

Abstract: The article aims to develop a study on the social, economic and demographic impacts of cultural activities in rural Spain, based on a selection of significant cultural initiatives and projects. Specifically, it seeks to explore not only the role of culture as a catalyst for socioeconomic development and its influence on demographic trends but also to examine whether it plays a crucial part in enhancing self-esteem, social cohesion and quality of life in rural areas. To this end, we will analyse twenty cultural projects across Spain. To study the impact of these projects, a survey has been conducted among three different groups: the project promoters; relevant agents in the local community due to their professional activity or political position; and, finally, the local population potentially affected by the projects.

Keywords: Rural Development, Cultural Projects Impacts, Intangible Assets, Rural Communities Revitalisation

Abstract: El objetivo de este artículo es desarrollar un estudio sobre los impactos sociales, económicos y demográficos de las actividades culturales en la España rural, basado en una selección de iniciativas y proyectos culturales significativos. En concreto, se pretende profundizar no solo en el análisis del papel de la cultura como catalizador del desarrollo socioeconómico y su influencia en las tendencias demográficas, sino también examinar si desempeña un papel crucial en la mejora de la autoestima, la cohesión social y la calidad de vida en las áreas rurales. Para ello, se analizarán veinte proyectos culturales a lo largo de la geografía española. Para estudiar el impacto de estos proyectos, se ha realizado una encuesta entre tres grupos diferentes: los promotores del proyecto; individuos destacados en la comunidad local debido a su actividad profesional o posición política; y, finalmente, la población local potencialmente afectada por el proyecto.

Palabras clave: Desarrollo Rural, Impacto Iniciativas Culturales, Activos Intangibles, Revitalización Rural

Highlights

- Cultural projects generate positive socio-economic impacts on rural development.
 - Intangible effects (social capital and those related to well-being) are the most valued.
 - Economic and demographic impacts are also positive.
 - Place-based culture helps transform rural peripheries into vibrant places to live.
 - Cultural Economics applied to Rural Development drives a new analytical approach.
-

1. Introduction

Europe's rural population has decreased significantly over the last 200 years. As a result, in many areas of the continent, the population densities are very low and society's concern for this situation has grown in recent decades. Rural depopulation in Spain was particularly important between 1950 and 1980. The rural-urban exodus was the main reason for the rural demographic contraction, although since the end of the 20th century, negative natural growth has been the most important factor. This migration can be explained by the differences in income and job opportunities between rural and urban areas, the lack of productive diversification in rural areas, and the growing gap in access to public services, and the scarce job opportunities for rural women (Collantes and Pinilla, 2011). As a consequence, some Spanish regions have reached extremely low population densities, comparable to those in the north of the Scandinavian countries.

Within this context, public policies have largely focused on attempting to revive these areas through measures aimed at creating employment or guaranteeing adequate access to public services.

Although this approach is reasonable, other fundamental aspects that also determine the choice of the place of residence are often overlooked. In addition to the ability to obtain income or enjoy the services of the welfare state, people seek additional reasons for living in a specific place that empowers them and makes them feel free and relevant (Sen & Nussbaum, 1996). There is evidence that many of these reasons are qualitative and subjective (care, sharing, social and family bonds, trusting others), as shown by research on well-being and happiness on a global level (Helliwell et al., 2025) and by specific studies on the rural world (Mahon, 2018). In addition to its high intrinsic value, culture is undoubtedly one of the assets that most efficiently contributes to these economic, social and personal impacts (Ateca, 2021).

Therefore, the objective of this study is to evaluate the impacts of cultural activities on the development and well-being of small rural towns in which the local communities play a leading role.

We focused on initiatives that are unrelated to the “cultural industry”, in which prices and mainly public subsidies, while still being important, are secondary to the community and the appraisals of those who participate in them. They are not consumers experiencing a final product but audiences who recreate emotions in spaces that generate connections. Therefore, these initiatives do not fit into business models that have an impact easy to estimate through econometric tools based on the handling of precise statistical and monetary sources (Pleeter, 2012). Instead, we chose cultural activities in rural Spain, based on a selection of relevant cultural initiatives and projects, distanced from certain metropolitan dynamics, which are considered representative for reflecting on what is significant when discussing development on the individual, community, and territorial levels. The empirical ‘heart’ of our paper consists of a survey with over 1,000 participants from the village where the cultural activities took place.

As we shall see, our proposal requires the redefinition of certain concepts and methodologies in the wake of the major debates emerging when culture and economics are combined with rural development. Widening perceptions of the value-added of the arts and culture from an urban-centric viewpoint implies a new rural development paradigm (Mahon et al., 2018).

In the Spanish context, research on cultural activities such as archaeology (Herrero, 2019), festivals (Querol & Ginés, 2021; Martínez et al., 2023), and museums (Coll et al., 2015), has highlighted their role as economic drivers in rural areas. Taking a more reflective perspective, several insightful contributions have examined the management strategies employed to revitalize rural communities (Camarero et al., 2019; García-Ferreiro, 2022), as well as how connections between contemporary art and small Andalusian villages illustrate the blurring of boundaries with urban culture and the emergence of a new rural identity (García-Pozuelo, 2023).

While all these studies inform our research, we focused on a broader sample of “bottom-up” cultural projects in rural areas, which are highly heterogeneous. Our approach is based on a more qualitative understanding of development that integrates both the tangible and intangible dimensions of economic, social, demographic, and well-being impacts. This is a holistic and applied study, open to the combination of various theoretical frameworks rather than being limited to a single theory, specific creative activity, or rural area.

Furthermore, little attention has been given to the role of culture as a key factor for personal well-being and the dynamism of small rural towns from a holistic perspective (Ramos *et al.*, 2024). Thus, we are especially concerned with evaluating the impacts of cultural projects and citizen participation in relation to qualitative aspects such as well-being and quality of life, health, loneliness, bonding and bridging capital, self-esteem, territorial branding and changes in social and symbolic perceptions (and prejudices) associated with rural areas.

Ultimately, our analyses of the relationships between cultural activity and rural development are inspired by the capability approach (Nussbaum & Sen, 1993), which is concerned with individual perception of one’s own capabilities in a given context. In this way, based on the Spanish experience, we can contribute to an emerging body of literature that highlights the research gap between culture and (personal)

development in rural areas, in contrast to the numerous studies that address this topic in urban settings (Mahon, 2018; Duxbury, 2021). Particularly, works that go beyond the more recognised discourses of cultural economics are noteworthy, offering new qualitative insights that reframe the previously dominant functional paradigm in inspiring policies and strategies (Oman, 2021; Scott et al., 2018; Balfour et al., 2018; Lu and Qian, 2023).

2. Theoretical background

We are concerned with the extent to which culture contributes to the development of people living in small rural towns in Spain. To address this question, it is first necessary to provide some definitions.

There are many definitions of culture and both the researchers that address it and the institutions that manage it usually adapt them to the context in which they operate (Holden, 2006). In our case, we define cultural activities following Throsby (2001: 4): “those activities drawing upon the enlightenment and education of the mind rather than the acquisition of purely technical or vocational skills [...] To give this second definition more precision [...] Three such characteristics are suggested [...] creativity in their production [...] symbolic meaning [...] output embodies potentially intellectual property”.

Defining rural is also difficult because it depends heavily on the context. The more descriptive definitions adopt statistical indicators, with the population being the most usual, often with population density, land use and proximity to urban centres (Woods, 2005: 5–6). While these characteristics are indeed relevant, our approach places greater emphasis on socio-cultural definitions, grounded in “the values and behaviours of residents and the social and cultural characteristics of communities” (Woods, 2005: 9). As Massey (2017: 77) asserts, “space is not absolute, it is relational.” From this perspective, narrowly local, administrative, or geographical approaches are insufficient. Most rural residents commute to nearby service towns and participate in wider labour market areas. Conversely, many urban dwellers maintain second homes in rural villages, actively contributing to their vitality. The European Union is currently revising its methodological frameworks to improve analysis and policymaking (Dijkstra and Jacobs-Crisioni, 2024). The draft concept of “Functional Rural Areas” emphasizes social relations and introduces a “new geography” that reflects contemporary dynamics. These include population flows, international migration and the broader effects of globalisation, all of which are contributing to an ongoing hybridisation of rural and urban lifestyles, as noted earlier. As Camarero, Oliva, and Sampedro (2025: 41) argue, “these have become unhelpful categories that no longer reflect social reality.”

Aware that rural is no longer the opposite of urban, our study focuses on cultural projects in which the local communities of small towns play a leading role either as their creators or as their audience. It is not just their content that is relevant, but also how these projects are carried out, the spaces in which they are created and shared, the relationships between their promoters and audiences and the degree to which the local and community level shapes the universal level. The programming of these projects takes a bottom-up approach and the local residents and population are highly relevant players. This last group, which is very difficult to define, is a key piece in rural revival and exemplifies the aforementioned mixture of rural and urban, functional and personal. The case studies selected reflect the dynamics of small towns, which, going beyond their demographic size, can generate creative and vibrant spaces, enabling their residents to feel more empowered and relevant.

This leads us to the third dimension of our study, the notion of development. Development is still identified with growth in political and most academic debates, but development is much broader and even autonomous (Easterlin, 1995), because we are referring to well-being and happiness. For our study, we consider Sen and Nussbaum’s capability approach (1993) to be ideal. It may seem abstract and formal but the OECD (2011) has been applying it in statistical terms for more than a decade. Development is understood as the exercise and extension of the capabilities that enable a meaningful life to be freely defined on a personal and community level. A capability account of well-being is also very well suited for understanding the importance of place for well-being. Some dimensions of well-being are constitutively place-related (Robeyns, 2020), such as feeling part of the community in which one interacts and being given the chance to contribute to collective action. In the activities studied, the people who intervene,

either as creators or audience, recreate and enjoy the culture in which they participate as a part of the freedom that generates well-being (Sen, 1985), and “oblige the cultural issues to appear in the media and development goals” (Rausell, 2012).

