

September 22, 2013

Marianne Öberg Tuleus

Marianne.oberg-tuleus@oru.se

Örebro University, Sweden

Abstract: This paper takes its point of departure in the understanding of culture as something we as human beings share and have in common. Culture is what makes us *human* beings (Geertz 1973). The Örebro regional plan addresses “culture for all” as a question of societal inclusion. As such “culture” is set within the frames of institutional settings. The objective of the paper is to contribute to the understanding of culture as tool for an inclusive society with an overall ambition to address the call for “culture for all”, its complexity as well as its societal and political dimensions. The paper inquires into what *social identities, or subject positions, are constructed in the Örebro regional plan for culture*. The question builds on the assumption of text, or discourse, as a social practice (Fairclough 1992). The result of this text analysis points to the assumption of an inclusive society, where the citizens share the same values and ideals. This assumption provides a common ground for the cultural activities that are recognized in the regional program. When difference is introduced as an analytical tool, social identities as gender, social class, age and ethnicity come into focus. An overall conclusion is that in addressing “all” traditional values and norms are reproduced within dominating structures that open for sameness but close for difference.

Keywords: culture, social identities, discourse, social practice, sameness, difference

Social identities and “Culture for All” – on culture as a tool for an inclusive society.

Prologue

The project “Participation and Theatre” (sw. Delaktighet och Teater - DoT) started in January 2013. The project aims at inquiring into the experiences and outcomes of an earlier project called the Visukal project. The word “visukal” is a compound of the words visual and musical. It was created during the work with the stage performance of FAME the Visukal, which was the artistic peak of the Visukal project where the overall aim was to develop performing arts on equal terms. This meant that all activities within the project were related to sign languaging and the inclusion of deaf and hard of hearing people in cultural activities. The Swedish Arts Council (kulturradet.se) funds the project Participation and Theatre (DoT), and it is run by the regional theatre in Örebro; Örebro länsteater (www.lansteatern.se)

Within the DoT project the regional plan for culture was read and discussed in order to establish the objectives of cultural development, and consequently the governing principles for institutional culture within the Örebro region. Also an overall objective of this reading was to inquire into possible implications for performing arts in sign language, and the future development of performing arts on equal terms. We found that a main theme in the regional plan for culture was the call for “culture for all!” (orebroll.se/kulturplanen), but also we noted that the text specifically mentioned children and young people, children with special needs, as well as the deaf, the hard of hearing and other people who use sign language as a means of communication. This finding is the source of the inspiration for this paper, which focuses on culture as a tool for an inclusive society.

National and regional cultural policy objectives – a question of sameness and difference

We live in a society today that is recurrently described as global, multicultural and pluralistic. This assumption provides a point of departure for claiming that what we have in common is diversity in the widest sense. In this context culture offers a common ground which we all can relate to in many different ways. As such culture takes shape as a many-faceted phenomenon. From a societal perspective culture is something we as human beings share and have in

common. It is what we tend to refer to when we want to explain why we celebrate some traditions and not others, or when we describe ourselves in terms of the language we speak or sign (Geertz 1973).

Also culture is a societal responsibility. It is provided for by “society”, and offered to its citizens in different social and institutional settings. National and regional theatre buildings is one example. Libraries and local transport services is another. However we might also argue that culture is what separates one group of people from other groups of people. For instance, some (groups of) people celebrate Christmas, while others do not. Also, some (groups of) people go to the theatre or visit the museum while others do not. In this sense strangeness presents itself as a dimension of culture when what is seen as “culture” or “cultural habits” are not shared by all citizens within a society (Hastrup 2010). From this point of view culture rather provides borders between different individuals or between different groups of people than bring people together.

