Soziokultur and its evaluation
How to evaluate the impacts of Soziokulturelle projects.

Hanna-Julia Terbrack
Soziokultur and its evaluation

How to evaluate the impacts of Soziokulturelle projects.

Hanna-Julia Terbrack
Groningen, January 2012
Table of content

Introduction 1
Notions of culture and art 3
1 The history and development of the notion of Soziokultur 5
   1.1 The origins of Soziokultur in the 1970s 6
      1.1.1 The new cultural policy 6
      1.1.2 The left-winged movement 8
   1.2 The development of the 1980s and 1990s 11
      1.2.2 Review of the cultural policy developments 13
   1.3 Soziokulturelle Zentren 14
   1.4 Critical appraisal 16
2 The structure and goals of Soziokultur nowadays 18
   2.1 The structure of the Soziokulturelle field 19
      2.1.1 Soziokultur on state level 22
         2.1.1.1 Commission of inquiry 22
         2.1.1.2 The Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren 26
         2.1.1.3 The Fonds Soziokultur 29
      2.1.2 Soziokultur on federal state level 30
         2.1.2.1 The Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur 30
         2.1.2.2 The Stiftung Niedersachsen 30
         2.1.2.3 The Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Soziokultur Niedersachsen 31
      2.1.3 Soziokultur on a local level 33
         2.1.3.1 The municipalities 33
         2.1.3.2 The Soziokulturelle centers 33
   2.2 Critical appraisal 36
3 The basic concepts of the evaluation of cultural projects 38
   3.1 The evaluation discourse within the cultural field 40
   3.2 The functions and tasks of evaluations 42
      3.2.1 The methods of evaluations 44
   3.3 The assessment of the complex functioning of art and culture 50
      3.3.1 The intrinsic impacts of artistic offerings 52
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2 Differences between recipients and participants</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 An evaluation framework for Soziokulturelle projects</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Indicators and figures for the evaluation of the goals of Soziokultur</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 An evaluation method for Soziokulturelle projects</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 The limitations of evaluation as a measurement method</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Showcase evaluation design</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1 General method</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Timetable of the evaluation</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3 Evaluation design</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3.1 Goals and Indicators</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3.2 Questionnaires</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Participant questionnaire at the start of the project</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Participant questionnaire after the finishing of the project</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Visitors questionnaire</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix I: Evaluation format</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix II: Interview with Gerd Dallmann</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

The term Soziokultur (socioculture) was coined during the time of the new cultural policy in Germany in the 1970’s. It stands for an interdisciplinary notion of culture, combining several art forms reaching from theater, music, or fine arts in every imaginable appearance, with an accent on less prestige forms of culture like children theatre or cultural activities connected with social movements or immigration. Soziokultur supports the principle ‘Culture for everyone, Culture from everyone’, meaning that the public is animated to be creatively and esthetically active themselves, to become a participant rather than a consumer. The field of Soziokultur consists of several cultural centers, which have originally tried to build an alternative and counterculture to the established and elitist ‘high culture’ institutions and the commercial entertainment culture, creating a “third column” of cultural activity in Germany. Nowadays the barriers between these areas have become more fluid.

Even though Soziokultur forms an integral part of the German cultural system, it still lacks greatly in scientific appraisal, national and particularly international recognition and often seems arbitrary to the outsider, because of its wide ranging and diverse practice. There are very few sources that fathom the history of the field and even fewer that highlight its current appearance. In addition, its offerings and methods are rarely analyzed regarding their effectiveness and positioning in the field. Soziokultur and its grassroots field of action lack the prestige of “high culture” institutions and therefore lack a traditional lobby in the German cultural system. As the field is dependent on public subsidies and funding, these are problems that threaten the existence of the Soziokulturelle centers. Due to the financial crisis, cutbacks had to be made in the regional and local budgets and culture often seems to be the first austerity measure.

Several expert conferences have been held to find indicators for measuring the desired societal impact of Soziokulturelle projects and to find a way of professionalization and development for the field. Especially in the risk of cutbacks, the issue of making the impacts of Soziokultur visible becomes more urgent.

During my placement at an umbrella association for Soziokulturelle centers in Lower-Saxony, I attended several of these cultural policy events and expert conferences that dealt with
these problems of the field. Based on my knowledge gained in evaluation practices in cultural policy during my academic studies, I have often proposed and discussed the value of implementing evaluation in the practice in such conferences and events. Connecting to these experiences, in this thesis I will develop a practical framework for evaluating Soziokulturelle projects through analyzing the basic concepts of the evaluation of cultural projects, building on the groundwork of a thorough study of the history and current appearance of the Soziokulturelle field.

This thesis seeks to achieve two goals. Firstly it aims to add to the identification process of the Soziokulturelle field, which is still very young and still in its institutionalization process in the German cultural system. It still lacks in a thorough scientific appraisal and is often subject to the criticism of arbitrariness, for it generally includes all art forms as well as extremely diverse methods and particularly supports amateur art.

Therefore, as a starting point the first chapter will fathom the history of the Soziokulturelle field and its development. It does so by analyzing the writings of the theoretical agents of the new cultural policy and the notions of the left-winged movements in the 1960’s and 1970’s in Germany, from which Soziokultur advanced. Following, the field’s further development in 1980’s and 1990’s will be examined. The first chapter will conclude with a review on the highlighted developments that led to the origination of the Soziokulturelle centers and ceases with a critical appraisal on the historical and theoretical basis of Soziokultur. In the second chapter more recent articles and official statements will be looked at to highlight the current structure and conclude the goals of the Soziokulturelle field nowadays. The mission statements and publications of the most important actors of the field, on state, federal state and local level, are gathered and analyzed on what aims the Soziokulturelle practice voices nowadays.

These goals that were concluded from the prior research will form the groundwork for the second part of the thesis, which aims to develop an evaluation method for Soziokulturelle projects. A method which makes the impacts of Soziokultur visible can be an important mean in the struggle for subsidies and cutbacks in an evidence-based cultural policy. Moreover a critical reflection of the Soziokulturelle practice helps to make it more transparent for stakeholders, for other fields as well as the general public, and can above all
be a means for its improvement. Therefore in the third chapter the basic concepts of evaluating cultural projects are gathered, analyzed and applied to the inherent qualities of Soziokultur. This will be done by means of the documentation of a German expert conference held on the evaluation of cultural offerings, as well as recent publications on this issue by Gesa Birnkraut and Armin Klein. However the specific functioning and benefits of artistic projects are not highlighted by these sources and thus will be mainly assessed on the basis of a research by Quirijn van den Hoogen.

Concluding from the foregoing findings, in the fourth chapter indicators for the goals of Soziokultur, their indicators and measurements, and an evaluation framework will be developed and presented (compare figure 5 and evaluation format appendix I). The limitations of evaluation as a measurement method will be reflected and the thesis will be completed with an adaptation of the findings to a showcase evaluation design for an actual Soziokulturelle project.

**Notions of culture and art**

The notions of culture and art have a multitude of definitions and a general and uniform classification would limit the complexity of the terms. However it is useful to determine how the notions of culture and art are understood in this thesis.

According to the sociologist Rudi Laermans, culture can be defined as a *socially shared reservoir or repertoire of signs*. This definition is very close to the notion of the ‘extended concept of culture’ that is handled in the field of Soziokultur, meaning the norms and values that people in societies share and that are expressed through the arts, the humanities or even through their activities in daily life. In practice this can be an expression of or a contribution to culture, such as a political discussion, building a community playground, a knitting course or a poetry slam etc. Culture here is therefore what the sociologists Gielen and Van den Hoogen call “the cornerstone of a society”. (Gielen en Van den Hoogen 4)

“Within a cultural community, habits and customs are preserved and it is only because of this that there can be shared meanings and therefore communication and mutual relationships as well. This is exactly why culture is socially integrating and capable of enhancing social cohesion.” (Gielen en Van den Hoogen 4)
Culture therefore creates social structures; it sets the order within a society. Art, however, functions opposed to this: “Whereas culture sets the measure (the rhythm, the regularity) of things and life, art rather sets a ‘dismeasure’.” (Gielen en Van den Hoogen 4) Art functions through rebelling against the known ‘measure of things’ through showing new modes of perception and different possibilities about how culture is subject to contingency (Gielen en Van den Hoogen 6) However, what is a new mode of perception depends on the recipient, which means that the question of what is art to a person does always include an individual assessment. Art arises thus out of an individual, while culture arises out of collective – art can create heterogeneity, dynamic and change in an homogeneous cultural collective. The Soziokulturelle practice lies at a point somewhere between culture and art. The Soziokulturelle centers pursue creating spaces for communication, preserving ethnical or social cultural expressions and serve as a binding factor in a community. At the same point their goal is to stimulate the participants and recipients own creativity, through enabling them to have access to the experience and creation of artistic objects and therefore enable new modes of perception and a new range of possibilities. Not all of the artistic expressions created through the Soziokulturelle practice would be classified as art in the above cited avant-garde sense of the word. These artistic objects and performances may be esthetic expressions of traditional values and beliefs. They can include innumerable forms and manifestations, from purely entertaining to challenging ones. This particular notion about art will be closer discussed later on in this thesis.
Chapter 1

The history and development of the notion of Soziokultur

1.1 The origins of Soziokultur in the 1970s

The German term Soziokultur and its implementation in the cultural field originated during the late 1960s, early 1970s. Its history therefore is a short one, compared to the century long histories of the origins of museums, theaters or concert halls. Soziokultur emerged out of a twofold of simultaneous developments, one activated by UNESCO conferences and initiated by state organs and the other stemming from a self-organization of the people. Starting as a theoretical claim, Soziokultur later evolved into one of the main pillars of the German cultural system.

In the course of the welfare period of the industrial nations of Europe, the UNESCO conference about cultural policy in 1972 in Helsinki advised the countries to take measures against the inhospitality of their cities, which came about with the need for a fast and functional rehabilitation of the cities after the war. In the advice emphasis was laid on the role of culture and therefore the education and support of the variety of cultural workers. A following conference held in 1976 in Nairobi presented practical provisions on how to solve the inhospitality problem, emphasizing the democratic partaking in culture for all social classes, the encouragement of all forms of cultural expression and the buildup of cultural centers. In Germany, under a social-liberal government, the societal democratization through the intensification of the cultural life was declared a state duty. (Stüdemann 23) “Culture for everyone-Culture from everyone” turned into the slogan for a cultural policy

---

1 In the 1950s, after the Second World War, the destroyed parts of the cities in Europe had to be reconstructed very fast and effective. Not having the time or money to spend on the consideration of esthetical questions, lead to a very functional design of the new buildings. By the late 1960s this design was perceived as ugly and inhospitable.
that saw culture as a compensation for social deficiencies and a possibility for enhancing competences.

1.1.1 The new cultural policy

One of the main representatives of the new cultural policy was Hilmar Hoffman. In his book *Kultur für alle. Perspektiven und Modelle*, written in 1979, he stated that it is necessary to rupture the traditional order of cultural life that excludes people through their lack of knowledge, education or habits. The organization of culture in mass, elite or alternative culture as well as its linking to its established institutions, the museum, theater, concert halls, the opera and the library, Hoffman saw as restraining. He argued that already the used language of these institutions creates thresholds that keep people from participating in cultural activities, through a highbrow linguistic usage and terms that need previous knowledge to understand them. This notion is a precursor of the concept of cultural competence and education that is popular in Germany. To participate in cultural activities one has to have the competence to do so and extract meaningful experience out of such participation. This competence can only be gained through its education and contact with cultural offerings. Institutions and projects that pursue these goals, such as to be found in the Soziokulturelle field, thus mediate cultural competence. In the 1970s Hoffmann criticized that Germany’s cultural institutions, instead mediating cultural competence, expected their recipients to already possess it.

Hoffmann pleaded that the new cultural policy should break open these structures and create the general conditions that enable every citizen, no matter which financial, social or educational background, to partake in every kind of cultural activity. The aim was thus to create an accessible culture, which in itself constituted a democratic ambition.

„Eine demokratische Kulturpolitik sollte nicht nur von dem formalen Angebot für alle ausgehen, sondern kulturelle Entwicklung selbst als einen demokratischen Prozess begreifen, der künstlerisches Schaffen, Reichtum einer historisch gewachsenen Kultur und demokratische Gesellschaft gleichermäßen einbezieht. “ (Hoffmann 29)

The approach to democratize society through culture meant to comprehend culture in a holistic way. Hermann Glaser and Karl-Heinz Stahl were the first who brought up the term
Soziokultur in the discourse surrounding the German new cultural policy. Close to the notions of Hilmar Hoffman, they wanted to overcome a comprehension that elevates ‘the world of the humanities’ as the actual culture and therefore alienates culture from the daily life of an individual. This dated understanding of culture evolved under the impact of romanticism and the German idealism and was now criticized by several theoreticians as elitist. To build a strong democratic society, they argued, it would be necessary to create a pluralistic cultural live that actively integrates every level and aspect of society. (Mielke 96)

The prefix ‘Sozio’ in the term Soziokultur was understood as the recombination of culture and life - to make equal opportunities and participation possible. Glaser and Stahl pleaded for a digression from elitist hegemonic culture and a convergence to a pluralistic form of an esthetic practice. (Glaser/Stahl 35 ff)

The scholar Tobias Knoblich states that this meant a break of various traditional divisions, as between the cultural and the civic space, the public and the artist or professional and amateur art. (Knoblich 8) In this context culture returned to be a political medium of communication that moved away from its neutral position. While other fields were characterized by exclusion through language, power, money, education or habits, Soziokultur had the potential to be a venue for societal discourses made available for everyone. As Glaser and Stahl stated, Soziokultur is “der Versuch, vorrangig, neben anderen Aspekten, Kunst als Kommunikationsmedium zu begreifen […], die plurale Gesellschaft auf der kommunikativen Ebene zusammenzubringen”.

Glaser/Stahl 25) These views speak of an extended concept of art and culture. Art is seen as a general medium of communication, a medium that transports meanings and is closely connected to society. Furthermore the concept of culture was no longer limited to the traditional canon of art. The notion of culture now involved the participant’s social reality and their daily life. Different kinds of cultural forms as folk culture, choir singing, Children Theater or crafts, were stimulated by the new cultural policy. However there was not only an emphasis on alternative culture, but also the attempt to free the classical art- and cultural forms from a narrow-minded interpretation and staging, and make them accessible for a new public. Therefore Soziokultur was not seen

---

2 The romantic notion of culture restricted it to a purely intellectual phenomenon that one could reach through the study of the arts. This meant that people from a lower class with less education and spare time were excluded from this culture.
as a decrease of the esthetical standards but as an integration of culture in society.
(Glaser/Stahl 34) To realize the civil right to (have access to) culture the policy makers
initiated the building of cultural centers as places of free access of information, progressing
discourses and engagement.

1.1.2 The left-winged movements

As stated earlier, Soziokultur evolved between a twofold of mutual influencing
developments. Next to the existing social-democratic strategy of modernization motivated
by the agents of the new cultural policy, sociocultural initiatives emerged out of different
left-libertarian movements. They stood for a social utopian alternative, not seeing cultural
practice as a compensation of social shortcomings or a possibility to gain competences, but
as an expression of direct political ambitions. (Stüdemann 23) These public initiatives were
organized by the surroundings of the youth subcultures, the peace-, women-, or ecology
movements or autonomous activists, and also formed spaces of free communication, that
later were united with the centers that evolved out of the new cultural policy, under the
term Soziokulturelle Zentren: “Der Hintergrund der “Karriere” soziokultureller Einrichtungen
ist sicher sowohl in der kulturellen Praxis freier Initiativen, Gruppen und Bewegungsmilieus
zu suchen als auch in den Bemühungen reformorientierter Kulturpolitiker.” (Knoblich 9)

The cultural theorist Horst Groschopp bases the contribution of these movements to the
Soziokultur on six attributes that are ascribed to them. 1. Their exceeded distance from the
state, 2. because of their association structure a closer connection to democracy and
community, 3. thier clear social impetus because of their need for decreasing the social
discrepancies, 4. their preference of educational offerings, rather than entertaining or
esthetical ones, 5. their expansion of the term culture, through seeking worldly equivalences
to everything religious and 6. finally their overcoming of the dogmatic church and the
creation of a new understanding of culture and through free organization and
enlightenment. (Groschopp 379)

Seen as one of the most important impacts within the left-winged movements, is the
development of autonomous youth centers in the seventies. They initiated self-organization
and administration within the cultural field, which until than was not a very common
concept. In practical terms this meant that groups of mostly young people occupied a vacant venue and organized different activities there, from cultural to political ones. The claim for self-administration of these groups and the denial of the public authorities to admit this often clashed in actual street revolts. The result of this conflict was, in the end, the attempt of a form of cooperation in which the municipal administrators would provide means to a self-organized venue without intervening in their form or content. (Mielke 100)

Often cited by the actors of these left-winged movements and theoretically closely connected with the core concept of Soziokultur, is the theoretician Herbert Marcuse and his notion of affirmative culture. His essay Über den affirmativen Charakter der Kultur from 1937 received new attention in the course of the critical discourse of the Frankfurter Schule. In his essay Marcuse pleaded for the passing of the distinction between culture and society, as it originated in Romanticism and was further shaped in the German Idealism. He criticized, just as Glaser and Stahl did later, that this understanding of culture removed it sociologically and in value from societal processes. (Marcuse 58) Firstly because it makes culture available only to a small educated public and excludes other classes and secondly, because this notion of culture is restricted to the world of the mind, as it is only supposed to change the individual from within and it does not call for concrete actions. Marcuse defines this notion as affirmative because it affirms and preserves the dominant societal circumstances. Even if the notion of the world of the humanities had a reformative character at the time of its becoming, because it introduced to the people that there was more to life than the daily grind, the author saw it now standing for the oppression of the masses.