These three approaches to rural, culture and development enable us to outline a conceptual framework from which to study the impact of twenty rural cultural projects on their local communities. Therefore, culture constitutes an important goal in itself, coinciding with the objective of greater local development, in the sense that it broadens the capabilities, relevance and freedom of the residents. And, simultaneously, it is an essential tool for obtaining this, because a developed community would not be attainable if it did not have activities that expressed the creativity of its people, in welcoming spaces, where new ideas and emotions emerge that make us feel better than before. They are dynamics that “oblige the cultural issues to appear as means and goals of development” (Rausell, 2012).

These analyses of well-being and happiness define the central points to be tested in our research on the impacts of culture. They are made up of many elements, some objectively provided by the markets and governments, but others are more subjective with a high intrinsic value due to the community and personal actions involved in their elaboration and recreation process.

Concerning the former, many studies on social capital have contributed important arguments to local development. A distinction is usually made between elements that facilitate the commitment to a group to which one belongs, that is, bonding capital, and those that are related to the predisposition to welcome and integrate people and groups into it, namely bridging. Both are highly relevant in the countryside (Agnitsch, 2006) and reinforced when culture brings these communities together (Buccura, 2022). Based on interviews and questionnaires, we have sought to determine the extent to which these cultural activities generate strong and weak ties, understanding that the strength of the weak ties with the outside is more decisive for increasing their reputation or territorial branding (Granovetter, 1983).

The aspects related to life satisfaction that culture provides when one is an active part of it constitute the main reasons for conducting this research. For some time, we have believed that the dynamism of the rural world is not so much related to the number of inhabitants residing therein but to the capacity of its population to be able to choose how and where to carry out a meaningful life and materialise their wishes (Sáez, Pinilla and Ayuda, 2001; Pinilla and Sáez, 2021). Surprisingly, the majority of impact studies do not address quality of life, but “what really matters are the capabilities of people, that is, the extent of their opportunity set and of their freedom to choose among this set, the life they value” (Stiglitz et al., 2010).

Our initial hypothesis, again under the theoretical framework adopted, is that, for the development of rural areas and the well-being of their populations, these latter aspects are absolutely crucial and, on the whole, have not been considered. This links with the rising trend in the analysis of public policy proposals for the shrinking rural areas that emphasise the importance that these elements have for the well-being of people and the development of these areas (Pinilla and Sáez, 2021; Gkartzios et al. 2022; Hofstede et al., 2022; Pospěch et al. 2024; Sáez and Pinilla, 2024).

Our research relates to a growing series of studies that assess the role of culture in Spain in recent years. Some of these studies are more conceptual and methodological, such as Pérez (2021) and Ateca (2021). Along these lines, seeking to overcome the monetary vision of the economy, as an interdisciplinary area in which the financial aspects are important but also the community values and mentalities, we can find studies such as Rausell et al. (2007) and Barbieri et al. (2011), and more recently Rausell et al. (2022). Others are more applied in nature but also include an in-depth analytical review, such as the study by Bonet et al. (2023) and those that integrate the Spanish case into international perspectives (Boix et al. 2022).

The first initiative is an ambitious project titled MESOC – Measuring the Social Dimension of Culture, aimed at improving our understanding of the value and impact of cultural policies funded by the European Union. The project involves ten academic partners from seven European countries and is coordinated by the Universitat de València. Case studies have been conducted in metropolitan areas, including three in Spain: Barcelona, Valencia, and Jerez de la Frontera. Drawing on discussions, consultations, workshops,

and applied research, the project has developed a “Convergent Model” to explain how cultural activities can foster transformations at the individual, community, and societal levels. These transformations are examined in terms of health and well-being, civic engagement and participation, and urban and territorial innovation. The project's “bottom-up” research orientation proves particularly valuable for exploring the significance of cultural initiatives led by local communities, extending beyond conventional impact metrics.

Boix et al. (2022) present a comprehensive study addressing the creative and cultural industries (CCIs) across three territorial scales: national, regional, and local. The local dimension includes 518 municipalities – some of them small rural towns – in the Spanish region of Valencia. The regional level encompasses 275 European regions, while the national analysis covers 78 countries across five continents. The impact of CCIs on per capita income is estimated through econometric methods based on multiple data sources. Findings indicate a significant economic impact at all three territorial levels, though the effects are heterogeneous and largely dependent on the specific development conditions of each area.

As mentioned earlier, in the Spanish rural context, the relationship between culture and development has traditionally been studied through specific activities – especially festivals and initiatives tied to tangible cultural heritage – or through broader research that combines rural and urban areas and includes industrial dimensions. However, a more integrative approach to rurality, culture, and development has recently gained traction, giving rise to a growing academic literature. Notable contributions include those by Nogales (2021), García-Pozuelo (2023), and Ramos et al. (2024), most of which emerge from research projects still in their early stages. We aim to contribute to this holistic perspective by investigating the impacts of cultural projects rooted in rural communities while understanding development as a process that transcends economic growth and enhances individuals’ capacity to act as capable and engaged members of their society.

3. Methodology

The methodology was subject to a series of key conditioning factors. First, it had to meet the overall objectives of the project within the framework in which it was implemented. The study was promoted by the Ministry of Culture of the Government of Spain through its programme “Cultura y Ruralidades” (Annex 1 and Map 1), with the double objective of determining the key factors in the life of cultural projects and their impact on the territory and people. This latter factor implied an in-depth analysis of the role of culture as a determining element of the socio-economic development of rural territories and of the well-being and quality of life of the population. These two objectives required different methodological instruments; semi-structured interviews for the first and questionnaires for the second⁵. The results presented in this paper are based exclusively on the questionnaires completed by the three groups surveyed.

The second prior consideration is related to the territorial area of the study, the rural world. The purpose was to determine the impact of cultural projects located in small rural towns outside metropolitan areas.

⁵ A detailed study of the life and characteristics of the projects can be found in Sáez et al. (2024).



Fig 1. Geographical location of the projects studied. Source: Project selection by the Ministry of Culture, Government of Spain

Fieldwork begins with the selection of the cultural projects to be studied. This defines the municipalities and target population, and from there, the sample size. The following preferences and/or starting conditions are established for the project selection process:

- The possibility of generating exogenous processes. Without questioning the possible value of the initiatives for individuals and the community, projects without a clear collective vocation, or those that were itinerant or concentrated in a brief time were given lower priority in the selection process. The project or activity undertaken had to offer goods or services related to a culture going beyond mere commercialisation or functioning as a public management agency. It had to show a vocation for establishing synergies with the local community and social fabric.
- Territorial diversity and the representation of different realities of Spain's rural world, with initiatives implemented in municipalities with less than 10,000 inhabitants – some with less than 500 –

considering different profiles with more dispersed or concentrated habitat models. Bearing in mind the heterogeneity of the sample and the need to systematise the analysis, four types were distinguished resulting from the combination of size/functionality and accessibility: (1) small town in the peripheral area; (2) small town in the dynamic/accessible area; (3) a town with its centrality in the dynamic/accessible area; (4) a town with its centrality in the peripheral area.

- Diversity concerning the type of projects and the relationship that they have with different cultural sectors. This diversity justifies the decision to classify them into four groups. (1) permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public; (2) spaces for creation, production, and mediation; (3) festivals and events of a fixed duration, with the possibility of expanded programming throughout the year; (4) dissemination and socialisation projects that are more or less stable and sustained over time.
- Representation of both public and private initiatives and even those of a mixed or subsidised nature.
- Minimum time of five years, enabling the impacts attributable to the selected project to be identified.

Next, the maximum number of projects was selected within the limitations imposed by the available human and financial resources. Annex 1 summarises the 20 projects that were selected.

To evaluate the impacts, the target population is the residents of the towns or villages where the cultural initiatives are located or within their sphere of influence. This group is essential, as they are the potential stakeholders affected by the project's impact on its surroundings. However, it was decided to compare their perception with that of another two key groups: the promoting agents (the individuals who lead or form part of the coordination team for the project under study) and the so-called qualified agents (this group includes individuals who, under their professional activity or affiliation with political, professional, or interest groups, have more specialised engagement with the project, such as local government team members, municipal technical staff, and personnel from Rural Development Groups and/or LEADER Local Action Projects).

As previously mentioned, the fieldwork combined two instruments: the semi-structured interview, whose use was limited to the promoters to address one of the research objectives (to understand the key aspects of the projects' life cycle), and the questionnaire, addressed to all groups. Table 1 includes the datasheet of the sample and a summary of the principal elements that determined the fieldwork.

The design of the questionnaire was based on identifying the variables that would enable us to obtain relevant arguments for the research. On the whole, it was composed of closed questions as they facilitate their coding and subsequent exploitation. In essence, it included two types of variables: categories that could be associated with a numerical code, such as gender, level of interest in culture, their relationship with the project, among others, and qualitative variables that could be categorised through a Likert scale (this type of variable was used to obtain the opinion of the people surveyed on the potential impacts of the projects). Then, the number of questions was adjusted by the time of completion and the type of survey. Moreover, it was fundamental to keep the wording simple, particularly in the questionnaire administered to the local population, given that, as it was not an in-person questionnaire, it would be sensitive to problems of comprehension by the participants.

Annex 3 includes the questionnaire sent to the local population. The model sent was personalised by the specific project to which it refers, the municipalities affected and the local language. The surveys for the local population were conducted through two methods: either by telephone or online. Combining two different survey methods does not yield neutral results, as there is a possibility of bias depending on the level of involvement in or commitment to the project that the individuals completing the online surveys may have. However, priority was given to reaching as many people as possible.

Tab 1. Data sheet of fieldwork. Source: own elaboration based on the responses to the survey or questionnaire provided by the various stakeholders

Promoting agents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample: Promoters of the 20 cases selected • Instrument: Interview and questionnaire (although the evaluation of the impacts is conducted through closed question it includes a part with open questions) • Form of gathering the information: in-person • Timeframe: May-September 2022
Qualified agents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample: 40 people, two agents per project • Instrument: Questionnaire (although the evaluation of the impacts is conducted through closed questions it includes a part with open questions) • Form of gathering the information: previous telephone contact and the completion of an online questionnaire • Timeframe: September-November 2022
Local population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample: 2,451 people. The final size of the sample for each project was determined by taking into account the population of the municipality or municipalities of reference, together with the objective of guaranteeing a sample error of no more than 10%*. The population under study was, in principle, those registered in those municipalities constituting the direct sphere of influence of the cultural projects**. In some cases, the population of reference for the purpose of the survey was extended to include nearby municipalities included in the direct sphere of influence of the project (Annex 2 summarises the final distribution of the sample, the population size of reference and the sample errors). • Instrument: Questionnaire with closed questions • Form of gathering the information: Telephone and online • Timeframe: October-November 2022

* The final sample error is not always controllable by those implementing the field work and is conditioned by factors such as the success rate of the telephone surveys (relationship between the calls made and surveys completed). The effectiveness and cost are related to the type of survey procedure used. Therefore, efforts were made to maximise the efficiency of the process and reach the largest number of surveyed people possible with the available means. This is why the online survey phase was conducted first, and depending on the number of responses obtained, the effort was intensified in the telephone survey in the municipalities where required.

