

This document is part of the project 'Debate answering the challenges of immigration and multiculturalism', supported by European Commission - Europe for Citizens Programme. The document content does not necessarily reflect the viewpoints of the European Commission.

DEBATE ANSWERING THE CHALLENGES OF IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURALISM – EVENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Kranjska Gora and Ljubljana

20. – 27.11.2010




**QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS -
EVALUATION OF THE 'DEBATE ANSWERING THE CHALLENGES OF IMMIGRATION AND
MULTICULTURALISM' EVENT**

Who are our participants?

The survey was conducted amongst the 47 participants who attended the event 'Debate answering the challenges of immigration and multiculturalism' in the week following the end of the event. Questionnaires were prepared in Google documents for online participation and distributed to the participants individually. The questionnaire was completed by 52 participants (the survey also addressed the participants not covered by the project grant).

Country	Total	Female	Male	Participants with less opportunities
Slovenia	15	9	6	5 geographically disadvantaged 3 social background
Poland	6	2	4	3 social background
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	10	5	5	All based on national background
Italy	3	1	2	Data not available
Lithuania	7	3	4	4 social background
Romania	6	2	4	2 social background
Total	47	22	25	27


The majority of the respondents (42% or 22) were from Slovenia, followed by Romania, Poland, Lithuania and Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The category 'other', which received the second highest group representation, is composed by participants that attended the event, but whose participation was not covered by the project grant. The majority (86% or 45) of the participants that participated in the survey were debaters, which also hold true



for the event as a whole. The function 'debaters' in this survey denotes the participants that attended the event with the primary goal of participating at lectures, electives and the tournament.


The functions of judges, teachers and lecturers were to some extent overlapping during the event so the participants were asked to choose their primary function (lecturers and teachers were in the majority of cases also judges). For the majority of the respondents this was not their first time that they attended an international event based on the methodology of formal debate (69% have attended it before). The structure of the participants experience provides a good composition for the transfer of knowledge and sharing of good practices since it was possible for the more experienced students to gain from the event in the sense of exchanging knowledge with students who have similar experience on one hand, and on the other, for the young participants to gain insights and participate in the transfer of knowledge with students who have a considerable pool of experience.

The diversity of experience levels is also reflected in the structure of the past experience with international events by the participants. As Chart 3 reveals, the majority of the participants have been involved in debating for more than 2 years and a third of the respondents indicated that they have not been involved in debate for more than 2 years.



Through the structure of the participants the event accommodated one of the primary goals of the project, which was to assemble a group of students from different national backgrounds and with different levels of experience in an environment which would facilitate an open discussion and promote the need for the exchange of views from different perspectives.

Was this the first time you've attended an international debate event?



Lessons learned

The project was set up with an ambition to equip university students with the skills and knowledge necessary to develop critical awareness about the challenges that the EU is facing internally in the context of increased immigration flows and in that light also the challenges these processes bear on

the development of EU foreign policy and the socio-economical policies. With these goals in mind the project partners developed the strategy to build a sustainable NGO network across the EU and wider which would help to facilitate and develop the methodology of informal learning through the exchange of good practices and capacity building to promote the idea of critical public discourse.

How do you assess the impact of this event on...




Chart 1

The areas in which a great majority of the participants (more than 80%) indicated that 'the event contributed a lot' were the categories of: i) providing for the understanding of European issues from a multicultural perspective, ii) exchange of good practice; the promotion of multicultural learning and bringing the multicultural dimension into debate. Following these results the event therefore contributed greatly to understanding of the issues from different cultural perspectives and through that also to the fulfilment of the primary goal of the event which was to recognize the need of a constructive intercultural dialogue if we want to successfully tackle the growing concerns connected to immigration and multiculturalism.

With regards to the development of a sustainable network of NGO's in the sphere of informal learning the majority of the respondents felt that the event did contribute a lot. The assessed categories included: i) acquiring new skills in project work (70%); ii) strengthening the work of your organization (62%); iii) future planning of similar events (62%). The category in this cluster which was most critically assessed was the category of NGO networking, since only 47% believed that the event contributed a lot and another 13% believed that the event did not provide for this at all. The main cause for the lack of activities and sessions connected to the strengthening of the NGO network was the underlying assumption that the planned educational activities will stimulate non-formal ties, which to some extent holds true, since the participants recognized the above mentioned categories which directly translate into NGO networking and form constitutive parts of a successful cooperation (e.g. future planning of common similar events).




