

Micropolis 2023

The power of strong local communities



Erasmus+

Final / 15.11.2023

Cultural activities with added community values. Survey in Middelfart Municipality

Editors: Hans Jørgen Vodsgaard, Susanne Juhl Paaske, Kamilla Krogh Uttrup and Henrik Louring.

© 2023: Interfolk, Institute for Civil Society; the Volunteer Center Middelfart; Department for Leisure and Communities, Middelfart Municipality.

All rights reserved. This local Erasmus+ Report: “Cultural activities with added community values. Survey in Middelfart Municipality” may be quoted with source reference.

Publisher: Interfolks Forlag

Layout: Interfolks Forlag

Published: August 2023

This Survey has been developed in the context of the 16 months Erasmus+ small-scale partnerships (Key Action 2, Adult education) entitled “Micropolis 2023 - the power of strong, inclusive identity and local relations”, May 2023 – September 2024, where the applicant and coordinator organisation is Wawerskie Centrum Kultury from Poland.

For more information, see the project portal: <https://micropolis.club/>

The project has been supported by the Polish National Agency of the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union



This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and neither the Polish National Agency of the Erasmus+ programme nor the European Commission can be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of content

ABSTRACT	4
I. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH.....	6
Part of an Erasmus+ development project	6
Objectives of the survey	6
The respondent groups.....	7
The questionnaire.....	7
II. SURVEY RESULTS	8
BACKGROUND INFORMATION	8
Profile of the respondents	8
Profile of the respondents' organizations	9
CONTENT QUESTIONS	11
1. Goals and values	11
2. Structure (management, decision-making, organisation forms).....	18
3. Activities (for members and audiences)	23
4. Networking and communication with stakeholders.....	28
Comments from respondents to questionnaire	34
SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS	35
Combined values of mission, structure, and activities for subgroups.....	35
The subgroups' added community values in a nutshell	39
III. PERSPECTIVES	41
Summary.....	41
Recommendations.....	42
ANNEXES	43

Abstract

Methodology

The three main target groups for this survey are the social and cultural civil society associations and the public cultural and information institutions in Middelfart municipality.

The objectives are to disclose their ability to promote four essential community values: local identity, social inclusion, active citizenship, and environmental sustainability. The approach has been to examine the status and potentials for changes in four main aspects of the organisations, namely:

- The stated values (in the organisation's key documents)
- The structure (the leadership, decision-making, and forms of organising activities)
- The activities (for members and audiences)
- The networking and communication (with external stakeholders)

This approach, where we examine main aspects of the organisations' functionality, will help to give a more specific and manageable picture of where actions may be possible and needed.

Profile of the respondents and their organisations

Most of the respondents are voluntary and unpaid leaders from the board or with positions of trust in the associations, and a minority are paid employees, mainly from the subgroup of public institutions.

Almost 60 pct are men, and 80 pct are above 50 years, and nearly 2/3 have a university degree.

Nearly 2/3 of the participating organisations are member-based civil society associations and informal civic groups, while 1/3 represents public or self-owned institutions.

Nearly 60 % of the organizations do most of the work by volunteers and unpaid leaders.

The large majority of 60 % are only active in Middelfart municipality, but 7 % mention that they sometimes participate in international activities and 11 % would like to participate more in international activities.

The organisations' ability to promote added community values.

When we calculated together the organisations' scores from the three main aspects: Missions, Structures, Activities, we can see the following overall assessments:

Re local identity and cohesion: As an average, 47 % of the organisations assess that they to a high degree promote local identity and cohesion. The social associations state the highest assessment with 51 %, the cultural associations are in the middle with 48 %, and the public cultural associations lowest with 41 %.

Re social inclusion and diversity: 40 % of the organisations assess that they to a high degree promote social inclusion. Again, the social associations state the highest score with 52 %, the cultural associations the middle score with 39 %, and the public cultural institutions the lowest score with 28 %.

Re active citizenship and democratic values: Again, 40 % of the organisations assess that they to a high degree promote active citizenship. Here, the social associations state the highest score with 55 %, the cultural associations the middle score with 38 %, and the public cultural institutions the lowest score with 28 %.

Re environmental sustainability and nature protection: Only 20 % of all the organisations assess that they to a high degree promote environmental sustainability, and 65 % state they do it to a low degree.

For this added community value, we have the opposite tendency, where 23 % of the public institutions assess they to a high degree promote sustainability, and only 20 % of the cultural associations think so, and the social associations are in the bottom with 16 %. This seems to be the added value, where there is most potential for improvements.

The organisations' cooperation with external stakeholders

The organisations also assessed their degree of networking and communication with the following stakeholders:

Re exchange with other civil society organisations: Overall, a majority of 58 % of the respondents think they only cooperate with other civil society associations to a low degree.

Re exchange with the wider local community: Overall, 43 % of the respondents think they to a high degree cooperate or communicate with the wider local community.

Re exchange with public authorities (the culture department, public culture institutions, etc): Overall, 44 % of the respondents assess they only cooperate with the public authorities to a low degree. Anyhow, their experiences with the cooperation indicate a high recognition of an equal and co-creative collaboration with the cultural department and other public cultural institutions.

Re communication channels: Overall, 40 % of the respondents assess to use the new communication channels to a high degree, and they cooperate to some degree with other civil society associations and public institutions about communication to the wider public.

Recommendations with reference to the survey:

The survey disclosed that:

- The green values and practises regarding environmental sustainability and nature protection had a low score, and there were many possibilities for improvement of this type of added community value among the social and cultural civil society associations.
 - There could be a need for promoting the green objectives by for example developing new training courses on how social and cultural associations can include sustainable green values and practises in their local activities.
- The different NGO sectors did not have much mutual which could open for both knowledge transfer, activity development, and improved communication to the wider communities.
 - There could be a need for more common meetings or even a forum to promote exchange of experiences, to clarify common interest and to coordinate the communication and cooperation with the local authorities and institutions in the municipality.
- The associations could improve their abilities to be more inclusive for people with visible and non-visible disabilities” or to include immigrants with a different linguistic/ cultural background in the activities.
 - There could be a need for having more focus on including marginalised groups in the activities and maybe also to develop common introduction materials and services by the associations for new citizens that have moved to the municipality.
- Young people have a weak representation in the local associational life, and other studies also tell that many young people are vulnerable and lonely, and they need to come out and meet other young people in inclusive physical and creative activities.
 - There could be a need for new initiatives to reach out and engage young people in general in the associational life and especially the increasing group of vulnerable and lonely young people.

I. Methodological approach

Part of an Erasmus+ development project

This Survey Summary Report is made in the context of the ERASMUS+ project: “Micropolis – the power of strong local communities” that takes place May 2023 – August 2024.

The name “Micropolis” is used to describe a city district or a town that has successfully created a strong, inclusive local identity and an active participation and cooperation of inhabitants, so that they can function as the ancient „polis” – the fully democratic, local community where everybody is involved.