This tension between, on the one hand, a society shaped by an “all-inclusive” homogeneous cultural setting, and, on the other hand, a heterogeneous society where different groups of people live a “culture” of their own is described by Kwame Anthony Appiah (2005) as a tension between sameness and difference. Appiah takes his point of departure in an understanding of diversity as “cultural diversity” (p 114) from where he points to sameness in terms of unity. This means that people live their lives in similar ways. They (tend to) wear similar clothes, eat hamburgers, drink coca cola, watch the “same” teve programs and speak English. From this understanding of sameness, Appiah’s analysis presents difference as a question of identity. Here it is from the point of view of the group of people that you identify with that cultures take shape. Ethnicity, religion or social categories like deaf or disabled people are some unifying principles that provide a shared ground for difference.

In this paper “culture for all” is addressed as a question of societal inclusion. It means that “culture” is set within the frames of institutional settings, and takes shape in Swedish policy texts on culture. The objective of this paper is to contribute to *the understanding of culture as tool for an inclusive society* with an overall ambition to address the call for “culture for all”, its complexity as well as its societal and political dimensions. The paper inquires into what *social identities, or subject positions, are constructed in the Örebro regional plan for culture*. The question builds on the assumption of text, or discourse, as a social practice. This implies “a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation, institution or social structure that frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them (Fairclough & Wodak 1997, p 258).

Culture as cultural policy documents – a Swedish example.

In this section “culture for all” is set within a Swedish (cultural) framework, where the national cultural policy objectives provide a point of departure. It is the Swedish government, and the department of culture (sw. kulturdepartementet), that set the frames for the political meanings of culture, and consequently, for when and how institutional culture is to be funded by the state. The national cultural policy that is set by the Swedish government and parliament is carried out and put into effect by the Swedish Arts Council (www.kulturradet.se). On the regional level it is the responsibility of the county council to develop culture within the region. This work includes the construction of a regional plan for culture. This is what we want to develop together!” is the title of the regional plan for culture in the Örebro region 2012-2014 (http://www.orebroll.se/Files-sv/%c3%96rebro%20l%c3%a4ns%20landsting/Regional%20utveckling/Kultur/Kulturplan%202012-14/Kulturplan_OLL.pdf?epslanguage=sv).

The national context - new cultural policy objectives

In 2009 new national cultural policy objectives were established in Sweden. In an official declaration the government states that

“Culture is to be a dynamic, challenging and independent force based on freedom of expression. Everyone is to have the opportunity to participate in cultural life. Creativity, diversity and artistic quality are to be integral parts of society's development” (<http://www.government.se/sb/d/3009/a/168379>).

In order to achieve these objectives six main areas are addressed in terms of what cultural areas and activities that are to be promoted. What is of special interest in this paper is that “culture for all” is expressed in terms of opportunities for *everyone* to experience and to have access to culture. Also children's and young people's right to culture is brought into attention (<http://www.kulturradet.se/en/In-English/Cultural-policy-objectives>).

You could say that the national cultural policy objectives are to provide a tool for national governance of local government policies in the domain of culture. The national objectives state an overall understanding of culture, as a “dynamic, challenging and independent force based on the freedom of expression”, and they build on the idea that “Everybody is to have the opportunity to participate in cultural life” (<http://www.government.se/sb/d/3009>). This includes all citizens “regardless of where in the country one lives or if you have a disability” ([kulturradet.se/cultural-policy-objectives](http://www.kulturradet.se/cultural-policy-objectives)).

The overall aim of the Swedish Arts Council is to make “culture accessible – in every respect” (<http://www.kulturradet.se/en/In-English/Areas-of-operation>). Building on the national cultural objectives described above a reasonable conclusion is that the meaning of participation is

twofold. It includes the possibility to access in every respect as well as to take part in a productive way. In other words participation involves activity as in both “getting there” and “doing something”. This implies that cultural activities take place within a societal and national “all- inhabitants-in-Sweden” frame.

A regional context – the Örebro regional plan for culture

On a regional level it is the County Council that has the overall responsibility for the collaborative cultural model that is to be used for “allocating State allowances to regional cultural activities, whose main outcome is the cultural plan for the region” (<http://kulturradet.se/en/In-English/Areas-of-operation>). This process is to build on co-operation, and in a statement from the Örebro County Council, it is described in terms of open dialogue and close co-operation with the municipalities and cultural institutions in the region.¹ The regional responsibility for developing culture within the region includes production as well as assessment and evaluation of the regional plan for culture. “This is what we want to develop together!” is the title of the regional plan for culture in the Örebro region 2012-2014 (orebroll.se/).

