Rotterdam als jonge, multiculturele stad steeds meer mensen die niet tot ons traditionele bereik behoren. Dat maakt het voor ons meer dan ooit nodig om onze rol te verbreden en nieuw publiek te vinden." (p. 4). With regard to programming, RPhO discusses the concerts on offer with the specific aim of attracting a different audience than their regular visitors, saying that "met doelgroepgerichte producties als Brasil Sinfônico en Harry Potter in Concert trokken we in 2016 duizenden bezoekers die nog nooit naar ons orkest waren komen luisteren." (p. 6). With regard to the audience, it seems that RPhO has a good overview of their audience's characteristics. For several concerts, RPhO describes which audience segments were present and how many visitors were new visitors. For example, the program *Core Classics* was introduced because audience research showed that there are some "muziekliefhebbers [...] die wel belangstelling hebben voor klassiek, maar die denken er te weinig van af te weten om ervan te kunnen genieten in de concertzaal." (p. 8). To cater to this audience segment's needs, RPhO developed a program with an introduction hosted by the director and some musicians from the orchestra. In addition, RPhO organized a weekend school "voor kinderen uit achterstandswijken, dat jaarlijks door zo'n 1.000 nieuwsgierige jongeren vrijwillig wordt gevolgd." (p. 9). Furthermore, RPhO provides extensive information about their audience research, which focuses on:

- *"Het profiel van onze bezoekers*
- *De klanttevredenheid en waardering van onze bezoekers over de bezochte concerten*
- *De effectiviteit van onze marketingcommunicatie*
- *De voorkeuren en wensen van onze bezoekers*
- *De voorkeuren, wensen en bezoekbarrières van potentiële bezoekers*
- *Onze merkpositie in naamsbekendheid, merkbinding en waardering"*

(p. 15)

Because of these aspects of audience research, RPhO gained the insight that the "orkest een breed publiek bedient." (p. 17). Their ambition to attract a broader audience is reflected in the "lancering van een aantal nieuwe formats en innovatieve producties." (p. 17). These new formats prove to be effective for attracting a diverse audience since "bij geen enkel format is sprake van een meerderheid voor één doelgroep." (p. 17). Additionally, RPhO provides

information about its audience's place of residency, audience group characteristic, age and visiting frequency per type of format.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture notes that RPhO's audience is still "overwegend eenzijdig van samenstelling." (p. 325), although RPhO's ambitions to attract a broader audience are good. The council feels that "door de samenwerking op te zoeken met andere culturen in de stad" (p. 325) RPhO is on the right track, however, their effort could have been bigger already.

In the annual report 2018, RPhO states that their audience reach has improved significantly. An example can be found in the programming of *Wijk in de zaal* which attracted "heel veel Rotterdammers uit alle wijken van de stad [...] voor een eerste kennismaking" (p. 5). Two out of three visitors that visited RPhO because of *Wijk in de zaal* were new visitors. In addition, RPhO states to have succeeded in attracting a younger audience as well. With regard to the program *Core Classics*, 38 percent of visitors in 2017 were younger than 46 years whereas a year later 49 percent of visitors were younger than 46 years. Similar to the annual report of 2016, RPhO provides a clear overview of the concerts organized and the audience groups that were visiting these concerts. With regard to audience research, the aspects covered in 2016 are discussed in the annual report of 2018 again. Compared to earlier years, more visitors live in Rotterdam (31.6 percent in 2016 compared to 35.0 percent in 2018) and younger people are increasingly visiting. For example, in 2016 only 4 percent of regular visitor were between 26 and 35 years. In 2018, this was 9 percent. When we look at the *Core Classics* program, 5 percent of visitors were between 26 and 35 years in 2016 whereas this is 13 percent in 2018. This percentages illustrate that RPhO may not have reached their full potential when it comes to audience reach, however, the increase in attracting a new audience suggests that RPhO is on the right track.

De Doelen

In 2016, De Doelen celebrated its 50th birthday. In the annual report of 2016, De Doelen mentions that they have expanded their programming team. As a result, they focused more on "andere accenten in programmering [...], met name op het gebied van wereldmuziek, 'indie-classical' en cross-overs" (p. 2). Additionally, more diversity in programming was reached because of intensifying cultural collaborations. De Doelen states that the programming in their anniversary year was "divers en vernieuwend." (p. 4). With regard to its audience, De Doelen reports to have attract "veel (nieuw) publiek bij een veelomvattend concertprogramma." (p. 4). However, additional information about the new audience is not provided. De Doelen only shares some information about the audience's age, namely that 20.8 percent of the people buying a ticket were between 18 and 35 years, "waarmee het de grootste groep is geworden

(een stijging van 38,4% t.o.v. 2015)." (p. 2). Although this may be a positive increase, it would have been more interesting to view this in light of other audience's characteristics.

Although the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture believes that De Doelen's "eigen programmering op het gebied van de canonieke cultuur is goed, zelfs dynamisch te noemen." (p. 97), De Doelen should improve its programming focusing on other genres. A change in programming could lead to attracting a diverse audience and the council states that "De Doelen zou zich als geen ander moeten instellen op vernieuwing van de klassieke muziek en op ander publiek." (p. 97) since De Doelen's audience is still rather uniform according to the council.