Chart 2


The logistics and the general assessment of the event are presented in the Chart 6. The aim of this part of the survey was to acquire an overview of the different aspects of event organization, which can be clustered into three groups: event logistics, main methodological framework and supporting activities. The general conclusion of this part of the survey is that the event was successful in all three aspects since in all of the three categories the respondents indicated that the event was either 'excellent' or 'good'.

As the chart indicates the participants expressed the highest rate of satisfaction with the general logistics of the event ('accommodation quality' and 'host hospitality' where more than 90% of the respondents felt that they were either 'excellent' or 'good'. On average 82% believed that these aspects of the event were excellent). The cluster of the activities comprising the main methodological framework of the event, namely content electives, debate theory lectures, practice debates and debate exercises followed the trend with more than 90% of the respondents indicating that the activities were either 'excellent' or 'good'. The main difference with the first cluster was the lower percentage of respondents indicating that the activity was excellent (in average 50% believed that

the activities in this cluster were excellent, and another 43% on average believed they were good. Best assessed category was the debate theory lectures).

The cluster of activities that received the lowest satisfaction rate were the supporting activities where, although all still received a generally positive feedback, also present the categories which the participants evaluated the most critically. The activity that received the worst evaluation was the public discussion on multiculturalism in Europe, the quality of which was to a certain extent compromised by the inexperience of the moderators and a general lack of structure and rules guiding the open discussion. The aim of the discussion was to bring together representatives of the organizations dealing with the topics of the event and to engage them with the participant's point of view on the issue. While the organizer partially accomplished that goal by setting up the platform we also let too many issues at hand of the organization members who do not have the necessary expertise to logistically accommodate an event which requires juggling between different stakeholders.

Overall the participants felt that the level of gained knowledge was excellent (62%) and good (33%) which indicates that the activities as a whole did leave an extremely positive impact on the participants, although there were minor difficulties with organizing supporting activities.




With regard to the topical framework of the event, which was reflected in the topic selection covering the processes of immigration (e.g. The EU should grant amnesty to all illegal aliens currently inside the EU) and multiculturalism (e.g. The EU should grant Roma education

in their own language) the participants felt that the topic were either 'excellent' (29%) or 'good' (52%). Following the final / open remarks on the evaluation sheet the participants felt that pressing economic issues, EU foreign policy, security issues should be addressed to a greater extent, but other than that expressed a general commitment to the topic area and listed further examples of debate in this topic area (expansion of the EU to the Western Balkans, youth unemployment, fair trade practices and debates directly related to the role of NGO's in the EU).

As Chart 7 shows the respondents believed that through the selection of the debated topics they have learned most about minority rights in the EU (85% indicated that they have learned a lot), followed by amnesty in the context of illegal immigration (67% indicated that they have learned a lot) and workers rights in the EU (56% indicated that they have learned a lot). The topic area in which the participants believe that they have gained the least knowledge about was the topic of principles of the basic income in the EU. The level of gained knowledge to some extent confirms the content area focus of the event, which was mainly concentrated upon the processes of immigration and minority rights in the European Union and its effects on the socio-economical processes of the EU in international context.

The
electives,
selected 1
hour
lectures on
a variety of
topics
connected
to the
methodolo
gy and




topics of the event, were generally assessed in positive terms (Chart 8). The electives in the group of 'debate strategies and techniques' got the best evaluation point (83% believed that they were very useful and that they have learned a lot), followed by electives in the content area of EU immigration policies and (71% of the respondents indicated that they have learned a lot in these sessions). The electives covering the topics of EU integration and expansion, EU external issues and the logistics of debate fell approximately under the same satisfaction level, which was around 60% of respondents indicating that they have learned a lot.

Recommendations for the future

Following the general assessment of the event and the level of satisfaction with the goals of the event the participants were asked to make recommendations for the future events. The category of closed-ended questionnaires reflected on the activities which formed the baseline of the event in 2010. The results on the need to implement more of the same activities in the future are reflected in Chart 9. The analysis reveals that the participants in general felt that there should be more electives related to the judging of the debates (54%), followed by electives related to the debate theory (46%) and debates (42%).

Chart 9 also reveals that the activity that received the least support was the category of open forum discussion for which 29% of the respondents indicated that they disagree that there should be more of it. The Chart reveals that participants first objective of coming to the event was acquiring skills of argumentation, followed by the objective of learning and acquiring new knowledge in the selected content areas. The



methodology of the event did however significantly increase the participants' awareness of the selected topic areas of the event as evident in from the above analysis.