“Hatten zur Zeit des kämpferischen Aufstiegs der neuen Gesellschaft alle diese Ideen einen fortschrittlichen, über die erreichte Organisation des Daseins hinausweisenden Charakter, so treten sie in steigendem Maße mit der sich stabilisierenden Herrschaft des Bürgertums in den Dienst der Niederhaltung unzufriedener Massen und der bloßen rechtvertigenden Selbsterhebung: sie verdecken die leibliche und psychische Verkümmerung des Individuums.” (Marcuse 61)

Therefore the call for the reconnection of culture and life as presented in the theory of Herbert Marcuse and realized in autonomously organized accommodations, was crucial for origination of Soziokultur.

3 See footnote 2, p. 7
This reconnection of art and life was also desired from within the left-winged artistic ranks itself. Its most important agent may be the artist Joseph Beuys whose slogan “Jeder Mensch ist ein Künstler” became popular in the 1970s, especially within the student revolts. Beuys’ comprehensive utopia of the reformation of society, emanated from an extended understanding of art, which he called ‘social art’. The idea that every human is an artist, involved every part of society that includes creative potential, also meaning general production processes. In his interviews and writings Beuys explained his idea of a re-democratization of the social environment asking for a direct governing by the public. The extension of the mind in the face of materialistic politics he sees only possible on an artistic level. (Lange 101) The artist thought of the world as a social organism that had to be designed in a way that everything can be politically active. Beuys explained that the questions surrounding the societal drawbacks were not questions for the political notion, but for the artistic notions, because they asked for the “how”. For example, how are the dependency relations of a human shaped within his job situation? Someone had to take on the artistic notion to answer this question, meaning the question concerned the form⁴. Beuys believed that society had taken a form that operated against the human, as for example economic structures. To reform society one had to think about and create new, more suitable forms of societal organization. To do this, culture and art would be the perfect starting points, because they enhance the self-determination of the human through creativity and allow for new forms to occur. Every individual, Beuys stated, forms society in a new way and is thus an artist. (Beuys 1987 16)

He and his followers were also calling for the buildup of spaces with free access to information and cultural education. “Hier stellen wir das Modell einer Informationsstätte vor. Wir haben ein Interesse daran, daß in der nächsten Zeit so viel wie möglich Informationsstellen entstehen als Schulungsstätten für Freiheit, Demokratie und Sozialismus.”(Beuys 15) Beuys theoretical aims and artistic projects concerning the re-democratization of society and culture can be seen integrated in the diverse strands of the left-winged movements. They tried to break open the societal structures that organized

⁴ In Beuys definition of form he meant the composition or design of things and societal processes. In this notion, to think about the form of something, no matter if this thing was an artwork, a process or any other object, is being creatively active.
culture solemnly in mass, elite or alternative culture and that restrained it to the established institutions, as the museums or theaters. This structure of the cultural field prevented people from having access to culture and was to be reformed so that every citizen would be able to participate. The notions of the left-winged movements, as well as the notions surrounding Beuys were, later termed the movement of 1968 (68er-Bewegung). The field of Soziokultur has its origins in this movement.

1.2 The development of the 1980s and 1990s

In spite of the many similarities between the aims of the new cultural policy and the left-winged movements, there is a main difference to be stated. While the intention of the new cultural policy was to reform the cultural field and benefit from the positive side effects as a desired re-democratization of society, the left-winged movements’ final aim was to actually rupture the old social system and form a new one. Culture is here merely one, albeit an important, part of a utopian project, whereas for the new cultural policy, the reformation of the cultural system constituted its central point. Despite this difference in final goals, in the midst of the 1980s the movements had merged and Soziokultur had further established itself in the German cultural field. 5 Next to traditional cultural venues, as theaters or museums, Soziokulturelle centers were founded and formed a new part in the field. These centers were still autonomously organized but were financially dependent on external sources, first and foremost on stately financing. In the cultural policy the functional reasoning supporting Soziokultur was replaced by a pragmatic policy that was interested in short-term achievements and goals outside the cultural and social space. In the 1970s the engagement of the reformers was prominently meant to help emancipatory concerns and the democratization of society, through enabling cultural participation and activity. In the 1980s

5 One has to note that the institutionalization process in the BRD took longer than in the DDR. While in the DDR the idea of the societal production of culture was very prominent and realized through several cultural institutions that created wide offerings for the public, the BRD held on to traditional cultural venues. After the reunion several of the Eastern-German institution made use of the possibility to merge with the Western beginnings of Soziokultur and animated its development. (Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren 2009)

6 Functional reasoning in German cultural policy meant an understanding of cultural offerings that fulfilled specific, in the case of Soziokultur social, long-term functions in society.
however, cultural policy in Germany was defined by a spectacular festival culture and the awareness that culture can be an economic factor. (Sievers/Wagner 11)

In this context, Soziokultur forfeited some of its critical potential and societal goals in favor of a thriving cultural practice. Stüdemann supports this point by asserting that Soziokultur was reigned by a post-modern ‘anything goes’ mentality – the Soziokulturellen Zentren offered a diverse range of cultural activities but exhausted themselves in an esthetical self-reference, instead of relating to current issues, like the increasing unemployment and impoverishment and the decay of society in traditional social milieus. “Der politische ‘Feldzug’ gegen die kulturelle Affirmation sozialer Ungleichheit kommt genauso zum Erliegen wie die Provokation einer gelebten sozialutopischen Alternative.” (Stüdemann 24) The author claims that Soziokultur begins to understand itself ‘just’ as a complementary addition in the versatile cultural field in Germany and therefore reduces its political power.

This trend is opposed with the beginning of the 1990s. In the face of a growing instability, through globalization, ecological crisis and mass unemployment, and the failure of control mechanisms of the state, facing national debts, the civic engagement becomes popular again. Civic involvement, as promoted by the Soziokultur, is seen as a condition for a strong democracy, within a neoliberal policy that cuts back benefits of the German welfare state. The autonomously organized Soziokulturelle Zentren that arose out of public initiatives, are welcomed by the policy as cost-saving cultural alternatives. Stüdemann, stating that workers in Soziokultur are mostly poorly paid and often working voluntarily, criticizes this trend that can be seen as an effect caused by the occurrence of a post-fordistic work practice.

Post-fordism is manifested in the idea of ‘immaterial’ labor and products, as realized for example in the Soziokulturelle Arbeit, where the creative capability of the workers and the symbolic value of the produced goods are important factors. The labor is structured in small businesses organized by independent cultural producers. Their work is often structured in temporally restricted projects, which is in fact comparable to the project-based work of the Soziokulturelle Zentren. The creative workers are autonomous entrepreneurs that skip from project to project as a freelancer or even work voluntarily. In the post-fordist system that has changed from a product orientated to a symbol orientated market, the keys to success are flexibility and communicative and social skills. It is the informality that governs the shop
With creative work being dependent on immaterial labor, thinking processes and ideas, the worker can easily take his work with him wherever he goes. There are no clear-cut lines between work and free time anymore, unless the worker manages to set these lines himself (Gielen 19). Another line that blurs in this process can be the definition of the job itself, as people are working in multi-disciplinary fields that are somehow connected to creative work. Having not one permanent job, but skipping around different projects, the workers find themselves in a space of constant flux and uncertainty. Workers are not jobless, they certainly have lots of projects to work on, but are most likely unemployed. This model can only function with the existence of a certain work ethic, which most notably can be found in the surroundings of Soziokultur. Still according to the zeitgeist of the 1960s and 70s, the cultural workers are working for the societal cause. The cause has to seem more important than social and financial security. Hence the workforce in Soziokultur is mostly cheap but ambitious, not limited but also not secured by contracts and therefore set an archetypal example of the neo-liberal politics that governed Germany in the 1990s.

1.2.2 Review of the cultural policy developments

To review the cultural policy developments after the Second World War until the 1990s, in which the origins of Soziokultur can be found, a closer look has to be given to the notions of Gerhard Schulze. The sociologist classifies these periods in four guiding motifs. After the war, there was an emphasis on the restoration and fostering of the cultural heritage from 1945 until the sixties, which Schulze names the *high culture motif*. With the beginning of the sixties the *democracy motif* evolved. This accented the popularization of the high culture for the masses and an understanding of culture that had a stronger orientation on the people’s needs. In the end of the sixties the evolving *Soziokultur motif* displaced the *high culture motif*. The policy regarding the care of artworks resigned for an approach that accents the social environment, which followed the creation of the first communication centers, or Soziokulturelle Zentren. While in the high culture motif the educated individual was the main component, in the Soziokultur motif the autonomous, self-fulfilling individual was important. The fourth motif that Schulze names, is the *economy*
motif that developed in the late eighties and is affected by a structural political and economic reasoning.

Comparable to this organization of the cultural policy developments in motifs, Stüdemann structures the above described societal contexts in that Soziokultur evolved under the four terms transformation, secession, addition and integration. Its way starts in the sixties and seventies as a statist reformation of society (transformation) and a social utopia by left-winged movements (secession), over its integration in a versatile cultural field (addition) in the 1980s and finally integrating in a neoconservative civil society (integration) in the nineties.

“Der Weg der Soziokultur führt nolens volens vom etatistischen kulturorientierten Projekt zur Gesellschaftsreform (Transformation) über die Virulenz einer sozialutopischen Enklave der Neuen sozialen Bewegungen (Sezession) zur ablesbaren Integration in die plurale Kulturgesellschaft (Addition) und schließlich in eine neokonservativ verfasste, im Entstehen begriffene Bürgergesellschaft (Integration).” (Stüdemann 27)

The evolution of Soziokultur resulted already in the 1980s in the becoming of the desiderated ‘centers of free communication’ where every citizen could get access to a cultural offering that is closely related to his life. These centers were termed Soziokulturelle Zentren.

1.3 Soziokulturelle Zentren

Even though the benefit and feasibility to give a clear cut definition of a Soziokulturelles center is still under debate, attempts were made to at least sketch a framework. The researcher Joachim Schulze describes a Soziokulturelles center as:

“[…] eine selbstverwaltete, von (Bürger-)Initiativen aus den ‘Neuen Sozialen Bewegungen’ durchgesetzte, aufgebaute und getragene Einrichtung, die eine in der Perspektive politisch begründete und ausgerichtete Kultur- und Sozialarbeit mit hohen Anteilen an Eigenaktivität der Nutzer(innen) entweder selbst leistet oder durch eine entsprechende Infrastruktur ermöglicht. Dabei bietet sie eine (bewusste) Alternative zu profitorientierten oder partei- beziehungsweise verbandskontrollierten Institutionen und kommunalen Einrichtungen.” (Schulze 232)
The core elements of a Soziokulturelle center lay well-grounded in their origins in the movements of 1968 and could develop through the support of the new cultural policy. The organizations arisen from this are autonomously organizing cultural and social offerings with a clear societal and often political impetus. These offerings are aimed to enable as creative as well as organizational participation as possible on the side of the users. The centers are identifying themselves as the executive hand of the Soziokulturelle practice and therefore claim to be an alternative to the traditional cultural institutions.

In the discourse of cultural theorists and actors of the field, defining Soziokulturelle centers, there are several recurring key points mentioned. The autonomy of the center seems to be extremely important, as well in administrative terms as to political orientation. It should not be controlled by any other, party- or organizational, agenda than its own, stemming from its origins as a public initiative. Therefore it also has to be non-profit. Its sociocultural work has a political aim in itself, deconstructing traditional divisions, for example the one between the producer, who determines the content of a cultural work, and the recipient, who can just absorb, through enabling anyone to participate in cultural productions. Consequently, even though seen as whole Soziokultur shares mostly left winged positions, its concept of societal partaking is what defines its political agenda in its years of initiation and draws through until nowadays.

The venues used as Soziokulturelle centers are often old factory buildings or the like, which architectural form and original use, document a distance from the conventional cultural field. (Mielke 103) The buildings have an historical relevance for the people in their surroundings – well known workplaces with a long tradition that lied idle, before being used as a cultural center. The hope is that the buildings are more likely being accepted and visited by the citizens. In addition to their repute, the buildings architecture is not meant to impress as an object of prestigious representation, as museum or opera buildings might be intended. It is a place with a close connection to the people, underlining the ideology of Soziokultur.

It is important to mark that ‘Sozio’ does not mean the same as social. Even though social work may be a part of Soziokultur, its difference is that social work mostly arises out of concrete problems. The term Soziokultur in contrast refers to a more holistic reclaiming of the public space and its creation, not aiming to fix specific issues. (Knoblich 10)
1.4 Critical appraisal

Deductively one can state that the origins of Soziokultur lie in the 1970s, where it arose on the one hand out of the new cultural policy trend that was aiming to democratize the cultural field through enabling access to culture for every citizen and therefore also to contribute to a democratic society as a whole. This meant in practice to enable participation and equal opportunities. On the other hand, there were the left-winged movements creating autonomously organized cultural projects and venues, calling for the breakdown of traditional thresholds, as between culture and daily life or recipients and participants. These two trends merged into one, creating the Soziokulturelle centers. In the following decades of the 1980s and 1990s the institutionalization process of Soziokultur increased rapidly. New Soziokulturelle centers and associations were formed and became a steady part of the German cultural field. Being embedded in societal contexts and dependent on external financing, problems concerning the original concept of Soziokultur arose, as the critique of depoliticization or the arbitrariness of the Soziokulturelle practice shows. However just few scientific sources can be found to document this development. How these problems and progress evolved in recent years will be discussed in the second chapter of this thesis.

Seen as a whole the discourse about the development of Soziokultur is not extremely widespread, just a few authors can be found that engage themselves scientifically in this subject. Therefore the information to be found can seem fragmentary and one sided. This undershoot of scientific appraisal might be because of the fact that Soziokultur is still a fairly young discipline and that an intensified exploration of the subject still will need more time. It is however noticeable that particularly the integration process of Soziokultur in the eighties until the late nineties seems to be the period that is the least explored. There could be a slight reluctance of the actors of the Soziokultur field to critically reflect upon trends that deviate from their former ideology. Further scientific investigation would be interesting and helpful here.

Next to the actual development and implementation of Soziokultur, an important result of this discourse was the beginning of a debate of the functions of culture in a democratic society. The idea of an art practice that locks itself in an ivory tower guarded by a threshold of specific language and knowledge of respective social codes has been highly criticized and
gave way to the becoming of the notion of an integrating culture that fulfills a societal responsibility. Surely this did not cause the complete overthrow of a culture that works excluding or follows the ‘l’art pour l’art’ thought – in the end a “Culture for everyone and from everyone” still might be an utopia- but it changed the face of culture in Germany significantly. In the course of the implementation of a cultural practice that is connected with the people, also traditional institutions reacted to the new impulses. Next to the production and staging of art, different art educational approaches evolved to mediate between the cultural expressions and the people. Furthermore the cultural projects that outspokenly were searching for a societal impact were not limited to the work of the Soziokulturelle centers, but spread throughout the field in versatile forms. Nowadays the Soziokulturelle practice has become an integral part in the cultural field of Germany.
Chapter 2

The structure and goals of Soziokultur nowadays

Introduction

In this chapter a closer look will be taken on the surrounding structure, the subjects and goals of the current Soziokulturelle practice. This will be done by including the different organizational levels, starting at the institutions at national state level, until concluding with presentations of actual Soziokulturelle centers.

The cultural system in Germany is mostly organized at federal state level and differs in each of the sixteen states to a lesser or greater degree. In this thesis the large federal state of Lower-Saxony is taken as an exemplary case for the funding structures of Soziokultur, also the two presented centers serve as showcase scenarios for the direct Soziokulturelle practice. Therefore a “typical” big-scale urban and a rather small-scale rural center have been taken into account.

In general there is notably insufficient scientific appraisal on the field of Soziokultur, which made it difficult to research this chapter. It is based mostly on the (mission) statements of the current actors of the field that are for example declared on their websites, some official (policy) publications and the book Soziokultur und ihre Förderung durch die Länder, which describes the funding structure of Soziokultur. To verify the development following the recommendations of one official policy document, an expert of the field had to be interviewed to get some views on the subject, because there was no further material on it to be found. The statistics used in this chapter were collected by the Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren in 2009/2010 and were published in 2011.

From the beginnings of the Soziokulturelle practice in the 1970s until nowadays, Soziokultur has been established and has established itself into the German cultural field to a high degree. There are over 460 officially recorded Soziokulturelle centers in Germany, where 27 million visits per year at Soziokulturelle events, with rising tendency. (Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren 2011 3) In comparison, the people that attended traditional theater offerings in 2011 are around 19 million (Deutscher Bühnenverein Theaterstatistik) and on
4823 museum institutions, there came 109 million visitors (Institut für Museumsforschung 2010). Roughly that makes 22641 attendants per museum per year, while a Soziokulturelle centers could count 58696 participants (these are obviously not the actually counted numbers per institution, but will differ according to the size and popularity of the institution). These numbers show that the Soziokulturelle centers, in comparison with traditional cultural venues, even though small in number they are intensively visited and can record high numbers of participants.

2.1 The structure of the Soziokulturelle field

Several associations and organizations have been formed, that support Soziokultur, on national state and federal state level, through lobby and public relations work and funding. Beyond that, the cultural policy has accepted and incorporated the Soziokultur as an autonomous cultural field and has developed funding methods for it, which however differs in the sixteen federal states. One of the original agents of Soziokultur, Bernd Wagner, confirms this incorporation of the Soziokulturelle practice:

“[…] soziokulturelle Aktivitäten [haben] seit ihrer Herausbildung in den siebziger Jahren sich zu einem der wichtigen Pfeiler der gegenwärtigen kulturellen Landschaft herausgebildet, die nicht nur für deren Breite und Vielfalt unverzichtbar geworden sind, sondern sich auch durch Qualitäten auszeichnen, die in anderen kulturellen Bereichen weit weniger entfaltet sind.” (Wagner 2004 22)

The Soziokulturelle field has developed a complex structure in the German cultural system. On the state level it is represented by its lobbies, the Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren and the Fonds Soziokultur. Within the cultural policy the main policy bodies that oversee the promotion of Soziokultur is different in every federal state, ranging from ministries of culture (as the Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur in LowerSaxony) to merely the municipalities in Bavaria.