Theoretical assumptions – the construction of unity and identity

The objective of this paper is to contribute to the understanding of culture as tool for an inclusive society. In addressing culture as a possible tool for inclusion, the Swedish policy context directs attention to two main areas of interest. Firstly, culture is open for “everyone” in terms of the possibility to *participate* in cultural activities. Participation, we learn from the heading “Opportunities for everyone to experience culture, participate in educational programs and develop their creative abilities” ([www.kulturradet.se/cultural policy objectives](http://www.kulturradet.se/cultural-policy-objectives)) means to have access to cultural events as well as to be able to develop your own creative abilities within the frame of (institutional) culture. Secondly, to attain the objectives, one group of citizens is to be focused on. Institutional culture is to “pay particular attention (to) the rights of *children and young people to culture*” ([kulturradet.se/cultural policy objectives](http://kulturradet.se/cultural-policy-objectives), my emphasis). This statement is one out of the six principles which phrase the objectives of Swedish cultural policy. The other five principles are addressed to “everyone”. With Appiah (2005) you could say that sameness presents itself in the text as the “same” opportunities, the “same” possibilities and the “same” rights, while difference takes shape in different degrees of attention to different groups of people.

¹ “för att lyckas måste arbetet ske i bred dialog och i nära samverkan med länets kommuner och det övriga kulturlivet” (Lejegren, orebroll.se/)

² “en naturlig fortsättning på den regionala samverkan” (p 6)

In inquiring into the call for “culture for all” the question of what it means to mention, or in Charles Taylor’s (1994) vocabulary to recognize, one (age) group of people emerges. In relation to Appiah’s (2005) analysis of cultural diversity as a question of sameness and difference, I claim that how people are put into groups, or categorized, expresses an understanding of how individuals relate to each other, and consequently how social identities are shaped. Different categories enhance different characteristics, or properties. In the case of the national cultural objectives in Sweden it is biological age that provides one of the “borders”. This paper inquires into what *social identities, or subject positions, are constructed in the Örebro regional plan for culture*. The question builds on the assumption that social identities are set up in discourse and that statements position subjects so that “to describe a formulation *qua* statement does not consist in analyzing the relations between the author and what he says (or wanted to say, or said without saying); but in *determining what position can and must be occupied by any individual if he is to be the subject of it* (Foucault 1972, p 95-6, my emphasis).

To establish sameness also implies a construction of difference. It is in the tension between “us” and “them” that patterns and deviances are located. As Clifford Geertz puts it: “The more things come together, the more they remain apart: the uniform world is not much closer than the classless society is” (Geertz 2000, p 248). Geertz is referring to the problem of anthropology in its quest for understanding culture(s). Although it may seem a giant leap from Geertz’ context to the Swedish cultural policy objectives, I claim that from a discursive understanding of texts as a social practice (Fairclough 1992) the call for “culture for all” have implications for what we experience as unity, or sameness, on the one hand, and difference on the other hand. The national cultural objectives in Sweden state that everybody is to have the opportunity to participate in cultural life and cultural activities, and a reasonable conclusion is that by “cultural life and cultural activities” nationally and regionally provided culture is implied. This establishes the relation between a national and a regional level.

Methodological considerations

The paper is written within the methodological framework of text analysis (Fairclough 1995, 2003), and a critical tradition that builds on the assumption that “language is an irreducible part of social life, dialectically interconnected with other elements of social life, so that social analysis and research always has to take account of language” (Fairclough 2003, p 2).