** Although the starting point was the number of people registered in the municipality, it was difficult to precisely differentiated this population from that actually residing there or that which could be affected by the project. For this reason, a block of questions relating to the characterisation of the surveyed people includes one question referring to their usual residence, preferentially admitting the responses of those whose usual residence was in the municipality but also those of residents of nearby town who frequently visit the municipality in which the project is carried out and those of seasonal residents who live for long periods of said municipality.

To obtain the data, online and telephone surveys were conducted, using town councils, local associations, and various organizations as disseminators. Ultimately, 1,337 surveys were collected in the online phase, of which 977 were valid⁶, and 1,474 valid surveys were collected in the telephone phase. Therefore, the total sample included 2,451 people.

The central part of the questionnaire sought to analyse the role of culture in the development or rural territories, addressing the economic, demographic and social impacts while also focusing on qualitative aspects related to well-being on an individual and community level.

The surveys that were completed by the three groups included common questions but also specific elements: 1) the impacts to evaluate were broken down into more detail in the case of the questionnaires administered to the promoters and relevant agents (the response time indicated that they should be shortened in the case of the local population), 2) the evaluation of each of the impact variables in the questionnaire conducted among the promoters required a double response by the participant, a rating of between 0 and 10 and also a ranking of importance within the impacts assessed (it was

⁶ The 360 invalid surveys were due to the respondent were not residing in the town where the cultural initiatives were located or within its area of influence, or not having completed the entire questionnaire.

observed that this second request was very difficult to answer in a remote context and was therefore eliminated from the questionnaire administered to the rest of the groups) and 3) the questionnaires to the relevant agents and local population included questions related to aspects that could be included in the evaluation such as their interest in culture, their relationship with the project and certain personal details.

4. Results

This section presents the assessment of project impacts by those involved in their management, the local population and the qualified agents who were surveyed. We will first explain the results derived from the surveys of the local population, followed by a brief comparison of the results from the three consulted groups.

We believe that some of the findings support our core assumptions, particularly the importance of culture as a key driver for revitalising communities and giving more meanings to life. However, this is not understood in the conventional sense of transforming cultural assets and heritage into competitive advantages to generate employment or business opportunities. While such outcomes are often expected and respondents do report perceived economic impacts – especially in tourism-related activities such as restaurants, bars, handicrafts, accommodations, and retail – there is limited evidence of effects on employment or real estate investment. More significantly, the highest-ranked outcomes are those related to social cohesion, local empowerment, territorial identity and, most notably, an increased awareness of individual and collective capabilities. Investing in intangible dimensions – such as creativity to enhance personal potential and a sense of belonging to foster self-empowerment – i.e., culture itself – appears to be a promising strategy for making small rural towns more attractive places to live (Gibson & Gordon, 2018; Lu & Quian, 2023). As observed in other studies on rural areas, “artists can be agents of change that transform places but at the same time take responsibility for inclusion and participation” (Coenen, 2023: 1).

4.1 Impacts Perceived by the Local Population

A major advantage of the survey conducted among the local population is the high number of people who responded with a total of 2,451 surveys. There were generally between 75 and 200 responses for each project, which we also consider a reasonable margin to ensure the representativeness of the results, given that these are towns with a small number of inhabitants. Furthermore, when analysing these responses, we will also take into account the typology of respondents, their municipalities and the medium through which the survey was conducted.

Beginning with the general results, it should be noted that the local population assigns a significant impact to the projects, with all question blocks regarding the effects scoring between 6/10 and 8/10 (Table 2). The social capital, bonding and bridging effects are considered to have the greatest impact (7.86/10), followed closely by those related to personal and community well-being (7.24/10). The respondents consider that, thanks to the development of the projects, territorial branding, that is, the image people have of their town (7.76/10) and the external image, i.e., that of non-residents (8.03/10), have improved significantly. A strengthening of local community is attributed to the project, bonding internal links and the pride of belonging. While intangible, it is undoubtedly highly valuable in giving meaning to a better life. Regarding the improved external reputation, bridging or relational capital, this can generate varied effects such as attracting new residents or occasional visitors. It is also interesting to note that the projects have influenced how residents perceive culture, its intrinsic value, which has a very high score (7.84/10).

The improvement in personal and community well-being extends to various aspects, such as expanding leisure opportunities (7.56/10), which is undeniably important when living in a small place, personal cultural enrichment (7.64/10), or strengthening relationships with neighbours through participation in activities (7.25/10). Although it is also worth noting that the projects are considered to foster the integration of new residents (6.58/10), this is the area with the lowest score in this group of impacts.

Tab 2. Summary of perceived impacts for all projects by the local population. Source: own elaboration based on the responses to the survey by the local population

Impacts (grouped by type)	Average Rating
Encourages the attraction of new residents and/or the retention of the population	6.87
Demographic Impacts	6.87
Increases the income of businesses and professionals in the area	7.23
Influences the creation of new businesses or economic activities	5.28
Increases job opportunities for the local population	5.74
Revaluation of premises, housing, or rentals	5.71
Economic Impacts	6.01
Offers more leisure and entertainment options for the local population	7.56
Encourages the acquisition of knowledge and fosters a more creative and critical spirit	7.64
Improves relationships among the local population	7.25
Facilitates the integration of new neighbours into the town	6.58
Helps improve the well-being and self-esteem of residents	7.30
Personal and Community Well-being Impacts	7.24
Improves the image that residents have of their town	7.76
Enhances the knowledge and/or improves the reputation of the locality and its surroundings	8.03
Improves the image that residents have of culture	7.84
Social and Relational Capital	7.86

Although the assessment of economic and demographic impacts is lower, we believe it is still significantly positive. We consider that the development of these projects has facilitated the attraction of new residents and the retention of the population (6.87/10). Regarding the economic impacts, the most highly rated aspect, by far, is the increase in income that the projects have brought to businesses and professionals in the area (7.23/10). Other positive outcomes include the creation of businesses (5.28/10), the improvement in employment opportunities (5.74/10) and the revaluation of properties (5.71/10), although these results are only slightly above 5/10.

Next, we believe it is important to contextualise these assessments by considering the types of projects and the diverse characteristics of the respondents.

4.1.1 Impacts by Type of Project

Beginning with the typology of the projects, it is important to highlight that the variation in the assessment of effects is very moderate in all cases (Table 3). However, some interesting differences can be observed. For instance, the projects that are perceived to generate the highest impacts are those categorised as festivals and time-limited events, regardless of the type of impact considered. Permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public are also considered to have a significant reputational impact and an impact on personal and community capacities. The other types of projects also receive very high ratings.

These high evaluations of festivals and time-limited events are evident in their reputational effects (8.2/10) and their personal and community well-being effects (7.72/10), similar to the case of permanent cultural spaces open to the community (reputational: 7.98/10; qualitative: 7.39/10).

Tab 3. General impacts perceived by the local population for projects grouped by typology. Source: own elaboration based on the responses to the survey by the local population

Category	Number of Respondents	Demographic	Economic	Personal Well-being	Social and Relational Capital
Permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public	897	6.83	5.90	7.39	7.98
Creation and mediation spaces (seasonal or otherwise)	451	6.86	5.94	6.89	7.35
Festivals and time-limited events	478	7.16	6.51	7.72	8.20
Dissemination and socialisation projects (heritage, books, visual arts...)	625	6.71	5.86	6.92	7.78
Total	2,451	6.87	6.01	7.24	7.86

Regarding the demographic and economic effects, there are no major differences between the different types of projects, with the results being moderate in all cases. The most significantly perceived economic impact is also associated with festivals and time-limited events (6.51/10) as they are usually large-scale events concentrated in short periods. In any case, the social and personal satisfaction effects are greater than the economic ones (Mahon & Hyryläinen, 2019; Querol & Ginés, 2021).

4.1.2 Impacts by Type of Rural Town

The place of residence of the respondent seems to have only a slight influence on their perception when evaluating the effects of the project (Table 4). Ratings are lower for respondents who live in the same place where the projects are located and higher for those linked to or involved in the local community, even if they are not officially registered there. In any case, the differences are minimal.

Tab 4. Impacts by project according to the respondent's usual residence concerning the rural town where the project is located. Source: own elaboration based on the responses to the survey by the local population

	Number of Respondents	Average Rating by Type of Impact			
		Demographic	Economic	Personal and Community Well-being	Social and Relational Capital
The rural town	1,903	6.71	5.81	7.07	7.73
The rural town is not where I live, but it is very close and I usually go there regularly	257	7.30	6.65	7.72	8.14
Although I am officially registered in the rural town, I live for long periods in another rural place	62	7.03	6.32	7.94	8.45
Although I am officially registered in another rural place, I spend a lot of time in this rural town	229	7.58	6.93	7.97	8.48
General total	2,451	6.87	6.01	7.24	7.86

In terms of the type of rural town where the project is located, it is worth highlighting that it is the smallest and most peripheral areas that give the highest ratings for two of the four analysed impacts: demographic

and personal and community well-being (Table 5). It is not surprising that these locations experience the greatest impact from projects, given their smaller size, compared to areas situated in more dynamic regions with greater access to cultural activities. Similarly, the perception of demographic impact may be greater in smaller areas where slight changes in population are clearly noticeable. On the other hand, it is precisely the larger rural towns located in dynamic or accessible areas that perceive the least demographic (6.55/10) and economic (5.46/10) impacts, but where high reputational impacts are noted (7.93/10).