Next to the main organizations, there are several other foundations and funds at which Soziokulturelle centers and projects can apply for subsidies and support. Most federal states have a Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Soziokultur that cares for the interest of the Soziokulturelle centers in their state. Soziokultur is subsidized through the municipalities by 33 percent, the federal state take a share of 13 percent, the German federation, the EU,
funds and other are engaged with an overall 12 percent. The remaining 41 percent of financial means are generated by the centers themselves. This is a high percentage compared to other traditional art institutions, for example the theater statistics of the Deutscher Bühnenverein in 2008/9 show that the theaters only bring in 18,5 of their finances through their plays. Each member of a theater audience in Germany is subsidized with an amount of 99, 31 euro, at the Soziokulturelle centers this amount is just 4, 88 euro.  

(Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren 17/18) These figures are exemplary for the comparison between the funding of Soziokultur and the traditional arts in Germany, which that the institutionalization process of Soziokultur in cultural policy is still not completed. The surrounding structure of Soziokultur nowadays, with its different actors as well as it subsidy flow, is highlighted in the following figure.

7 Unfortunately these figures on state subsidies were not published for museums in Germany.
Figure 1: Structure of subsidies in the Soziokulturelle field
2.1.1 Soziokultur on state level

2.1.1.1 Commission of inquiry

The cultural system in Germany is mainly organized on a federal state level, therefore no state ministry for Soziokultur, or even culture in general, exists. However between the years 2004 and 2007 the German Bundestag initiated a commission of inquiry of the cultural system in Germany. Commissions of inquiry are instruments of political counseling working as a link between science and politics. In these, experts of the respective field and members of the Bundestag from every faction are working on long –term societal questions, which different juridical, economical, social and ethical aspects have to be taken into consideration. (Heyer/Lienig 3) After scientifically exploring the respective issue for the time of a legislative period, the commission sums up their findings and recommends actions to the current policy. However, these recommendations are not binding in any way, legally or otherwise.

In the extensive evaluation of the different cultural fields in Germany also the Soziokulturelle field was explored, through questionnaires that were answered by the different Landesarbeitsgemeinschaften and the responsible ministries and an expert discussion with the agents of several Soziokulturellen centers. The evaluation was supposed to give answers about the supporting organizations of the centers, the subject and audience of their programs, the network between the centers and other cultural institutions, the situation of the full-time employees as well as the role of the volunteers and further specific issues of the Soziokultur as well as a clearance of its definition. (Enquete Kommission 2007)

The commission asserted that the self-assigned duties of Soziokultur are the creation of meeting places that offer intercultural and intergenerational cultural programs. Most of the federal states acknowledge its profound societal relevance and confirm that the centers are almost the only cultural offerings in the rural areas*. The centers engage in a people

---

* Sometimes this is with the exception of communal libraries, but more often these are incorporated within the Soziokulturelle centers themselves.
orientated city/community development. Increasing multi-ethnic communities add to the need of an integrative cultural work. A study of the institute for cultural policy (Institut für Kulturpolitik) shows that Soziokulturelle centers have the highest percentage of migrant participation of all cultural institutions. They are therefore the most important cultural venues that mediate intercultural\(^9\) competence. (Institut für Kulturpolitik 2005 cited by Enquete Kommission 134) The commission states that the recognition of the Soziokulturelle practice grows and finds its way into other cultural forms as well. But because the practice of the centers are so closely related to societal and local needs, the centers differ greatly from each other in their organization and programming. This is however, following the commission, not random arbitrariness but their main principle and method, since it gives them the possibility to react to current circumstances. (Enquete Komission 133) The main goals of Soziokultur that the commission determines from the responses of several actors of the Soziokulturelle field are:

- create participatory cultural work considering all genres, with a focus on children and youth work
- strengthen political and democratic education
- provide non-profit offerings orientated on local needs and the strengthening of the community
- provide low-threshold offerings that also integrate deprived recipients
- encouragement of creative individual activity and the mediation between professional artists and laymen ship (Enquete Kommission 133)

However when the different officials of the federal states were asked on what definition the funding of Soziokultur is based on, the answers differed so greatly, that almost every corner of the cultural field could be included. The commission assumes that the promotion of Soziokultur than is based upon the respective institutions and not on a clear-cut definition. This presents a problem, since it means that the officials within the cultural policy may

\(^9\) Intercultural competence, is the ability to effectively cope and work with people with different cultural backgrounds on the grounds of respect for each other, without one side being the proselytizing one. (Institut für Interkulturelle Kompetenz und Didaktik)
include Soziokultur as an independent cultural field, but do not have a clear idea about what Soziokultur represents and how it is defined. Definite identification factors are missing here.

The problems that the commission detected in the Soziokulturelle field are of a more practical nature. For example concerning the employee structure of the institutions that were run by only 38 percent full- and part time workers and 62 percent voluntary workers, which is a challenge for the amount of programming that is being done at the centers. The few full- and part time workers are paid considerably less than average in the cultural field and are mostly not prepared for their annuity/pension. Adding to this, for financial reasons the few paid jobs are more and more replaced by voluntary work. The assessment also shows that in the centers a sort of self-exploitation is common practice: unpaid long hours, abdication of adequate wage and social services. This work environment contrasts the complex tasks that have to be accomplished on a daily basis. These require a thorough knowledge in several art genres as well as the mediation of them, management skills as well as the balancing between public subsidies and the centers internal cash flow. (Enquete Kommission 134) An environment that is hostile to qualified workers, can compromise the quality and effectiveness of the Soziokulturelle practice in the long run.

“Gemäß ihrer Bedeutung für die Bevölkerung hat Soziokultur vielerorts noch keine entsprechenden Förderstrukturen ausgebildet, was sich in diesem an einigen Stellen, außerhalb des Kreises der Akteure vor allem aber in der qualitativen Analyse für Hessen belegen lässt. Die Tradierung der Haushalte, der fehlende öffentliche Diskurs um Kunst und Kultur, die oftmals in den Haushalten unter “freiwilligen Leistungen” genannten Förderungen im Bereich Soziokultur und die Kürzung der öffentlichen Haushalte lassen die Zukunft der Kulturpolitik in diesem Bereich nicht in einem guten Licht erscheinen und Düsteres erahnen.” (Braach/Hesse 14)

Concluding, the commission expressed six recommendations on how to handle these issues. First, the commission recommends that the federal states should institutionalize the Soziokultur as an independently promoted field and to evaluate its experiences with interculture\textsuperscript{10}, participation and its impact on the quality of life of the citizens. The second

\textsuperscript{10} Interculture develops through the process when at least two cultures impact each other through interaction and communication. In this process the cultures involved are not dependent from one another and are of the same value. In this interaction a new ‘culture’ can evolve, an interculture. (Institut für Interkulturelle Kompetenz und Didaktik)
point is to start evaluating the practice of Soziokultur, so that recommendations can be
drawn on the development of adequate study and education programs that prepare
youngsters for a possible career in the field. In the light of the upcoming generation change
in the Soziokultur, the commission advises to install traineeships in the respective centers.
Furthermore there should be a cooperation program installed in the federal states between
universities and the centers. The fourth recommendation of the commission is for the states
to strengthen the collaborations between the all-day schools and centers that offer children-
and youth work. Fifth, they state that the German federation should sustain the subsidies of
the Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren and advance as an institutional subsidy\textsuperscript{11}. At
last the commission recommends the raising of the financial means of the Fonds Soziokultur
about 25 percent. (Enquete Kommission 137)

These recommendations were made in 2007. Almost five years later an interview with Gerd
Dallmann, CEO of the Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Soziokultur Niedersachsen, shows that
almost none the advices were put into action. Dallmann was one of the experts interviewed
by the inquiry commission. Because there is no literature to be found on the impact of the
commission’s report, for this chapter empirical data on this subject had to be collected.
Dallmann states that even though it was welcomed in the field, that Soziokultur was
acknowledged on state level, the recommendations did not have a vast impact on the field.
He explains that the funding policy of the municipalities is still very diverse and overall, in the
wake of the financial crisis, did not improve. In Lower-Saxony the funding on federal state
level was raised, however not significantly. The recommendation to evaluate intercultural
competences was indeed selectively fulfilled, for example through an in-depth study about
interculture in the federal states. Also the claim to improve the ways of education for
Soziokultur was executed through an in-depth study, a cooperation project with the
University of Hildesheim and a funding program for traineeships was installed, which yet

\textsuperscript{11} Institutional subsidies mean the allocation of financial means for the yearly expenses of the receiving
institution. This can mean the whole or a great deal of the expenses. Although the subsidy has to be applied for
every year, the institutional subsidy resembles a permanent obligation of the state (federal or national) for the
institution. (Krämer/Schmidt) With project subsidies only marked-off projects are subsidized, which means a
higher bureaucratic effort and less money for the institution.
only facilitates a few placements. Dallmann however states, that next to underfunding, the change of generations in the centers can be a problem for idealistic reasons. The current generation was part of the founding of the centers and often finds it problematic passing over responsibilities to a generation that does not have such a strong commitment for their cause. The fourth recommendation, concerning the cooperation between schools and the centers for a better daycare for children and young people, was not equipped with enough means to be successfully executed. The advice to fund the Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren permanently as an institution and to raise the subsidies of the Fonds Soziokultur about 25 percent was not followed.

2.1.1.2 The Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren

In 1979 several cultural venues aligned under the association Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren e.V. to build a network among one another and to strengthen the Soziokulturelle centers. It now is representing more than 500 different Soziokulturelle centers and initiatives in front of the public and political boards. The function of the BSZ is to bring forward the network of the different centers and enable advisory services, skill enhancement, exchange and support. It is the goal of the work of the BSZ to fight for the acknowledgement of Soziokultur, as being seen equally important to established cultural venues and being treated equal under fiscal law as well as when it comes to stately financing.

Comparable to what has been concluded in the first chapter of the thesis, the Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren sees the origins of Soziokultur mostly in the social movements of the 1970s and the encouraging of a new democratic way of life. The new cultural policy helped to institutionalize the Soziokulturelle practice, against a traditionalist policy that was set in its ways. The BSZ describes Soziokultur nowadays as the synopsis out of every cultural, social and political interest and need of a society or a societal group:

„Unter Soziokultur versteht man die Summe aus allen kulturellen, sozialen und politischen Interessen und Bedürfnissen einer Gesellschaft beziehungsweise einer gesellschaftlichen Gruppe. Der Begriff Soziokultur beschreibt aber auch eine kulturelle Praxis mit starkem Gesellschaftsbezug, die sich auf
They state that Soziokultur consists of a cultural practice with a strong connection to society and the current local needs and conditions. This connection of the daily life with art and culture, they see as an addition to the pure elitist promotion of the arts – even though the BSZ sees the old contrast between high culture and Soziokultur as now mostly outdated. They explain that Soziokultur is not against other traditional art forms, but states that it is the highest duty of Soziokulturelle offerings to improve the living conditions of the people through any possible artistic and cultural means. The challenge of Soziokulturelle activities is to enable creative participation and the access to art and culture for as much people as possible, especially those which have it more difficult to gain access to cultural offerings. The public of the centers consist of 22, 9 percent under the age of 20, and 34, 8 under the age of 40, with 20, 3 percent of the total audience with a migrant background.

(Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren 2011 13)

“Soziokultur will Kultur und Gesellschaft in engen Zusammenhang stellen. Soziokultur ist Kulturpraxis, die auf einen freien Zugang für eine breite NutzerInnenschicht angelegt ist. Soziokultur geht davon aus, dass jede(r) Kultur hat und diese aktiv mitgestalten kann. Soziokultur darf nicht auf Kunst eingeengt werden, sondern ist Medium zur Gestaltung einer demokratischen Gesellschaft und politischer Einflussnahme. Soziokultur ist keine Sozialkultur, denn sie reduziert sich nicht auf die Behebung gesellschaftlicher Defizite. Soziokultur ist Vielfalt aus Prinzip!” (Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren [online])

The BSZ notes that the practice of Soziokultur has become more accepted over the years also getting established outside the Soziokulturelle sector. The institutionalization process of the 1980s and 1990s is seen on one hand as a success in the sense that Soziokultur became known by the public and more recognized by the policy. On the other hand the

---

12 Neither the statistics for theater, nor for museums give any numbers on the attendance of people with migrant background, or on the age of their attendants. The statistics for museums do however show that there were efforts made to include program offerings specified for people with migrant background (of 6281 museums, 1856 museums pointed out to have such offerings). (Institut für Museumsforschung 2010) The statistics for theater did show that there does exist theater specifically for children and youngsters (for example, in communities from 200.000 to 500.000, there were 3052 specific plays for youngsters and children, compared to 8474 regular plays in 2011. (Deutscher Bühnenverein 2011)
professionalization and institutionalization were debated by many actors of the cultural field as bound to the adaption to the market, its depoliticization and its loss of emancipatory goals. (Wagner 2004 23) Art and culture is nowadays self-evidently happening in public spaces and every cultural venue offers educational and participative activities that mediate between the art and the recipient. Even though this is a desirable effect of the impact of Soziokultur, this mainstreaming also causes critique about the supposedly lost unique profile of its practice. The BSZ states that the Soziokulturelle centers especially come under critique for their extremely broad offering and therefore for being too arbitrary. Also the decrease of specific political and societal engagement is pointed out by critics.

„Dennoch bleibt die Frage, ob dieses allgemeine Einverständnis, die damit verbundene Etablierung der Soziokultur in Institutionen und ihre Anerkennung quer durch das Spektrum der Parteien, nicht durch einen inhaltlichen Bedeutungsverlust ihres politischen Programms erkauft wurde, ein Bedeutungsverlust, den paradoxerweise ein Überfluß an Sinngehalten hervorrief, die dem Begriff der „Soziokultur“ durch seine erfolgreiche Verbreitung aufgebürdet wurden.“ (Röbke 38)

When the Soziokulturelle practice becomes the ‘common’ cultural practice, it is of course a sign of success, but it also brings up the question: What is the unique function of Soziokultur? The BSZ sees this question answered in the challenge of the key societal issues that the centers focus on currently and that distinguish them from traditional cultural venues. These issues are: the overcoming of prejudices, the highlighting of the climate change and sustainability, finding new forms for the connection of work and life, giving room for underrepresented forms of culture, the rediscovery of failing as an integral part of a creative process and, still, the promotion of the vision by Hilmar Hoffmann that the engagement with cultural values cannot be limited to certain social classes.

(Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren [online])

Not all of these key points belong to the cultural field in the classical sense, but they are approached through an artistic practice. The offer of a Soziokulturelle center is in between cultural and artistic, as well as educational, social, communicative or advisory activities. The BSZ states on their website that the concept of the field of Soziokultur also deals with around 50 percent of the contents of any other field. The way how these different areas are connected with each other and with the local circumstances through a Soziokulturelle practice, should be the specific worth of Soziokultur, according to the BSZ.
2.1.1.3 The Fonds Soziokultur

The main funding body of Soziokultur that gets their financial means from the state is the *Fonds Soziokultur*. It gets ca. 1 million euros per year to allocate further. This is in discrepancy with the amount of projects that are in the application process every year, which would sum up about 10 million euros. (Sievers 5) In a practical sense the Fonds Soziokultur is a funding body that acts as an aid for Soziokulturelle centers to help themselves, through the allocation of grants and default guarantees for time limited projects. An adequate amount of self-generated financial means is expected for the allocation of grants, statistically that means that in a Soziokulturelle project funded by the Fonds their means cover about 30 percent, 45 percent are allocated by other institutions and the remaining 15 percent are generated by the project management. The third-party funds are however decreasing over the last years. (Sievers 5)

The goal of the Fonds Soziokultur is to strengthen the innovation processes and consistency of the Soziokulturelle practice. They fund Soziokulturelle projects that include the people’s daily life and at the same time have an impact on the further development of art and culture, which lays a stronger emphasis on the artistic and aesthetic functions of Soziokultur, than for example the BSZ. However, the Fonds Soziokultur also adheres to the vision that in the end the funding of Soziokultur benefits the esthetical, communicative and social needs and skills of the people. Grants are allocated on the basis that the projects preserve and enhance cultural equal opportunities and the democratic culture and that they engage in cultural education and participate actively in societal life.

The current focus the Fonds sees in Soziokultur, is the encouragement of inclusion, the equal living with each other in spite of all differences. Projects that engage in that subject through unique models of cultural and social participation are specifically supported. (Fonds Soziokultur 2012)
2.1.2 Soziokultur on federal state level

2.1.2.1 The Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur

The sixteen federal states each have their specific organization of their cultural system and the funding of it. To not go beyond the scope of this thesis, only the structure of the cultural system of Lower Saxony will be taken as a specific case study.

In Lower Saxony the Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur (MWK) has the financial means to subsidize different cultural projects and institutions, including Soziokultur. In 2004, the same time the commission of inquiry was initiated, the budget of Soziokultur in Lower Saxony was pruned about 50 percent, leaving only 725,000 euro to allocate to Soziokulturelle centers and projects, while the applications that year added up to the two million mark. After dealing with this budget for seven years, for the period 2011/2012 there were an extra amount of two million Euros available. The different Soziokulturelle initiatives apply at the MWK for investment measures, for example the modification of a center, and project aid for an amount starting at 10,000 euro. Furthermore the MWK facilitates the Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Soziokultur Niedersachsen (LAGS) as an institution. The projects and investments that are granted are recommended by a periodically changing advisory board of professionals of the Soziokultur and other cultural fields and are officially accepted by the current minister of science and culture. The official statements of the MWK concerning the main characteristics of Soziokultur are in line with what is generally emphasized: the focus on active participation of every citizen in a comprehensive cultural practice that engages in current societal issues. (Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur 2012)

2.1.2.2 The Stiftung Niedersachsen

A big foundation in Lower-Saxony that recently addressed Soziokultur as a specific field of subsidy measures, with a financial frame of 250,000 euro, is the Stiftung Niedersachsen. As the MWK, it lets an expert advisory board decide which projects are supported and gives only broad key aspects that the funded projects should include. These are: the enabling of
communication and networking between cultures and generations, through a high degree of participation, and the search for strategies that tackle the problems that go alongside with the demographic change of society.