The empirical material is *the Örebro regional plan for culture 2012-2014*. It is the official and public document where the Swedish cultural policy objectives are set within the Örebro region. The text is written by the Örebro County Council, and it builds on an ongoing discussion between regional representatives from different cultural areas. It is stated in the text that it is to be understood as a natural continuation of the on-going regional co-operation² and in this

² “en naturlig fortsättning på den regionala samverkan” (p 6)

sense it provides a second step in a mutual process which aims at making the region a place where culture flourishes and plays an important role in people's lives³.

Considering the scope of this paper, the analysis was focused on the wording of meanings. Wording "contrasts with a dictionary-based view of vocabulary" (Fairclough 1992, p 190). It directs attention to alternative ways of phrasing, or, with Julia Kristeva, signifying different domains of experience (Moi, ed 1986, pp 62-73). Wording builds on the assumption that verbal language takes shape from different theoretical, cultural or ideological perspectives. The way we "see" a domain of experience emerges in the lexical items we use, and consequently, a domain can be worded in different ways. Alternative wordings are assumed to have political and ideological significance, and "rewording", as well as "alternative wording" and "overwording" (Fairclough 1992, p 190-192) are understood as a part of social and political struggles. Rewording 'handicap' as 'disability' is one example, 'patient' reworded as 'user' is another.

Inspired by Appiah (2005) I set out by ordering the material into categories of ethnical, religious and social vocabulary.⁴ In this process I noticed that a similar categorization was spelled out in the text. It said: "Everyone, regardless of sex, class, age or background, is entitled to his or her cultural heritage"⁵ (my translation). To meet with the demands on quality and validity within qualitative research (www.vr.se, Larsson 2005), I came to the conclusion that this finding had to be included in my further readings. In other words, to do good research the researcher has to be as flexible and as wakeful to the empirical material as possible (Clandinin & Connelly 2000). Consequently I re-ordered the material into the categories: gender (sw. kön), social class (sw. klass), age (sw. ålder) and ethnicity (sw. bakgrund). The focus on the wording of social identities, or subject positions, within constructed categories meant an overall analytical approach. In order to grasp the text synthetically I took on a second step. Bearing the questions that the result of the first analysis brought forth (see Result – critical reflections), I turned to the text with a focus on patterns and deviances. This approach builds on Appiah's (2005) discussion of culture as sameness, in the sense of unity, and as difference, in the sense of identity (see above "National and regional cultural policy objectives – a question of sameness and difference"). Inspired by Michel Foucault (1972) I phrased the questions: Who is addressed in the text? Who is produced in the text? In what societal contexts?

³ "göra länet till en plats där kulturen sprudlar och spelar en viktig roll i människors liv" (p 6)

⁴ See Appiah (2005) for a discussion on analytical categories in relation to cultural diversity (p 114-154).

⁵ "Alla, oavsett kön, klass, ålder eller ursprung, ska ha rätt till sitt kulturarv" (Regional kulturplan i Örebro län 2012-2014, p 33).

The result of the text analysis is structured in accordance with the categories of gender, social class, age and ethnicity. In a concluding remark the social identities that are brought forward are discussed in terms culture as a tool for an inclusive society.

Culture and the domain “culture for all”

The Örebro regional plan for culture is structured into six chapters. In the introduction (chapters 1-3) we learn about the national cultural objectives for Sweden and how they frame the regional policy level. Also the Örebro region is described from a historical perspective, which includes the past and the present as well as the regional structure for, and organization of, culture.⁶ This historical perspective is followed by a chapter on the (new) model for co-operation, which provides a bridge to the main objective of the text; the plan for regional culture between 2012 and 2014. The plan for the future consists of two chapters. They address a cultural life for everyone, and art and culture in the Örebro region.⁷ In this third section of the text culture is described as a tool for regional development. In this context accessibility and participation is stressed. Also culture is shaped as stage performance, which includes theatre, music and dance, as cultural heritage, film, library, activities that promote handicraft, art and culture, and free professional culture.⁸ The text ends with conclusions.