The Danish project team includes representative from the Culture Department in Middelfart Municipality, The Voluntary Centre Middelfart, and Interfolk, institute for Civil Society. For further information about the project, please see the website of the project: <https://micropolis.club/>

The aim of this Survey Summary is to gain more knowledge of the local cultural organisations potential to provide added community values for the benefit of the living conditions in Middelfart municipality.

The Danish summary of the survey will be published in October 2023, og the Danish project team intends to invite the cultural associations and other stakeholders in Middelfart municipality to meetings and workshops in the period November 2023 – March 2024 to discuss the results of the survey and to plan possible follow-up initiatives.

Objectives of the survey

We are aware that the core values of the cultural associations and institutions are to provide possibilities for the members and audiences to experience and be engaged in arts, crafts, culture, and heritage activities, where they can be enlivened and enlightened in a free and joyful community with others.

Anyhow, the culture activities have beside these essential core values also the potential to generate “added community values”, like promoting:

- Local identity, connectedness to the area, community spirit and social cohesion
- Social inclusion and diversity
- Active citizenship and democratic values
- Environmental sustainability and green values

The aim of the survey has been to clarify the status (the baseline) of the added community values among the cultural actors in Middelfart Municipality and disclose areas, where the culture organisations can make improvements. The approach is to examine the status and potentials for changes in four main aspects of the organisations, namely:

- The stated values (in the organisation’s key documents)
- The structure (the leadership, decision-making, and forms of organising activities)
- The activities (for members and audiences)
- The networking and communication (with external stakeholders)

Hereby we can disclose areas in the organisations, where the “added community values” are low, and where the organisations especially could make changes, if they wish to improve the “added values”.

This approach, where we examine main aspects of the organisations' functionality, will help to give a more specific and manageable picture of where actions may be needed.

The respondent groups

We have invited approx. 75 representatives of the cultural associations and other local actors engaged in cultural activities to take part in the survey, including:

- The civil society associations in the area of arts, crafts, culture, and heritage.
- Other civil society associations from the social, health and green areas that also have cultural activities alone or in cooperation with others.
- Evening schools and other adult education organisations that have topics of arts, crafts, culture, and heritage.
- The culture and citizen centres in the many smaller towns in the municipality
- The cultural and educational activities of the parish councils
- Public culture institutions, such as libraries, museums, music schools, and other providers of arts, culture, and heritage in the municipality.

The number of answers were 27, which is a reasonable response rate out of 75 invitations. Unfortunately, we did not get replies from the parish councils or the culture centres in the smaller towns in the municipality.

Anyhow, we think the group of respondents to a high degree are representative for the three main groups in the survey: the social civil society associations, the cultural civil society associations, and the public cultural institutions.

The questionnaire

The online questionnaire is made by using Google form. It is designed to be self-explanatory, and it is based on closed questions except from the final open question, where the respondents can comment the questionnaire.

The initial questionnaire was bigger than the final version. The initial design used 8 questions for all the main series, and we had open questions after each of the 4 main sections. But we decided to make the questionnaire smaller to avoid that some respondents would withdraw due to the scope of the questionnaire. Therefore, we reduced the questions for the main series from 8 to 4 questions, and we skipped the more demanding 4 open content questions, and only had one concluding open question, where the respondent can comment on the online questionnaire.

In average, it took the respondent less than 30 min to complete the questionnaire, and only few complained that it was too long and took too much time to answer.

II. Survey results

Background information

Profile of the respondents

For the group of all 27 respondents, the following can be mentioned:

- 53 % of the respondents are voluntary and unpaid leaders from the board or with positions of trust in the associations, while a smaller group of 19 % are paid managers, especially from the subgroup of public institutions.
- Almost 60 % are men, and 40 % women.
- Almost 80 % are over 50 year and more than 40 % are more than 70 years.
- Almost 63 % have a university degree, while 22 % have a vocational education and the remaining 10 % only have primary school or something else.
- And 56 % are retired, while approx. 40 % are in work, and less than 4 % have other status, and no one is in education.

Variations among the three subgroups regarding personal profiles

For the subgroup of **social associations (10 respondents)**, the following can be mentioned:

- The proportion of unpaid board chairmen among the respondents is 90 %, which is much higher than for the whole group.
- The proportion of men is higher with 70 %.
- The proportion of elderly people is higher, with 90 % above 50 years. Correspondingly, 80 % are retired. This tendency is not surprising, due to very few youth associations in the area.
- There are fewer with a university education, with only 40 %, and the share with vocational education is 50 % and the group with only a primary school degree is 10 %.

The lower degree of education may be related to the fact that social and health problems affect everyone, but to a greater extent the less educated, and hereby this group can have a higher representation.

For the subgroup of **cultural associations (10 respondents)**,¹ the following can be mentioned:

- The proportion of unpaid board chairmen is 70 %, which is lower than in the social area.
- The proportion of men is 70 % like the social associations.
- The average age is higher here with 100 % above 50 years.
- The proportion with a university education is higher with 60 %, and the proportion with a vocational education is lower with only 30 %.
- The proportion of retired people is slightly lower with only 70 %, while 30 % are in full-time work (and this may be related to the fact that those with higher education and a job in the cultural field are not so worn out and they typically retire later).

¹ The cultural associations include both amateur arts, voluntary culture, handicrafts, and cultural heritage.

For the subgroup of cultural public institutions (10 respondents), including libraries, museums, music schools, junior high schools, the tourist information, the following can be mentioned:

- The proportion of respondents from board positions is lower (only 30 %), while the proportion of employed managers from the institutions (20 %) and other employees with leading functions (30 %) is higher than for the area of civil society associations.
- The proportion of men is also lower, with only 40 %, while 60 % are women.
- The age distribution is more spread out, still with 60 % above 50 years and 40 % above 70 years, due to the sample of persons from the boards of the public/self-governing institutions, while the 40 % between 30 – 49 years must refer to the employees in the institutions.
- The proportion with a university education is also highest in this group, with 90 % and only 10 % from others.
- The proportion of retired people is lower with only 40 %, while 40 % are in full-time jobs and 20 % in part-time jobs.

Profile of the respondents' organizations

More than half, 53 pct come from member-based civil society associations and 11 % from informal civic groups, while 29 % comes from public or self-owned institutions and 7 % from others.

The activities of the organisations are divided between 37 % from artistic areas of activity and 11 % from cultural heritage, and 37 % from the social area, while 14 % are from interdisciplinary activities or others.

Approx. 55 % of the organizations do most of the work by volunteers and unpaid members and managers, while 41 % do the work mainly by paid staff, and 4 % mention something else (e.g. special subsidy schemes for activation, interns, etc.)

The large majority of 60 % are only active in Middelfart municipality, while 15 % are members of a national organisation, and 7 % have members from all over the country. 7 % mention that they sometimes participate in international activities and 11 % would like to participate more in international activities.