2.1.2.3 The Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Soziokultur Niedersachsen

A more specific statement on the current main topics of the Soziokultur comes from the Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Soziokultur Niedersachsen (LAGS), an umbrella association for the different Soziokulturelle centers in Lower Saxony. The LAGS functions as a lobby and network for the centers at the federal state level. It represents the centers in front of the cultural policy of the state and offers the possibility of advice and supervision for their members and other non-profit cultural organizations. There are Landesarbeitsgemeinschaften for Soziokultur in almost every state of Germany, everyone with an own specific focal point.

The LAGS sees Soziokultur positioned in the center between art, education and social work, with a connection to city- or regional development and civic involvement. The broader function of the Landesarbeitsgemeinschaften is to develop positions within these correlations from the view of the Soziokultur and to bring these into the cultural political discourses. In their mission statement the LAGS states several key issues that society and therefore the Soziokultur is dealing with nowadays: the demographic change and interculture, cultural economy and cultural tourism, civic engagement and the rural areas that are lacking in infrastructure. (LAGS [online])

The organization states that as the German society becomes older, there are overall less citizens and an increasingly intercultural. Therefore they see the need for a generation comprehensive and intercultural offerings in cultural venues. Communication and networking between generations and cultures are main objectives in the Soziokulturelle centers.

The active partaking of all citizens, through a strong focus on civic engagement, department comprehensive cooperation and the collaboration of professionals and laymen, the LAGS sees as necessary for an effective Soziokultur, but also for an effective society. The stately funded cultural fields are important for the cultural economy as a research and experimental field, especially where there are collaborations between professionals and amateurs and the
encouragement of young initiatives. Soziokulturelle centers are creating an effective infrastructure which enables such experiments. Even though the LAGS sees the position of Soziokultur within the cultural economy as a positive one, it states that there are still doubts about its position within cultural tourism. The active partaking in cultural tourism could hold a solution to the financial problems of the centers, but the close cooperation with the touristic sector could also endanger the Soziokultur to compromise their goals and to be guided more towards financial outcomes.

A significant factor in Lower-Saxony is the strengthening of the cultural infrastructure in the rural areas. There are much less traditional cultural venues to be found in small cities and villages. Soziokultur is an important influence here, because often a Soziokulturelle center is one of the only cultural venues in the area where the people can partake in a cultural offering. In Germany 42 of the 460 Soziokulturelle centers are situated in towns with under 5.000 inhabitants, another 57 centers are in communities with fewer than 20.000 citizens. That means that 21, 5 percent of the centers work in very small rural communities and try to respond to their specific surrounding. Expectations and needs of the public may differ between rural areas and cities and it is always the goal of a Soziokulturelle facility to detect these and address them. (Bundesvereinigung Soziokultureller Zentren 2011 5) The LAGS believes that it is important for any rural center to also detect the changes occurring in the rural regions, as the increase of external people, as immigrants or people from the city, and to create a communicational structure to react to these changes. Almost half of all the members of the LAGS in Lower-Saxony have their offices in the rural parts\(^\text{13}\) of the federal state. They have a noticeable influence on the regional development and the sustainability and communicational structure of the region.

Even though the LAGS states various positive effects of the engagement of and with Soziokultur, it states that the constant underfunding of Soziokultur endangers its effectiveness and even its existence. Rather than funding time-limited projects, they note that it is necessary to build up and strengthen steady structures that support the long-term goals of Soziokultur. (Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Soziokultur Niedersachen 2012)

\(^{13}\text{Which the LAGS defines as region with less than 40.000 inhabitants lacking in infrastructure. (LAGS [online])}\)
2.1.3 Soziokultur on a local level

2.1.3.1 The municipalities

As stated earlier, the municipalities provide a great deal of the financing of the Soziokulturelle centers; however this is almost completely on a voluntary basis. The municipalities do not generally publish official statements on the definition or goals of financing the Soziokultur. In individual cases the reasoning of communal worth and a long-term existence of the centers can be found. With the fundamental cutbacks of most municipalities, the financing of Soziokulturelle venues has also shrunk in various communities and cities, so that already some centers are on the verge of bankruptcy.

2.1.3.2 The Soziokulturelle centers

Even though the organizational structures differ greatly, all of the centers are non-profit organizations providing around half of their incomes themselves and gaining the other half through subsidies and funding. The following figure shows, which strands of their practice the centers perceive as important. They see their main responsibility in the enabling and production of cultural and artistic offerings (for children, youngsters and adults) that form a counterpart to the traditional forms or art and culture and support creative autonomy. To a lesser extent the centers aim for the altercation with intercultural, societal and political and social issues.
To get a closer look at the actual Soziokulturelle practice, two different mission statements of centers in Lower-Saxony will be highlighted as examples for the goals and structure of the Soziokulturelle centers in general. Both an urban and a rural center have been taken into account.

Faust e.V. is an urban Soziokulturelle center in Hannover that was founded in 1991 for a conversion of an old factory to a central point in the neighborhood for Soziokulturelle Arbeit. Building an infrastructure for art, culture, education and social work in its neighborhood and beyond, it has grown into a popular venue for interdisciplinary and intercultural work, which covers almost every aspect of cultural forms and content. It is run by staff of five full-time employees, another three half-time workers and alternating trainees, but often projects and most of the 25 associations that take place at Faust are also run by volunteers. Just as every other of the Soziokulturelle centers Faust e.V. depends on project subsidies but provides around 60 percent of its earnings through income from popular shows and gastronomy.

They present national and international artist, but also support local and regional ones and young talent. In their mission statement they state that they are trying to create a space for
alternative, emancipatory, individual and constructive ways of life, by incorporating all sorts of associations and groups of people in the structure of the center. For example various self-organized migrant associations have the option of using a space and other means at Faust. Their structure is based on the belief in practical solidarity and taking collective responsibility for the whole, therefore the center minds a careful use of resources and economizing. The center wants to create a space for new forms of work and life, including especially deprived people. Faust states that it is trying to be actively involved in discourses regarding societal issues, through organizing debates, workshops and other communicative events. (Faust e.V. 2012)

The rural center Lewer Däle Liebenburg e.V. is solely organized by volunteers. It offers an interdisciplinary cultural range mostly created by people in the region. Structured as an association it has 143 permanent members that yearly pay 20 euro as support for the center. The management and programming is run by a voluntary directorate with four members. In 2011 the Lewer Däle had 5369 people participating in their offerings, in a community with 8620 inhabitants. (Lewer Däle Jahresrückblick 2011) The cultural program is solely financed through project subsidies and project sponsoring; therefore they do not have an average annual balance. (Lewer Däle Liebenburg e.V. 2012)

The center focuses on intergenerational offerings, because most of their members are over 50 years old. Lewer Däle describes it as a specific challenge to make most of their cultural offerings (physically) accessible for the elderly and enable relations between community members, which otherwise would be hard to form. Therefore it tries to include especially people that could be disadvantaged in traditional provincial structures, as newcomers, migrants or the members of the local psychiatry. The center tries to encourage its members not only to take part, but to create activities, so that others may benefit from the existent pool of knowledge and creativity. Herefrom evolved examples like “learning parents”, where seniors help young children with learning deficiencies. (Lewer Däle Liebenburg e.V. 2012)
2.2 Critical appraisal

The recent structure of Soziokultur in Germany is diverse and defined by various actors. The ones actually active in the practical offering of Soziokultur are financially dependent on subsidies given by institutions that are often not directly related to Soziokultur, but to culture in general. This may be one of the reasons that the Soziokulturelle actors are merely funded for specific projects, while the traditional art venues are permanently financed as institutions by the federal states. In general it was difficult to compare statistical results from the Soziokulturelle field to the statistics of the theater and museum field, first because of different methods and presentation and second because the theater and museum field seem to lack thorough and transparent statistics that can be found in public inventories. However the documented numbers show that the Soziokulturelle field, despite its relatively small number of venues and it’s, compared to the traditional venues, low funding, has a comparably high number of attendants and participants.

Furthermore the field of Soziokultur is still lacking in scientific appraisal. The only sources that are available on the content and impact of Soziokultur are the mission statements, publications and debates of its recent actors. These publications are determined by a biased objective, for obvious reasons. Nonetheless these publications clearly show that Soziokultur is the intersection between artistic, cultural, societal, political and social discourses. In spite of its diversity, after a thorough study of the statements of its recent actors, one can find reoccurring aims and goals mentioned. These goals are to:

1. Enable creative participation for all citizens, no matter what background
   1.2 Through creating a cultural infrastructure
   1.3 Through a focus on intercultural and intergenerational efforts

2. Strengthen democracy
   2.2 Through enabling civic engagement and participation
   2.1 Through building an awareness for current societal issues
3. Respond to current local needs and conditions
   3.1 Through engaging in urban development

4. Form a necessary addition to the traditional forms of culture
   4.1 Through giving room to underrepresented forms of culture
   4.2 Through enabling artistic experiments
   4.3 Through forming connections to other fields (as education, politics, ecology etc.)

5. Improve the living conditions of the citizens through artistic, cultural and social means

As can be seen, these goals for a great deal center around social impacts of culture and art. However, the issue of how exactly the Soziokulturelle offerings can affect people, communities or even society is rarely broached in the found publications. The attempts to evaluate Soziokultur are merely concentrated on quantitative facts and numbers, as for example the statistic documentation of the BSZ is. This does not really grasp the qualitative essence of what Soziokultur aims for. The following chapters of this thesis attempt to fill this scientific gap through analyzing different attempts to evaluate the social impact of culture and then using these results to find an appropriate form of evaluation for the above named goals of Soziokultur.

Clearly there is also an economic impact of Soziokultur possible, for example when urban quarters are revalued through urban development; however this is not a specific aim of the engagement of the Soziokulturelle practice in urban development and therefore will not be taken into account within this thesis.

---

14 For example through functioning as a mouthpiece for otherwise not heard groups or organizing petitions etc.
Chapter 3

The basic concepts of the evaluation of cultural projects

Introduction

In the third chapter the basic concepts of evaluating cultural projects, concentrated on the evaluation of their qualitative impacts, are gathered, analyzed and applied to the inherent qualities of Soziokultur.

In a first step the discourse of the German cultural field about the evaluation of cultural offerings is shortly broached, through highlighting statements made in conference texts or in researches. Following, the different structural possibilities, when executing an evaluation, are gathered and explained. This will be done through highlighting the notions regarding the evaluation of cultural offerings drawn from the documentation of the conference Evaluation in der Kulturförderung (Evaluation in cultural funding) as well as from recent books of two German cultural theorists, Gesa Birnkraut and Armin Klein.

In a third step the specific functioning of the impact of artistic offerings is addressed, noting also the differences between participation and reception. Here specific researches on the impact of arts will be taken into account, foremost the notions on the functioning of the arts of Quirijn van den Hoogen and Hans van Maanen.

Clearly it is not the aim of this chapter to find an assessment for the whole Soziokulturelle field, but to find a way to evaluate Soziokulturelle projects. This makes sense because of two reasons: firstly, because a project is a manageable frame – a time limited process with a starting and an ending point where causal chains are possibly easier to be detected and stated (though projects can possibly develop into a longer lasting offering). Secondly, because, as stated in the previous chapter, the Soziokulturelle practice is mostly based on project (and not institutional15) subsidies from public funds and it should be in their interest as a stakeholder, to analyze the effectiveness of the projects they are financing.

15 See footnote 11, p.29
It is important to note that this chapter does not aim to find evaluative methods for artistic quality, in the Soziokulturelle practice or in any other artistic offerings. This is because the Soziokulturelle practice is not limited to artistic offerings, but includes much broader concepts, not all containing traditional art forms. It is important to find an evaluation frame that can be applied to most of these offerings. This frame will focus on the social and societal effects of the cultural projects. However the specific qualities of artistic offerings regarding social impacts will be highlighted at length.

The economic impact of culture will not be highlighted in this thesis, as the actors of the Soziokulturelle field are non-profit organizations funded through the state and do not pursue to have an economical, but rather societal and social impact on their surroundings.

Concluding from the foregoing findings, in the fourth chapter indicators for the goals of Soziokultur, their indicators and measurements, and an evaluation framework will be developed and presented (compare figure 5 and evaluation format appendix I). The previously concluded goals are used as a guideline for evaluating Soziokulturelle projects: if a project is funded as Soziokultur, it has to be possible to identify it as such. Therefore, however diverse the offerings and projects are, they should contain core elements of its field. If this is not the case, the Soziokulturelle centers risk sliding to arbitrariness, which is one of the already stated points of critique raised against them\(^\text{16}\).

The limitations of evaluation as a measurement method will be reflected and the thesis will be completed with an adaption of the findings to a showcase evaluation design for an actual Soziokulturelle project.

---

\(^{16}\) see p. 27, 31/32
3.1 The evaluation discourse within the German cultural field

The Society for Evaluation (Gesellschaft für Evaluation e.V.) in Germany already deals with the subject of evaluation since 1997, but only recently started to think about culture as an individual subject in 2007. This shows that in the German cultural field evaluation is a rather young topic. (Birnkraut 9) The chairman of the German cultural council (Deutscher Kulturrat) Max Fuchs complained several times that evaluation should be an integral part of the cultural policy in Germany, which currently, is not the case. (Max Fuchs 2004 81)

Evaluation has become a highly discussed topic over the last years within the cultural world, in Germany and other Western countries. Seen by the cultural politicians as the long hoped for instrument for finally measuring the effects of the cultural projects that are financed through public taxes - by the cultural producers it is feared as a means to control the freedom and quality of art and culture, which they would rather not see put into pre-defined frameworks.

The CEO of the Swiss fund Pro Helvetia Pius Knüsel points out the potentials of this heated discourse within the cultural field. He states that because it is public money that is spend on culture, the public should have a right to follow the processes. Evaluation enables this, because processes and goals become visible and more transparent. (Knüsel 32) Also the scholar Armin Klein stresses this point: “Mit Hilfe begleitender und/oder abschließender Evaluationen soll fest- und sichergestellt werden, dass eine Kultureinrichtung tatsächlich das erreicht hat, was sie intendiert hat und für was sie öffentliche Mittel erhalten hat.” (Klein 293)

Furthermore Knüsel and Klein believe that it is important that the producers of cultural offerings reflect on their work constructively to achieve what they aim for. However here lies a problem, as Knüsel describes, because there is a general suspicion within the cultural field against being checked and controlled. One often cited reason against this control is the adjured ‘freedom of the arts’, or the belief that it is impossible to measure things such as the impacts of culture and art. Knüsel states that this does not count true and that these doubts against evaluations are only claimed to prevent a possible and feared cut of financial means, when a negative outcome should be revealed. (Knüsel 32-34)
The scholar Armin Klein supports this view in his book *Der exzellente Kulturbetrieb*, stating that the claim that art and culture are not measurable is made by the cultural producers purely as a protection against criticism and to preserve their institutions. However, Klein explains, it is true that such complex matters as cultural and artistic offerings should not be measured by purely quantitative means, (Klein 69) as there are qualitative matters at stake in these offerings.

To constructively participate in this discourse, the first question that needs clarification is: What exactly is meant by an evaluation of a cultural offering?

A general definition of the term evaluation is given by Reinhard Stockmann, the director of the Center for Evaluation (Centrum für Evaluation Ceval) at the University of Saarbrücken, in his essay for the congress *Evaluation in cultural funding*. He defines an evaluation as an important instrument for the generation of know-how. It is executed to collect and interpret information to finally draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the cultural project from this assembled data. (Stockmann 47)

More specifically aimed to clarify the evaluation of cultural offerings, the writer of the book *Evaluation im Kulturbetrieb*, Gesa Birnkraut, notes that an evaluation in cultural institutions should focus on the creation of knowledge and the initiation of learning processes. (Birnkraut 17) As it can be seen in the statements ruling the current discourse the point of legitimization in front of stakeholders should not be underestimated, as they are interested in an effective advancement of the subsidized institutions and the success of their funded projects.

Birnkraut also notes that the results of an evaluation should not be seen as definite facts, but are, and should be object to vital discussion: “Und es wird als besonders wichtig angesehen, dass die Ergebnisse der Evaluationen Diskussionsbasis sind, dass es sich selten um eine feststehende Aussage handelt, sondern um diskurswürdige Daten.” (Birnkraut 17) For the above mentioned definitions are still very general, a closer look has to be taken on the methods and implementations of evaluations.
3.2 The functions and tasks of evaluations

The ideal function of an evaluation is to check the aspired aims of the project - firstly to benefit from the knowledge gained, within the organization itself, secondly to provide that knowledge for others and thirdly to present the results to stakeholders outside the organization. These are all important reasons to strive for initializing evaluation within the practice of Soziokultur. It could be a means for improvement of the processes, for the organization itself, as well for others if the evaluation is made transparent. This can be especially useful for the exchange of best practice models between professionally and voluntarily run venues. Furthermore a well-documented evaluation of the successes of Soziokulturelle projects can function as a legitimation of their funding in front of stakeholders and policy.

In his essay Stockmann illustrates the specifical tasks an evaluation has to perform. These are monitoring the process of a project; checking the aspired goals of the evaluated project; checking the (entire) impacts of the project; checking the relevance/significance of the projects content and method, and finally look for causal relations between the project and the goals and impact. (Stockmann 54) These tasks all count true and should be included in the evaluation of cultural or Soziokulturelle projects. Especially the third task is interesting here; since it highlights that there can be impacts of the project that are not predicted by the formulated goals. Therefore there has to be given room to the assessment of unpredicted impacts. The checking of the relevance of the project consists of the question, whether there is a demand for the project. However within cultural and Soziokulturelle projects this means also if there is the artistic and societal need for a project. This does not have to include a large number of people attending it, but can mean that it gives room to underrepresented or innovative form of culture. The last task, detecting causal relations in cultural evaluation between a project and its impacts is a complex subject, for it deals with qualitative data, and will be highlighted later on in this chapter.