Before the cultural policy plan of 2017 – 2020 started, De Doelen formulated new ambitions. With regard to the audience, De Doelen wanted to generate "een groter bereik onder een brede groep Rotterdammers" (p. 2). As becomes clear in the annual report of 2018, De Doelen reformulated its ambitions into becoming "een plek waar iedereen zich welkom voelt. Waar alle nationaliteiten en leeftijden van de stad, het land en de wereld elkaar ontmoeten." (p. 2). The opening of *De Doelen Studio* should help in reaching this goal. According to the annual report, *De Doelen Studio* is "een podium en ontmoetingsplek voor heel Rotterdam en een plek waar de drempel naar de Doelen verlaagd wordt." (p. 3). In addition, the new Friday night series *CLUB DOELEN* was introduced to present "muziek door jonge makers, tegendraadse ensembles of solisten en de meest verrassende of onverwachte muziek van nu." (p. 7). Therefore, it seems that De Doelen incorporated the council's advice of innovating their programming. With regard to its audience, it remains unclear whether De Doelen attracted a broader audience. The information provided is limited to mentioning the diversity in programming that brings "een breed publiek naar de Doelen." (p. 9). Therefore, there is room for improvement when it comes to sharing information on audience composition.

4.2.9 Theater

Theater Rotterdam

As mentioned before, Ro Theater, Rotterdamse Schouwburg and Productiehuis Rotterdam merged to become Theater Rotterdam in 2017. For the analysis of the annual reports of 2016, the annual reports of the three theaters individually will be briefly discussed.

In 2016, Rotterdamse Schouwburg "koos ervoor zich meer te verbinden aan andere disciplines" (p. 7) which has led to a more diverse programming. With regard to the audience, Rotterdamse Schouwburg states that its "cultureel diverse programmering werd geïntegreerd in het aanbod zonder dit als doelgroepenbeleid uit te venten" (p. 6). As a result, no information on audience characteristics is shared. The information shared on Productiehuis Rotterdam's audience of 2016 is more elaborate, which is also expressed with the following statement: "Het publiek van Productiehuis Rotterdam is even veelzijdig als de makers waarmee we werken."

(p. 13). In addition, the majority of their audience from Rotterdam exist of "twintigers en dertigers die graag uitgaan, gericht zijn op het centrum van de stad en veel online zijn. Daarnaast bestaat een groot deel uit vaste schouwburgbezoekers." (p. 13). With regard to programming, Productiehuis Rotterdam provides a description of every production. This is something Ro Theater does in its annual report of 2016 as well. An example of diversity in programming can be found in the performance called *Moeders*, which is accompanied by the following description:

> *"Moeders geeft een kijkje in de keuken van vrouwen zoals we die tegenkomen op straat, bij de supermarkt, en op het schoolplein. Rotterdamse vrouwen van verschillende leeftijden en met verschillende culturele achtergronden vertellen persoonlijke en universele verhalen over eten, dromen, de verbondenheid van vrouwen en de kracht die daarachter schuil gaat."*

(p. 11)

With regard to audience, Ro Theater reports to conduct audience research. However, results of the audience research are not shared.

The Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture presents interesting advice for Theater Rotterdam's plans for 2017 – 2020. With regard to programming, the council feels that their "programmering is spannend. De ingrediënten voor succes zijn aanwezig" (p. 364). However, a clear plan on how to reach diversity in programming is lacking, as the council states: "Teleurstellend is de beperkte rol van culturele diversiteit. Op enkele verwijzingen naar makers met een andere culturele achtergrond of evenementen als de viering van het Chinees Nieuwjaar, vermeldt het plan daar weinig over." (p. 364). Similar comments were made by the council with regard to audience diversity. The council states that "hoe de organisatie dit wil realiseren valt eigenlijk nog niet goed te beoordelen. Daarvoor is het plan onvoldoende uitgewerkt." (p. 365). Hence, it seems as if the merged Theater Rotterdam has big ambitions but does not succeed in making them concrete and measurable.

The annual report of 2018 of Theater Rotterdam described diversity in programming quite extensively. However, little information is shared on audience groups and information concerning audience is limited to visitor numbers. In the annual report, Theater Rotterdam reports that "Voor Theater Rotterdam is het invulling geven aan de Code Culturele Diversiteit een prioriteit." (p. 7). They continue by saying that "Dat doen we binnen onze programmering: we toonden in 2018 lokaal en internationaal cultureel diverse voorstellingen," (p. 7). In the annual report, diversity in programming is often mentioned and Theater Rotterdam's programming is extensively described. That makes it even more unfortunate that there is no description of the audience groups reached by the diverse programming in the annual report.

Luxor Theater Rotterdam

In the annual report of 2016, Luxor Theater Rotterdam states to have attracted a lot of visitors from Rotterdam "dat aangaf al heel lang niet meer in het Luxor Theater te zijn geweest" (p. 4) with their first co-production. Furthermore, Luxor puts a specific emphasis on Rotterdam and its diverse population with the following statement:

> *"Omdat de stad Rotterdam zeer divers is, en Luxor bovendien altijd programmeert met deze diverse bevolkingssamenstelling in gedachten, sluit eigenlijk iedere voorstelling aan op het DNA van Rotterdam. Wanneer er gekeken wordt naar voorstellingen die geprogrammeerd worden voor specifieke niet-Westerse bevolkingsgroepen, dan waren daar in 2016 zeventien voorstellingen van zestien verschillende producties."*
>
> (p. 6)

Therefore, it seems that Luxor has a strong focus on diversity in its programming and audience. However, an elaboration on the audience groups is not shared in the annual report.

This view is shared by the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture, which states that Luxor presents "een divers en een breed programma." (p. 210). Moreover, the council agrees with Luxor's statements that they are a place where "de culturele carrière van Rotterdammers" (p. 210) can launch, considering Luxor's reputation and public interest in the theater. With regard to its audience, the council states that Luxor "heeft een omslag gemaakt, zodat het bestaande publiek beter bediend wordt. Daarnaast zijn nieuwe groepen enigszins in kaart gebracht." (p. 211).