Tab 5. Impacts perceived by the local population according to the group of rural towns where the projects are located. Source: own elaboration based on the responses to the survey by the local population

	Number of Respondents	Average Rating by Type of Impact			
		Demographic	Economic	Personal and Community Well-being	Social and Relational Capital
Small population in a peripheral area	492	7.19	6.18	7.36	7.76
Small population in a dynamic/accessible area	322	6.83	6.18	7.06	7.48
Population with centrality in a peripheral area	1,091	6.89	6.17	7.26	7.98
Population with centrality in a dynamic/accessible area	546	6.55	5.46	7.21	7.93
General total	2,451	6.87	6.01	7.24	7.86

4.1.3 Impacts According to the Profile of Respondents and Other Relevant Variables

Now we will assess how the respondents' perceptions of the impacts of the projects are influenced by the respondents' profile based on sociodemographic variables and their level of interest in culture.

First, it is important to note that the ranking of impacts by type is very similar across all of the population profiles considered. Thus, all groups – regardless of the classification variable, such as gender, age, employment status, or level of education – assign the highest values to reputational effects, followed by those related to personal and community well-being, then demographic impacts, with economic impacts ranked the lowest.

When distinguishing responses based on gender, in general, and across all types of effects considered, the ratings from women are higher than those from men, especially in the case of demographic impacts (7.11/10 compared to 6.51/10) (Table 6).

Tab 6. Impacts by Respondent's Gender. Source: own elaboration based on the responses to the survey by the local population

	Number of Respondents	Average Rating by Type of Impact			
		Demographic	Economic	Personal and Community Well-being	Social and Relational Capital
Men	948	6.51	5.76	7.04	7.65
Women	1,475	7.11	6.20	7.39	8.02
Unspecified	25	5.92	4.96	6.20	6.37
Dk/na	3	6.00	5.75	6.50	7.67
Total	2,451	6.87	6.01	7.24	7.86

Tab 7. *Impacts by Age of Respondents. Source: own elaboration based on the responses to the survey by the local population*

	Number of Respondents	Average Rating by Type of Impact			
		Demographic	Economic	Personal and Community Well-being	Social and Relational Capital
Up to 29	172	7.40	6.70	7.85	8.27
30 -59	1,298	6.81	6.10	7.45	7.99
60 and older	965	6.85	5.78	6.87	7.62
Unspecified	16	6.44	5.20	6.50	7.19
Total	2,451	6.87	6.01	7.24	7.86

The rating of impacts is higher among younger respondents, particularly in the case of economic impacts, which they perceive much more strongly compared to the over-60s group (6.70 versus 5.78) (Table 7). Additionally, it is interesting to note that both young people (under 29) and middle-aged individuals (30–59) perceive the impacts related to personal and community well-being as much higher than the over-60s (7.85 and 7.45 compared to 6.87). This could suggest that these cultural initiatives have a very positive qualitative influence on the younger age group.

Employment status and education level also seem to influence the perception of impacts, although the order that can be established varies by type of impact (Table 8). The most generous in their ratings are students (aligned with the previously mentioned results when considering age). In any case, the differences are relatively small.

When considering the respondents' level of education, the most noticeable differences are observed in the effects related to personal and community well-being, together with the reputational impacts, with the highest ratings given by those with a higher level of education (Table 8). In contrast, the greatest demographic and economic impact is noted by respondents with no completed formal education.

Tab 8. *Impacts by Respondent's Education. Source: own elaboration based on the responses to the survey by the local population*

	Number of Respondents	Average Rating by Type of Impact			
		Demographic	Economic	Personal and Community Well-being	Social and Relational Capital
No completed studies	79	7.32	6.19	7.00	7.53
Basic (up to School Graduate)	694	6.93	5.88	6.89	7.61
Intermediate (High School / Vocational Training)	843	6.76	5.96	7.16	7.78
University or equivalent	825	6.89	6.17	7.65	8.18
Unspecified	10	6.90	5.65	6.23	6.78
Total	2,451	6.87	6.01	7.24	7.86

The respondents' interest in culture is a decisive factor in their assessment of the project's impacts, as the rating increases significantly when respondents declare an interest in it (Table 9). This difference is evident across all impact categories, though it is more pronounced in certain areas, such as those related to personal and community well-being (8.16 and 7.62 when the respondents' interest is very high and high, compared to 5.26 and 5.98 when their interest is very low or low) or reputational effects (8.57 and 8.26 when the interest is very high or high, compared to 6.03 and 6.57 when the interest is very low and low).

It is important to note that the ranking of impact categories by type does not change with varying levels of cultural interest. The same order of impact ratings is maintained: reputational, well-being,

demographic, and economic. There is only one exception: people with the least interest in culture perceive a greater demographic impact than well-being, although the difference is small. This result is logical since their lower interest in culture means they do not perceive a significant improvement in their well-being from attending or being aware of such projects.

Tab 9. Impacts by Respondent's Interest in Culture and Cultural Events or Activities. Source: own elaboration based on the responses to the survey by the local population

	Number of Respondents	Average Rating by Type of Impact			
		Demographic	Economic	Personal and Community Well-being	Social and Relational Capital
My interest in culture is very low	47	5.51	4.05	5.26	6.03
My interest in culture is low	196	5.78	5.10	5.98	6.57
I have a medium level of interest in culture	846	6.47	5.67	6.74	7.43
My interest in culture is high	910	7.17	6.28	7.62	8.26
My interest in culture is very high	452	7.55	6.70	8.16	8.57
Total	2,451	6.87	6.01	7.24	7.86

4.2 A Comparison of Impacts Perceived by Different Types of Agents

The comparative analysis of the impact assessments made by the various agents surveyed offers very interesting results (Table 10). Project promoters have the advantage of being able to assess the projects with a deep knowledge of them and the impacts they have generated. However, this advantage could be offset by the bias introduced by their central role in the projects. The analysis of the assessments of the qualified agents allows for the reinforcement and refinement of the conclusions drawn from the consultation process with the local population.

First, all agents agree that the projects generate positive impacts in all the types studied. The variation in the evaluation of effects is not very wide. The highest-rated impacts are within a narrow range of around 9. The lowest-rated impacts never fall below 6 and are typically around 7.

Tab 10. Impact Assessment as Perceived by Different Types of Agents. Source: own elaboration based on responses to the survey or questionnaire from the various stakeholders

	Average Rating by Type of Impact			
	Demographic	Economic	Personal and Community Well-being	Social and Relational Capital
Promoters	7.00	7.17	8.48	9.35
Qualified Agents	7.31	6.95	8.35	8.75
Local Population	6.87	6.01	7.24	7.86

The local population, project promoters and qualified agents almost completely agree on the ranking of impacts. They all consider the reputational impact to be the most significant, giving it the highest rating, followed by personal and community well-being. The only difference is in the ranking of demographic and economic impacts. For the local population and qualified agents, the demographic impacts are more important than the economic ones, whereas for the promoters, the opposite is true. In any case, the differences in the scores for these two categories are very small. It is important to highlight this broad and near-total agreement among all groups, which, given the subjective nature of any survey, lends considerable value to the responses obtained.

For all impacts, the lowest ratings are given by the local population. The highest ratings are for community engagement, well-being and economic impacts from the promoters and for demographic impacts from the qualified agents. It seems clear that the promoters' significant involvement in the projects may lead them to have a higher perception of their impacts

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The survey results show that the perceived impacts of the cultural projects in rural communities are high, both in terms of their more conventional economic and demographic dimensions but particularly in those related to their contribution to the vitality of the rural communities and personal development, in line with other studies carried out in different countries (Anward-McHenry, 2011; Duxbury, 2021; García-Ferreiro, 2022; Coenen, 2023; Lu and Qian, 2023; Kozina et al., 2024).

One significant result is that, assuming a score above 5 indicates a positive effect, all three surveyed groups consider that all the types of impacts studied exceed this threshold, and in some cases, quite significantly. In other words, there is unanimous agreement that cultural projects have yielded positive results at the local level, regardless of the type of impact considered.

There is consensus that the highest-rated impact categories are reputational and those related to personal and community well-being, with average scores ranging between 7.87 and 9.40, and 7.26 and 8.68, respectively, depending on the group of respondents. Therefore, the qualitative, intangible effects – reputational, social capital and well-being-related – are the highest-rated impacts across the examined projects. In contrast, the analysis of more tangible effects – demographic and economic – reveals greater variation depending on the specific initiative being assessed. Nevertheless, in all cases, they score lower than the former, with average estimates according to the group of respondents ranging from 5.99 to 6.93 for economic impacts and between 6.87 and 7.00 for their ability to attract or retain the population.

The surveyed local populations highlight that the external reputation and knowledge of the town and its surroundings have improved significantly due to the projects. There are also very high ratings in terms of internal reputation, with improvements in how residents perceive their town.

Additionally, they feel that their self-esteem and well-being have considerably improved, both personally and about community bonds, leading to the conclusion that these initiatives strengthen their connection to their place of residence, improve their quality of life and reinforce their social capital, bonding and bridging.

In conclusion, while many plans focus almost exclusively on measures aimed at achieving a demographic or economic effect, primarily quantitative and monetizable, it is important to highlight, based on this study, that people also value other aspects in their lives and when choosing where to live. Seeking to fulfil one's capacities and being a relevant agent for the community are good reasons to live in a place – because in this way people feel better there, having a meaningful life and strengthening their self-esteem and social bonds. This, therefore, is the most significant outcome of the development of these cultural projects in rural areas.

Although economic and demographic impacts received a lower overall rating, they are still considered positive. In the case of economic effects, the most important impacts are those considered to be direct, which result in increased income for the local population – through direct contracts with creators and other professionals, procurement from suppliers, or increased revenue for other economic agents such as tourist accommodations, hospitality establishments and craft workshops. Meanwhile, the capacity of these projects to generate indirect impacts, such as new employment opportunities for the local population or influence on the creation of new businesses, is rated much lower.

While the ratings of impacts are always positive, they sometimes vary significantly depending on various factors. Greater involvement, proximity, knowledge or participation led to more positive ratings. Regarding participation, it is worth noting that the people who frequently attend project activities – 20% of the local population surveyed and, in principle, those most suitable for assessing the effects related to

personal and community well-being – raised the local population's ratings for this category by almost one and a half points, reaching the highest range.