Variations among the three subgroups re profile of their organisations

The following can be mentioned about the **social civil society associations**:

- 80 % of the respondents come from member-based associations or informal citizen groups and 20 % from others.
- Only 10 % paid employees to do most of the work.
- As an average, 60 % are only active in Middelfart municipality, while a higher proportion of 30 % are members of a national organization (probably because the social area has more resources to be more well-organised), while no one has participated in international activities or mention a desire for this.

The following can be mentioned about the **cultural civil society associations**:

- 70 % come from member-based associations or informal citizen groups, while 30 % come from independent self-owned institutions (which are often in a border area between the public sector and the private or civil society sector).
- 20 % have paid employees who do most of the work, and this must be due to the higher proportion of self-owned institutions, which typically have paid employees.
- As for the social associations, only 60 % are active in Middelfart municipality, and the proportion of members of a national organization is lower with only 20 %. But there are 10 % who would like to take part in international activities.
- It can also be mentioned that 60 % comes from artistic activities (theatre, music, dance, visual arts, etc.), and 30 % from cultural heritage, while 10 % comes from interdisciplinary activities. There were no responses from handicraft and art wares or other cultural activity areas.

The following can be mentioned about the **cultural public institutions** (like libraries, museums, music schools, junior high schools, tourist information, etc.):

- In this group, 50 % come from public organizations and 30 % from self-owned institutions, while 20 % from civil society associations (and this indicates that some of the respondents in the border areas between associations and self-owned institutions have been “reused” to reach 10 answers for the group).
- Here 70 % are paid managers and employees, while 30 % are volunteers who are active in the organisations' boards, etc.
- As for both the social and cultural associations, 60 % of the public institutions are only active in Middelfart municipality, and the proportion of members of a national organization is lower with only 10 %. But 20 % state an interest in participating in international activities, which is higher than for the civil society associations.
- Here, 50 % come from organizations with artistic activities, 30 % from cultural heritage, and 20 % are interdisciplinary.

Content questions

1. Goals and values

Here the respondents should assess to what degree the stated goals and values in their organisation promote “added community values”, - including the four focus points: social identity, social inclusion, active citizenship, and environmental sustainability – by assessing:

1. The statutes
2. The key documents, like annual report, next year’s action plan, policy papers, etc
3. The activity programmes and promotion materials
4. The evaluation and monitoring procedures

The methodology and data

We here present the combined assessment score for all four areas (statutes, key documents, pr-material, evaluation procedures) for each of the four community values (local identity, social inclusion, active citizenship, and green sustainability).

The method is to look at the percentages above and below the middle value of “some degree”, and here we also interpret the answers “don’t know” as “low degree” or as “not at all”, because if the chairman or manager or lead employees in the organisation “don’t know”, if such values are mentioned in the key documents of the organisation, they probably not are mentioned.

1b: The influence of the values on the local identity and social cohesion

1a: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
13,75 %	16,75 %	18,5 %	13,25 %	24 %	13,75 %
30 %		19 %	51 %		

Overall, a majority of 51 % of the respondents think the values of local identity are not mentioned much and it seems to have a low importance for their presentation of values and goals. Still, 30 pct think they give it a high importance.

Furthermore, the replies to the series of questions indicate that the degree of importance for the local identity is quite similar between the different types of documents: Statutes, key documents, activity materials, and even for the focus points of the evaluation procedures.

Variations among the subgroups regarding local identity and social cohesion

1a: Social associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
25 %	20 %	12 %	8 %	30 %	5 %
45 %		12 %	43 %		

1a: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
15 %	20 %	23 %	12 %	18 %	12 %
35 %		23 %	42 %		

1a: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
5 %	20 %	30 %	10 %	10 %	25 %
25		30 %	45 %		

The social associations have in average a middle score, while the cultural associations and public cultural and information institutions have a lower valuation.

The difference is especially related to the question about evaluation procedures, where the social associations state a higher value looking at the added value of local identity and local cohesion.

It is unclear if the higher valuation refers to local identity and connectedness to the area, or to social cohesion, mutual recognition, and trust between the members. The last is most likely, because it is important in associations, where the members support each other in a difficult situation with social and health related challenges.

1b: The influence of the stated values on social inclusion and diversity

1b: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
14 %	5 %	15 %	17 %	34 %	15 %
19 %		15 %	66 %		

Overall, 2/3 of the respondents think the values of social inclusion are not mentioned much and it seems to have a low importance for their work values and goals. Still, 19 pct think they give it a high importance.

Again, there is not much difference of valuation between the different types of documents: Statutes, key documents, activity materials, and even for the focus points of the evaluation procedures; and this strengthen the validity of the average scores.

Variations among the subgroups regarding social inclusion

1b: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
32 %	8 %	15 %	18 %	22 %	5 %
40 %		15 %	45 %		

1b: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
10 %	3 %	12 %	13 %	50 %	12 %
13 %		12 %	75 %		

1b: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
7 %	3 %	23 %	18 %	22 %	22 %
10 %		23 %	62 %		

We can see, all subgroups are below the middle score of “some degree”, and again the social associations have the relatively highest score, while the cultural associations have the lowest score with 75 % on a low score. The reason for this difference is unclear.

1c: The influence of the stated values on active citizenship

1c: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
12 %	16 %	21 %	14 %	24 %	13 %
28 %		21 %	51 %		

Overall, a majority of 54 % of the respondents think the values of active citizenship are not mentioned much and it seems to have a low importance for their presentation of values and goals. Still, 28 pct think they give it a high importance.

Again, there is not much difference of valuation between the different types of documents, and it strengthens the validity of the average scores.

Variations among the subgroups regarding active citizenship and democratic values

1c: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
30 %	22 %	20 %	8 %	15 %	5 %
52 %		20 %	28 %		

1c: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
10 %	13 %	29 %	23 %	15 %	10 %
23 %		29 %	48 %		

1c: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
10 %	15 %	20 %	18 %	12 %	25 %
25 %		20 %	55 %		

Again, we can see that the social associations have the highest score, where 52 pct state a “higher degrees”, while 48 % of the cultural association state “lower degrees”, and the “public institutions” have the lowest score with 55 % at the scale of “lower degrees”.

It makes sense that respondents from the public institutions (or private firms), where the respondents are paid employees, do not give “active citizenship and democratic values” a high score, because their reference is a work life with leaders who hires and dismisses employees and where the employers have the right to manage the work. They do not have annual meetings, where the members / the employees elect or dismiss their leaders. Their expectations are not democracy in the institution, but fairness and transparent decisions and a right to have influence on the decisions and their own work situation, but not “economic democracy”.