The annual report of 2018 states that there has been an improvement in Luxor's programming. The new program *Luxor Bruist* enables "een actieve in plaats van receptieve cultuurbeleving" (p. 5) with a higher visitor number as a result. In addition, "wanneer er gekeken wordt naar voorstellingen die geprogrammeerd worden voor specifieke niet-Westerse bevolkingsgroepen, dan waren er in 2018 in dat kader 34 voorstellingen." (p. 7-8). The number of performances for specific non-Western audience groups has doubled since 2016. Another improvement compared to the annual report of 2016, is that Luxor includes information on audience research conducted by Rotterdam Festivals in the annual report of 2018. From the audience research it appears that "Luxor van alle Rotterdamse instellingen het breedste publiek trekt." (p. 12). The audience research is based on three "typische Rotterdamse producties" (p. 12) and, for example, shows that 11.7 percent of the audience are "kort gezegd: de oudere Rotterdammer in de oudere Rotterdamse wijken" (p. 12). This group consists of 21.9 percent of the total population of Rotterdam.

4.2.10 Overview of cultural institutions' results and discussion

Table 2 presents an overview of relevant topics discussed in the annual reports of the cultural institutions. It focuses on whether topics such as diversity in programming, visitor numbers, or visitors' place of residency are discussed in the annual reports. + indicates that these topics are discussed, ± indicates that these topics are referred to but not clarified and - indicates that these topics are not discussed at all. It proved to be difficult to merge the information per discipline since two cultural institutions in the same discipline may have achieved other improvements. Therefore, Table 2 focuses on cultural institutions individually.

Table 2 shows that most cultural institutions discuss their visitor numbers. However, that may be the only topic that is discussed by all cultural institutions. When it comes to diversity in programming and other audience characteristics, the cultural institutions do not always provide clear information. 13 out of 18 cultural institutions do not even provide information on what part of the audience consists of new visitors, in both the annual reports of 2016 and 2018. This might be alarming since it implies that the cultural institutions in question do not have a view on whether they have attracted a new audience. Consequently, it will be hard to determine whether these cultural institutions managed to attract new, more diverse audience groups.

Moreover, Table 2 shows that 10 out of 18 cultural institutions do not share information on their audience's place of residency in both the annual reports of 2016 and 2018. Perhaps the cultural institutions assume that the majority of their audience consists of Rotterdam inhabitants considering the cultural institutions' location. However, it may also be the case that people from outside of Rotterdam, or even tourists from outside the Netherlands, are included in the audience. Therefore, it is interesting that information on audience's place of residency is absent. The lack of information means that cultural institutions do not have an overview of how many inhabitants of Rotterdam are reached or who their audience actually consists of.

An interesting finding is that one cultural institution, IABR, discussed most of the topics in the annual report of 2016, but refrained from discussing these topics again in the annual report of 2018. Therefore, we can speak of a negative development in the discussion of diversity in the case of this cultural institution. In contrast, CJD shows a positive development in the discussion of diversity. In the annual report of 2016, CJD only mentioned its visitor numbers whereas the annual report of 2018 provided more information on the audience composition. Two cultural institutions, Kunsthal and RPhO, stand out in a positive way. These two cultural institutions discuss most of the topics in their annual reports in both 2016 and 2018. Hence, Kunsthal and RPhO provide the most comprehensive information on their audience characteristics.

	Architecture, design and e-culture				Visual arts and photography				Cultural education and social cohesion			
	AIR		IABR		Kunsthal		CBK Rotterdam		SKVR		Hofplein	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
Diversity in programming	±	±	±	±	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Audience: Visitor number	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Audience: New visitors	-	-	±	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
Audience: Age	-	-	±	-	±	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
Audience: Gender	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
Audience: Place of residency	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
Audience: Level of education	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
Audience: Motivation for visiting	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+

	Dance				Film				Municipal collection and heritage			
	Scapino Ballet		CJD		LV		IFFR		MBVB		WMR	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
Diversity in programming	±	±	±	±	+	+	+	+	+	+	±	+
Audience: Visitor number	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Audience: New visitors	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Audience: Age	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	±	-	±
Audience: Gender	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Audience: Place of residency	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	±
Audience: Level of education	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
Audience: Motivation for visiting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-

	Literature and debate				Music				Theater			
	PI		Passionate Bulkboek		RPhO		De Doelen		Theater Rotterdam		Luxor Theater	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
Diversity in programming	+	+	±	±	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Audience: Visitor number	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Audience: New visitors	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
Audience: Age	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	±	-	-	±
Audience: Gender	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Audience: Place of residency	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	±	-	-	+
Audience: Level of education	-	-	-	-	±	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Audience: Motivation for visiting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 2. Overview of topics discussed by the cultural institutions.

Table 3 presents an overview of the results found in the annual reports of the cultural institutions based on the level of attention to diversity. Similar to Tabel 2, Table 3 focuses on cultural institutions rather than disciplines. Furthermore, it is important to note that the category *Overall attention to diversity in both programming and audience* does not say anything about the level of attention. Especially with regard to diversity in audience, cultural institutions in this category differ from those that started to conduct audience research with preliminary results on the one hand to a clear presentation of audience composition on the other hand. (We will discuss this in further detail in Table 4.) However, the changed level of attention to diversity makes it impossible to ignore increased efforts, regardless of how small they may appear. Therefore, certain cultural institutions with some attention to diversity in audience are placed in this category.

It is important to note that for 2016, IABR is placed in the category *In general little attention to diversity in programming and audience*. The reason for this is that although the cultural institution provided some information on its audience in the annual report of 2016, there was no specific attention to diversity. From the information provided in the annual report, we can derive that the majority of the audience consists of a homogenous group with the specific motivation for visiting being out of professional interest. Therefore, it did not seem right to categorize IABR in a category that has some attention to diversity.