Similarly, marked deviations are observed when analysing the respondents' interest in culture, as when it is very high or high, significant impacts are detected in terms of both well-being and reputation.

Younger populations give significantly higher ratings, especially in the case of economic and well-being effects, which could again be related to the potential of cultural projects to curb population loss, in a context where the proportion of young people in rural areas has alarmingly decreased in recent years and where the rural youth identify access to leisure and culture as one of their priorities. Therefore, encouraging active youth participation in cultural life, together with the recruitment and expansion of young audiences, could be new lines of action for many projects.

As for the gender of the respondents, women perceived slightly higher impacts in all categories. This is once again linked to participation, as female involvement in these types of projects is notably higher than male involvement. Given these results and considering the high male-to-female ratio in rural compared to urban populations, it would be worth focusing on the development of cultural projects with a gender perspective that address the challenges, narratives, perceptions, and representations of rural women.

Another population group for which project promoters indicated greater participation is new residents. According to the perceptions of the local population and, to a greater extent, those of qualified agents and promoters, this participation contributes to their integration into the community.

These results lead us to the conclusion that culture has a relevant impact. In economic terms, its contribution to the Spanish GDP in 2023 was 2.5% and to employment 3.6%. These figures are similar to the average for the European Union at 2.6% and 3.8% respectively⁷. However, this is very far from the weight of other activities, such as construction, tourism or the automotive sector, essential for determining the economic cycle. If we were to ask about the influence of cultural activities according to the most common statistical criteria in politics and also in the most consolidated lines of research, the answer would be that it had little direct influence. Furthermore, the cultural and creative industry, which is the principal driver of the sector, is highly sensitive to agglomeration economies, which are so important in metropolitan areas (Scott, 2000) and non-existent in small towns (Rantisi and Christopherson, 2006). Therefore, its direct impact in financial terms tends to be even lower in the rural world.

However, our survey contains significant nuances that go beyond this more conventional interpretation. On the one hand, the cultural activities studied are place-based and “bottom-up”, in the sense that their most decisive tangible and intangible resources are specific to rural areas and their scenarios are immobile. They are not marketable or exportable goods and services. On the other hand, while levels of income and wealth are important elements in determining well-being, as previously indicated, based on studies on happiness, they are not the only or principal aspects. Therefore, we have realigned our question with the more stimulating debates on development, which, without ignoring these aspects or the demographic challenges, which are always important, focuses on determining the extent to which culture rooted in the rural communities contributes to capacitating and empowering the people who live there. All of these issues are interdependent, but, given their complexity, their research is still scarce (Anward-McHenry, 2011), although it has advanced in the measurement of the social impact of culture (Bonet and Calvano, 2023). Hence, to the two dimensions of the most visible direct economic and demographic impacts we have added those that are related to social capital and personal capabilities. The instrumental value of culture is important, but it is necessary to broaden the conceptual frameworks and policy agendas to understand the intrinsic value of culture in rural development (Scott, Rowe and Pollock, 2018)

Consequently, as we have explained in the theoretical section, values and markets, cities and rural, qualitative and physical assets are all related and interdependent factors for building better lives for rural people. We need to balance them all in order to generate well-being based on a sense of community,

⁷ Eurostat: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statisticsexplained/index.php?title=Culture>

creative transformation, entrepreneurship and capabilities. Literature reviews on “community-embedded arts-based development in rural areas” reveal that culture is considered as a “creative fire” (Balfour, Fortunato and Alter, 2018). Arts can be a kind of “catalyst” for economic opportunities in the countryside directly through tourism and “indirectly by enhancing participation and creativity in public decision-making, strengthening community capacity, identity and sense of place” (Anwar-McHenry, 2009). There is a “strong tendency to direct rural development from competitiveness and traditional enterprise policies towards a more holistic, systemic and place-based “vitality policy” including softer development values related to attractive living environments, communality and the well-being of residents” (Makkonen & Kahila, 2021). According to this new paradigm on rural development, centred on capacities, freedom and social sustainability, our research reveals a variety of ways by which culture can be an effective strategy to positively impact the Spanish countryside.

Acknowledgments

This study was funded by the Spanish Ministry of Culture. We express special thanks to Benito Burgos at the Ministry and the entire team who collaborated from the Directorate General of Cultural Rights. We would also like to thank Alberto Conejos for interviewing the promoters of the cultural projects, helping us to better understand their intangible dimensions. We are grateful for the comments provided by the reviewers and editors, which have helped improve our work. Any remaining errors are our sole responsibility. Finally, we are also most grateful to the project promoters and to all those who responded to our survey for their valuable cooperation.

Academic references

- [1] Abeledo, R., Coll, V. & Rausell, P. (2016). Culture as a factor of socio-economic innovation in rural areas: the case of the artistic craftwork cluster of La Città Europea dei Mestieri d'Arte (CITEMA), *Ager*, 20, 73–103. DOI: 10.4422/ager.2015.15.
- [2] Agnitsch, K., Flora, J. & Ryan, V. (2006). Bonding and Bridging Social Capital: The Interactive Effects on Community Action. *Community Development*, 37(1), 36–51. DOI: 10.1080/15575330609490153.
- [3] Anwar-McHenry, J. (2009). A place for the arts in rural revitalisation and the social wellbeing of Australian rural communities. *Rural Society*, 19(1), 60–70. DOI: 10.5172/rsj.351.19.1.60.
- [4] Anwar-McHenry, J. A. (2011). Rural empowerment through the arts: The role of the arts in civic and social participation in the Mid-West region of Western Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(3), 245–253. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2011.03.001.
- [5] Ateca, V., Ganuza, J. J. & Prieto, J. (2021). *Economía y cultura. Una mirada hacia el futuro*, Madrid: Funcas.
- [6] Ateca, V., Villarroja, A. & Wiesand, A. J. (2021). Heritage engagement and subjective well-being in the European Union. *Sustainability*, 13(17), 9623. DOI: 10.3390/su13179623.
- [7] Balfour, B., Fortunato, M. W.-P. & Alter, T. R. (2018). The creative fire: An interactional framework for rural arts-based development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 63, 229–239. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.11.002.
- [8] Barbieri, N., Partal, A. & Merino, E. (2011). Nuevas políticas, nuevas miradas y metodologías de evaluación: ¿cómo evaluar el retorno social de las políticas culturales? *Papers: Revista de Sociología*, 96 (2), 477–500. DOI: 10.5565/rev/papers/v96n2.139.
- [9] Belfiore, E. (2022). Is it really about the evidence? Argument, persuasion, and the power of ideas in cultural policy, *Cultural Trends*, 31(4), 293–310. DOI: 10.1080/09548963.2021.1991230.

- [10] Boix, R., De Miguel, B. & Rausell, P. (2021). The impact of cultural and creative industries on the wealth of countries, regions and municipalities, *European Planning Studies*, 30(9), 1777–1797. DOI: 10.1080/09654313.2021.1909540.
- [11] Bonet, L., Calvano, G. & Fernández Compañía, P. (2023). Exogenous and endogenous factors affecting the social impact of cultural projects: the case of Barcelona ecosystem. *City, Territory and Architecture*, 10(1), 9. DOI: 10.1186/s40410-023-00196-3.
- [12] Bonet, L. & Calvano, G. (2023). *Measuring the social dimension of culture: handbook*. Barcelona: Trànsit Projectes.
- [13] Bucura, E. (2023). Bonding and bridging: Perceptions of social capital in community music. *Athens Journal of Humanities and Arts*, 10(2), 149–176. DOI: 10.30958/ajha.10-2-5.
- [14] Camarero, L. A. (2019). Los patrimonios de la despoblación: la diversidad del vacío. *Revista PH*, 98, 70–87. DOI: 10.33349/2019.98.4517.
- [15] Coenen, K. (2023). Creatively transforming periphery? Artists' initiatives, social innovation, and responsibility for place. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift-Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 77(1), 47–61. DOI: 10.1080/00291951.2023.2169193.
- [16] Coll-Serrano, V., Rausell-Köster, P. & Abeledo-Sanchis, R. (2015). Estimación del impacto económico de los museos a través de las nuevas tecnologías de la información: el caso del museo Ene.Térmica. *Transinformação*, 27(3), 265–275. DOI: 10.1590/0103-37862015000300008.
- [17] Collantes, F. & Pinilla, V. (2011). *Peaceful Surrender. The Depopulation of Rural Spain in the Twentieth Century*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.
- [18] Da Silveira, N., Zea, M. C., González, H. D. & Valencia, K. A. (2022). Una aproximación multidimensional al análisis de los impactos causados por las condiciones de la pandemia de Covid-19 en el Área Metropolitana del Valle de Aburrá, Colombia. *Cuadernos de Geografía: Revista Colombiana de Geografía*, 31(2), 377–394. DOI: 10.15446/rcdg.v31n2.96293.
- [19] Dijkstra, L. & Jacobs-Crisioni, C. (2024). *Defining Functional Rural Areas*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- [20] Domenech, R. B., Molina, B. D. M. & Köster, P. R. (2023). The impact of cultural and creative industries on the wealth of countries, regions and municipalities. In Lazzeretti, L., Oliva, S., Innocenti, N. & Capone, F., eds., *Rethinking Culture and Creativity in the Digital Transformation* (pp. 170–190). Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.
- [21] Duxbury, N. (2021). Cultural and creative work in rural and remote areas: An emerging international conversation, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 27(6), 753–767. DOI: 10.1080/10286632.2020.1837788.
- [22] Easterlin, R. (1995). Will raising the incomes of all increase the happiness of all? *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 27(1), 35–47. DOI: 10.1016/0167-2681(95)00003-B.
- [23] Frey, B. S. & Briviba, A. (2023). Two types of cultural economics, *International Review of Economics*, 70(1), 1–9. DOI: 10.1007/s12232-022-00410-7.
- [24] García-Ferreiro, D. (2022). Una investigación sobre modelos culturales en el medio rural ahonda en las relaciones entre arte, territorio y población. *PH: Boletín del Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico*, 30(105), 21–23.
- [25] García-Pozuelo, S. (2023). Ruralidades líquidas: nuevas identidades versus viejos imaginarios. *ARTxt. Revista de Experimentación Artística*, (2), 73–92. DOI: 10.24310/artxt.2.2023.17173.
- [26] Gibson, C. & Gordon, A. (2018). Rural cultural resourcefulness: How community music enterprises sustain cultural vitality. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 63, 259–270. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.11.001.
- [27] Gkartzios, M. & Crawshaw, J. (2019). Researching rural housing: With an artist in residence, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 59(4), 589–611. DOI: 10.1111/soru.12224.

