

---

## **InterCultural Iceland – 2017 Post Course Survey Report**

### **Introduction**

InterCultural Iceland has been offering in-service courses for teachers, trainers and others involved in any kind of educational work since 2003. The sociologist and teacher, Guðrún Pétursdóttir, founder and main trainer of ICI had by that time written two books about intercultural education and cooperative learning in multicultural groups, joined several European projects and given training courses in Iceland for some time. The first courses that were offered for European participants were through the Grundtvig and Comenius programs and after that through Erasmus+ mobility programs. Altogether we count 1.400 European participants on our courses from 32 countries.

Even though all participants on all courses are invited to give feedback on the final day of the course this is anonymous and paper based and focuses on the specifics of the course undertaken including accommodation, administration and course content. We also get a lot of individual feedback from enthusiastic participants who tell us that the ideas and methods that we are introducing and training “really work!” but we have never until now taken the step to make a professional and thorough survey to find out how useful our training has been in the longer term.

In 2016 we started to run an annual survey seeking post course feedback. All participants are sent the survey some months after the course to allow practice and reflection on what was learned. This, in addition to the initial feedback help us to evaluate the impact of the training and make any changes in response to the feedback.

The survey rubric allows direct year on year comparisons to be made.

### **Outcome**

Using the ‘Survey Monkey’ system a 100 randomised responses were used to analyse results. 222 surveys were sent representing the total number of participants in 2017. The answers were as followed:

1. In response to the question: **‘On reflection how worthwhile do you think the course was?’** the responses were an average of 4.40 out of a possible 5. This compares with an average for 2016 of 4.74 which is not statistically significant. Overall this does not vary in any significance from 2016 and the most common rating was 5, the highest available.

1	2	3	4	5	Average
0	5	11	23	61	4.40

Whilst many of the comments on this question featured very positive remarks in relation to the trainers personally these have not been copied below for brevity. There were no negative comments. A selection of comments follows:

- Excellent
- A good balance between theory and practice.
- A really useful course for me to reflect on my practice and update and improve it
- A great course with great information
- Great activities and a real eye opener
- I will certainly use these methods
- Gave me ideas and made me feel
- Extremely helpful and shaped my way of understanding others
- I changed a lot and became able to see the unseen process around me, I cannot express how grateful I am and thank you so much for this course
- It was eye opening to learn, think and exchange with the others and the trainers – it was like an opening door process which has only just started
- The course made me more conscious about the issues and how responsible I am for my migrant students and how I can improve their experience
- Great trainers – always positive and friendly
- A wonderful insight into the lives of the past during our trip – thanks Gudrun

2. In response to the question: **‘Have you used any of the ideas and practices you learned on the course?’** a quarter (25%) said they had used most of the ideas and 75% had used some. It should be noted that whilst the majority of participants are teachers there will be several who are not and thus will perhaps not be able to actively use the methods but can cascade and promote them. Comments highlighted specific methods that had been trialled to good effect. Over half had tried class climate activities and introduced some methods into teaching and others had moved into use of full cooperative learning techniques. Most were working towards this as an aim. This represents an increase in those using the methods by the time they received the survey in comparison with 2016 with all course participants using the ideas and practise at some point after the course.

Most of the ideas	25
Some of the ideas	75
None of the ideas	0

3. When asked to rate **how well the ideas and practices worked** out of 5:

1	2	3	4	5	Average
0	0	2	45	53	4.51

The average rating was 4.51 which is an increase from 4.20 in 2016. Whilst most reported high levels of enjoyment and positive learning arising from the practice some felt they needed more time to practice and improve and some felt they had not yet been able to embed practice due to time constraints. Most showed positive reflection and constructive self criticism. Some respondents have shared their experiences more fully with their group and with the trainers. Listed below are some of the comments given by respondents to this question:

- The students need to get used to this method of working and then the results will be even better
- It went well. The more you use the methods the better it get as you learn what works and what can go wrong
- I have not only used the methods with students but in dealing more widely within the institution
- I have been able to adapt this with physics
- I have used it in class but also in social activities and found that this has helped the Hungarian students to step forward and be supportive of those with different backgrounds and I have seen groups become more mixed with the International students and now they are more social and supportive and have fun together

4. In response to the question: **‘Have you been able to pass on what you have learned in your workplace?’** 84% answered ‘Yes’. This represents an increase of 5% on 2016. For those who had not yet done so the comments showed that this was planned in the future:

- We are still reflecting and planning with our colleagues
- In intensive talks with teachers at the school
- We have tried it but are evaluating how successful it was
- Not yet but I plan and hope

5. When asked which ICI courses participants might be interested in joining in the future the responses were:

<b>Diverse Society - Diverse Classrooms</b>	13
<b>Reaching, Keeping and Teaching Learners</b>	14
<b>Sensitisation Training with reference to Racism, Migration etc</b>	6
<b>Assessment for Learning</b>	11
<b>Learning Social Skills in Nature</b>	14

The responses are broadly similar to 2016. A few comments noted that they would not be able to attend any more courses due to job change or internal policies of their workplaces and expresses sorrow at this. Over half expressed an interest in further ICI courses specifically and around a further 25% had a non specific interest.

6. In response to: **‘Do you think learners/service providers have had a better service as a result of your attendance on the course?’** 93 respondents felt that this was the case. This is a 13% increase on 2016.
7. The question **‘Would you recommend ICI as a training provider’** drew a response of ‘Yes’ from 100 respondents. This is a 1% increase on 2016.
8. The final question asks participants which course they undertook. There was a pro rata sample of 100 taken across all courses randomly.

**Summary:** Overall respondents answered for the most part in the most positive categories with the highest ranking of 5 being the most often given response across all rated questions. Where there were less positive responses these were generally due to external constraints such as staff development dates after completion of survey or not having a teaching role in the period concerned.

In most respects the results of the 2017 survey show an increase in participant satisfaction with a pleasing 5% increase in participants being able to share their learning with others in the workplace.

The key improvement is one of a 13% increase in feeling their learners receive a better service from them as a result of undertaking the course.

The response rate was higher than in 2016 (69% against 61.8%). With external surveys tending to generate response rates of around 10 – 15% (FluidPulseSurveyData2016) the response rate for this survey is significantly high.

It is acknowledged that there is a methodological flaw in that courses held toward the end of the year have less time between course and survey in which to reflect and embed. However this would indicate an overall increase rather than decrease in ratings so in terms of overall analysis can be discounted.

The final analysis shows a high level of satisfaction and application of the ideas and techniques which gives an improvement in the ratings given in 2016.

Cherry Hopton  
InterCultural Iceland  
December 2017