Level of attention to diversity	Cultural institutions in 2016	Cultural institutions in 2018
In general little attention to diversity in programming and audience	• AIR • IABR • WMR	• AIR • IABR
Attention to diversity in programming, but little attention to diversity in audience	• CBK Rotterdam • Hofplein • Scapino Ballet • CJD • LV • IFFR • MBVB • PI • Passionate Bulkboek • Theater Rotterdam • Luxor Theater	• CBK Rotterdam • Scapino Ballet • IFFR • MBVB • WMR • PI • Passionate Bulkboek • De Doelen • Theater Rotterdam

Overall attention to diversity in both programming and audience	• Kunsthal • SKVR • RPhO • De Doelen	• Kunsthal • SKVR • Hofplein • CJD • LV • RPhO • Luxor Theater

Table 3. Overview of cultural institutions' results.

It is striking that in the municipality's cultural policy framework, much attention is paid to audience groups and audience research. In contrast, in most of the annual reports of the cultural institutions, it becomes apparent that the cultural institutions focus more on reporting on their programming instead of their existing and potential audience groups.

What we can conclude from the limited information provided in the annual reports is that institutions in the architecture, design and e-culture discipline pay the least attention to diversity in programming and audience in both 2016 and 2018. Their main audience consists of professionals, policymakers and other experts and it appears that these institutions do not feel the urgency to appeal to a broad and diverse audience. This raises the question to what extent cultural institutions in the architecture, design and e-culture discipline are suitable for focusing on diversity in audience when it comes to ethnic background, gender, physical disabilities, educational level and age, among other aspects.

At the other end of the spectrum we find institutions such as Kunsthal, SKVR and RPhO. These institutions pay most attention to diversity in programming and audience in both 2016 and 2018. Furthermore, they specifically focus on different audience segments in their annual reports. With regard to SKVR, this could be because their specific aim is to introduce and involve children from diverse backgrounds to the arts. Therefore, it may be logical that they are aware of their audience.

This is not the same for RPhO, who are also doing well when it comes to diversity. We have seen that RPhO pays attention to audience research and consistently discusses this in their annual reports. This might be a bit surprising since RPhO's programming predominantly focuses on classical music and cultural institutions focusing on classical music increasingly have to deal with an ageing audience. Perhaps the focus on diversity can be explained by this ageing audience and the threat of losing the right to exist if RPhO does not innovate their programming. Attracting a new and younger audience may help in increasing their brand recognition and invest in repeat visitors. In addition, I suspect that attracting a new audience may have something to do with a possible increase in revenue. This could apply to cultural

institutions in other disciplines as well. However, since this research does not focus on finances, this remains a speculation.

What we have seen when we discussed Kunsthal in section 4.2.2 is that Kunsthal aims to attract diverse audience segments by mixing up diverse genres in their programming. It appears that this is an intrinsic goal since Kunsthal does not only express this aim but also acts upon it. Furthermore, they share their insights on the diversity of their audience and how they are trying to improve their audience reach. Therefore, their efforts seem genuine.

The majority of disciplines pay more attention to diversity in programming than they do to audience diversity in their annual reports. The reason for this remains unclear, especially since the municipality stresses the importance of audience research and identifying the existing and potential audiences. In contrast, the municipality does not pay a lot of attention to programming as we have discussed before. However, a possible reason for cultural institutions mainly focusing on programming is that this may be a bit easier to report on. In general, cultural institutions already have a description of their different programs which they use in their announcements and other marketing tools. I do not suggest that the report on programming in annual reports does not receive special attention. However, it may be possible that reporting on programming is significantly easier than reporting on audience since information on programming is already available whereas information on audience needs to be gathered. Adding to that, it could also be because cultural institutions have more grip on their programming compared to their audience composition. Writing the report on programming is done by the cultural institutions themselves whereas the audience paying a visit ultimately remains the audience's own decision. Furthermore, the description of programming can be more freely interpreted compared to the description of audience size and composition, which is more concrete. This can be illustrated by the example of LantarenVenster who organized the Festival Latino Americano Rotterdam. The name of the festival may suggest that the festival attracted a lot of visitors with a Latin American background. However, this is just an assumption and we cannot be certain that this is true if LantarenVenster does not report on the audience segments that the festival attracted. This example may show why it may be easier to report on programming rather than on audience, while doing so does strongly suggest that an institution is concerned about audience composition and doing its share to enhance diversity.

Some cultural institutions in the category *Attention to diversity in programming, but little attention to diversity in audience* made improvements when it comes to getting information on audience's place of residency or motivation for visiting. However, these improvements seem so minor that statements regarding diversity are still hard to make. Nevertheless, Table 4 presents an overview of the changes in strategy, how minor they may be, that can be detected in the cultural institutions' annual reports of 2016 and 2018. Similar to Table 3, Table 4 focuses

on cultural institutions rather than disciplines since the two cultural institutions in the same discipline may have achieved different improvements.

Change in strategy between 2016 and 2018	Cultural institutions
Hardly any change in focus on diversity	• AIR • IABR
Slightly increased focus on diversity but remains vague and speculative	• CBK Rotterdam • Scapino Ballet • IFFR • WMR • PI • Passionate Bulkboek • Theater Rotterdam
Slightly increased focus on diversity, mentions to conduct audience research and discusses some of the results	• Hofplein • CJD • LV • MBVB • De Doelen • Luxor Theater
Increased focus on diversity and presents a clear overview of audience composition	• Kunsthal • SKVR • RPhO

Table 4. Overview of cultural institutions' change in strategy between 2016 and 2018.