1d: The influence of the stated values on the environmental sustainability

1d: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
5 %	10 %	11 %	15 %	45 %	14 %
15 %		11 %	74 %		

Overall, a significantly majority of 74 % of the respondents think the values and goals of environmental sustainability are not mentioned much, and that it seems to have a low importance in all their key documents. Only 15 % think they give it a high importance.

The environmental sustainability is clearly the added value with the lowest score, and the low score can be seen in the valuation of the different types of documents as well as the evaluation procedures, and it strengthens the validity of the average scores.

The green challenges are the topic that gets less attention among the respondent groups, even though Middelfart hosts the yearly People’s Green Climate Meeting – see <https://klimafolkemoedet.dk/>

Variations among the subgroups regarding sustainability

1d: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
2 %	5 %	13 %	18 %	57 %	5 %
7 %		13 %	80 %		

1d: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
10	7 %	11 %	7 %	58 %	7 %
17 %		11 %	72 %		

1d: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
3 %	12 %	15 %	5 %	40 %	25 %
15 %		15 %	70 %		

Here we have the opposite tendency, where the social associations have the lowest score where 80 % state “lower degrees”, and the cultural associations state 72 % and public institutions only state 70 % in the “lower degrees”.

It may indicate that the “environmental challenge” overall is more on the agenda in the public institutions than in the civil society associations that are active in the social and cultural field. There is a general tendency that NGOs are rather single-case-oriented and focus on a specific field of interest, while the public servants work in institutions that typically have broader societal obligations.

2. Structure (management, decision-making, organisation forms)

Here the respondents should assess to what degree their organisations' structure promote the four "added community values":

- A. Local identity and social cohesion
- B. Social inclusions and diversity
- C. Active citizenship and democratic values
- D. Environmental sustainability

2.1: The structure's influence on local identity

2.1: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
23 %	20 %	25 %	10 %	14 %	8 %
43 %		25 %	32 %		

Overall, more respondents, like 39 % think the structures to a high degree promotes the local identity and local cohesion, while 34 % think it only promotes it to a low degree. A relatively big group of 27 % think it does to "some degree".

The replies to the series of questions indicate that 44 pct only to low degree "emphasise common narratives and symbols about the uniqueness of their district", while 30 % think they do. A big majority of 74 % state that they promote mutual trust and recognition between the participants, and 40 % to a high degree and 41 % to some degree "find it important to lend a helping hand to solve possible challenges in the local communities".

Variations among the subgroups regarding local identity and cohesion

2.1: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
32 %	13 %	25 %	15 %	10 %	5 %
45 %		25 %	30 %		

2.1: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
25 %	25 %	25 %	7 %	8 %	5 %
50 %		25 %	20 %		

2.1: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
15 %	22 %	31 %	2 %	15 %	15 %

37 %	31 %	32 %
------	------	------

Overall, the respondents think the structure to a higher degree than the mission papers recognise and promote local identity and cohesion; and it is the cultural associations that has the highest score with 50 pct stating “higher degrees”, followed by the social associations.

The specific question, where the cultural associations have an extra ordinary high score compared to the other subgroups are that they to a much higher degree “sometimes emphasise common narratives and symbols about the uniqueness of their district.”, while they have a lower score in relation “to lend a helping hand to solve possible challenges in the local communities”.

2.2: The structure’s influence on social inclusion

2.2: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don’t know
16 %	13 %	32 %	15 %	18 %	6 %
29 %		32 %	39 %		

Overall, more respondents, like 44 % think the structures to a low degree promotes social inclusion, while 29 % think it promotes it to a high degree. A relatively big group of 27 % think it does to “some degree”.

Furthermore, the replies to the series of questions indicate that the boards are not balanced in terms of age (very few board members are below 50) or in terms of gender (where there is a majority of men). A majority of 59 % think “the places for activities are accessible to people with visible and non-visible disabilities”.

Variations among the subgroups regarding social inclusion

2.2: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don’t know
30 %	5 %	30 %	8 %	25 %	2 %
35 %		30 %	35 %		

2.2: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don’t know
15 %	18 %	29 %	18 %	20 %	0 %
33 %		29 %	38 %		

2.2: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don’t know

8 %	20 %	29 %	10 %	15 %	18 %
28 %		29 %	43 %		

The variations of the subgroups' scores are not significant, but we see the former tendency, where the social associations have the relatively highest score followed by the cultural associations.

At the specific questions, we can see the social associations state that the group of managers and boards to "some degree" are balanced in age, gender, and ethnic diversity, which the replies in the basic information about profiles of respondents and organisations did not confirm.

All three subgroups state that the places for activities to a high degree are "accessible to people with visible and non-visible disabilities".

2.3: The structure's influence on active citizenship

2.3: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
40 %	16 %	15 %	1 %	14 %	14 %
56 %		15 %	29 %		

Overall, a majority of 56 % of the respondents think the structures promote active citizenship to a high degree, while 29 % think it only does it to a low degree.

The replies to the series of questions show that 74 % think their organisations to a high degree are based on democratic principles as member-based associations; and 66 % that the members to a high degree "have free access to important information about decisions in the association".

But 56 % think they only to a low degree "offer training opportunities for all members to develop their skills in democratic association management and the performance of positions of trust."

Variations among the subgroups regarding active citizenship

2.3: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
53 %	14 %	10 %	0 %	18 %	5 %
67 %		10 %	23 %		

2.3: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
42 %	13 %	17 %	2 %	15 %	11 %
55 %		17 %	28 %		

2.3: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
---	--	--	--	--	--

Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
17 %	18 %	23 %	0 %	13 %	29 %
35 %		23 %	42 %		

Again, we can see that the social associations have the highest score, where 67 % state a “higher degrees” of promoting active citizenship, and the cultural associations follows with 55 %, while 42 % of the “public institutions” access “lower degrees”.

The higher score for the social associations versus the cultural associations refer mainly to a much higher score about “offering training courses for the members”, which may reflect the fact that the social associations have more public support and resources, including better options for free training courses than the cultural associations.

This variation also indicates the different democratic rationalities in the civil society areas and the public (and private) sector. The civil society area is based on active citizenship and bottom-up democratic values, while the public sector is based on bureaucratic rationality and top-down political control (by democratic elected city councils, regional councils, and national parliament).

2.4: The structure's influence on environmental sustainability

2.4: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
20 %	9 %	18 %	7 %	31 %	15 %
29 %		18 %	53 %		

Overall, a majority of 53 % of the respondents think the structures only promotes environmental sustainability to a low degree, while 29 % think it does to a high degree.

The replies to the series of questions show that the organisations to a low degree or not at all have initiated green strategies, and they do not offer training opportunities for members to incorporate green goals into the activities.

The main “green aspect” is that the board and other organizers usually use e-communications instead of sending hard copies by physical postal delivery, but the reason is probably not green goals, but because they wish to save time and costs, and to use a more efficient form of working.