These tasks Stockmann describes are performed to fulfill several possible functions of regular evaluations, similar to the ones stated above: first the gaining of knowledge, second the exertion of control, third the creation of transparency and enabling a discourse, and
fourth the documentation of success (the legitimation in front of stakeholders). (Stockmann 49)

Even though written for a conference specific to the evaluation of cultural funding and offering, in his essay Stockmann names mostly functions and tasks that could also count true for any project, other than cultural. Adding to these non-specific functions and tasks of evaluations the scholar Hildegard Bockhorst tries to specify reasons for taking up the challenge of an evaluation in a cultural institution. These are:

1. To support and improve the practice
2. To encourage quality management processes
3. To generate original data for the development of concepts
4. To get to know the interests of one’s users better
5. To detect how the arts and culture operate
6. To check which of the claims of impact, associated with the competences the user gains through cultural education, can bear up to scientific standards
7. To learn and document, if the structure are effective as promised
8. To encourage self-monitoring processes in institutions

(Bockhorst 2008 28)

Again, all these named tasks and reasons can count true for the evaluation of cultural projects. However, yet again most are very practical tasks that concern organizational processes, which are also dealt with in other than cultural institutions. The more specific task that Bockhorst determines is, for one, the assessment of how arts and culture operate. This is such a general and wide-ranging claim that it seems unrealistic to find an answer to it in a simple evaluation. However it is an important point to note, because an evaluation of a cultural and artistic offering should take up the challenge to detect the specific impacts and benefits of their practice. This point will be assessed at length later on in this thesis, for it is a complex matter to detect. As well the sixth point is specific to cultural and artistic offerings fathoming which of the claims of impact of cultural education can bear up to scientific standards. Here it had to be clarified who would be the one claiming these impacts. In the Soziokulturelle practice, it should be the organization formulating them and openly discuss them with as well their possible stakeholders and their participants.
Adding to these tasks and functions, within the Soziokulturelle field another possible function of evaluations is important. As already stated in the introduction, an evaluation that checks if the project does include one or more of the core elements of Soziokultur, which were determined in the second chapter, can enable an identification factor within the field. Thus an evaluation can also be a mean to indicate the affiliation of a project to Soziokultur and allows its organizers to check the relevance of the project against the core elements of the field, as well as demonstrating this against possible stakeholders.

From these findings several functions and tasks of the evaluation of cultural offerings can be concluded. It is expedient to check if the developed evaluation will actually fulfill the required tasks of an evaluation: this means checking the aspired goals of the project, as well gives room to the checking of other, maybe unexpected, impacts. The evaluation should indicate causal relations between the project and its impacts. It should point out the relevance and effectiveness of the projects content and methods. If it is an artistic project that is being assessed, the evaluation should indicate its specific benefits and impacts.

Adding to this an evaluation of a Soziokulturelle project should enable an identification factor within the field, through looking at and checking the core elements of Soziokultur.

3.2.1 The methods of evaluations

There are different methodological approaches that can be applied during an evaluation; the most suitable are presented in the following passages.

Firstly, Stockmann explains, it has to be chosen between an internally and an externally conducted evaluation. An internal evaluation is conducted by the people who also execute the project, with the benefit that they have expertise on the subject and they can immediately implement their findings. The downside is however that these organizers are not impartial to the project and most likely want it to be a success; therefore their evaluation could be biased. Another issue can be met when even though the expertise concerning the topic of the project may exist, in the usual case there is no knowledge present in the organizations concerning the conduction and interpretation of evaluation data. However it is the more cost effective option, which is of main concern for Soziokulturelle centers.
The upside of an external evaluation is that it is conducted by an impartial professional that is familiar with effective evaluating methods. However, the disadvantage here is that someone external monitoring the project, can be intimidating for the project members and that it is an extra expense factor. (Stockmann 56) Both of these evaluation forms are to be made, in the best case scenario, accessible not only to the organization itself, but also to stakeholders, the participants and possibly other Soziokulturelle centers.

Birnkraut assesses the process of evaluations closer. She points out that there are three times when an institution can start an evaluation (internal or external). The first is a **front end evaluation** that evaluates structures, offerings and concepts, before being implemented. That means that it evaluates something that not yet exists in the institutions reality, often through trying to detect the requests of ones users and implement those in new concepts. The second is the **formative evaluation** that monitors processes, as for example in current cultural projects. It has the benefit to document interim results and goals. If expected interim goals are not reached, the project management can reroute their project. The **summative evaluation** checks, if the expected goals are reached at the end of the project and gives a review on the whole process. (Birnkraut 42/43) In most cases, it makes sense for the evaluators of a Soziokulturelle project to use a mix of the formative and the summative method, to possibly adjust aspects of the project and finally document if the expected aims were reached. It can however, make sense to also use the front end method, for it is one of the main goals of Soziokultur to respond to the needs of their participants. Through a front end evaluation a Soziokulturelle center could detect if their project plan actually reacts to current local circumstances. Not included in these three forms that Birnkraut names, is the option of a long-term evaluation which assesses the sustainability of the possible effects after the project is over. Even though this would be a very interesting and useful approach, it is also a very complex process, for it is almost impossible to detect clear causal relations between the effects and the cause after a project has ended, and it is also a highly cost-intensive process.

Birnkraut and Klein illustrate the process of a general evaluation as a cycle, wherein every step affects the following steps. Starting with a project, the organization has to ask what
they strive to achieve and therefore determine their **aims and goals**. This seems to be an obvious point, but is in fact not always the case. Klein stresses this through stating:

„Die durchaus sinnvolle öffentliche Finanzierung meritorischer (Kultur)güter, die durch Steuermittel (und damit durch den individuellen Konsumverzicht eines jeden Einzelnen) getragen wird, sollte deshalb in Zukunft ersten mit einer klaren Zielorientierung (was soll mit diesen meritorischen Gütern erreicht werden?) und zweitens mit einer effizienten Wirkungskontrolle (werden die angestrebten Ziele tatsächlich erreicht?) verbunden werden.“ (Klein 68)

This is an issue especially faced in the Soziokulturelle field, for it is so diverse in its nature that officially there are no general goals formulated for the Soziokulturelle practice. The goals that were formulated in the second chapter can be used here as a framework, next to more specific aims and goals, which are formulated by the organizers of the Soziokulturelle project that is to be evaluated.

Klein states that the most crucial point of an evaluation process is the formulation of **indicators**. These determine how to measure and show the achievement of the formulated aims and goals and therefore imply the success (or failure) of a project and will be discussed more thoroughly later on. (Klein 315)

Following the project is carried out. In a subsequent step, a **review** of the project is undertaken and recommended actions for the following project are concluded. (Birnkraut 53) Birnkraut emphasizes Kleins critique by stating that besides the actual execution of the project, the clear and transparent definition of goals and indicators as well as the review of the project are critical points in cultural institution that are often neglected. (Birnkraut 54)

A thorough description of the procedure of the evaluation of a cultural offering that includes the essential points just named is given in a figure by Max Fuchs (86) and will be used as a guideline for developing an evaluation method for Soziokulturelle projects.
This figure sums up and specifies the before mentioned steps. In an evaluation, one first has to clarify the subjects that are to be evaluated. Fuchs determines this step as the formulation of a problem statement. However, the formulation of only one comprised problem statement can be limiting for the complex and diverse goals of some projects,
therefore this thesis will make use of the more general formulation of several evaluation subjects. In a second step methodological questions have to be solved in relation to the evaluation subjects; such as if the data is internally or externally conducted, if one uses a formative, summative or, even though not mentioned by Fuchs, front-end evaluation etc. Following the goals and indicators are determined and an evaluation design is developed. This means that questionnaires, group feedbacks or interviews etc. have to be developed, depending on what are the most suitable methods for the goals pursued. Succeeding the evaluation is executed, concluding interim and final results and their assessment, a critical reflection on the evaluation and finally implementing its results.

When planning an evaluation one has to realize that there are different categories of the data that can be detected. There are the quantitative measurable input and output data, as the time and costs that went into the project and the number of participants etc. In case of the generation of qualitative data one can evaluate the outcome and the impact of a project. (Birnkraut 45/46) The outcome looks at the quality of the results, such as the benefits to the participants.

For the data that deals with long term effects, which are not only at use for an individual but for the society at large, Birnkraut uses the term impact. (Birnkraut 45/46) This can mean for example the social cohesion in a community. To get a clear assessment of such impacts it needs a long-term evaluation, which carries on after the project is over. This however is often very cost and work intensive and realistically will not often be taking place within cultural institutions, for there are not enough means for such a process.

Birnkraut explains in her book that the identification of key figures, or indicators (she uses these terms synonymic), is the most important and also most difficult part of an evaluation of a cultural project. Their function is to make the expected goals measurable. There are quantitative as well as qualitative key figures. The quantitative figures measure monetary or metric matters (Birnkraut 63), such as economic output or attendance and are therefore often perceived as hard evidence.

In opposition, qualitative figures are often criticized for being vulnerable to subjective interpretation. Birnkraut however notes that this criticism could also be raised against quantitative data, as it is just as open to subjective interpretation. For example, a high
number of attendants at an exposition at an arts gallery can mean that the gallery knew well what the likings of their public were. But it can also mean that the gallery chose to show art that hits the public taste instead of something innovative or unknown. The scholar states that for the correct assessment of key figures, their effective linking to the expected goals is essential. (Birnkraut 63/64)

Qualitative data chart effects such as the innovation of artistic aspects or the change of perception of the recipients/participants which is more complex to put in numbers. To generate data responding to these aspects, Birnkraut recommends that one has to assemble statements of the participants before and after the cultural offering, as well as conducting personal interviews and group feedback. The difficulty here lays in the interpretation of such statements as well as putting them into comparable frameworks.

Birnkraut suggests that to get comparable results, qualitative data should always be combined with quantitative data. To illustrate her point, the scholar gives an example of the evaluation of the civic participation in a community center. In this case the scholar would recommend measuring the quantitative key figures of how many volunteers are involved in relation to professionals; the number of volunteers involved in management responsibilities in relation to professionals; the number of participants of the community in relation to other users. Furthermore qualitative statements concerning the time and energy spent in relation to the quality of the work results and the input of coordination, time and energy spent on volunteer management in relation to the accomplishments of the volunteers have to be assessed. The scholar states that through the mix of these key figures it is possible to give a statement about the intensity of civic participation in the center. (Birnkraut 69)

It is important to note that qualitative results however, can be made quantitatively measurable through using questionnaires that include multiple choice questions. If the questions and possible answers are posed clearly, this can simplify an assessment process for the evaluator and the participant, because it asks for less effort. Nonetheless, such questions are not a complete replacement for open questions that are answered freely, because only these can detect real individual notions as well as unpredicted impacts. A mix of both should be used.

The researcher Birnkraut uses the term key figures and indicators interchangeable. This is a
point, which this thesis will not follow. It seems that the scholar aims to count qualitative data just as quantitatively, but does not actually give a clear method for it. The statements that could be collected, to detect qualitative data, are not the same as operating figures; they stay qualitative and interpretable throughout the evaluation.

Additionally, when talking about the impact of a cultural offering, in this thesis, the personal outcomes, as well as the possibly following societal effects are meant, with the realization that long-term impacts can only be effectively detected through long-term evaluation.

Furthermore it has to be noted that Birnkraut seems to simplify the issue of qualitative data in artistic cultural offering and does not make an attempt to grasp the complexity of the subject. To really assess the impact of cultural and artistic offerings a closer look has to be taken on the specific goals of Soziokultur and cultural theory.

3.3 The assessment of the complex functioning of art

As is shown in the self-conception of the Soziokulturelle centers\textsuperscript{17}, more than half of their program offerings aim to be artistic in nature. Therefore a closer look has to be given on the evaluation of the specific functioning of artistic offerings.

Francois Matarasso, who was one of the first researchers to do a large-scale evaluation on the social impact of community arts, suggests:

“The greatest social impacts of participation in the arts – and the ones which other programmes cannot achieve – arise from their ability to help people think critically about and question their experiences and those of others, not in a discussion group but with all the excitement, danger, magic, colour, symbolism, feeling, metaphor and creativity that the arts offer. It is in the act of creativity that empowerment lies, and through sharing creativity that understanding and social inclusiveness are promoted.” (Matarasso 1997 80)

This statement shows that Matarasso believes that there is specific value to artistic offerings that other offerings do not share, namely the mediation of critical reflection. It is important to take a closer look on the impacts that are specific to art, and should be treated in an evaluation as such, and those which are not.

\textsuperscript{17} See figure 2, p. 34
The reviewed scholar Gesa Birnkraut advises to assess personal statements of the recipients of artistic offerings, to gain insight on the outcome and impact of these offerings. (Birnkraut 104) This means that the evaluator assesses statements on what the recipients experienced throughout the offerings, to eventually explain their impact. This view complies with the method used by Matarasso in his research *Use or ornament?*, for which he used in-depth interviews and questionnaires to form conclusions on the social impact that the participants of several community art projects experienced. He put those statements into frameworks concerning the impact of art on personal development, social cohesion, community empowerment and self-determination, local image and identity, imagination and vision and finally health and well-being. From his findings Matarasso inferred that, although the conducted statements were very diverse, it is possible to say that well organized cultural offerings are able to impact people and their surroundings in a positive way.

However this method, and particularly how it was applied in his Matarasso’s research, has got its limitations, some of them also noticed by the scholar himself. A critical review on the research was written by Paola Merli. In this review she states that Matarasso’s research design was flawed because it had neither control groups nor a long-term assessment of the impacts and therefore the research could in no way proof causal relations between the participation in the arts and the social impact. (Merli 110) That the absence of hard-proof for a causal relation in evaluations of cultural offerings is problematic is supported by the scholar Joshua Guetzkow in his paper *How the Arts Impact Communities*, stating that:

“As with much social research, arts impact studies typically suffer from selection bias problems, which make it difficult to identify clearly the causal role of the arts. This problem is usually expressed by the truism that ‘correlation is not causation.’ For example, research indicates that people who participate in the arts are healthier and happier [...]. But, does this mean that arts involvement makes people healthier and happier, or that such people are more likely to get involved in the arts?” (Guetzkow 17)

18 One should note that Matarasso did write a response to Merli’s critique stating that his research was not meant as an academic but as an exploratory study to help the practice and therefore should only be criticized as such. “Above all, Merli criticizes the study for not doing what it does not set out to do, expecting it to adopt methods such as longitudinal analysis and control groups, which would be challenging in a major university research project, and were never realistic or appropriate in an exploratory study of this kind.” (Matarasso 2002 340)
Guetzkow further notes that from a social policy point of view, the question is not if these cultural offerings have a social impact, but if they have a stronger impact than other offerings, as for example an intercultural soccer game. This argument however does not count completely true for the cultural field, since (at least in Germany) the cultural policy is concerned with the support and assessment of cultural offerings and there is the established belief that art and culture is not merely funded for its social impact. Nonetheless it is important, especially when a cultural practice outspokenly aims for social goals, to critically review if and why their used methods are effective.

In his research Matarasso also notices these limitations, but takes that the arts cannot be completely fathomed and stay intangible to some extent is exactly why they are worthy to society.

“This should remind us that people, their creativity and culture, remain elusive, always partly beyond the range of conventional inquiry. There are intangible factors at work, invisible changes and unquantifiable benefits. There are positive and negative outcomes, and some which are both, or change from one to the other. If we recognise that this is why the arts are important to social development, rather than becoming frustrated at our inability to fit them into an established frame, we are more likely to use them successfully and to recognise the outcomes.” (Matarasso 75)

Not all off the internal processes and resulting impacts of an artistic experience can be clearly dissected; a certain opacity is inherent to the personal and complex functioning of experiencing art. However, with these limitations in mind, the above assessed notions do show that it is possible to understand the functioning and impact of the arts better, through analysing the experiences of art recipients more thoroughly.

3.3.1 The intrinsic impacts of artistic offerings

The theoretician Max Fuchs also poses the question Wozu Kunst? in one of his papers, fathoming the functioning of art in society, through the study of anthropological, philosophical and art theoretical notions. Again, here the notion is defended that art should be studied from a point that tries to understand how individuals experience it. Fuchs states that the cultural (here meaning societal) relevance of art emerges out of its significance for
the people. Art would have no relevance if it there is no one experiencing and eventually benefit from it:


From his study he concludes several cultural (societal) functions of art:
- the development of a time and space consciousness
- the forming of an identity of individuals and groups
- the creation and resistance of plurality
- the offer of interpretations and world visions
- the symbolization of communal experiences
- the offer of life styles and descriptions
- the de-legitimization of processes in societal areas (political, economical, juridical etc.)
- the reflection of current forms of morality
- the self-observation and description of individuals, groups, societies, periods
- the overcoming of fears in the light of societal and individual risks
- integration (Fuchs 2005 14/15)

These functions partially line up with the notion of Soziokultur that artistic and cultural offering are specifically able to fulfill societal and social goals. However, these functions could for the most part also be fulfilled through other means. For example, to overcome fears in the light of risks one may also use an educational or psychological training, which could be just as or even more effective. To actually find and determine the benefits of artistic and cultural offerings, over others, there has to be taken a closer look on the practical functioning of an art experience.

In his dissertation Performing arts and the city the scholar Quirijn van den Hoogen supports the notion that the impact of artistic offerings should be studied through the assessment of the experiences of the recipients:

“The research into the functioning of art in society cannot be based upon specific properties of cultural objects themselves, but should be based on the specific nature of the experience of such
objects. The functioning of culture and art in society occurs through the values that cultural activities generate for individuals. These values can yield certain functions for the individual, and both the individual values and functions can yield functions on a collective level.” (Van den Hoogen p.237)

Van den Hoogen distinguishes between intrinsic and extrinsic impacts of art. The intrinsic impact of an artwork is generated through the specific form of communication between the recipient and the artwork; therefore the artwork cannot just be exchanged with a different one, or even a different experience. The impact is thus dependent on the aesthetic experience of the recipient. Extrinsic impacts are not related to the experience of the specific communication that takes place between the artwork and the recipient, but are related to the whole experience (Van den Hoogen 41); as for example that in the process of making an intercultural musical one will meet people with other ethnic backgrounds and make new relations. These experiences could be provided through other activities as well, as for example through an intercultural sports game.