The majority of cultural institutions have increased their focus on diversity but remain vague and speculative. Some cultural institutions mention to attract people for whom participation in the arts is not self-evident. However, what is meant with such a statement is hardly ever explained, and therefore, remains unclear. Especially for such a promising statement – it implies that the cultural institutions managed to attract first-time visitors – it is not clear why participation is not self-evident. It may be because of someone's socio-economic background or gender but it could also be because of possible disabilities. Therefore, it is my opinion that cultural institutions should be more specific when saying to have attracted people for whom participation is not self-evident. If cultural institutions do want to use this term, an explanation is necessary to avoid any misunderstanding.

Remaining vague and speculative may have something to do with certain institutions not feeling the urgent need to focus on diversity. As we have discussed, the municipality stresses the importance of audience research. However, we have also seen that it is unclear how compulsory the municipality's recommendations are and specific consequences are not mentioned. It could, therefore, be the case that some cultural institutions do not see the immediate need of conducting audience research since the municipality proposes audience research as a recommendation rather than a necessity.

We have seen that some cultural institutions have increased their efforts to gain insights in their audience. Although they may have started to conduct audience research, most cultural institutions only present information in their annual reports on visitor numbers, visitors' evaluation of the programming and whether the audience has visited the cultural institutions before. These data may be interesting, but do not provide a lot of information in terms of diversity. In most of the cases it is unclear how – e.g. with an online survey, real life interview or optional questionnaire on site – and when – before, during or after visiting – audience research was conducted. Furthermore, in most of the cases the cultural institutions do not discuss what the consequences will be of their findings, and if and how they will try to attract more people from certain audience segments based on their gained insights.

Some cultural institutions do mention diversity in their annual reports. However, an explanation of what is exactly meant is often missing. With regard to the definition of diversity, as presented by the Code Cultural Diversity, the definition may be *too* broad. As mentioned before, the term diversity focuses on ethnic background, gender, physical disabilities, educational level, age, etcetera. When cultural institutions mention diversity in their annual reports, it is not clear whether they mean diversity in the broadest sense of the term or whether they specifically focus on a specific aspect of the term. As a result, it may seem that cultural institutions use the term to be perceived as involved with diversity. However, without a specification of the term, it is not clear what the cultural institutions are specifically focusing on and what not.

In contrast, other cultural institutions are specific about certain diverse audience segments in certain programming. However, it may happen that they specifically focus on a small portion of the total audience, thereby not focusing on the majority of the audience at all. This can be illustrated by the example of MBVB's guided tours *Ongehoord Boijmans* and *Ongezien Boijmans.* As we have discussed, the first guided tour focuses on deaf and hearing-impaired visitors and the second guided tour focuses on blind and visually impaired visitors. These two guided tours are definitely examples of the museum becoming more inclusive. However, in their annual report, MBVB pays specific attention to these two guided tours without focusing on diversity in the total audience. The two guided tours are rather highlighted and no

other information on the rest of the audience is provided. Furthermore, it was not specified in the annual report how many people took part in the guided tours. As a result, it remains unclear what MBVB's audience composition looks like exactly. With regard to the total audience, it is interesting that MBVB does not report on audience characteristics since they stated that they started conducting audience research. This example illustrates that an explicit focus on diverse audience segments should not go without reporting on the total audience.

5. Conclusion

In 2019, the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture published a call for action for an inclusive cultural sector. The council noticed a gap in the cultural sector between established cultural institutions and new initiatives, and offered recommendations on how the cultural sector in Rotterdam can improve and go forward. The importance of bringing established cultural institutions and new initiatives closer together in order to prevent the gap in the cultural sector, is expressed by the following statement:

"De Raad onderstreept voor Rotterdam het belang om zich te concentreren op inclusiviteit in culturele zin. Kijkend naar Rotterdam is het gezien de opbouw - een jonge stad met ruim 170 nationaliteiten - ongewenst dat juist in deze stad een groeiende kloof bestaat tussen enerzijds de gesubsidieerde sector die - het geheel bekeken - als gesloten, eurocentrisch en traditioneel mag worden beschouwd en anderzijds het informele veld, van nature cultureel diverser en inclusiever. Dit terwijl de kracht van Rotterdam juist ligt in de gelijkwaardige mix van deze twee."

(p. 3)

In order to reach more diversity, the council advices the municipality to give more weight to the Code Cultural Diversity (which after the publication of this call for action developed into the Code Diversity & Inclusion) and make it more binding. More specifically, the council states "om inclusiviteit dit keer structureel in de culturele sector te laten beklijven, beveelt de Raad aan de Code Culturele Diversiteit blijvend onderdeel te maken van subsidiecriteria" (p. 22). This would mean that cultural institutions could be assessed based on their involvement in the code and that the code would be less free to interpretation. The advice of the council corresponds to what we have seen before. The code should become a permanent aspect in deciding on subsidies instead of something non-binding. In addition, the council discusses audience research. What we have seen in some of the annual reports, is that not all cultural institutions conduct audience research. Some cultural institutions even let go of audience research. The council advices to make audience research compulsory in the annual reports since they believe that "bewustwording van drempels bij non-publiek kan helpen om een meer inclusieve publiekswerking op gang te brengen." (p. 25). It is expected that, as a result, a better overview can be presented when all audience researches are combined.

This research aimed to identify to what extent the objectives of the cultural policy framework of the municipality of Rotterdam matches the objectives and practices of the city's cultural institutions, specifically focusing on diversity in programming and audience. In the

theoretical framework we have seen that diversity in cultural policy is on the Dutch national agenda since the second half of the twentieth century. However, if we specifically look at Rotterdam's municipality's cultural policy framework of 2017 – 2020 and the annual reports of both 2016 and 2018 of several cultural institutions in the city, we notice a discrepancy. The majority of cultural institutions analyzed are not transparent or offer limited transparence when reporting on their programming and audience. Although the municipality has a strong focus on the diversification of the audiences and audience research, most cultural institutions mainly focus on their programming and merely share information on visitor numbers. Perhaps the municipality's focus and recommendations are still too non-binding and more consequences are needed in order for cultural institutions to feel the urgency to engage in diversity matters.