- [28] Gkartzios, M. & Lowe, P. (2019). Revisiting neo-endogenous rural development. In Scott, M., Gallent, N. & Gkartzios, M., eds., *The Routledge Companion to Rural Planning* (pp. 159–169). Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.
- [29] Gkartzios, M., Gallent, N. & Scott, M. (2022). A capitals framework for rural areas: ‘Place-planning’ the global countryside. *Habitat International*, 127, 102625. DOI: 10.1016/j.habitatint.2022.102625.
- [30] Granovetter, M. (1983). The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. *Sociological Theory*, 1, 201–233. DOI: 10.2307/202051.
- [31] Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., De Neve, J.-E., Aknin, L. B. & Wang, S., eds. (2025). *World Happiness Report 2025*. University of Oxford: Wellbeing Research Centre.
- [32] Herrero, L. C. (2019). Economía de la arqueología: valor e impacto económico del patrimonio arqueológico. *Cuadernos económicos de ICE*, 98, 25–41. DOI: 10.32796/cice.2019.98.6945.
- [33] Hofstede, H., Saleminck, K. & Haartsen, T. (2022). The appreciation of rural areas and their contribution to young adults’ staying expectations. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 95, 148–159. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.07.018.
- [34] Holden, J. (2006). *Cultural value and the crisis of legitimacy*. London: Demos.
- [35] Johnston, W. J., Leach, M. P. & Liu, A. H. (1999). Theory testing using case studies in business-to-business research, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 28(3), 201–213. DOI: 10.1016/S0019-8501(98)00040-6.
- [36] Kozina, J., Clifton, N. & Bole, D. (2025). People or place? Towards a system of holistic locational values for creative workers. *Cultural Trends*, 34(1), 83–104. DOI: 10.1080/09548963.2024.2304851.
- [37] Lu, Y. & Qian, J. (2023). Rural creativity for community revitalization in Bishan Village, China: The nexus of creative practices, cultural revival, and social resilience, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 97, 255–268. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.12.017.
- [38] Mahon, M. (2018). The transformative potential of the arts and culture in sustaining rural futures. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 63, 214–216. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.09.016.
- [39] Mahon, M. & Hyyryläinen, T. (2019). Rural arts festivals as contributors to rural development and resilience. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 59(4), 612–635. DOI: 10.1111/soru.12231.
- [40] Makkonen, T. & Kahila, P. (2021). Vitality policy as a tool for rural development in peripheral Finland. *Growth and Change*, 52(2), 706–726. DOI: 10.1111/grew.12364.
- [41] Martínez, I., Sanz, E. & Iso, A. (2023). Movilidades y reproducción patrimonial e identitaria en celebraciones festivas rurales del Pirineo navarro, España. *Antipoda. Revista de Antropología y Arqueología*, (52), 61–86. DOI: 10.7440/antipoda52.2023.03.
- [42] Massey, D. (2005). *For space*, London: Sage Publications.
- [43] Nogales, R. (2021). Sembrando para quienes nos sucederán: resignificación de “lo rural” a través del arte y la cultura en un contexto de crisis ecosocial (R-Rural). *Periferia internacional. Revista para el análisis de la cultura y el territorio*, 23, 165–180. DOI: 10.25267/Periferica.2022.i23.18.
- [44] Nussbaum, M. & Sen, A., eds. (1993). *The quality of life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. DOI: 10.1093/0198287976.001.0001.
- [45] Oman, S. (2021). *Understanding well-being data: Improving social and cultural policy, practice and research*. Cham: Palgrave MacMillan. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-72937-0.
- [46] Pinilla, V. & Sáez, L. A. (2021). What Do Public Policies Teach Us About Rural Depopulation: The Case Study of Spain, *European Countryside* 13(2), 330–351. DOI: 10.2478/euco-2021-0021.
- [47] Pleeter, S., ed. (2012). *Economic Impact Analysis: Methodology and Applications*. Dordrecht: Springer.

- [48] Pospěch, P., Klíma, O. & Hubatková, B. (2024). Loss and autonomy: Making sense of rural life at the inner periphery. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 64(4), 709–724. DOI: 10.1111/soru.12494.
- [49] Querol, V. & Ginés, F. (2021). Festivales en el territorio y acceso a la cultura. Análisis de los festivales culturales como elemento de desarrollo territorial en la provincia de Castellón, *Revista Española de Sociología*, 30(2), a39. DOI: 10.22325/fes/res.2021.39.
- [50] Querol, V. & Sánchez, X. G. (2021). Festivales en el territorio y acceso a la cultura: Análisis de los festivales culturales como elemento de desarrollo territorial en la provincia de Castellón. *Revista Española de Sociología*, 30(2), 4. DOI: 10.22325/fes/res.2021.39.
- [51] Ramos, I., De Rosa, A., Galluzzo, L., Biedermann, A. & Santolaya, J. L. (2024). Integrating Different Approaches and Tools to Evaluate Socio-Cultural Impact of Services Projected in Low-Population Environments, *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 12, 141–152. DOI: 10.4236/jss.2024.123013.
- [52] Rantisi, N., Leslie, D. & Christopherson, S. (2006). Placing the creative economy: scale, politics, and the material. *Environment and Planning A*, 38, 1789–1797. DOI: 10.1068/a39210.
- [53] Rausell-Köster, P., Ghirardi, S., Sanjuán, J., Molinari, F. & Abril, B. (2022). Cultural experiences in the framework of ‘cultural cities’: measuring the socioeconomic impact of culture in urban performance, *City, Territory and Architecture*, 9(1), 40. DOI: 10.1186/s40410-022-00189-8.
- [54] Rausell, P., ed. (2012). *La cultura como factor de innovación económica y social*. Universidad de Valencia.
- [55] Rausell, P., ed., Abeledo, R., Carrasco, S. and Martínez, J. (2007). *Cultura. Estrategia para el desarrollo local*. Madrid: Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional.
- [56] Robeyns, I. (2020). Wellbeing, place and technology. *Wellbeing, Space and Society*, 1, 10013. DOI: 10.1016/j.wss.2020.100013.
- [57] Sáez, L. A. (2021). Análisis de la Estrategia Nacional frente a la Despoblación en el Reto Demográfico en España, *Ager: Journal of Depopulation and Rural Development Studies*, (33), 7–34. DOI: 10.4422/ager.2021.18.
- [58] Sáez, L. A., Pinilla, V. & Ayuda, M. I. (2001). Políticas ante la despoblación en el medio rural: un enfoque desde la demanda. *Ager: Journal of Depopulation and Rural Development Studies*, (1), 211–232.
- [59] Sáez, L. A. & Pinilla, V. (2024). *Ends and Means in Spanish Depopulation Policies: Rethinking Development Objectives in Sparsely Populated Rural Areas* [working paper]. University of Zaragoza.
- [60] Sáez, L. A., Navarro, M. C., Pinilla, V. & López Azcona, A. (2024). *Claves e impactos de la cultura en el medio rural. El valor de lo intangible*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.
- [61] Saiz-Echezarreta, V., Galletero-Campos, B., Castellet, A. & Martínez-Rodrigo, A. (2022). Evolution of the public problem of depopulation in Spain: longitudinal analysis of the media agenda. *Profesional de la información*, 31(5). DOI: 10.3145/epi.2022.sep.20.
- [62] Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2020). Renovación del pensamiento económico-empresarial tras la globalización: Talentism and Happiness Economics. *Bajo palabra*. (24), 293–318. DOI: 10.15366/bp.2020.24.015.
- [63] Scott, A. J. (2000). *The cultural economy of cities: essays on the geography of image-producing industries*. New York: Sage Publications.
- [64] Scott, K., Rowe, F. & Pollock, V. (2018). Creating the good life? A wellbeing perspective on cultural value in rural development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 59, 173–182. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.07.001.
- [65] Sen, A. (1985). Well-Being, Agency and Freedom: The Dewey Lectures (1984). *Journal of Philosophy*, 82(4), 169–221. DOI: 10.2307/2026184.

- [66] Sen, A. (2004). How Does Culture Matter? In Rao, V. & Walton, N., eds., *Culture and Public Action*, (pp. 37–58). Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- [67] Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Other sources

- [68] Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A. & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2010). Report by the commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress.
Retrieved from: ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/8131721/8131772/Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi-Commission-report.pdf.