Variations among the subgroups regarding sustainability

2.4: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
22 %	3 %	20 %	5 %	40 %	10 %
25 %		20 %	55 %		

2.4: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
22 %	8 %	20 %	5 %	35 %	10 %
30 %		20 %	50 %		

2.4: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
8 %	17 %	23 %	5 %	22 %	25 %
25 %		23 %	52 %		

The variations of the subgroups' scores are not significant, but regarding the green values we here again see the small tendency, where the structures of the public cultural and information institutions are relatively most green, and the social associations is relatively the least green.

3. Activities (for members and audiences)

Here the respondents assessed to what degree their activities promote the four “added community values”:

- A. Local identity and social cohesion
- B. Social inclusions and diversity
- C. Active citizenship and democratic values
- D. Environmental sustainability

3.1: The activities’ influence on local identity and cohesion

3.1: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
32 %	26 %	20 %	11 %	6 %	5 %
58 %		20 %	22 %		

Overall, a majority of 58 % of the respondents think their activities promote local identity and social cohesion to a high degree, while 22 % think the activities only do it to a low degree.

Furthermore, the replies to the series of questions indicate that the organisations do only to some degree use creative activities to illuminate and appreciate the local cultural heritage and historical environments? But at the same time their activities to a high degree promote a sense of local identity and community among the participants. And furthermore, the activities provide a friendly atmosphere and strengthen the mutual trust among the participants.

The respondents are also to a high degree ready to lend a helping hand to solve common social challenges in the local communities.

Variations among the subgroups regarding local identity and cohesion

3.1: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
45	17 %	18 %	7 %	8 %	5 %
62 %		18 %	20 %		

3.1: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
28 %	30 %	25 %	12 %	3 %	2 %
58 %		24 %	17 %		

3.1: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
22 %	40 %	28 %	3 %	2 %	5 %
62 %		28 %	10 %		

Overall, the respondents think the activities to a higher degree promote local identity and cohesion than the structures and the mission papers. The activities of the public institutions get the highest overall score compared to the other two subgroups with more “some degrees” than “lower degrees”.

3.2: The activities' influence on social inclusion

3.2: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
35 %	15 %	20 %	7 %	15 %	8 %
50 %		20 %	30 %		

Overall, half of the respondents think the activities promote social inclusion to a high degree, while 30 % think the activities only do it to a low degree.

Furthermore, the replies to the series of questions state the activities to a high degree are open and inclusive for immigrants with a different linguistic/ cultural background as well as for people with disabilities. Likewise, all participants can feel safe expressing their opinions and possible criticism of the activities.

But nearly none have a price policy, where people with fewer financial resources can get a price reduction on their quota?

Variations among the subgroups re social inclusion

3.2: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
57 %	13 %	12 %	0 %	18 %	0 %
70 %		12 %	18 %		

3.2: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
35 %	18 %	19 %	8 %	18 %	2 %
53 %		19 %	28 %		

3.2: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
17 %	18 %	37 %	5	5	18 %
35 %		37 %	28 %		

Here we have high variations between the activities of the subgroups. 70 % of the social associations assess “higher degrees” of social inclusion, and 53 % of the cultural associations also assess “higher degrees”, while only 35 % of the public institutions assess “higher degrees”. The tendency of the area of activity area follows the tendency of the area of structure, but with a stronger and more clear variation.

3.3: The activities' influence on active citizenship

3.3: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
20 %	14 %	26 %	21 %	12 %	7 %
34 %		26 %	40 %		

Overall, more respondents, like 40 % think the activities to a low degree promotes active citizenship, while 34 % think it promotes it to a high degree. A relatively big group of 26 % think it does to “some degree”.

Furthermore, the replies to the series of questions state the activities to a high degree allow participants to evaluate and provide feedback on their experience of the activities.

But they do only to a low degree have meetings with other cultural organizations in the municipality to exchange experiences and plan joint activities. Likewise, they don't meet with other associations to clarify common positions on local cultural policy issues; and they do only to some degree try to influence local cultural policy, both via public debate and dialogue with the municipality's authorities?

Variations among the subgroups regarding active citizenship

3.3: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
30 %	15 %	22 %	15 %	18 %	0 %
45 %		22 %	33 %		

3.3: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
22 %	13 %	25 %	25 %	10 %	5 %
35 %		25 %	40 %		

3.3: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
8 %	15 %	34 %	25 %	5 %	13 %
23 %		34 %	43 %		

Again, we can for the area of activity as for the area of structure see that the social associations have the highest score, where 45 % state a “higher degrees” of promoting active citizenship, and the cultural associations follows with only 35 %, and the public institutions get the lowest assessment with 23 %.

3.4: The activities' influence on environmental sustainability

3.4: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
9 %	12 %	13 %	14 %	36 %	16 %
21 %		13 %	66 %		

Overall, a significantly majority of 66 % of the respondents think the activities only to a low degree promotes environmental sustainability, while 21 % think it promotes it to a high degree.

Furthermore, the replies indicate the respondents only to a low degree find it important to organize activities characterized by green goals of environmental sustainability or by goals of protection of the local nature and ecosystems. And they only to a low degree have discussions at annual meetings and other events about helping to have an environmentally sustainable local community, and they only to some degree find it needed to deal with this challenge in future meetings.

Variations among the subgroups regarding sustainability

3.4: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
5 %	10 %	7 %	18 %	48 %	12 %
15 %		7 %	78 %		

3.4: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
8 %	5 %	17 %	20 %	38 %	12 %
13 %		17 %	70 %		

3.4: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
10 %	18 %	17 %	15 %	15 %	25 %
28 %		17 %	55 %		

As for 2.4: Area of Structure Again, we can for 3.4: Area of Activity see an overall low score for green initiatives in all subgroups, and again the social associations have the lowest score with 78 % assessed with “lower degrees”, and the cultural associations follows with 70 % “lower degrees”, and the public cultural and information institutions have only 55 % “lower degrees”.

4. Networking and communication with stakeholders

Here you must assess to what degree your organisation needs to adjust parts of the networking and communication with stakeholders to improve the “added community values” – by ticking the point of degree.

The topics regarding networking and communication with stakeholders to be assessed are:

1. Exchange with other civil society organisations
2. Exchange with the community
3. Exchange with public authorities (municipality, government)
4. Communication channels

4.1: Cooperation with other civil society organisations

4.1: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
13 %	9 %	20 %	21 %	28 %	9 %
22 %		20 %	58 %		

Overall, a majority of 58 % of the respondents think they only cooperate with other civil society associations to a low degree, while 22 % think they do it to a high degree.

Furthermore, the replies to the series of questions indicate that there seems to be some cooperation between the social and cultural associations, but not with the cultural or civic centres in the smaller towns in the municipality.

There is not much cooperation about improving the social inclusiveness of the activities, for example that cultural associations cooperate with association for people with disabilities so they easier can be included in the associations with activities for all citizens. And there is especially not cooperation with green associations on how to improve the green practices in the social and cultural associations.