We have seen that some cultural institutions, such as Kunsthal and RPhO, are on the right track when it comes to focusing on diversity in their programming and audience. These cultural institutions stand out because they offer programming specifically focused on different audience segments. This could be due to increasing brand recognition and investing in repeat visitors. Furthermore, they are transparent in offering information in their annual reports. We have also seen that the majority of cultural institutions discussed still have a long way to go. Most cultural institutions should increase their efforts when it comes to targeting specific audience segments with their programming and conducting audience research. Cultural institutions such as SKVR and Hofplein in the cultural education and social cohesion discipline, have the important task of kindling enthusiasm in the younger generations and providing them with cultural competence. Therefore, it is important that their efforts reach the whole population of Rotterdam thereby focusing on diversity in the broadest sense. Furthermore, it has been striking that most cultural institutions refer to diversity only implicitly and that they remain vague and speculative. These cultural institutions should intensify their attention to diversity and become more concrete when discussing diversity in their annual reports and other documents. Cultural institutions in the architecture, design and e-culture discipline are the least involved with diversity. Their audience predominantly consists of professionals and from the annual reports it seems that these cultural institutions do not have specific action points to become more diverse in the near future. In short, most cultural institutions do not focus on diversity sufficiently. It will be interesting to see how their objectives and practices concerning diversity will develop in the near future.

5.1 Recommendations based on this research

One of the ways in which cultural institutions can increase their involvement in diversity is to actively adhere to the Code Diversity & Inclusion. We have seen that the municipality advices the cultural institutions to endorse the code. However, the code is rarely mentioned in the

annual reports that we have analyzed for this research, which implies that the municipality's advice is seen as non-binding. Furthermore, this lack of focus on the code poses the question to what extent cultural institutions take the code seriously. If the cultural sector truly aims to be diverse and inclusive, active acknowledgement of and participation in the Code Diversity & Inclusion is necessary. We have seen that this urgency is also expressed by the Rotterdam Council of Art and Culture. However, it is important to note that diversity is one of the several subsidy criteria cultural institutions have to keep in mind. Other criteria that should be taken into consideration as well are artistic quality, the position of the cultural institution in the cultural sector and the business operations, among other things. Still, I believe that cultural institutions should adhere to the comply-and-explain principle when it comes to the Code Diversity & Inclusion. This means that cultural institutions should actively comply with the code. In addition, they should communicate and explain in which ways they are doing so.

When it comes to the third conclusion discussed earlier that was proposed by the municipality – cultural institutions have to clarify in their own reports which audience segments are most important to target and which segments they do not want to appeal to necessarily – cultural institutions could make use of the SMART principle, which was originally introduced by Doran in 1981. Although the principle has some variations now, SMART stands for Specific, Measurable, Attainable (or Achievable), Realistic (or Relevant) and Timely. By following this principle, cultural institutions should be able to (S) identify what their goal is, (M) how they will measure their results, (A) whether it is possible to accomplish their goal, (R) whether the goal is realistic to achieve and (T) whether the goal is possible to achieve in a certain time frame. Specifying a goal can help cultural institutions to identify which audience segments they specifically want to focus on. Consequently, if all cultural institutions would make use of this principle, an overview could be developed of the cultural institutions' different objectives and to what extent all audience segments are catered for. The latter is a wish of the municipality. The SMART principle shows that perhaps more criteria are necessary for some cultural institutions to research and report on their audience. As it appears in the cultural policy framework, the municipality's objective of attracting a broad audience seems to some extent non-binding and without consequences if the cultural institutions do not adhere to it.

I do not suggest that the SMART principle is the only method that could be effective. However, it seems that it may be valuable to offer cultural institutions more instruction. By making use of the SMART principle, or something similar, cultural institutions will need to identify their goal in the first step. This goal may be different for each cultural institution, and therefore, the next steps will be different for each cultural institution accordingly. As said before, other principles or methods may be equally or even better suited. Another example may be Locke and Latham's five principles of goal-setting (Bookboon, 2012). This principle focuses on Clarity, a clear and explicit goal; Challenge, a goal that is challenging but still achievable;

Commitment, the whole team should be committed to making the goal effective; Feedback, the possibility to correct or clarify before the goal is reached; and Task complexity, the goal should not be too complex to realize.

From what we have seen in the annual reports, cultural institutions do not apply an assessment scheme on their own initiative. Therefore, it could be valuable if the municipality would make this more compulsory while leaving the cultural institutions the room for adjusting the principle to their own needs. We have discussed before that cultural institutions do not have to attract all different audience segments individually. However, all cultural institutions together should. The SMART principle or five principles of goal setting are examples of principles that could be applied in cultural institutions' strategy. Adjusting these principles to cultural institutions' own needs might be highly valuable since cultural institution A might want to attract a more diverse audience consisting of audience segment Y while cultural institution B might want to attract audience segment X. The attraction of different audience segments might ask for different strategies and perspectives. The first step of either principle is to identify a clear goal, which may be different to different cultural institutions and asks for some flexibility.

5.2 Recommendations for future research

Besides the municipality's cultural policy framework, the data set of this research was limited to the annual reports of two cultural institutions per discipline. The selection of the cultural institutions was based on the highest amount of subsidy received. For further research, I recommend to include more, if possible all, cultural institutions that receive a subsidy from the municipality. It would be interesting to see how smaller institutions and new initiatives, that receive less subsidy, perform when it comes to diversity. If these cultural institutions perform better, it is interesting to research why exactly these institutions perform better. With regard to the annual reports in particular, I recommend further research to include interviews as well. As we have seen, some annual reports include vague and speculative terms. An additional interview with a representative of the cultural institution could possibly clarify certain expressions or phrases.