The point of departure in the regional plan “This is what we want to do together!” is an inclusive and intercultural society. In an adress to “all” (sw. alla), the citizens of the Örebro region are invited (encouraged and challenged) to participate in ongoing cultural activities, both as audience and actors. Put differently, “everyone” is invited to be consumers as well as producers of culture. This meaning is worded (all) kinds of people, (all) regardless of gender, class, age or background, and (all) social classes.⁹ The number of different wordings point to ‘culture for all’ as an overworded domain, and consequently to “peculiarities in the ideology of the group responsible for it” (Fairclough 1992, p 193).

Also the text directs attention to the pronoun ‘all’ as including different degrees of ableness. To state that people who are deaf or hard of hearing are not to be excluded from culture, it is spelt out under the heading ‘challenges’ that consumption and production of culture *also* includes

⁶ “Örebro län igår och idag” (p 10)

⁷ Kapitel 5: “Ett kulturliv för alla!” (16), Kapitel 6: “Konst och kultur i Örebro län” (p 26)

⁸ “Scenkonst” (p 26), “Kulturarv” (p 33), “Film” (p 38), “Bibliotek” (p 40), “Bild och form” (p 42), “Hemslöjdsfrämjande verksamhet” (p 44), “Konst- och kulturfrämjande” (p 45), “Det fira professionella kulturlivet” (p 46).

⁹ “alla slags människor” (p 12), “Alla, oavsett kön, klass, ålder eller ursprung” (p 33) “alla samhällsgrupper” (p 36)

(all) those who communicate by sign language (my emphasis).¹⁰ Furthermore, culture for “all” includes different social groups, e.g. all children and young people, all groups in society, all age groups in society, but also to all (different) parts of the Örebro region.¹¹

In the next section the domain “culture for all” is structured by social identities as gender, social class, age and ethnicity.

Equality – on gendered culture

The wording equality is established in the verbal constructions of the relation between men and women. Women and men are to be on equal terms and the agenda of culture for all includes the objective to work for equality within the region.¹² It is obvious that work to promote equality is seen as a societal and cultural concern, and that ‘culture’ is to be used as a tool for social change. Wordings like traditional (gender) borders, and traditional and repressive social structures point to the inclusion of a gender perspective, although gendered culture is not an obvious theme in the text. The Örebro region is worded as an equal region (1.2) and an equal cultural region (5.5). When the wording gender perspective appears, it is as one out of three perspectives which all relate to cultural heritage (sw. kulturmiljövård, p 36).

The wording “An equal region – Girls, boys, women and men – they are all to have the same possibilities to develop”¹³, provided the point of departure for searching the text for words like woman, man, girl and boy. The result showed that ‘girls’ with psychological problems were said to profit from dance, and, in relation to music, that the lack of female teachers in percussion instruments provides a reasonable explanation to why girls generally don’t choose to play those instruments. Women are described as active consumers of culture, while stories about the cultural heritage of the region is said to be dominated by a male perspective.¹⁴ This provides the backdrop to the future challenge for the domain culture for all to highlight women’s life stories within a regional context, and consequently, make them visible.

Social class – shapes of age, gender and ethnicity

When culture is addressed to everyone and “all”, the idea of society as a construction of different social contexts is evoked by the wording class (sw. klass). The wording ‘all social

¹⁰ “Möjlighet till kulturutövande och ett rikt kulturliv ska gälla även för den teckenspråkiga delen av befolkningen” (p 23)

¹¹ ”alla barn och ungdomar” (p 9), ”alla samhällsgrupper” (p 36), ”länets alla delar” (p 13)

¹² ”En jämställd region – Flickor, pojkar, kvinnor och män ska ha samma förutsättningar att utvecklas” (p 6)

¹³ En jämställd region – Flickor, pojkar, kvinnor och män ska ha samma förutsättningar att utvecklas” (p 6).