Variations among the subgroups regarding cooperation with other NGOs

4.1: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
22 %	3 %	17 %	20	35	3 %
25 %		17 %	58 %		

4.1: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
8 %	10 %	18 %	27 %	33 %	5 %
18 %		18 %	65 %		

4.1: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
15 %	13 %	22 %	10 %	25 %	15 %
28 %		22 %	50 %		

The assessments indicate that it is the public institutions that have the highest degree of cooperation with the local civil society associations, like just 28 %, while the cultural associations have the lowest degree of cooperation with only 18 %, and the social associations have a little higher level with 25 %.

Overall, the civil society associations do not cooperate much with NGOs from other areas, and unfortunately, we cannot see to what degree they cooperate with other NGOs from their own area.

Probably, the social associations have some collaboration with each other not least due to their common meeting centre and the coordinating functions of the Social Voluntary Center (Frivilligcenter Middelfart), but the cultural associations do not have a similar umbrella or committee that can promote cooperation and coordination between the cultural associations in the municipality.

4.2: Cooperation and communication with the local community

4.2: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
27 %	16 %	21 %	19 %	14 %	3 %
43 %		21 %	36 %		

Overall, 43 % of the respondents think they cooperate with the wider local community to a high degree, while 36 % think they only do it to a low degree. A relatively big group of 21 % think they do it to "some degree".

Furthermore, the replies indicate that the associations have members from the wider municipality and not only from Middelfart city; and they cooperate to a high degree with the public cultural institutions, such as libraries, tourist information office, music school, museums, etc.; and maybe surprising also with private actors in the municipality, such as companies from service, trade and production, associations for the retail trade, employers' organizations, and trade unions.

But they do not cooperate much with the evening schools and other liberal adult education providers.

Variations among the subgroups regarding cooperation with the local community

4.2: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
35 %	15 %	10 %	25 %	12 %	3 %
50 %		10 %	40 %		

4.2: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
33 %	15 %	19 %	13 %	20 %	0 %
48 %		19 %	33 %		

4.2: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
20 %	22 %	33 %	15 %	5 %	5 %
42 %		33 %	25 %		

The variations between the three subgroups are not significant. The social associations have the highest level of cooperation with 50 %, but also the lowest level of 40 % due to only 10 % in the middle. The public institutions have neither so many on high level nor on low level, but more in the middle.

4.3: Cooperation with public authorities and institutions

4.3: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
14 %	15 %	27 %	13 %	27 %	4 %
29 %		27 %	44 %		

Overall, 44 % of the respondents assess they only cooperate with the public authorities to a low degree, while 29 % think they do it to a high degree. A relatively big group of 27 % think they do it to “some degree”.

Furthermore, the replies to the specific questions indicate that there is not much cooperation about promoting environmental sustainability or local nature protection, and there is very low cooperation about receiving and introducing new citizens to the “leisure time possibilities” in the municipality.

But when they cooperate, there seems to be a high recognition of an equal and co-creative collaboration with the cultural department and other public cultural institutions.

Variations among the subgroups regarding cooperation with the public institutions

4.3: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
18 %	16 %	20 %	8 %	34 %	4 %
34 %		20 %	46 %		

4.3: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
10 %	12 %	30 %	16 %	30 %	2 %
22 %		30 %	48 %		

4.3: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
22 %	18 %	38 %	4 %	14 %	4 %
40 %		38 %	22 %		

Not surprisingly, the cultural and information public institutions have the highest level of cooperation with (other) public cultural institutions. The social association also cooperate more than the cultural associations with the public institutions and the municipality's culture department.

This may be more surprising, but again a probable explanation is that their area gets more public support, both from the state and the municipality, and they have more resources to coordinate cooperation with the public authorities and institutions and more local political attention with the representation of city council in the Voluntary Centre's board. While the cultural associations do not have any common financial resources, nor their own centre with a secretariat, nor the same political attention from the city council. They live more on their own, and it is not always so easy.

4.4: Using new communication channels

4.4: All respondents, 27 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
25 %	15 %	22 %	14 %	21 %	2 %
40 %		22 %	37 %		

Overall, 40 % of the respondents assess to use the new communication channels to a high degree, while 37 % only do it to a low degree. A relatively big group of 22 % think they do it to "some degree".

The replies to the specific questions indicate they to a high degree use the social media for their communication and promotion, and that they to some degree cooperate with other civil society associations and public institutions about communicating to the wider public.

The whole group of respondents only to a low degree use the national <https://www.kultunaut.dk> to promote their activities, and the low degree may be explained by the fact that the big subgroup of social associations instead uses the <https://socialkompas.dk>

Variations among the subgroups using new communication channels.

4.4: Social civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
20 %	20 %	12 %	10 %	38 %	0 %

40 %	12 %	48 %
------	------	------

4.4: Cultural civil society associations, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
35 %	8 %	22 %	13 %	15 %	7 %
43 %		22 %	35 %		

4.4: Public cultural and educational institutions, 10 replies					
Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
32 %	23 %	27 %	6 %	12 %	0 %
55 %		27 %	18 %		

It is the public institutions that score highest with 55 % in using the new communication channels, which while the cultural associations score 43 % and the social associations score 40 %, and they also have a bigger group of 48 % with low degrees.

Comments from respondents to questionnaire

4.1 Final comments from respondents

At the end of the questionnaire there was some open questions, where the respondents could comment the survey, if they wanted, and here follows their comments:

A nice and relevant study.

Our group is part of National organisation of Seniors and our purpose is to focus on being a senior in Middelfart municipality and through debates and other activities to help prevent loneliness.

It is very long to fill in and not so relevant to my association.

It is as if each association has enough in itself.

Not all questions are relevant to our organisation but can trigger some thoughts.

It immediately seemed to me that there are many difficult/complex questions, albeit relevant. Could probably use.

being able to put more than one cross in between. Gives me the opportunity to delve into some of the questions and much more, to closely read the articles of association, annual report etc. Mao. cause for more reflection.

We help refugees and immigrants in cooperation with the municipality. That is our main aim.

Alas, such a survey is contributing to me strongly considering whether I WANT to spend my time on voluntary work... STOP IT! NOW AND I MEAN NOW IT IS DISTURBING!

There are far too few answer options.

The association cooperates with similar associations in neighbouring municipalities.

Where it said that multiple answers could be chosen, this could not be done anyway.

The survey has given our association ideas for a better collaboration with organizations where there are common interests.

4.2 Time used.

They also stated how much time they had used to fill-in the questionnaire, and the results were:

- Less than 30 min: 63 pct;
- between 30 – 60 minutes: 37 pct.

Summary of survey results

Combined values of mission, structure, and activities for subgroups

To get a better overview of the subgroups assessments of their added community values, we have below calculated together their scores from the three main areas of their organisations: Missions, Structures, Activities.