Other recommendations for future research concern the other two important focus points of the Code Diversity & Inclusion. As mentioned before, this research focused on programming and audience. I recommend future research to pay attention to personnel and partners as well. With regard to personnel, I recommend further research to focus on inclusion and whether a diverse group of people occupy management positions. Since this research did not focus on cultural institutions' personnel, I cannot make claims about the people who currently are in decision-making positions. However, I expect that if such positions are filled by a diverse group of people, important decisions will be made taking into account different

perspectives, interests and concerns. With regard to partners, it would be interesting to see if and how cultural institutions cooperate with other cultural institutions, organizations and individuals. The cooperation with partners may say something about the willingness of cultural institutions to focus on topics such as diversity and their investment in the development of diversity in the cultural sector. The focus on cooperation may shed light on how the cultural sector as a whole is concerned with diversity. Finally, I highly recommend to keep conducting studies like this one in the future. Only then it will be possible to see the development of, and perhaps a change in, how diversity matters are being supported and acted upon.

References

Bennett, T. (2001). *Differing diversities: Transversal study on the theme of cultural policy and cultural diversity*. Council of Europe.

Berkers, P., Van Eijck, K., Gillis-Burleson, W., Zoutman, R., & Chin-A-Fat, D. (2018). Diversiteit, inclusiviteit en beleid in de Rotterdamse cultuursector. *Boekman*, *30*(115), 20-24. Retrieved from https://www.rrkc.nl/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/ Bm115_RentoZoutman.pdf

Blokland, H. (2005). Op weg naar het einde van onze cultuur: Sociaal-democratie in de moderne tijd. In Becker, F. & Van Hennekeler, W. (2005). *Cultuurpolitiek, WBS Jaarboek 2005* (pp. 37-59). Amsterdam: Mets & Schilt; Wiardi Beckman Stichting.

Bookboon. (2012, May 4). *The 5 golden principles of goal setting*. https://bookboon.com/blog/2012/05/the-5-golden-principles-of-goal-setting/

Boomkens, R. (1999, July 7). *Culturele doodklap*. De Groene Amsterdammer. https://www.groene.nl/artikel/culturele-doodklap

Borén, T., & Young, C. (2013). Getting Creative with the 'Creative City'? Towards New Perspectives on Creativity in Urban Policy. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *37*(5), 1799-1815. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01132.x

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Code Cultural Diversity. (2019). *Code Diversiteit & Inclusie*. Retrieved from https://codeculturelediversiteit.com/de-code/

De Jong, J. (1998). Cultural diversity and cultural policy in The Netherlands. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *4*(2), 357-387. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286639809358080

De Vries, C. (2020). *Cultuurmonitor Rotterdam 2018*. Gemeente Rotterdam, afdeling Onderzoek en Business Intelligence (OBI).

Doran, G. T. (1981). There's a S.M.A.R.T. Way to Write Management's Goals and Objectives. *Management Review*, 70, 35-36.

Gemeente Rotterdam. (2016). Alfabetisch overzicht instellingen cultuurplan Rotterdam 2017-2020. Retrieved from https://www.rotterdam.nl/vrije-tijd/cultuurplan-2017-2020/ Alfabetisch-overzicht-instellingen-CP-2017-2020.pdf

Gemeente Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Bevolking*. Onderzoek010. Retrieved March 30, 2020, from https://onderzoek010.nl/dashboard/Bevolking/

Gemeente Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Cultuur in Rotterdam*. Retrieved April 10, 2020, from https://www.rotterdam.nl/vrije-tijd/kunst-en-cultuur/

Gemeente Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Cultuurplan 2017-2020*. https://www.rotterdam.nl/vrije-tijd/
cultuurplan-2017-2020/

Hagoort, G. (2019). De praktijk staat nog ver weg van het nieuwe cultuurbeleid. Retrieved
from https://www.trouw.nl/opinie/de-praktijk-staat-nog-ver-weg-van-het-nieuwe-
cultuurbeleid~bf909d41/

Hesmondhalgh, D. C., & Pratt, A. C. (2005). Cultural industries and cultural policy.
International Journal of Cultural Policy, *11*(1), 1-13. doi:10.1080/10286630500067598

Kawashima, N. (1997). Theorising decentralisation in cultural policy: Concepts, values and
strategies. *The European Journal of Cultural Policy*, *3*(2), 341-359.
https://doi.org/10.1080/10286639709358053

Mangset, P. (2018). The end of cultural policy?1. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*,
1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2018.1500560

Matarasso, F., & Landry, C. (1999). *Balancing Act: Twenty-one Strategic Dilemmas in
Cultural Policy*. Council of Europe.

Mommaas, H. (2004). Cultural Clusters and the Post-industrial City: Towards the Remapping
of Urban Cultural Policy. *Urban Studies*, *41*(3), 507-532.
https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098042000178663

Mulcahy, K. (2006). Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches. *The Journal of
Arts Management, Law, and Society*, *35*(4), 319-330.
https://doi.org/10.3200/jaml.35.4.319-330

Nielsen, H. K. (2003). Cultural policy and evaluation of quality. *International Journal of
Cultural Policy*, *9*(3), 237-245. https://doi.org/10.1080/1028663032000161678

Nylöf, G. (1997). A method for evaluating cultural policy. *The European Journal of Cultural
Policy*, *3*(2), 361-376. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286639709358054

Pratt, A. C. (2005). Cultural industries and public policy. *International Journal of Cultural
Policy*, *11*(1), 31-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630500067739

Rotterdam Council for Art and Culture. (2018). *Durf te kiezen: Naar een dynamisch
Rotterdams kunst- en cultuurbeleid*.