Annex 1. List of projects under evaluation

Name	Project type	Promoter type	Municipality type	Region
Kilómetro de Arte	Spaces for creation, production, and mediation	Public Funding	Small population in a dynamic/ accessible area	La Rioja
Azala	Spaces for creation, production, and mediation	Small-Scale Private Entity	Small population in a dynamic/ accessible area	País Vasco
Centre d'Art i Natura (CAN) de Farrera	Spaces for creation, production, and mediation	Small-Scale Private Entity	Small population in a peripheral area	Cataluña
Centro de Desarrollo Sociocultural Germán Sánchez Ruipérez	Permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public	Public Funding	Small population in a dynamic/ accessible area	Castilla-Leon
Complejo Cultural As Quintas	Permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public	Public Funding	Small population in a dynamic/ accessible area	Asturias
Ecomuseo del Río Caicena	Permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public	Public Funding	Small population in a peripheral area	Andalucía
Espiello. Festival Internacional de Documental Etnográfico de Sobrarbe	Festivals and events of a fixed duration	Public Funding	Small population in a peripheral area	Aragón
Festival Agrocuir da Ulloa	Festivals and events of a fixed duration	Private Philanthropic Organization	Small population in a peripheral area	Galicia
Festival Internacional de Teatro Clásico de Almagro	Festivals and events of a fixed duration	Public Funding	Small population in a peripheral area	Castilla- La Mancha
Fundación Cerezales Antonino y Cinia	Permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public	Private Philanthropic Organization	Small population in a peripheral area	Castilla-Leon
Fundación Santa María de Albarracín	Dissemination and socialization projects that are more or less stable and sustained over time	Public Funding/Private Entity	Small population in a peripheral area	Aragón
Fundación Santa María la Real	Dissemination and socialization projects that are more or less stable and sustained over time	Public Funding/Private Entity	Small population in a peripheral area	Castilla-Leon
Fundación Uxío Novoneyra	Permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public	Small-Scale Private Entity	Small population in a peripheral area	Galicia

Genalguacil Pueblo Museo	Permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public	Public Funding	Small population in a peripheral area	Andalucía
Mancomunidad de Servicios Bibliotecarios Berragu	Dissemination and socialization projects that are more or less stable and sustained over time	Public Funding	Small population in a peripheral area	Navarra
Museo Vostell Malpartida	Permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public	Public Funding	Small population in a dynamic/ accessible area	Extremadura
Museu Terra	Permanent cultural spaces open to the community and the public	Private Philanthropic Organization	Small population in a dynamic/ accessible area	Cataluña
Mutur Beltz	Spaces for creation, production, and mediation	Small-Scale Private Entity	Small population in a dynamic/ accessible area	País Vasco
Política cultural del Ayuntamiento de Vilafranca	Dissemination and socialization projects that are more or less stable and sustained over time	Public Funding	Small population in a peripheral area	Valencia
Pueblos en Arte	Spaces for creation, production, and mediation	Small-Scale Private Entity	Small population in a peripheral area	Aragon

Annex 2. Statistical data about areas under study

PROJECT	POPULATION (*)	ONLINE SURVEYS	TELEPHONE SURVEYS	TOTAL SURVEYS	SAMPLING ERROR
1 KILÓMETRO DE ARTE	214	128	0	128	± 5.62%
AZALA	826	20	12	32	± 17.34%
CENTRE D'ART I NATURA (CAN) DE FARRERA	3,052	---	51	51	± 13.89%
CENTRO DE DESARROLLO SOCIOCULTURAL GERMÁN SÁNCHEZ RUIPÉREZ	6,123	35	179	214	± 6.72%
COMPLEJO CULTURAL AS QUINTAS	3,780	26	93	119	± 9.02%
ECOMUSEO DEL RÍO CAICENA	2,352	5	64	69	± 11.86%
ESPIELLO, FESTIVAL INTERNACIONAL DEL DOCUMENTAL ETNOGRÁFICO DE SOBRARBE	4,611	55	102	157	± 7.84%
FESTIVAL AGROCUIR DA ULLOA	8,813	141	53	194	± 7.10%
FESTIVAL INTERNACIONAL DE TEATRO CLÁSICO DE ALMAGRO	8,896	---	127	127	± 8.81%
FUNDACIÓN CEREZALES ANTONINO Y CINIA	1,232	6	48	54	± 13.31%
FUNDACIÓN SANTA MARÍA DE ALBARRACÍN	990	77	49	126	± 8.33%
FUNDACIÓN SANTA MARÍA LA REAL	6,711	2	227	229	± 6.49%
FUNDACIÓN UXÍO NOVONEYRA-FESTIVAL DOS EIDOS	1,024	92	35	127	± 8.31%
GENALGUACIL PUEBLO MUSEO	391	101	0	101	± 8.58%
MANCOMUNIDAD DE SERVICIOS BIBLIOTECARIOS BERRAGU	2,641	15	66	81	± 10.94%
MUSEO VOSTELL MALPARTIDA	4,060	20	71	91	± 10.37%
MUSEU TERRA	3,717	54	68	122	± 8.90%
MUTUR BELTZ	2,759	54	108	162	± 7.62%
POLITICA CULTURAL DEL AYUNTAMIENTO DE VILAFRANCA	2,201	125	64	189	± 6.96%
PUEBLOS EN ARTE	1,098	21	57	78	± 10.92%
TOTAL	65,491	977	1,474	2,451	± 1.98%

*) Population calculated based on Spanish National Institute of Statistics statistics for the year 2021, As a general rule, the population of the place where the project is located is used as the reference, However, in some cases, the reference population for survey purposes is extended to include nearby localities that fall within the project's direct area of influence,

Annex 3. Questionnaire for the local population

PROJECT ASSESSED/

The questionnaire begins with a brief reference to the project being assessed and a greeting to the participant.

BLOCK 0: CHARACTERISATION OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Q.1. YOU USUAL RESIDENCE IS (this question is adapted in each case depending on the rural town in which the project is located):

1. IN THE RURAL TOWN WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED
2. I DO NOT LIVE IN THE RURAL TOWN WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED, BUT I DO LIVE VERY NEARBY AND I FREQUENTLY VISIT IT
3. ALTHOUGH I AM REGISTERED IN THE RURAL TOWN WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED, I LIVE IN ANOTHER TOWN OR VILLAGE, BUT I SPEND A LOT OF TIME THERE.
4. ALTHOUGH I AM REGISTERED IN THE RURAL TOWN WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED, I HAVE LIVED IN ANOTHER RURAL TOWN FOR A LONG TIME
5. NONE OF THE ABOVE. (INTERVIEW NOT VALID) * (GO TO LAST APPRECIATION QUESTION) *

Q.2. TAKING INTO ACCOUNT ASPECTS SUCH AS BELONGING TO A CULTURAL ASSOCIATION, THE AMOUNT OF BOOKS THAT YOU READ, THE CONCERTS OR THEATRE SHOWS THAT YOU GO TO, ETC. HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR INTEREST IN CULTURE AND CULTURAL EVENTS OR ACTIVITIES?

1. MY LEVEL OF INTEREST IN CULTURE IS VERY LOW
2. MY LEVEL OF INTEREST IN CULTURE IS LOW
3. I HAVE AN AVERAGE LEVEL OF INTEREST IN CULTURE
4. MY LEVEL OF INTEREST IN CULTURE IS HIGH
5. MY LEVEL OF INTEREST IN CULTURE IS VERY HIGH

NOW WE ARE GOING TO TALK ABOUT THE PROJECT... (REFERENCE TO THE PROJECT BEING ASSESSED)

Q.3. DO YOU KNOW ABOUT THIS PROJECT, ITS OBJECTIVES AND/OR ITS PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES?

1. YES
2. YES, BUT ONLY SUPERFICIALLY
3. NO

Q.4. DO YOU KNOW THE PEOPLE WORKING ON THE PROJECT? DO YOU KNOW THEIR NAMES OR THE TASKS THAT THEY CARRY OUT?

1. YES
2. YES, BUT ONLY SUPERFICIALLY
3. NO

P.5. HAVE YOU PARTICIPATED IN ANY ACTIVITIES OF THIS PROJECT?

1. FREQUENTLY
2. OCCASIONALLY
3. NEVER

P.6. DO YOU HAVE ANY RELATIONSHIP WITH THIS PROJECT? (MARK ALL APPLICABLE ASPECTS)

1. VISITOR OR USER
2. RELATIVE OR FRIEND OF VISITORS OR USERS
3. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM A POLITICAL POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD
4. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM A POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT
5. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM THE POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD IN A LOCAL ASSOCIATION, FOUNDATION OR DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
6. SUPPLIER OF GOODS AND/OR SERVICES
7. OWNER OF A BUSINESS AFFECTED BY THE PROJECT
8. MEMBER OF A CULTURAL PROJECT RELATED TO THIS ONE
9. YOU WORK ON THE PROJECT

10. YOU COLLABORATE IN THE PROJECT (PARTNER, VOLUNTEER, FUNDER, ETC.)
11. NONE OF THE ABOVE
- P.7. AND WITH WHICH DO YOU MOST IDENTIFY?
1. VISITOR OR USER
 2. RELATIVE OR FRIEND OF VISITORS OR USERS
 3. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM A POLITICAL POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD
 4. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM A POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT
 5. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM THE POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD IN A LOCAL ASSOCIATION, FOUNDATION OR DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
 6. SUPPLIER OF GOODS AND/OR SERVICES
 7. OWNER OF A BUSINESS AFFECTED BY THE PROJECT
 8. MEMBER OF A CULTURAL PROJECT RELATED TO THIS ONE
 9. YOU WORK ON THE PROJECT
 10. YOU COLLABORATE IN THE PROJECT (PARTNER, VOLUNTEER, FUNDER, ETC.)

BLOCK 2: ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF THE CULTURAL PROJECT/ KULTUR PROIEKTUAREN

Q.8. I WOULD NOW LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE IMPACT THAT YOU BELIEVE THAT THIS PROJECT HAS HAD IN YOUR COMMUNITY. COULD YOU RATE THE IMPACT THAT YOU CONSIDER THAT THIS CULTURAL PROJECT GENERATES ON EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS ON A SCALE WHERE 0 WOULD BE NO IMPACT AND 10 WOULD BE A HIGH IMPACT.