Local identity and cohesion

Local identity	Summary 3 areas - Social associations					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	25 %	20 %	12 %	8 %	30 %	5 %
Structure	32 %	13 %	25 %	15 %	10 %	5 %
Activities	45 %	17 %	18 %	7 %	8 %	5 %
Average	34 %	17 %	18 %	10 %	16 %	5 %
High and low	51 %		18 %	31 %		

Local identity	Summary 3 areas – Cultural associations					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	15 %	20 %	23 %	12 %	18 %	12 %
Structure	25 %	25 %	25 %	7 %	8 %	5 %
Activities	28 %	30 %	25 %	12 %	3 %	2 %
Average	23	25	25	11	10	6
High and low	48 %		25 %	27 %		

Local identity	Summary 3 areas – Public Cultural institutions					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	5 %	20 %	30 %	10 %	10 %	25 %
Structure	15 %	22 %	31 %	2 %	15 %	15 %
Activities	22 %	40 %	28 %	3 %	2 %	5 %
Average	14 %	27 %	30 %	5 %	9 %	15 %
High and low	41 %		30 %	29 %		

This overview of the variations between the three subgroups effect on local identity and cohesion outlines that 51 % of the social associations assess a “high effect”, while 48 % of the cultural associations a high effect, and only 41 % of the public cultural institutions assess a high effect.

All three groups give the area of activities the highest degrees (to promote local identity and cohesion), and thereby all equal the potential for improvements especially could be in the areas of values and structure.

Social inclusion

Social inclusion	Summary 3 areas - Social associations					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	32 %	8 %	15 %	18 %	22 %	5 %
Structure	32 %	13 %	25 %	15 %	10 %	5 %
Activities	57 %	13 %	12 %	0 %	18 %	0 %
Average	40 %	12 %	17 %	11 %	17 %	3 %
High and low	52 %		17 %	31 %		

Social inclusion	Summary 3 areas – Cultural associations					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	10 %	3 %	12 %	13 %	50 %	12 %
Structure	25 %	25 %	25 %	7 %	8 %	5 %
Activities	35 %	18 %	19 %	8 %	18 %	2 %
Average	23	16	19	11	25	6
High and low	39 %		19 %	42 %		

Social inclusion	Summary 3 areas – Public Cultural institutions					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	7 %	3 %	23 %	18 %	22 %	22 %
Structure	15 %	22 %	31 %	2 %	15 %	15 %
Activities	17 %	18 %	37 %	5	5	18 %
Average	13 %	15 %	30 %	10 %	14 %	18 %
High and low	28 %		30 %	42 %		

This overview of the three subgroups own assessments of their effect on social inclusion clearly outline that the social associations assess the strongest effect (52 % with a higher degree), while the cultural associations assess a lower effect (39 % with a higher degree), and the public cultural institutions has the lowest assessments (28 % with a higher degree).

Again, all agree the highest effect already is promoted in the area of activities, and thereby the area of values and structure has a higher potential for improvements.

Active citizenship and democratic values

Active citizenship	Summary 3 areas - Social associations					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	30 %	22 %	20 %	8 %	15 %	5 %
Structure	53 %	14 %	10 %	0 %	18 %	5 %
Activities	30 %	15 %	22 %	15 %	18 %	0 %
Average	38 %	17 %	17 %	8 %	17 %	3 %
High and low	55 %		17 %	28 %		

Active citizenship	Summary 3 areas – Cultural associations					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	10 %	13 %	29 %	23 %	15 %	10 %
Structure	42 %	13 %	17 %	2 %	15 %	11 %
Activities	22 %	13 %	25 %	25 %	10 %	5 %
Average	25	13	23	17	13	9
High and low	38 %		23 %	39 %		

Active citizenship	Summary 3 areas – Public Cultural institutions					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	10 %	15 %	20 %	18 %	12 %	25 %
Structure	17 %	18 %	23 %	0 %	13 %	29 %
Activities	8 %	15 %	34 %	25 %	5 %	13 %
Average	12 %	16 %	25 %	15 %	10 %	22 %
High and low	28 %		25 %	47 %		

Again, we see that the social associations assess that they have a higher effect for active citizenship and democratic values (with 55 %), while the cultural associations have a lower assessment (with 38 %), and the public cultural associations has the lowest assessment (with only 28 %).

It can be mentioned that here it is the area of structure (management, decision-making, organisation forms) and not the area of activities that gets the highest score from all subgroups. They seem to think that this area of structure is quite ok and open for added values, and the potential for improvements is thereby mostly in the other areas of values and activities.

Environmental sustainability and nature protection

Sustainability	Summary 3 areas - Social associations					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	2 %	5 %	13 %	18 %	57 %	5 %
Structure	22 %	3 %	20 %	5 %	40 %	10 %
Activities	5 %	10 %	7 %	18 %	48 %	12 %
Average	10 %	6 %	13 %	14 %	48 %	9 %
High and low	16 %		13 %	71 %		

Sustainability	Summary 3 areas – Cultural associations					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	10	7 %	11 %	7 %	58 %	7 %
Structure	22 %	8 %	20 %	5 %	35 %	10 %
Activities	8 %	5 %	17 %	20 %	38 %	12 %
Average	13 %	7 %	16 %	10 %	44 %	10 %
High and low	20 %		16 %	64 %		

Sustainability	Summary 3 areas – Public Cultural institutions					
Areas	Very high degree	High degree	Some degree	Low degree	Not at all	Don't know
Values	3 %	12 %	15 %	5 %	40 %	25 %
Structure	8 %	17 %	23 %	5 %	22 %	25 %
Activities	10 %	18 %	17 %	15 %	15 %	25 %
Average	7 %	16 %	18 %	8 %	26 %	25 %
High and low	23 %		18 %	59 %		

This overview of the subgroups impact on environmental sustainability and nature protection outline that the public institutions have the highest percentage of “high degree” and lowest of “low degree” (23 % - 59 %), while the cultural associations are in the middle (20 % - 64 %), and the social associations assess they have the lowest effect (16 % - 71 %).

Both the social and the cultural associations assess the highest values to the area of structure with respectively 25 % and 30 %, while they give lower scores for their formulated green values and their lack of actual green plans for their activities.

Opposite, the public cultural institutions assess the higher value to their green activities. Anyhow, the room for green improvements are big for all three subgroups.

The subgroups' added community values in a nutshell

Below we have calculated together in a nutshell the scores for three subgroups regarding the four types of added community values.

Local identity and social cohesion			
subgroups	Higher degree	Some degree	Lower degree
Social associations	51 %	18 %	31 %
Cultural associations	48 %	25 %	27 %
Public institutions	41 %	30 %	29 %
Overall average	47 %	28 %	29 %

The social associations state the highest score, the cultural associations the middle score, and the public cultural institutions the lowest score regarding local identity and social cohesion.