The intrinsic impact of experiencing or, in the case of Soziokultur, actively participating in an artistic offering is thus marked by the generation of an aesthetic experience. However there are two different kinds of aesthetic experiences. Therefore there are also more or less extensive impacts possible that are specific to an artistic offering.

The scholar Hans van Maanen makes a distinction between art that generates a non-artistic aesthetic experience and art that generates an artistic aesthetic experience for the recipient. When a recipient is confronted with the specific properties of an artwork and he or she interprets it in different ways. If this confrontation does not challenge, but without interruption reassures the views and perceptions of the recipient, one can speak of an aesthetic experience. If however there is a gap between the artwork and the perception of the recipient, he or she needs to use their imagination to make sense of the artwork. This may lead to the changing of their beliefs and conception. This process is what Van Maanen calls an artistic aesthetic experience. (Van Maanen 2004 247-251)

Van den Hoogen analyses this distinction by looking at the intrinsic values and functions of these different experiences and their specific beneficial interdependence with their extrinsic values and functions, which are important when looking at an evaluation of an artistic offering.
As depicted in the figure, there are two intrinsic values generated by a non-artistic aesthetic experience: the empathizing with the imagined emotions evoked by the artwork and the excitement generated through the experiencing of non-present worlds. These values can lead to the sublimation of the recipients needs as well as to their satisfaction. The artistic aesthetic experience gives rise to new perceptions as well as the delight of using one’s imaginative capacities. This process can conclude into the functions of testing one’s views and insights, as eventually changing (or reconfirming) these. The values of the non-artistic aesthetic experience are that they can add value to the functions of the artistic experience. (Van den Hoogen 234) If an artistic project challenges the personal views and beliefs it can be a mean for personal development, which should be a focus of the evaluation of the outcome of cultural offerings.

However Soziokultur follows many other goals than personal development, as for example strengthening democracy or the creation of an intercultural society. These are functions that can be reached through other than cultural means as well and these other means are also intensively used within the Soziokulturelle practice. There are several examples of active engagement in political decisions that affect local surroundings or the forming of migrant organizations in the different centers.
But mostly the Soziokulturelle practice consists of cultural and artistic projects that just as well deal, for example, with matters of integration or democracy. Why is it important to keep these artistic projects as the integral part of Soziokultur? Why not erase the culture out of Soziokultur and just keep the societal and civic engagement? To give an answer to these questions, that are at the core of the field Soziokultur, an evaluation of their cultural and artistic projects should indicate why exactly these artistic means have a benefit over other (maybe more direct) means, to reach the aimed goals.

The theories of Hans van Maanen and Quirijn van den Hoogen can give a reply to these questions. They explain that the benefit of the aesthetic experience is that it works on the level of perception of the recipient.

“The specific nature of aesthetic experiences is that they operate on the level of perception. Thus they are specifically prone to occur in the first stage of community development because this is the stage where individuals relate themselves to certain groups. Particularly in a situation where bridges are needed to strengthen social links, the arts can offer an effective playground, for – when generating artistically intrinsic values – they are conducive to examining perceptions, an activity which is needed to form bridges. Thus, rather than establishing social connections themselves, aesthetic experiences seem to create the capacity of individuals to connect to others by strengthening their existing identities as a basis for responding to others in a more open way. Furthermore, subjects can widen their mental scope or capacity for empathy through aesthetic experiences that involve the use of the power of imagination.” (Van den Hoogen 303)

This specifically operates as follows: non-artistic and artistic aesthetic values at the personal level are the excitement due to the experience of non-present worlds and the empathizing with imagined emotions as well as the delight in using one’s powers of imagination, experiencing of new perceptions and the testing of one’s views and insights. The first two non-artistic aesthetic values can bring forth the sublimation of needs and their satisfaction and improve the attendants’ capacity for empathy. The satisfaction of sublimated needs, can lead to the well-being of the attendant. The three mentioned artistic aesthetic values that occur on a personal level can change or reconfirm the attendant’s views or insights, which will widen her or his mental scope and also improves hers or his capacity for empathy. (Van den Hoogen Figure 9.4 312)
“Feeling well, an improved capacity for empathy and having a wide mental scope all are important in interactions between a person and others. Thus, these intrinsic values at societal level aid in social bonding and social bridging.” (Van den Hoogen 305)

This social functioning that is specific to aesthetic experiences, as described by Van den Hoogen, is important to (the evaluation of) the Soziokulturelle practice. It shows that there are specific benefits to artistic and cultural offerings that do have an effective impact on social goals because they work on the level of perception and therefore should not be exchanged through purely social, political or educational methods and projects.
3.3.2 Differences between recipients and participants

The Soziokulturelle practice mostly consists of participatory projects and the own creative activity of the participants, rather than just experiencing the outcome of the work of professionals as an audience. Francois Matarasso states:

“There is an important difference between the experiences of participants in the arts and those of audiences; [...]. This distinction is important because participation is the main interface between the arts, volunteering and community activism.” (Matarasso 1997 74)

He goes on explaining that if people actively partake in artistic creation it also gives them the empowerment to steer their own developments.

Also van den Hoogen refers to Matarasso’s statement when analyzing the difference of the artistic experience as a recipient or a participant. He gives four assumptions on how these experiences differ. First a participatory project takes up a longer time span than the attendance of an art performance, therefore creating a long-term experience. Second, a participatory project can include a specified target-group and its member can form a connection over a longer period of time, possibly also after the project is finished. After the experience of a limited art representation the audience usually did not form deeper connections with each other. The third difference Van den Hoogen mentions is that when engaging in community arts projects one has to take active interest in the community, which in pure art attendance does not have to be the case. And lastly he states that participatory art projects aim to train certain skill of the participant that a regular art presentation does not pursue. (Van den Hoogen 281)

Adding to this, there is another important difference to be mentioned. In the practice of actual participatory art projects, as are being pursued in the Soziokultur, the participants have the possibility to create the content and form of the art objects and presentations themselves. After all there is a difference between expressing oneself autonomously and receiving what someone else expressed.

This research mainly aims to develop an evaluation method for the impact of projects on participants, as they are the main visitor group of the Soziokulturelle field and not every project is publicly displayed.
Chapter 4

An evaluation framework for Soziokulturelle projects

4.1 The indicators and measurement of the goals of Soziokultur

In the second chapter, five goals of Soziokultur were concluded. These were to:
1. Enable creative participation for all citizens, no matter what background
2. Strengthen democracy
3. Respond to current local needs and conditions
4. Form a necessary addition to the traditional forms of culture
5. Improve the living conditions of the citizens through artistic, cultural and social means

To develop a method how to evaluate these goals one has to first understand how these goals function and how one could achieve them through Soziokulturelle projects. Subsequently indicators that measure the success of these goals have to be found.

It is important to note that not every project has to fulfill every one of these indicators, or even every one of the named goals. This would be an unrealistically high expectation.

However, at least one of these goals should be pursued by a project to be defined as being part of the field of Soziokultur and in fact, be subsidized as such.

1. The first goal aims to enable creative participation for all citizens. The term all here, one has to note, is utopian in quantitative terms; not each single citizen will take part in projects of a Soziokulturelle center. Much more all is meant in a way that every citizen has the possibility to take part in culture and to express oneself creatively, if this is their wish to do so. The first condition for this to be possible is that there has to be a creative infrastructure that is available to every member of a community. So a first indicator to evaluate if this goal is approached through a project is, if it creates a form of, preferably long-term, cultural group, organization or network, to strengthen such an infrastructure. That means that the organization has to indicate in an evaluation if a new possibility was created succeeding to the project and if people actually plan to take part in it. This can be shown through the applications for funding of the new group/network/organization etc., and the enrollment
forms of the participants, or through the description of the concrete plans of the organization of such an initiative and a question in the questionnaire concerning the partaking in such an initiative. Another point is if the project has a **low threshold**, so there are no obstacles that deter people from partaking in the project. This can mean very practical indicators, such as the physical accessibility of the project, including for example options for the elderly or physically disabled. But this may also, and probably mainly, consist of the **mediation of cultural competence**, rather than the necessity of the possession of such knowledge, so everyone can make meaningful experience out of her of his participation in the project. Such mediation of cultural competence does also equip people to participate in other cultural activities and therefore strengthen their further partaking in a cultural infrastructure. To indicate the mediation of cultural competence one usually would have to undertake a reference measurement to firstly assess the cultural knowledge existent. However, an extensive measurement of the existent cultural knowledge of the participant would be too complex and cost-and time intensive for an evaluation, not aimed to function as academic research, but as an effective evaluation method in the Soziokulturelle practice. Therefore it is more useful to measure the average attendance of the participants to cultural offerings, as well as their highest educational level to assess their cultural capital. Furthermore it should be assessed if they feel if they gained a better understanding of the cultural or artistic activity in the project.

Dependent on the kind of project, the participants are people with **different social backgrounds**. Again here the highest educational level or the participant’s profession would be an indicator to measure this. Furthermore the Soziokulturelle field focuses on the creative participation for people of **different ethnic backgrounds and age groups**, which should be assessed through including age and ethnic background in the demographic data conducted through a questionnaire.

2. The second goal is the strengthening of democracy through encouraging and enabling civic engagement and participation. In their article defining the terms culture, art and creativity, Gielen and Van den Hoogen state that the political dimension of culture is often highlighted within cultural policy:

“This political dimension, aimed at citizenship, essential serves the democratic system by making lower social classes or minorities visible and empowering them. This can revitalize the public domain
and stimulate the public debate, which in turn leads to more political involvement.” (Gielen en Van den Hoogen 2)

Soziokultur believes in and builds on the social and political dimension of culture and art, for example through enhancing communal structures by enabling different forms of communication between citizens or through organizing artistic projects specifically aimed at neglected members of society. Democratic thinking and action does not come naturally to people, it needs education and the encouraging of autonomy and the ability to voice criticism. (Lind 62/63) These rights to access to education and culture are in the nature of a democratic society. If a Soziokulturelle center actively pursues and enables these rights for community members, this can be determined as strengthening the democratic structure in a society. This would include the actual mediation of democratic curricula and critical thinking. Therefore an evaluation should indicate if the participant feels that he gained insights concerning democracy, such as about his rights and responsibilities as a citizen. Furthermore it should be assessed whether or not the participant felt supported in forming his own opinions about the respective subject of the project.

It is important for a project, which goal it is to strengthen democratic structure, that it itself consists of a structure that admits and encourages the participants own initiative. This means the participants should be involved in a participatory project organization and there should be responsible positions for volunteers available. This can be indicated in an evaluation through the number of volunteers that were active in the project and the kind of positions and responsibilities they fulfilled. Following it should be assessed if the participants felt that they could contribute to the projects organization.

The content of the project should be rooted in the discourse of (current) societal issues and the mediation of these. There should be a thorough explanatory statement of the organizations motivation behind the projects concept, as well as questionnaire items that indicate if the participant felt that the issue was relevant in general and for her/him personally.

3. The content of a project should in fact not only be rooted in the societal discourse, but also respond to local needs and conditions, which is the third goal of the Soziokulturelle field. The project should respond to a local issue in some way. Again, next to an explanatory statement of the organization, in an evaluation the participants are to be asked through a
questionnaire, or through group/personal interviews, if they felt that the project was relevant to their community, if it was connected to their reality of life and if it indeed responded to a local issue they thought was important.

Very practically this goal can also be realized through engaging in community development. In this case it is important that in an evaluation, next to a depiction of the dealt with issue and the methods used by the organization, the participants demographic data is analyzed to assert how many and ‘what kind of’ community members participated in the project. Additionally, the collaborations that were formed with other institutions/associations to more effectively reach the respective goal, have to be charted.

4. Fourth, the project should form a necessary addition to the traditional forms of culture that rather focus on the canon of the arts. The canon excludes several forms of culture and the people creating them. Thus forming an addition to this canon can be achieved through giving room to underrepresented forms of culture. This not only means presentation of different ethnical cultural expressions, but also enable and show cultural expressions for disadvantaged and underrepresented members of the community. To determine data concerning these subjects, there should be an assessment of the general participant data regarding educational, professional and ethnic background, including figures of their representation in the local or societal cultural infrastructure included in the evaluation. These data will indicate in what way the participants are underrepresented or disadvantaged. Moreover the evaluation should indicate if the participants felt that the project did enable cultural expression for them.

This goal also includes the enabling of artistic experiments, which naturally can admit failure of these experiments (which would not be opposed to the project’s success). To assert if an artistic experiment was supported, an evaluation should show if, for example, a collaboration between professionals and amateurs was made or if it present young/new talent. The participants’ demographic data and professional experience is of importance here. Additionally, an opinion on the project from a professional of the field could be included, as well as an assessment of the participants if they, for example, were able to use different methods as usual.

Furthermore connections to other fields (as education, politics, ecology, health care etc.) should be formed, to support innovation and to maintain the vision that the methods of
Soziokultur are concerned with every aspect of society. These connections and collaborations made with associations/institutions should be depicted, as well as statements of the participants if they felt that they learned more about the respective field with which the connection was made.

5. It is easy to see that all of the named goals and indicators can be connected and have effects on each other. Therefore the last and all-encompassing goal of Soziokultur, to improve the reality of live off the participants through artistic, cultural and social means, can only be achieved through the reciprocal relations of the above named provisions. For example if disadvantaged and underrepresented member of the society can express themselves creatively, it can change and improve their position in their community. Or if people are gaining the means to know and comprehend their rights (and responsibilities) as a citizen, they may gain autonomy and empowerment over their lives.

If the project evaluated is however an artistic project, as the statistics\(^\text{19}\) show that it should be in most of the cases, it is important to detect and show the specific impacts of aesthetic experiences that can be a mean for improvement of the life of the participants. As has been shown through the research of Van den Hoogen, the creation of an aesthetic experience can induce the value **excitement due to the creation and experiencing of non-present worlds**. This can lead to the function of **sublimation of needs and the relieving of the sublimated needs** and therefore to positive feelings. Furthermore the participants can **empathize with the imagined emotions**, which can improve hers of his capacity of empathy. Even more effectively, the artistic offering can enable an artistically aesthetic experience, through the **delight of the participant in using hers or his power of imagination, experiencing new perceptions** and **testing hers or his views and insights**. Following a **change or reconfirmation of views and insights** can occur. One has to note that the enabling of exactly such a critical reflection is the benefit of the artistic offerings, as it empowers people and strengthens democracy, through developing tolerance and empathy. Above this it can be a mean for development for the participants, through gaining and reinforcing skills and enriching their lives. Therefore evaluating the development of critical reflection through artistic creation and experience can indicate why exactly the connections made in the core

\(^{19}\) See figure 2 page 34
of the Soziokulturelle practice (societal issues being approached through an artistic practice) are of essential importance.

However these mentioned values and functions are complex to measure in an evaluation. The before mentioned problem of causality has to be faced when assessing the values and functions of aesthetic experiences. The aesthetic values ‘excitement due to the experience of non-present worlds’ and ‘empathizing with imagined emotions’, and artistic values ‘delight in using one’s powers of imagination’, ‘experiencing of new perceptions’ and ‘the testing of one’s views and insights’, occur during the experience. It is logical to measure them shortly after the experience, for then is the most direct contact of the participant with the experience. Functions as ‘the sublimation of needs and their satisfaction’ and ‘improvement of the capacity for empathy’, as well as the ‘widening of the mental scope’ (the ability for critical reflection) or subsequent ‘well-being’ are generally hoped to be long-term effects. Thus these would require long-term evaluation. This is not only difficult for logistical and financial reason, but also because the cause-effect chain is not clearly determinable anymore after a while. Other experiences could have occurred that influenced the participants mental scope differently etc.

Additionally it should be noted that it is unrealistic to actually expect the attendance of one artistic project to influence the participant in a way that she or he ‘permanently’ has a widened mental scope as their life goes on after the experience as unpredictable as ever. The attendance in a Soziokulturelle project should be seen as an impulse and as such it should be measured.

It thus is more useful and effective to rather assess the values, than the functions, of an artistic project, as these can be evaluated during and directly after the project and causal chains are more clearly shown. A research method concerning aesthetic values by Marline Wilders can be used as a guideline here. The scholar initiated a research concerning the influence of theater buildings on the experience of recipients and in this context, also researched the aesthetic experience as such. From analyzing, amongst others, Hans van Maanen and Quirijn van den Hoogen, she constitutes several values that can be realized through experiencing a theater play. These are: the use of imagination, endeavor, surprise, inspiration, confrontation, relaxation, entertainment, boredom, emotion, challenge, identification, cognition, affirmation, insight and coming to know alternative views. (Wilders
These values are not exclusive for experiencing theater plays but certainly could count true for other aesthetic experiences as well. Although used as a guideline, Wilders methods have to be varied to be suitable for evaluating a Soziokulturelle project. Concerning the value ‘excitement due to the creation and experiencing of non-present worlds’ the participant should be asked if he found the creation of the artistic product\textsuperscript{20} inspirational, entertaining, relaxing, surprising or even boring. (Wilders 432) To assess the value ‘empathy with imagined emotions’, questions regarding the emotional affection of the participant should be included, such as if they felt that they could identify with the emotions created through the artistic product. The ‘delight of the participants in using their power of imagination’ can be asserted through asking, for example, if the experience did in fact appeal to their imagination. If the experience also ‘enabled new perceptions’ and ‘tested the participants view and insights’, can be assessed through questions like: “Did the creation of the artistic product challenged you to look at things differently?” or “Did the creation of the artistic product offer you alternative views on your life?”. (Wilders 434) Furthermore it should be determined if the participant felt that the artistic product was confrontational, or rather confirming to hers/his views.

From this above explained functioning of the goals of Soziokultur and the indicators to measure them, the questions in the evaluation form (appendix I) have been developed.

\textsuperscript{20} In the evaluation form artistic product etc. should be specified.
4.2 An evaluation framework for Soziokulturelle projects

In the foregoing chapter the methods of evaluations and the indicators for the Soziokulturelle goals have been clarified. In a following step, the task of using these findings to develop a framework for an evaluation of Soziokulturelle offerings is carried out.