	0- NONE EZER EZ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10- A HIGH IMPACT ASKO
IT FAVOURS THE ATTRACTION OF NEW RESIDENTS AND/OR THE RETENTION OF THE POPULATION	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT GENERATES AN INCREASE IN THE REVENUE OF THE COMPANIES AND PROFESSIONALS IN THE AREA. FOR EXAMPLE, BY INCREASING THE SALES OF THE SUPPLIERS OF GOODS AND SERVICES TO THE CULTURAL PROJECT OR INCREASING THE INCOME OF RESTUARANTS, BARS, SHOPS, ARTISANS, ETC.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT INFLUENCES THE CREATION OF NEW COMPANIES OR ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT INCREASES THE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES OF THE POPULATION OF THE AREA	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT GENERATES AN INCREASE IN THE VALUE OF SHOPS, HOMES OR RENTS	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT PROVIDES MORE LEISURE AND ENTERTAINMENT OPTIONS FOR THE POPULATION IN THE AREA	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT FAVOURS THE ACQUISITION OF KNOWLEDGE AND FOSTERS A MORE CREATIVE AND CRITICAL SPIRIT	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT IMPROVES THE RELATIONS AMONG THE LOCAL POPULATION	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

IT FAVOURS THE INTEGRATION OF NEW NEIGHBOURS IN THE VILLAGE	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT HELPS THE WELL-BEING AND SELF-ESTEEM OF THE RESIDENTS;THEY FEEL MORE FULFILLED AFTER PARTICIPATING IN ITS ACTIVITIES	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT IMPROVES THE IMAGE THAT THE RESIDENTS HAVE OF THEIR VILLAGE:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT FAVOURS KNOWLEDGE AND/OR IMPROVES THE REPUTATION OF THE TOWN AND ITS SURROUNDING AREA	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT IMPROVES THE IMAGE THAT YOU HAVE OF CULTURE	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

BLOCK 3: PERSONAL DETAILS

D.1. GENDER

1. MAN
2. WOMAN
3. NOT SPECIFIED

D.2. AGE: SPECIFY AGE

D.3. MUNICIPALITY OF RESIDENCE:

This section includes a closed list of municipalities that are adapted to each project

D.4. CURRENT PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION

1. STUDENT
2. ACTIVE WORKER
3. HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY CARE ACTIVITIES
4. UNEMPLOYED
5. RETIRED

D.5. LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED

1. NO COMPLETED STUDIES
2. BASIC (PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION)
3. MEDIUM (BACCALAUREATE / PROFESSIONAL TRAINING)
4. UNIVERSITY EDUCATION OR EQUIVALENT

D.6. THE DATA THAT YOU HAVE PROVIDED WILL NOT BE DISCLOSED TO ANY THIRD PARTY, EXCEPT IN CASES OF LEGAL OBLIGATION. YOU ALSO HAVE THE RIGHT TO ACCESS MODIFY AND ERASE THESE DATA AS SET OUT IN THE GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATION (REGULATION 20/6/679) OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT. IF YOU WISH TO ACCESS, MODIFY, ERASE, RESTRICTY AND/OR OPPOSE THE USE OF YOUR DATA, PLEASE CONTACT IKERFEL@IKERFEL.ES

THIS IS THE END OF THE SURVEY. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COLLABORATION

Questionnaire for the local population

PROJECT ASSESSED/

The questionnaire begins with a brief reference to the project being assessed and a greeting to the participant.

BLOCK 0: CHARACTERISATION OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Q.1. YOU USUAL RESIDENCE IS (this question is adapted in each case depending on the rural town in which the project is located):

1. IN THE RURAL TOWN WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED
2. I DO NOT LIVE IN THE RURAL TOWN WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED, BUT I DO LIVE VERY NEARBY AND I FREQUENTLY VISIT IT
3. ALTHOUGH I AM REGISTERED IN THE RURAL TOWN WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED, I LIVE IN ANOTHER TOWN OR VILLAGE, BUT I SPEND A LOT OF TIME THERE.
4. ALTHOUGH I AM REGISTERED IN THE RURAL TOWN WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED, I HAVE LIVED IN ANOTHER RURAL TOWN FOR A LONG TIME
5. NONE OF THE ABOVE. (INTERVIEW NOT VALID) * (GO TO LAST APPRECIATION QUESTION) *

Q.2. TAKING INTO ACCOUNT ASPECTS SUCH AS BELONGING TO A CULTURAL ASSOCIATION, THE AMOUNT OF BOOKS THAT YOU READ, THE CONCERTS OR THEATRE SHOWS THAT YOU GO TO, ETC. HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR INTEREST IN CULTURE AND CULTURAL EVENTS OR ACTIVITIES?

1. MY LEVEL OF INTEREST IN CULTURE IS VERY LOW
2. MY LEVEL OF INTEREST IN CULTURE IS LOW
3. I HAVE AN AVERAGE LEVEL OF INTEREST IN CULTURE
4. MY LEVEL OF INTEREST IN CULTURE IS HIGH
5. MY LEVEL OF INTEREST IN CULTURE IS VERY HIGH

NOW WE ARE GOING TO TALK ABOUT THE PROJECT... (REFERENCE TO THE PROJECT BEING ASSESSED)

Q.3. DO YOU KNOW ABOUT THIS PROJECT, ITS OBJECTIVES AND/OR ITS PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES?

1. YES
2. YES, BUT ONLY SUPERFICIALLY
3. NO

Q.4. DO YOU KNOW THE PEOPLE WORKING ON THE PROJECT? DO YOU KNOW THEIR NAMES OR THE TASKS THAT THEY CARRY OUT?

1. YES
2. YES, BUT ONLY SUPERFICIALLY
3. NO

P.5. HAVE YOU PARTICIPATED IN ANY ACTIVITIES OF THIS PROJECT?

1. FREQUENTLY
2. OCCASIONALLY
3. NEVER

P.6. DO YOU HAVE ANY RELATIONSHIP WITH THIS PROJECT? (MARK ALL APPLICABLE ASPECTS)

1. VISITOR OR USER
2. RELATIVE OR FRIEND OF VISITORS OR USERS
3. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM A POLITICAL POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD
4. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM A POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT
5. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM THE POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD IN A LOCAL ASSOCIATION, FOUNDATION OR DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
6. SUPPLIER OF GOODS AND/OR SERVICES
7. OWNER OF A BUSINESS AFFECTED BY THE PROJECT
8. MEMBER OF A CULTURAL PROJECT RELATED TO THIS ONE
9. YOU WORK ON THE PROJECT

10. YOU COLLABORATE IN THE PROJECT (PARTNER, VOLUNTEER, FUNDER, ETC.)
11. NONE OF THE ABOVE
- P.7. AND WITH WHICH DO YOU MOST IDENTIFY?
1. VISITOR OR USER
 2. RELATIVE OR FRIEND OF VISITORS OR USERS
 3. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM A POLITICAL POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD
 4. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM A POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT
 5. RELATIONSHIP DERIVED FROM THE POSITION THAT YOU HOLD OR HAVE HELD IN A LOCAL ASSOCIATION, FOUNDATION OR DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
 6. SUPPLIER OF GOODS AND/OR SERVICES
 7. OWNER OF A BUSINESS AFFECTED BY THE PROJECT
 8. MEMBER OF A CULTURAL PROJECT RELATED TO THIS ONE
 9. YOU WORK ON THE PROJECT
 10. YOU COLLABORATE IN THE PROJECT (PARTNER, VOLUNTEER, FUNDER, ETC.)

BLOCK 2: ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF THE CULTURAL PROJECT/ KULTUR PROIEKTUAREN

Q.8. I WOULD NOW LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE IMPACT THAT YOU BELIEVE THAT THIS PROJECT HAS HAD IN YOUR COMMUNITY. COULD YOU RATE THE IMPACT THAT YOU CONSIDER THAT THIS CULTURAL PROJECT GENERATES ON EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS ON A SCALE WHERE 0 WOULD BE NO IMPACT AND 10 WOULD BE A HIGH IMPACT.

	0- NONE EZER EZ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10- A HIGH IMPACT ASKO
IT FAVOURS THE ATTRACTION OF NEW RESIDENTS AND/OR THE RETENTION OF THE POPULATION	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT GENERATES AN INCREASE IN THE REVENUE OF THE COMPANIES AND PROFESSIONALS IN THE AREA. FOR EXAMPLE, BY INCREASING THE SALES OF THE SUPPLIERS OF GOODS AND SERVICES TO THE CULTURAL PROJECT OR INCREASING THE INCOME OF RESTAURANTS, BARS, SHOPS, ARTISANS, ETC.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT INFLUENCES THE CREATION OF NEW COMPANIES OR ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT INCREASES THE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES OF THE POPULATION OF THE AREA	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT GENERATES AN INCREASE IN THE VALUE OF SHOPS, HOMES OR RENTS	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT PROVIDES MORE LEISURE AND ENTERTAINMENT OPTIONS FOR THE POPULATION IN THE AREA	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT FAVOURS THE ACQUISITION OF KNOWLEDGE AND FOSTERS A MORE CREATIVE AND CRITICAL SPIRIT	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT IMPROVES THE RELATIONS AMONG THE LOCAL POPULATION	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

IT FAVOURS THE INTEGRATION OF NEW NEIGHBOURS IN THE VILLAGE	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT HELPS THE WELL-BEING AND SELF-ESTEEM OF THE RESIDENTS;THEY FEEL MORE FULFILLED AFTER PARTICIPATING IN ITS ACTIVITIES	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT IMPROVES THE IMAGE THAT THE RESIDENTS HAVE OF THEIR VILLAGE:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT FAVOURS KNOWLEDGE AND/OR IMPROVES THE REPUTATION OF THE TOWN AND ITS SURROUNDING AREA	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IT IMPROVES THE IMAGE THAT YOU HAVE OF CULTURE	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

BLOCK 3: PERSONAL DETAILS

D.1. GENDER

- 4. MAN
- 5. WOMAN
- 6. NOT SPECIFIED

D.2. AGE: SPECIFY AGE

D.3. MUNICIPALITY OF RESIDENCE:

This section includes a closed list of municipalities that are adapted to each project

D.4. CURRENT PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION

- 6. STUDENT
- 7. ACTIVE WORKER
- 8. HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY CARE ACTIVITIES
- 9. UNEMPLOYED
- 10. RETIRED

D.5. LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED

- 5. NO COMPLETED STUDIES
- 6. BASIC (PRIMARY AND SECONDARY ECUCATION)
- 7. MEDIUM (BACCALAUREATE / PROFESSIONAL TRAINING)
- 8. UNIVERSITY EDUCATION OR EQUIVALENT

D.6. THE DATA THAT YOU HAVE PROVIDED WILL NOT BE DISCLOSED TO ANY THIRD PARTY, EXCEPT IN CASES OF LEGAL OBLIGATION. YOU ALSO HAVE THE RIGHT TO ACCESS MODIFY AND ERASE THESE DATA AS SET OUT IN THE GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATION (REGULATION 20/6/679) OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT. IF YOU WISH TO ACCESS, MODIFY, ERASE, RESTRICTY AND/OR OPPOSE THE USE OF YOUR DATA, PLEASE CONTACT IKERFEL@IKERFEL.ES

THIS IS THE END OF THE SURVEY. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COLLABORATION