It must be mentioned that the high score for the social associations does not come from a high assessment of their promotion of local identity and connectedness to the area, but to a very high assessment of their ability to promote mutual trust and recognition between the members and their intentions to give a helping hand to solve possible challenges in the local communities. Their high score is not related to local identity and connectedness to the area, but to promotion of social cohesion.

Social inclusion and diversity			
subgroups	Higher degree	Some degree	Lower degree
Social associations	52 %	17 %	31 %
Cultural associations	39 %	19 %	42 %
Public institutions	28 %	30 %	42 %
Overall average	40 %	22 %	38 %

Again, the social associations state the highest score, the cultural associations the middle score, and the public cultural institutions the lowest score regarding the added community values, in this case social inclusion and diversity.

It can be mentioned that the data from the initial personal profiles indicated that the social associations were the subgroup with the most unbalanced composition of their boards in relation to age, gender, and ethnic representation, while the public institutions had a more balanced representation in their group of managers and key staff.

However, the questions about the associations' degree of social inclusion and diversity were about the status for their members (and not the minor groups of leaders). The point may be that even though the organisation seems rather exclusive and uniform in composition of leaders and key staff, it may still be able to implement inclusive activities. But still, if all the leaders and key staff are older white men, it seems not very likely that they will be conscious about or have competences to provide activities that are open and inclusive for young black women, and vice versa.

Active citizenship and democratic values			
subgroups	Higher degree	Some degree	Lower degree
Social associations	55 %	17 %	28 %
Cultural associations	38 %	23 %	39 %
Public institutions	28 %	25 %	47 %
Overall average	40 %	22 %	38 %

Again, the social associations state the highest score, the cultural associations the middle score, and the public cultural institutions the lowest score regarding the added community values, in this case active citizenship and democratic values.

Environmental sustainability and nature protection			
subgroups	Higher degree	Some degree	Lower degree
Social associations	16 %	13 %	71 %
Cultural associations	20 %	16 %	64 %
Public institutions	23 %	18 %	59 %
Overall average	20 %	15 %	65 %

Here we have the opposite tendency, where the public cultural and information institutions have the highest score, and the social associations the lowest score. And overall, this fourth added community value regarding environmental sustainability and nature protection has the weakest promotion from all three subgroups. This is the added value, where there seems to be most potential for improvements.

III. Perspectives

Summary

Profile of the respondents and their organisations

Most of the respondents are voluntary and unpaid leaders from the board or with positions of trust in the associations, and a minority are paid employees, mainly from the subgroup of public institutions.

Almost 60 pct are men, and 80 pct are above 50 years, and nearly 2/3 have a university degree.

Nearly 2/3 of the participating organisations are member-based civil society associations and informal civic groups, while 1/3 represents public or self-owned institutions.

Nearly 60 % of the organizations do most of the work by volunteers and unpaid leaders.

The large majority of 60 % are only active in Middelfart municipality, but 7 % mention that they sometimes participate in international activities and 11 % would like to participate more in international activities.

The organisations' ability to promote added community values.

When we calculated together the organisations' scores from the three main aspects: Missions, Structures, Activities, we can see the following overall assessments:

Re local identity and cohesion: As an average, 47 % of the organisations assess that they to a high degree promote local identity and cohesion. The social associations state the highest assessment with 51 %, the cultural associations are in the middle with 48 %, and the public cultural associations lowest with 41 %.

Re social inclusion and diversity: 40 % of the organisations assess that they to a high degree promote social inclusion. Again, the social associations state the highest score with 52 %, the cultural associations the middle score with 39 %, and the public cultural institutions the lowest score with 28 %.

Re active citizenship and democratic values: Again, 40 % of the organisations assess that they to a high degree promote active citizenship. Here, the social associations state the highest score with 55 %, the cultural associations the middle score with 38 %, and the public cultural institutions the lowest score with 28 %.

Re environmental sustainability and nature protection: Only 20 % of all the organisations assess that they to a high degree promote environmental sustainability, and 65 % state they do it to a low degree.

For this added community value, we have the opposite tendency, where 23 % of the public institutions assess they to a high degree promote sustainability, and only 20 % of the cultural associations think so, and the social associations are in the bottom with 16 %. This seems to be the added value, where there is most potential for improvements.

The organisations' cooperation with external stakeholders

The organisations also assessed their degree of networking and communication with the following stakeholders:

Re exchange with other civil society organisations: Overall, a majority of 58 % of the respondents think they only cooperate with other civil society associations to a low degree.

Re exchange with the wider local community: Overall, 43 % of the respondents think they to a high degree cooperate or communicate with the wider local community.

Re exchange with public authorities (the culture department, public culture institutions, etc): Overall, 44 % of the respondents assess they only cooperate with the public authorities to a low degree. Anyhow, their experiences with the cooperation indicate a high recognition of an equal and co-creative collaboration with the cultural department and other public cultural institutions.

Re communication channels: Overall, 40 % of the respondents assess to use the new communication channels to a high degree, and they cooperate to some degree with other civil society associations and public institutions about communication to the wider public.

Recommendations

The survey disclosed that:

- The green values and practises regarding environmental sustainability and nature protection had a low score, and there were many possibilities for improvement of this type of added community value among the social and cultural civil society associations.
 - There could be a need for promoting the green objectives by for example developing new training courses on how social and cultural associations can include sustainable green values and practises in their local activities.
- The different NGO sectors did not have much mutual which could open for both knowledge transfer, activity development, and improved communication to the wider communities.
 - There could be a need for more common meetings or even a forum to promote exchange of experiences, to clarify common interest and to coordinate the communication and cooperation with the local authorities and institutions in the municipality.
- The associations could improve their abilities to be more inclusive for people with visible and non-visible disabilities” or to include immigrants with a different linguistic/ cultural background in the activities.
 - There could be a need for having more focus on including marginalised groups in the activities and maybe also to develop common introduction materials and services by the associations for new citizens that have moved to the municipality.
- Young people have a weak representation in the local associational life, and other studies also tell that many young people are vulnerable and lonely, and they need to come out and meet other young people in inclusive physical and creative activities.
 - There could be a need for new initiatives to reach out and engage young people in general in the associational life and especially the increasing group of vulnerable and lonely young people.

Annexes

Key documents for the survey are mentioned here including links to see and download them:

1. [The English edition of the Survey Questionnaire, summary of answers](#)
2. [The Danish edition of the Survey Questionnaire](#)
3. [The shorter and refined Danish online version](#)
4. [Danish Flyer about the Survey](#)
5. [The graphic summary of the Danish survey](#)
6. [The answers transferred to an excel file](#)
7. [Micropolis, wp5, survey in Middelfart, EN summary, all replies](#)
8. [Micropolis, Middelfart, EN summary, only public institutions](#)
9. [Micropolis, Middelfart, EN summary, only cultural associations](#)
10. [Micropolis, Middelfart, EN summary, only social associations](#)