In general, following the different critical notions in the discourse surrounding evaluation, it is important to acknowledge the suspicion against evaluation, if existent in the Soziokulturelle center. Although it is a function of an evaluation to legitimize projects in front of stakeholders, it is important for the success of an evaluation, that the staff realizes and pursues its benefits, such as the creation of knowledge and the reviewing of the used methods. In the end the ultimate aim of an evaluation is always to improve the functioning of the center, in its own terms.

Adding to this, it is important that an evaluation implemented in participatory projects is done with the knowledge and involvement of the participants.

The first step to be made in finding a structure for the evaluation of a Soziokulturelle project, is determining its goals, to indicate what should be evaluated. These have to be firstly, the specific goals of the project, and secondly, the determination of the goals of the Soziokulturelle field that are being pursued (mostly though, these goals will overlap).

In the next step the success of these goals has to be made measurable, in linking effective indicators and key figures to them, as explained in chapter 3.4.
When the problem question and its measurement is determined, one has to develop a methodic scheme that will fit the process and aims of the projects, and that can be achieved with the means the institution has available. Within the logistic terms of a Soziokulturelle center, which has limited budgets as well as limited, and often voluntary, staff, already the question if to install an internal or an external evaluation can be tricky. If there is a staff member available that has the skills and time to fulfill a professional evaluation, the choice of an internal evaluation is the more likely. It limits financial risks and can improve the willingness of the staff to participate, for it does not install a feeling of being checked by someone not familiar with the complex workings of the institution. However, especially in a case where only voluntaries are working at a center that mostly do not possess profound knowledge on evaluation or the time to conduct it thoroughly, it can make sense to apply for extra funding of an evaluation that is conducted by an external professional, which guarantees knowledge on evaluation and can mean a possibility to have an outside view on the functioning of the institution. However, here also problems can occur, for example, when the professional evaluator is not sufficiently acquainted with the specific functioning of a Soziokulturelle project.

Internal/External evaluation

The next methodic question if the goals are best evaluated by a formative, summative or a front-end evaluation. In most cases, it makes sense for the evaluators of a Soziokulturelle project to use a mix of the formative and the summative method, to possibly adjust aspects of the project and finally document if the expected aims were reached. It can however, make sense to also use the front end method, for it is one of the main goals of Soziokultur to respond to the needs of their participants. Through a front end evaluation a Soziokulturelle center could detect if their project plan actually reacts to current local circumstances.
Having determined the framework of the aspired evaluation, the next step is to actually create an evaluation design, using the exemplary questionnaire in appendix I.

Evaluation design: questionnaires, personal interviews, group/individual feedback etc.

After setting up the actual evaluation design, it is expedient to check if the developed evaluation will actually fulfill the required tasks of an evaluation: this means if checks the aspired goals of the project, as well gives room to the checking of other, maybe unexpected, impacts. Adding to this, it should point out the relevance and effectiveness of the projects content and methods. If it is an artistic project that is being assessed, the evaluation should indicate the specific benefits and impacts of the aesthetic experience that is being generated.

Review of the evaluation design

After confirming the effectiveness of the evaluation, it has to be executed.

Execution of the evaluation

If a mix of the formative and summative evaluation is chosen, interim results can be analyzed, to possibly readjust the processes of the project.

Analyzing the interim results
Reaching the end of the evaluation process, the results of the evaluation have to be assessed. Where the goals reached? Were the projects methods effective? Where were problems? But also the evaluation has to be reviewed critically. How effective was the evaluation?

Assessing the results of the evaluation/reviewing the evaluation itself

Finally, the knowledge that was gathered with the evaluation can be used in the continuing processes of the institution. The evaluation results are to be presented to the participants, public and stakeholders in a transparent form.

Use and presentation of the results
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4.3 The limitations of evaluation as a measurement method

It has to be noted that the aim of the evaluation form developed in this thesis is to be used in practice. Although it is based on findings made through academic research, it cannot be seen as an attempt to implicate academic research design in the Soziokulturelle practice. This means also that an evaluation in practice does not give a holistic and definite picture about the impacts of a project – there are always limitations to an evaluation.

Looking at the discussed indicators of the goals of Soziokultur and their possible measurement in the evaluation form in appendix I, the most used method conducts qualitative data through posing multiple choice questions, as also proposed by Marline Wilders. This is useful for cost-effectiveness as well as comparability. If these questionnaires are conducted in large numbers, multiple choice questions can be a way to make qualitative data comparable in a statistical manner, (for example through stating that 85 percent of the participants taking part in the evaluation found the creation of the artistic product an emotional experience). However, this method obviously only gives limited answers and cannot always grasp the complexity of the topic (it does not, for example, answer why and in what form the participants found the creation of the artistic product an emotional experience).

Therefore conducting qualitative data through open questions, interviews or group feedback is necessary for a complete evaluation, especially to incorporate the option of detecting unexpected effects and impacts of the project. On the one hand assessing the answers to these questions is the most complex task of an evaluation and asks the greatest amount of effort and expertise on the side of the evaluators and may be difficult for the proposed self-evaluation of the Soziokulturelle centers, if the necessary knowledge on evaluation is lacking. Another downside of this method is that comparability between the statement is not a given, for they are deeply subjective in form and matter.

On the other hand enabling the participants to state something openly is a worthwhile task, because it does grasp the complexity of a possible impact more thoroughly and includes the participants in the evaluation process and therefore limits the risk of assessing them as mere objects.

Another problem, which can be determined, is the assertion of causality in the analysis of
evaluation data. It is tempting to ask the participant to state an opinion on the projects topic before partaking in the project as well as after partaking in the project to detect if changes occurred in his views. These changes one would assume to be caused by the partaking in the project. However this is not naturally the case. The participant may have had completely unrelated experiences that caused the change in his perceptions and an evaluation is not built to cover every one of such possibilities. Therefore it is important to create evaluation instruments concerning the experience of the participants that are as directly as possible related to the actual experiencing of the project. This means that instead of asking if changes occurred in the participant’s views and perceptions, it is more useful to ask if the participant’s views and perceptions were challenged during the project.

As shown in the evaluation form (appendix I) the first information that has to be gathered in an evaluation regarding a Soziokulturelle project is the participant’s demographic data. That includes the participant’s age, sex, if she or he is local or not local and information regarding their educational level and, if it is of importance for the goals that are to be evaluated, their ethnic background or the frequency they attend cultural offerings (compare Wilders 194). This information has to be taken into consideration, to answer questions concerning, for example, if the project reached its pursued audience. It also is possible that the demographic differences have influence on the experience of the participants when attending a Soziokulturelle project and therefore on the achievement of the pursued goals. However this is a complex topic that may be of importance for academic research and as stated above, the goal is to develop an evaluation method that can be used effectively in practice. It is not likely if the actors of a Soziokulturelle center conduct an evaluation themselves that they have the expertise to form well-founded assumptions on this influence. Therefore the evaluation will not attempt to investigate this complex matter.

Lastly it has to be noted that the proposed evaluation setup and questionnaires have to be specified for the respective project. This means that not all suggested indicators and measurements have to be used, but also that there can be others adding to a successful evaluation.
4.4 Showcase evaluation design

To give an outlook on how such an evaluation could look like, this thesis will conclude with the development of an evaluation design for an actual Soziokulturelle project called *Mangelware – Ein interkulturelles Einkaufsmusical* (Scarce goods – An intercultural Shoppingmusical), that is taking place at the Soziokulturelle center *musa* in Göttingen.

Project:

*Mangelware* is a music-and theater project with 40 participants from the age between 12 and 80 years. The process started in May 2012 and will probably be finished in August 2013. The participants can choose between the fields of theater, dance, singing and instrumental music and are working in seven groups with professionals of the respective fields, until coming together for collective rehearsals. The project is subsidized by the MWK with 19,500€, by the Stiftung Niedersachsen with 8000€ and by the KUNST e.V. with 2000€.

The project idea was developed around the notion that spaces for communication and encounter between different members and groups of the community in the west district in Göttingen are a ‘scarced good’. The musical therefore takes place in a fictional grocery discounter in this district. Here people meet and life stories are told, not matter what background - because grocery shopping is something everybody does.

Rivaling gangs, refugees that face deportation, elderly people that are disturbed by the youth groups, poverty and drug addiction; these are the problems of the west district in Göttingen. These are also problems that could be explored in the musical. It is however the plan that the actual content, life stories and issues of the musical will be created by its participants and then will be concentrated into a fictional storyline. The same plan applies to the musical part, as it is aimed for the evolvement of an intercultural orchestra (with instruments are not traditionally western) that supplies the music and is planned to exist permanently after the finishing of the musical.

The organizers pursue solidarity and tolerance development in the process of the project as well as the eclipse of social or ethnic differences. The conflict between individuals and different groups of the community are aimed to be addressed, at the same time stereotypes are to be diminished.
The duration of the project is planned for 16 months from May 2012 until August 2013, with four months of preparations, eight months of individual rehearsals, one month of collective rehearsals, one month of performances and the last two months of post-processing (including documentation).

4.4.1. General method

A mix of normative and summative evaluation will be used, accompanying the whole process and concluding the entire outcomes after the end of the project. The evaluation will be conducted internally by the organizers, who will conduct and analyze the data (quantitative and qualitative). The different group leaders will conduct data within in the different groups through organizing meeting with participants for group feedback and conducting questionnaires. The group feedbacks are to be documented by the group leader in writing and assessed by her or him and the organizers. Although the main focus lies on the evaluation of the experience of the participants in this particular case the experience of the audience will be evaluated additionally. This is useful to estimate whether or not, and in what way the audience benefitted from experiencing the musical. Moreover it is an interesting fact for the institution, if whether or not the audience members are from the local community, to give a statement about if the project reached the pursued recipients.

The goal and aim of the evaluation, as well as its results, have to be made transparent to the participants of the project. This also means that there should be a possibility for feedback of the participants installed.

The questionnaires are set up on the grounds of the evaluation form (appendix I) and were specified to the respective project. Room has been given for identifying possible unexpected impacts and views of the participants, through posing open questions (compare A2, B21, c1-3, d1-6). The relevance of the project can be estimated through the number of participants (demand) and posing open questions about expectations and perceptions of the participants. The specific benefits of aesthetic experiences are embedded in the indicators. The effectiveness of the used methods will be assessed through an interim group feedback to draw first clues, but a sufficient statement cannot be given until the assessment of the final results.
4.4.2 Timetable of the evaluation

May 2012:
- determine goals and their indicators
- appoint responsibilities in conducting the evaluation
- discuss value, aim and execution of the evaluation with the members of the staff
- answer and document the questions for organizers

August 2012:
- discuss value, aim and execution of the evaluation with the participants
- conduct first questionnaire
- assess first questionnaire

November 2012:
- conduct first group feedback
- assess results of first group feedback

April 2013:
- conduct visitor questionnaire

May 2013:
- conduct second questionnaire
- conduct second group feedback
- answer the questions for organizers
- assess the results of feedback, questionnaires etc.

4.4.3 Evaluation design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Questions/Statements for organizers before the execution of the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many participants are pursued?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many shows are pursued?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many visitors to the shows are pursued?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many participants and which instruments for the intercultural orchestra are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
necessary for it endure permanently?

5. Statement and data on the existence of special offering (such as the elderly or disabled people, attendance fees etc.).

6. Statement on how the concept for the musical came into being.

b. Questions for organizers after the execution of the project:

1. How many participants were there?

2. How many shows were done?

3. How many visitors to the shows were there?

4. Does an intercultural orchestra come about? With how many participants and what instruments?

c. Subjects to be addressed by interim group feedback

1. Satisfaction with the process of the project?

2. Satisfaction with the possibilities for participation in the form and story of the musical?

3. Problems that are noticed?

d. Subjects to be addressed by finishing group feedback

1. Satisfaction with the project?

2. Satisfaction with the possibilities for participation in the form and story of the musical?

3. Problems that were noticed?

4. Do you feel that the project did express your reality of life in the west district? If yes, in what way was that so? If you do not feel so, why was that so?

5. Was the project an emotional experience? If yes, in what way was that so? If you do not feel so, why was that so?

6. Were views and insights about the community in the west district challenged? If yes, in
what way was that so? If you do not feel so, why was that so?
### 4.4.3.1 Goals and Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution</strong></td>
<td>musa e.V.(Göttingen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project</strong></td>
<td>Intercultural musical <em>Mangelware</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Enables creative participation for the community members of the west district of Göttingen, no matter what background. | 1. The project has a low-threshold, meaning that everybody can participate (no auditioning).<br>   a. Exception orchestra: It is not the goal of the project for the participants to learn an instrument; therefore, in this particular case, the basic skills in playing the respective instrument are expected.  
2. Cultural competence is mediated, meaning there will be sufficient theatrical, vocal, dance and musical training offered and undertaken.  
3. The participants consist of: - people with different social backgrounds - people with different ethnic backgrounds - people of different age groups  
4. The project will create an enduring intercultural orchestra. | Cf. question A1, demographic data  
Cf. questions B1, B2  
Cf. demographic data  
Cf. question B3, a4, b4 |
| Responds to the local needs and conditions of the west district in Göttingen. | 1. The background story of the musical is set against the reality of life within the community.  
   a. The different story lines are actually created by the participants themselves, from their own experiences. | Cf. questions A2/3, B5, B7, d4 (Visitors C2/3)  
Cf. question B4, c2, d2 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The project will form an addition to the regular forms and members of culture and art. | 1. The project will enable cultural expression for underrepresented community members.  
2. The project will give room to underrepresented forms of music. | Cf. questions A1, B4, B5, B7, a6  
Cf. questions a4, b4, B3 |
| Improvement of the living conditions of the participants, through artistic, cultural and social means. | 1. The project will actively address the local issues of the west district in Göttingen as well as the personal issues of the participants.  
   a. Through enabling the participants to create and present story lines in the musical concerning these issues.  
2. The project creates a space for active communication and encounter between the different members of the community.  
3. The project will create an aesthetic experience, and in the best-case scenario, the project will create an artistic aesthetic experience | Cf. questions A2/3, B4, B5, B7, B8, B10, B21, d4(Visitors C2/3)  
Cf. question B4, c2, d2  
Cf. question B6, B7, B8  
Cf. B9-15, d5 (Visitors C1, C6)  
Cf. B16-20, c6 (Visitors C4/5) |
### 4.4.3.2 Questionnaires

**A. Participant questionnaire at the start of the project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural activity in musical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Did you participate in any other cultural activities before this musical?  
   - Yes, many others 🆘  
   - Yes, some others 🆙  
   - Only one or two others 🆗  
   - No, this my first 🆖  

2. What do you hope to gain from this project?
3. How do you feel about the community in the west district?
B. Participant questionnaire after the finishing of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural activity in musical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Do you feel there was sufficient theatrical/ musical/ vocal/ dancing training offered to you during the project?
   
   Yes, it was sufficient 0  It could have been more 0  No, it has not been enough 0  No opinion 0

2. Do you feel you understand your chosen cultural activity better now?
3. If cultural activity was musical: Will you take part in the ongoing intercultural orchestra?

Yes 0  No 0  Not sure 0

4. Did you feel that you could participate to the story and form of the musical?

Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

5. Did you feel that the story of the musical addressed the reality of life in the west district in Göttingen?

Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

6. Did you gain new contacts and relations with other members from the west district?

Yes, a lot 0  Yes, some 0  Not many 0  None 0  No opinion 0

7. Do you feel like you have gained a better insight to the life of other members of the west district?

Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

8. Do you feel like your views and insights regarding the other members of the west district have been challenged?

Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

9. Did you find the creation and experiencing of the musical inspirational?

Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes, very much so</th>
<th>Yes, to a certain amount</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Did you find the creation and experiencing of the musical entertaining?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Did you find the creation and experiencing of the musical relaxing?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Did you find the creation and experiencing of the musical surprising?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Did you find the creation and experiencing of the musical boring?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Did the creation of the musical affect you emotionally?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Did you identify with the created emotions in the musical?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Did the creation of the musical appeal to your imagination?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Did the creation of the musical challenge you to look at the west district differently?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, very much so</td>
<td>Yes, to a certain amount</td>
<td>Not very much</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Did the creation of the musical offered you alternative views on your life?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Did you experience the creation of the musical as confronting?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Do you feel that the creation of the musical has reconfirmed your views and insights of the west district?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. What did you gain from this experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Visitors questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Did you enjoy the show?
   Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

2. Did you feel that the musical depicted the reality of life in the west district in Göttingen?
   Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

3. Do you feel like you have gained a better insight to the life of the members of the west district?
   Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

4. Did you experience the musical as confronting?
   Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

5. Do you feel like your views and insights regarding the west district have been challenged through the show?
   Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

6. Do you feel that the musical has reconfirmed your views and insights of the west district?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very much so</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, to a certain amount</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

This thesis has sought to achieve two goals. Firstly it tried to form an addition to the scientific appraisal of the field of Soziokultur, which could add to the development and recognition of the field. The history and theoretical background have been assessed thoroughly and it has been shown that the origins of Soziokultur lay in two reciprocally influencing trends in the early 1970s: the new cultural policy as well as the left-winged protest movements of 1968. However there was a severe undershoot of scientific appraisal concerning the development of the Soziokulturelle field, especially regarding its further institutionalization process in the German cultural field in the 1980s and 1990s. It became apparent that in these years, the critique of arbitrariness started being raised against the Soziokulturelle practice, for it was extremely diverse and a common quintessence was hard to determine.

Ongoing, in the second chapter the current structure and notions of the actors of Soziokultur have been assessed. From these findings, it could be highlighted that the German cultural field Soziokultur still lacks the level of recognition of other traditional cultural fields. This is for one because of its young age, but also for its lack of scientific appraisal. However, based on the notions of the actors of the field, it was possible to determine five common goals for the Soziokulturelle practice, which can help the field in its further identification process. These are to:

1. Enable creative participation for all citizens, no matter what background
2. Strengthen democracy
3. Respond to current local needs and conditions
4. Form a necessary addition to the traditional forms of culture
5. Improve the living conditions of the citizens through artistic, cultural and social means

The first two chapters of this thesis have formed an addition to theoretical assessments of the history and current outlook on the field of Soziokultur, which are up to this point very scarce and exclusively to be found in Germany. Further research into these subjects seems useful and necessary for the further development, institutionalization and international recognition of such a relatively young cultural field.