¹⁴ ”kvinnor är aktiva kulturkonsumenter men, berättelser om kulturavet präglas fortfarande av ett manligt perspektiv (p 37)

classes ' is understood, and in the analysis treated, as synonymous to the wording 'all groups in society'.¹⁵ This wording is mentioned once in a section of the text where cultural heritage is discussed. It is stated in the text that the heterogeneity of society is to be made visible by applying a children's perspective, a gender perspective, and a multicultural perspective. These three perspectives provide alternative wordings of a traditional region which takes shape in male, Swedish and "adult" structures.

The domain of culture for all is worded as cultural heritage (sw. kulturmiljövård) and it takes shape in wordings of museum and archives preservation, while today's society is worded as new challenges. Children and women, as well as immigrants (sw. nyanlända invandrare) are to be made visible through cultural activities. It is interesting to note that while 'overwording' dominated the domain of 'all', wordings of social class is stable, but contextualized as age, gender and ethnicity.

(All) children and young people – prioritized culture

Culture for all children and young people is one out of four main objectives that are stated in the Örebro Regional plan for culture. This is in alignment with the national cultural objectives where children's and young people's right to culture is highlighted. This age category is consistently worded children and young people (Sw. barn och unga) when the text addresses children's and young people's (human) rights, and the possibility to participate in creative cultural activities in (all) different parts of the region, and cultural arenas, as well as in school.¹⁶

Within the target group worded all children and young people there are references in the text to "sign languaging young people" (sw. teckenspråkiga ungdomar). People of different ages and different degrees of ableness are made visible in wordings of disability¹⁷. Sign language and its users are mentioned recurrently within the context of theatre and performing arts. The wording sign language takes shape in compounds where its users are worded as citizens, youth, and the (target) group. The many wordings of ableness contribute to an image of the Örebro region as not only the capital of sign language but also the center of a sign languaging world (sw. den teckenspråkiga världen p 23), but also to tensions between ideological and political interests.

Ethnicity – Swedishness and difference

In the Örebro regional plan for culture the region is worded as encounters and diversity (sw. en region av möten och mångfald, p 10). 'Encounters' relates to a regional tradition of cultural encounters between citizens from different ethnical and cultural origins. The region

¹⁵ "alla samhällsgrupper" (p 36), "alla samhällets grupper" (p 36)

¹⁶ "kulturaktörer möter barn och unga på deras arenor" (p 17), "ge barn och unga möjlighet till eget skapande" (p 21), "barn och unga i hela länet" (p 29), "barns och ungas delaktighet" (p 34)

¹⁷ "Människor med funktionshinder" (p 28, 30), "människor med funktionsnedsättning" (p 34)

encompasses twelve municipalities located in geographically different settings, profiled by mining, agriculture, shipping and trading. This tradition of different locations and trades provided the necessary prerequisites for the Örebro region to become a place where people with different cultural experiences could meet. In short, the cultural heritage was formed between regional industries and customs. It is in this context that 'diversity' emerged.¹⁸

The text gives emphasis to diversity as a key to success in the future.¹⁹ Diversity in this sense includes (diverse) natural (regional) resources, industries and marketplaces. The verb 'to mirror' is used when diversity is discussed in relation to interculturalism and international cooperation. Culture takes shape as a link between the inhabitants in the region and (institutional) culture. The text emphasizes that regional culture is to mirror regional ethnical and cultural diversity in its productions and organization, as well as in its audience.²⁰

Also diversity is brought forth in the section headed cultural heritage (sw. kulturarv, p 33). Here the Örebro region emerges between the past and the present as a melting pot of social and cultural diversity. Cultural heritage as in the agenda of the regional museum (sw. Örebro läns museum) is to be focused on present day people and offer a venue for activities that direct attention to the past as well as the present and the future. In this context art and cultural heritage are suggested as tools for reflection on present day issues.²¹

On social identities and culture as a tool for an inclusive society – critical reflections

The result of the inquiry into the meaning of the domain "culture for all", as it is shaped in the Örebro regional plan for culture, points to sameness in the unifying sense of the word, but also to difference in the way in which we categorize the world. One conclusion is that the wording "all" signifies "everyone" as a human being, as an individual and as a member of different social groups. In the text some social groups, like disabled people (p 28) and young people who communicate by sign language (p 23) are mentioned, while other groups like young immigrant adults or boys are not.