Rotterdam Council for Art and Culture. (2019). *Beschouwingen over inclusiviteit, innovatie
en interconnectiviteit: Trends in de Rotterdamse cultuursector*.

Rotterdam Council for Art and Culture. (2019). *De stad is meervoud: Oproep tot actie voor
een inclusieve cultuursector*.

Rotterdam Council for Art and Culture. (n.d.). *The Rotterdam council for art and culture*.
Rotterdamse Raad voor Kunst en Cultuur. https://www.rrkc.nl/summary/

Rotterdam Festivals. (2019). *Rotterdam, cultuur en publiek bij elkaar gebracht*.
https://zakelijk.rotterdamfestivals.nl/rotterdam-cultuur-en-publiek-bij-elkaar-gebracht

Statistics Netherlands (CBS). (2019). *Bevolking; geslacht, leeftijd, generatie en migratieachtergrond, 1 januari*. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/37325/table?ts=1585037574379

Statistics Netherlands (CBS). (n.d.). *Hoeveel mensen met een migratieachtergrond wonen in Nederland?* Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. Retrieved March 10, 2020, from https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/dossier/dossier-asiel-migratie-en-integratie/hoeveel-mensen-met-een-migratieachtergrond-wonen-in-nederland-

Toepler, S., & Zimmer, A. (2002). Subsidizing the arts: Comparative perspectives on cultural policy. In Crane, D., Kawashima, N., & Kawasaki, K. (2002). *Global Culture: Media, Arts and Cultural Policy in a Global Context* (pp. 1-21). Routledge.

Van den Broek, A. (2008). Cultuurdeelname. In Van den Broek, A. & Keuzenkamp, S. (Eds.), *Het dagelijks leven van allochtone stedelingen* (pp. 149-169). Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (SCP).

Van den Broek, A., & Gieles, Y. (2018). *Het culturele leven: 10 culturele domeinen bezien vanuit 14 kernthema's*. Social and Cultural Planning Office.

Van der Goot, J. (2019, November 28). Maak kunst en cultuur in Rotterdam diverser en meer inclusief. Retrieved from https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2019/11/28/erken-de-diversiteit-ook-in-de-kunsten-a3981837

Van der Ploeg, F. (2005). The Making of Cultural Policy: A European Perspective. *CESifo Working Paper 1524*, 1-44. https://www.cesifo.org/en/publikationen/2005/working-paper/making-cultural-policy-european-perspective

Van Eijck, K. (2018). Culture for Everyone: The Value and Feasibility of Stimulating Cultural Participation. In Van Meerkerk, E. & Van den Hoogen, Q.L. (Eds.), *Cultural Policy in the Polder: 25 years of the Dutch Cultural Policy Act* (pp. 195-214). Amsterdam University Press.

Appendix A. Data set

Architectuur Instituut Rotterdam. (2017). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

Architectuur Instituut Rotterdam. (2019). *Financieel jaarverslag 2018*.

Centrum Beeldende Kunst Rotterdam. (2017). *Jaaroverzicht 2016*.

Centrum Beeldende Kunst Rotterdam. (2019). *Jaaroverzicht 2018*.

Conny Janssen Danst. (2017). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

Conny Janssen Danst. (2019). *Jaarverslag 2018*.

De Doelen. (2019). *Jaarverslag 2018*.

De Doelen. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

Gemeente Rotterdam. (2015). *Reikwijdte & Armslag: Beleidskader Cultuurplan 2017 - 2020*.

Gemeente Rotterdam. (2016). *Reikwijdte & Armslag: Cultuurplan 2017-2020; reactie op advies RRKC en verdelingsvoorstel*.

Hofplein Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2015-2016*.

International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2018.*

International Film Festival Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Annual Report 2018*.

International Film Festival Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Terugblik op IFFR 2016*.

Jeugdtheater Hofplein. (2018). *Jaarverslag 2017-2018*.

Kunsthal Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

Kunsthal Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2018*.

LantarenVenster. (2017). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

LantarenVenster. (2019). *Jaarverslag 2018*.

Luxor Theater Rotterdam. (2019). *Jaarrapport 2018*.

Luxor Theater Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Jaarrapport 2016*.

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2018*.

Passionate Bulkboek. (2017). *Jaarverslag 2016*.
Issuu. https://issuu.com/passionatebulkboek/docs/jaarverslag_2016_passionate_bul kboe

Passionate Bulkboek. (2019). *Jaarverslag 2018*.
Issuu. https://issuu.com/passionatebulkboek/docs/passionate_bulkboek_-_jaarverslag_2

Poetry International. (2017). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

Poetry International. (2019). *Bestuursverslag en jaarrekening 2018*.

Productiehuis Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

Ro Theater. (2017). *Jaarstukken 2016*.

Rotterdam Council for Art and Culture. (2016). *Cultuurplanadvies 2017-2020*.

Rotterdams Philharmonisch Orkest. (2017). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

Rotterdams Philharmonisch Orkest. (2019). *Jaarverslag 2018*.

Scapino Ballet Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2018*.

Scapino Ballet Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag '16*.

Stichting Kunstzinnige Vorming Rotterdam. (2017). *Jaarverslag 2016*.

Stichting Kunstzinnige Vorming Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Jaarverslag 2018*.

Theater Rotterdam. (2017). *Jaarstukken 2016: Productiehuis Rotterdam, Acteursgroep Wunderbaum, Rotterdamse Schouwburg*.

Theater Rotterdam. (2019). *Jaarverslag '18-'19*.

Wereldmuseum Rotterdam. (2017). *Jaarrekening 2016*.

Wereldmuseum Rotterdam. (2019). *Jaarverslag 2018*.