The developed goals of Soziokultur correspondingly establish the groundwork for an evaluation method for the Soziokulturelle practice. In this thesis it has been chosen to
concentrate on the development of an evaluation method for Soziokulturelle projects. This was firstly because a project is a manageable frame and second, because the Soziokulturelle practice is mostly based on project subsidies from public funds. However this decision was made, not without realizing that a project evaluation can only detect and show impulses which the projects may cause. It is not a mean to prove and show sustainable solutions to societal problems. The question remains if any cultural offering could fulfill such a purpose.

To find an applicable evaluation framework for Soziokulturelle projects, general evaluation methods regarding cultural offerings have been analyzed and applied. These general notions however did not indicate the specific benefit of projects that used artistic methods. Therefore in a second part this particular question was fathomed, finding that the specific value of artistic projects lays at the level of perception of the participant, who can engage in an aesthetic experience. The aesthetic experience can be a means for development for the participant. Concluding from the results of the third chapter, indicators and methods of measurements were developed for the earlier determined goals of the field and an exemplary evaluation form has been developed (cf. appendix I). This exemplary form can be used in practice to evaluate Soziokulturelle projects, when specified to the respective project. This means that the evaluators might have to add other measurements or only use a selection of the suggested indicators and measurements.

The exemplary evaluation form consists mostly of closed-ended questions that limit the answer of the respondents to a set of fixed choices, as these questionnaires are easier to interpret and to compare than open questions and group/personal interviews. The downside of this method is however, that it might not be able to grasp the complexity of the impacts of the projects and the personal experiences of the participants. With this restriction in mind, it is nonetheless expedient for Soziokulturelle centers to make use of such a form for cost and logistic reasons.

Adding to the exemplary evaluation form, the conducted findings were combined to design an evaluation framework for Soziokulturelle offerings, concluding with the development of a showcase evaluation design for an actual project. Unfortunately, this showcase evaluation was not actually conducted within the frame of this thesis, for as well time and practical
reasons. An actual testing of the described method would therefore be a necessary next step.

Critically reflecting upon this evaluation proposal, some issues have to be highlighted. An evaluation is only a limited instrument to conduct and analyze data. As stated in chapter 4.3, there are complex matters such as the question of causality, subjective interpretation, and the limitations of quantitative data that are insufficiently fathomed by an evaluation. However these limitations make evaluations realizable in practice. A Soziokulturelle center has neither got the financial and logistic means, nor the knowledge available to conduct a holistic academic research. It is however important that they can collect and analyze data, for legitimization in front of stakeholders and to develop and improve their practice. To do so, evaluation can be a suitable instrument, as it does so in an for the practice applicable way.

This does not seek to say that evaluation is not still an extra expense and work factor, which might not be achievable with the scarce financial and labor means available to the Soziokulturelle centers. However, in most of the projects, as the example of the showcase design has shown, there is already time for documentation and reflection taken into account. When the evaluation is conducted by the executing staff that already is involved with the project the expense factor can be reduced, as they are already urged to document their work and the expertise about the project is high. Nevertheless it is not likely that the executing staff has knowledge about the conduction and interpretation of evaluation data. The exemplary evaluation form as well as the framework developed in this thesis, can simplify the evaluation process for a Soziokulturelle center. Additionally, could the possibly missing knowledge in the domain of evaluation be acquired, for example, through the offering of workshops by umbrella associations, such as the Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Soziokultur in Lower Saxony. The Lags already organizes such meetings and workshops every half year for their member free of charge. With a thorough instruction and a list of indicators and measurements as presented, the labor factor could be reduced to an achievable effort. The rest of the expenses could be covered by the project funding, as it should be in the interest of the stakeholders to have a thorough evaluation of their funded projects. These notes try to show that, at least in theory, the implementation of evaluation in the practice of Soziokultur is feasible.
An evaluation could mean the improvement of the Soziokulturelle practice, through gathering data and examples of best and worst case scenarios, on which the respective institutions but also others, if made transparent and available, could gain know-how from. This can be especially helpful in the case of Soziokulturelle centers that are solely run by volunteers, which would have rich data to fall back on and which could improve and alleviate their own practice. Moreover the evaluation of the Soziokulturelle projects on the grounds of common goals of the field guards it from the critique of arbitrariness and helps it to define a very diverse field. Finally, thorough evaluation can be a helpful source, although by far not a guarantee, to legitimize projects in front of stakeholders.

This thesis has depicted the value of implementing evaluation in the Soziokulturelle field, regarding the identification and improvement of its practice as well as its legitimization factor. It has shown that Soziokultur has transformed from its protest origins to a widely attended and unique part of the German cultural field that enables participants from every social background not only to attend and find access to culture, but also to societal issues and democratic structures. To remain such a crucial part of the cultural field, but also to advance and further institutionalize, a constant reflection of the Soziokulturelle practice is needed. Evaluation can be a useful tool for such a reflection and recognition of Soziokultur in the cultural field as in other fields of society.
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## Appendix I

### Evaluation format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General participant data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest educational attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals of Soziokultur</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measuring method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The project has a low-threshold, meaning that everybody can</td>
<td>a. Assessment of the general participant data regarding educational, professional and ethnic background.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Enable creative participation for all citizens, no matter</td>
<td>b. Statement and data on the existence of special offerings (such as access for the elderly or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Italic terms are to be exchanged through respective, specified terms. (For example artistic product->theater play)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Cultural competence is mediated</th>
<th>a. Assessment if the participant gained new knowledge in the cultural offering, for example through questionnaire:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-&gt; Do you feel that the cultural/artistic project was sufficiently explained to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, the mediation was sufficient 0 The mediation could have been more intensive 0 No, the mediation not been enough 0 No opinion 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-&gt; Do you feel you understand you have a better understanding of the cultural/artistic activities in the project now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-&gt; Do you feel you have a better understanding of the cultural/artistic activities in the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Assessment if the participant possesses pre-knowledge about the creation of cultural or artistic expression, for example through questionnaire:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-&gt; Do you participate in any other cultural or artistic offerings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 10 or more others 0 Yes, 5 to 10 others 0 Only 1 or 2 others 0 No, this my first 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| -> If you do/did participate in other cultural or artistic offerings, what were/are these? ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>what background participate without having pre-knowledge</th>
<th>disabled people, or low attendance fees etc.) by the organization.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Strengthen democracy | A. The project mediates democratic curricula and supports critical reflection | a. Assessment if the participant gained knowledge about democratic curricula and felt that her/his ability to critically reflect upon respective subjects was supported; for example through questionnaire:

> - Do you feel like you learned something about democracy within the project?
Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

> - Do you feel like you have gained insights about your rights as a citizen?
Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0

> - Do you feel like you have gained insights about your responsibilities as a citizen?
Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| C. The project creates a form of, preferably long-term, cultural group, organization or network | a. Assessment if the project does in fact subsequently creates a form of cultural group, organization or network, through thorough description and or applications for funding etc. by the organization, as well of the expected participation through enrollment forms or questionnaire.

> - Will you take part in the cultural offering that was created through the project?
Yes, I will 0  Yes, probably 0  Probably not 0  No, I will not 0  I am undecided 0 |
|  | now? If so, why and in what way? If not, why was that so?... |  |
| B. The project’s subjects root in important (current) societal issues. | a. Short depiction of why the issue that the project is dealing with, came into being (qualitative data).  
| | b. Assessment of the importance of the issue for the participants.  
| | -> Do you feel that the issue treated in this project is important to you? |
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0

-> Do you feel that the issue treated in this project is important for society as whole?
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0

C. The project consists of a participatory organization.

a. Assessment of number of volunteers, their demographic data and in which positions they were in (quantitative data).
b. Assessment if the participants felt included in the project’s organization; for example through questionnaire:
-> Do you feel like you could contribute to the project’s organization?
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0
-> Do you feel like your opinion mattered within the project’s organization?
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0
-> Do you feel that your initiative was encouraged during the project’s process?
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0

3. Respond to

A. The project responds

a. Short depiction of why the issue that the project is dealing with, came into being (qualitative
| current local needs and conditions | to a local issue. | data).  
b. Assessment if the participants/visitors felt if the project was connected to local circumstances, for example through questionnaire:  
-> Do you feel that the project is effectively connected to the local circumstances in ... ?  
Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0  
-> Do you feel that the project was relevant to your local community? If so, why and in what way? If not, why was that so?  
...  
| B. The project is connected to the reality of life of the participants. | a. Assessment if the participants felt if the project was connected to their reality of life, for example through questionnaire:  
-> Do you feel that the project is connected to your reality of life?  
Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0  
-> If you feel that the project is connected to your reality of life, in what way is that so? If you do not feel so, why is that so?  
...  
|
| C. The project engages in community development. | a. Short depiction of the issue that the project is dealing with regarding community development and the methods used (qualitative data).
b. Assessment of the participant’s demographic data regarding how many and what kind of community members participated (quantitative data).
c. Assessment of the cooperation’s that were formed within the community to more effectively reach the respective goal; what kinds of associations/ institutions etc. were approached and included (quantitative data). |
| 4. Form a necessary addition to the traditional forms of culture | A. The project gives room to underrepresented forms of culture (either of different ethnics or of underrepresented or disadvantaged members of society) |

|  | a. Assessment of the general participant data regarding educational, professional and ethnic background, including figures of their representation in local/ societal cultural infrastructure (quantitative data).
b. Assessment if the participants felt that the project did enable cultural expression for them, for example through questionnaire. 
-> Do you feel that you could express yourself through the project?
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0 
-> Do you feel that the project expressed your culture/ reality of life?
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0 
-> If you feel that the project did express your culture/ reality of life, in what way is that so? If |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B. The project enables artistic experiments. | a. For example: the project consists of a collaboration of professionals and amateurs; the project gives room for the presentation of young/new talent → assessment of the participants professional experience and demographic data (quantitative data).
|   | b. Assessment of the artistic methods used by the participants (qualitative data):
|   |   | -> Did you use different methods than usual for this project? If so, why and in what way? If not, why was that so?
|   |   |   |
| C. The project connects the field of culture and art to other fields (as | a. Depiction of the connections and cooperation made with other fields; demographic data of participants, what kinds of associations/institutions etc. were approached and included (quantitative data). |   |
| 5. Improve the living conditions of the citizens through artistic, cultural and social means | education, politics, ecology, health care etc.) | b. Assessment how the participants felt about the connection other fields, for example through questionnaire:  
-> Did you learn more about the respective field through participating in this project?  
Yes, very much so 0  Yes, to a certain amount 0  Not very much 0  Not at all 0  No opinion 0  
-> How did the connection made with the respective field influence the project?  
... |
| 5. Improve the living conditions of the citizens through artistic, cultural and social means | A. The project improves the life of the participants through the reciprocal relations of the different components of the project. | a. For example through personal interviews/group feedbacks (qualitative data):  
-> Do you feel that the project enriched your life? If yes, in what way is that so? If you do not feel so, why is that so?  
... |
| 5. Improve the living conditions of the citizens through artistic, cultural and social means | (If artistic project) B. The project improves | a. Assessment if the participants felt excitement due to the creation and experiencing of non-present worlds, for example through questionnaire: |
the life of the participants through enabling an aesthetic experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Did you find the creation and experiencing of the <em>artistic product</em> inspirational?</td>
<td>Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did you find the creation and experiencing of the <em>artistic product</em> entertaining?</td>
<td>Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did you find the creation and experiencing of the <em>artistic product</em> relaxing?</td>
<td>Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did you find the creation and experiencing of the <em>artistic product</em> surprising?</td>
<td>Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did you find the creation and experiencing of the <em>artistic product</em> boring?</td>
<td>Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Assessment if the participant experienced empathy with the imagined emotions, for example through questionnaire, group feedback or interview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Did you find the creation and experiencing of the <em>artistic product</em> has affected you emotionally?</td>
<td>Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Could you identify with the created emotions in the <em>artistic project</em>?</td>
<td>Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Was the project an emotional experience for you? If yes, in what way was that so? If you do not feel so, why was it not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(If artistic project)</td>
<td>C. The project improves the life of the participants through enabling an artistic-aesthetic experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a. Assessment if the participant had delight in using hers or his power of imagination and experiencing new perceptions, for example through questionnaire: | -> Did the project appeal to your imagination?  
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0  
-> Did the creation of the artistic product challenged you to look at things differently?  
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0  
-> Did the creation of the artistic product offered you alternative views on your life?  
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0  
-> Did you experience the creation of the artistic product as confronting?  
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0  
-> Do you feel that the creation of the artistic product has reconfirmed your views and insights of the respective subject?  
Yes, very much so 0 Yes, to a certain amount 0 Not very much 0 Not at all 0 No opinion 0 |
(Qualitative data; through questionnaire, group feedback or interview)
Do you feel that the creation of the *artistic product* has challenged your views and insights about *the respective subject*? If yes, in what way is that so? If you do not feel so, why is that so?

...
Appendix II

Interview with Gerd Dallmann

Concerning the recommendations of the committee of the German Bundestag

With Gerd Dallmann – CEO of the Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Soziokultur Niedersachsen

Conducted 27 July 2012 in Hanover, Germany

J: Ich habe mich jetzt einige Zeit mit dem Schreiben der Enquete Kommission befasst und mich vor allem gefragt, dass sind ja tolle Handlungsempfehlungen aber was ist davon wirklich durchgesetzt worden?

G: Erst mal muss man dazu sagen dass diese Handlungsempfehlungen viel zu allgemein gestellt sind um konkret etwas bewirken zu können. Und sie sind eben auch in keiner Weise bindend. Es ist natürlich gut, dass die Soziokultur auch von offizieller Seite anerkannt wird, aber es ist nun mal immer noch ein Fakt dass sie im Gegensatz zu den klassischen Kultureinrichtungen in Deutschland chronisch unterfinanziert ist. Grundsätzlich kann man aber auch sagen dass das, was die Enquete-Kommission festgestellt hat durchaus reale Probleme und Situationen in der Soziokulturellen Landschaft widerspiegelt. Ich habe ja auch, wie du weißt, selber an dem Bericht mitgewirkt. Und ein bisschen ist ja im Nachklang des Berichts doch passiert.

J: Wir können uns ja an den einzelnen Empfehlungen entlang hängeln und du gibst mir deine Einschätzungen zu den einzelnen Punkten. Also der erste Punkt empfiehlt den Ländern und Kommunen, soziokulturelle Zentren als eigenständigen Förderbereich zu entwickeln. Weiterhin sollten die Erfahrungen der Soziokultur mit Interkulturalität etc. evaluiert werden, so dass auch andere kulturelle Bereiche sie nutzen können.

G: Also in den Kommunen in Deutschland ist das einfach wahnsinnig unterschiedlich. Es gibt da durchaus manche, die versuchen ihre Zentren so gut wie möglich zu erhalten und sich um ihren Wert bewusst sind. Leider muss man aber in der Gesamtsicht sagen das nicht viel

**J:** Ok, der zweite Punkt empfiehlt eine Zusammenarbeit der Bundesregierung und der BSZ für eine Evaluation der Zentren im Hinblick auf Erkenntnisse zur Weiterentwicklung von Ausbildungen und Studiengängen in den Kulturwissenschaften. Ist das so zu Stande gekommen?

Nachwirkung jetzt zum Beispiel Volontariate für junge Absolventen eingerichtet. Aber das kann sich natürlich nicht jedes Zentrum leisten oder wird nicht subventioniert.

**J: Um den Generationenwechsel und Volontariate geht es ja auch bei Punkt drei.**

G: Ah ja, da steht es. Also teilweise ist das in die Tat umgesetzt worden, die Stiftung Niedersachsen hat zum ein eigenes Programm für Soziokultur entworfen, über das auch durch Ausschreibungen Volontariatsstellen finanziert werden können. Aber das wurde nicht im Breiten großräumig erstellt und finanziert, was in der Finanzkrise und in der Kultur eben auch nicht wirklich geht.

**J: Außerdem besagt Punkt drei dass ein Modellprojekt zur Kooperation von Hochschulen und soziokulturellen Zentren einzurichten ist.**


**J: Bei Punkt vier geht es auch um Bildung, nämlich um die aktive Förderung von Kooperationen von Zentren die außerschulisches Kinder- und Jugendarbeit anbieten und Ganztagsschulen.**

G: Das ist insgesamt problematisch. Erst mal spielt bei dieser Forderung ein Grundproblem der Ganztagsschule 'light' mit rein, die bei uns jetzt eingeführt wurde. Weder die Schulen noch die besagten Zentren haben dafür die Ausstattung und das Personal, um eine ganze Schülerschaft qualitativ ausreichend zu betreuen. Und es wird zwar teilweise kommunal gefördert, aber das reicht nicht aus. Hinzu kommt dass das hier in Niedersachsen die Beziehung des Bildungsministeriums und des MWK, sagen wir mal, entwicklungsbedürftig ist. Und das sind nun mal die zuständigen Ministerien die so etwas institutionell fördern
können. Also hier würde ich die eher verneinen, dass die Handlungsempfehlung durchgesetzt wurde.

_J: Jetzt sind wir bei Nummer fünf, die besagt dass die Förderung der BSZ als Dach- und Fachverband beibehalten und institutionell werden soll._

_G: Also die Förderung wurde beibehalten aber nicht als institutionelle, sondern immer noch als Projektförderung. Was natürlich problematisch ist, weil sich so viel schwieriger, nachhaltige Strukturen für die Soziokultur auf Bundesebene bilden lassen._

_J: Und der sechste und letzte Punkt besagt, dass die Mittel des Fonds Soziokultur um mindestens 25 Prozent erhöht werden sollten, vor allem für Projekte mit interkulturellem Bezug._

_G: Das ist leider in keiner Weise so geschehen._

_J: Also abschließend ziehe ich da keine wirklich erfolgreiche Bilanz._

_G: Das könnte man so sehen, ja._

_J: Vielen Dank für diese Einschätzungen!_