Building on the assumption that social identities are shaped in the naming of society a reasonable critical reflection addresses what it means, in terms of inclusion, to mention some social groups among many possible groups. One answer is that those not mentioned are considered a "natural" part of culture in the Örebro region, and as such already assumed in the call for "Culture for All". This is in alignment with Judith Butler's (1999) theory on gender as

¹⁸ En mötesplats för människor med olika kulturella erfarenheter och den mångfald som detta skapar" (p 10).

¹⁹ "Mångfald är en framgångsfaktor för framtidens regioner" (p 6)

²⁰ "Inte minst är det viktigt att kulturlivet verkligen speglar samhällets etniska och kulturella mångfald i såväl produktion, organisation som publik" (p 20).

²¹ "Museet ska vara en mötesplats för samtal och reflexion kring det förflutna, samtid och framtid. Kulturarv och konst ska användas för att ge perspektiv på vår tids viktiga frågor" (p 33)

binary relations and negations, where “girl” makes sense as “not boy”. In the Örebro regional plan for culture this would mean that disabled people make sense as “not able”, “sign language” as “not verbal” and “children and young people” as “not adults”. However this hardly explains the absence in the text of social groups like for instance homo- or transsexual people, blind people, and immigrant young adults. An alternative suggestion could be that social groups are mentioned as a means of making them “normal” or, in other words, included in society, while all others are made invisible.

Within the wordings equality and gender the social identities of women offer an understanding of women as dominated by men and a male perspective. They are worded as consumers of culture and their absence in certain cultural contexts is explained as a result of male dominance. A male perspective provides the dominating perspective in which cultural traditions within the region take shape. The stories that are told are told by men, and what men do in terms of “culture”, for instance the instruments they play, is also what women and girls are encouraged to take on. The wordings of equality that appear in the text evoke a traditional and heteronormative society into which we are born, as females and males.

Sameness dominates the wordings of equality, and culture is worded as (male) culture, while difference is made invisible. Although the wordings of equality include the lexical unit ‘gender’, the question is if the meaning of the domain culture for all is to be understood as intertwined with gender. Another possible conclusion is that ‘gender perspective’ is a wording, and as such provides an alternative wording of equality.

Finally, a critical reflection on the social identities shaped in the wording ‘all groups in society’. In terms of sameness children, young people, women and immigrants are addressed, and produced as “missing”. A traditional society is reproduced in the wordings of cultural heritage and sameness emerges in the dominating cultural heritage preserved in museums and archives. Difference is addressed, and worded as (new) ethnical groups and (new) age groups. Still difference that is related to social background and class is made invisible.

References

Appiah, Kwame A (2005): *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Butler, Judith (1999): *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge.

Clandinin, D. Jean, & Connelly F. Michael (2000): *Narrative Inquiry. Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Fairclough, Norman (1992): *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995): *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, Norman (2003): *Analysing Discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge
- Fairclough, Norman & Wodak, Ruth (1997):
- Foucault, Michel (1972): *The Archeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Geertz, Clifford (1973): *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, Clifford (2000): *Available Light. Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hastrup, Kirsten (2010): *Den flexibla gemenskapen*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Larsson, Staffan (2005): Om kvalitetskriterier i kvalitativa studier. *Nordisk pedagogik. Nordic Educational Research*, 1/2005, p 16-35.
- Moi, Toril, ed (1986): *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Taylor, Charles (1994): *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University.
- *Summary in English of *Report on the Swedish Committee of Inquiry on Cultural Policy* (SOU 2009:16).
- **Cultural policy objectives* (<http://www.kulturradet.se/en/In-English/Cultural-policy-objectives>).
- **The Örebro regional plan for culture; This is what we want to develop together!* (<http://orebroll.se/sv/Regional-utveckling/Kultur/Regional-kulturplan>).
- *Information about the project Participation and Theatre (DoT) www.lansteatern.se

