

## Evaluation of the conference

About 50 active participants were asked to fill in an evaluation form, and 21 did so. The following is a summary of their data. All legible comments were transcribed verbatim. *Organisers' comments in italics.*

### 1. Individual presentations

a) Instruction: "Please mark the best THREE talks in parallel sessions". Results:

Presenter/s: Title	Votes
Boyask et al: <i>Researching diversity for education policy: ... a partnership project</i>	3
Baraldi et al.: <i>... intercultural mediation through dialogue interpreting in healthcare services</i>	2
Clement & Swindells: <i>Triangulation: ... school exclusion, anti-social behavior, state parenting</i>	6
Dub��: <i>Creating an alternative model of inclusion: French minorities in Canada</i>	1
Egmond et al.: <i>The mean(ing) of learning across cultures: Sapere aude or hao-xue-xin?</i>	5
Ertl et al.: <i>MedInt: Developing a curriculum for medical interpreters</i>	0
Fozdar & Volet: <i>Intercultural confidence at university</i>	4
Hadaia: <i>Researchers on the move. Intercultural dimensions in sciences and humanities</i>	0
Ipsiroglu et al.: <i>... effects of culture on "compliance" ... "Transcultural Paediatrics Initiative"</i>	1
Kint et al.: <i>QuartierNEXTDOOR: Improving social cohesion in the Brussels neighborhood</i>	0
L��cio: <i>The Educating City: An intercultural approach through social-educational mediation</i>	1
Moazedi & Satzinger: <i>Blackface and yellowface: On ethnic stereotypes in character design</i>	4
Piatti: <i>Neuland: Bringing refugees and Austrians together</i>	1
P��chtrager: <i>Social networks of elderly people – an intercultural comparison</i>	3
Schneider & Isik: <i>Transcultural school social work practice</i>	6
Schrammel: <i>Multilingual Graz</i>	1
Ward: <i>Developing children's awareness and knowledge of cultural diversity</i>	4

*Organisers' comment: Not all forms were submitted in time for the closing ceremony, in which prizes were offered. On the basis of available forms at that time, the first prize was offered to Marieke van Egmond, the second to Farida Fozdar, and the third to Maryam Laura Moazedi. On the basis of the above more extensive data, the first prize should have been shared by Matt Clement and Sharon Schneider (with 6 votes each), the second prize offered to Marieke van Egmond (5 votes), and the third prize shared by Farida Fozdar, Maryam Laura Moazedi and Ronan Ward (4 votes).*

Regarding this procedure, participants wrote the following informal comments on the evaluation form:

- It would be easier to answer if you put them together in sessions (not alphabetical)
- I do not give rankings. Everyone is equally welcome & important
- I don't want to support ranking, I think each of those presentations & posters was OK; and it's not possible to do an objective ranking
- Why are the keynote speakers not evaluated?
- There's a problem here: It was not possible to attend all of those presentations (the most diligent persons could attend only 50%), so it was not possible to compare them.

*Organizers comments:*

*Evaluation played an important part in cAIR10. Evaluation procedures were as transparent and fair as possible and this was no exception. cAIR aims to promote interculturality and reduce the impact of racism. To achieve these goals we must identify and promote the best work. The main reason why the conference was a success, we believe, is that we developed and applied appropriate careful evaluation procedures for accepting and revising abstract submissions. Someone has to decide what is good and what is not; in the evaluation here, it was the active conference participants. Another aim of this procedure was to give young inexperienced researchers the chance to have their work recognized. Without assessments of this kind there is a tendency to focus on the work of experienced, well-known practitioners and researchers and neglect that of those less experienced and known. The keynote speakers were not included in this procedure, for three reasons: they were professional (their costs were covered); we wanted to promote less known and experienced colleagues; and there was not enough time after the last keynote to include him in the voting. We realized in advance that it was only possible to evaluate talks that one had attended; but deciding to attend a talk based on the title and abstract can also be considered a form of evaluation.*

b) Instruction: "Please mark the best THREE international posters". Results:

<b>Presenter/s: Title</b>	<b>Votes</b>
<b>Billy &amp; Chiutsu:</b> <i>Intercultural dialogue ... artist residence programs ... Batwa in Congo Basin</i>	0
<b>Bisesi &amp; Brabec:</b> <i>The representation of time among different cultures and musical systems</i>	3
<b>Križan &amp; Moranjak:</b> <i>Regionalism, interculturality, and prosperity in a Croatian town</i>	2
<b>Li:</b> <i>Word music in the Fox Trot of Shanghai and Sirens</i>	3
<b>Mazur &amp; Bargłowski:</b> <i>How to ... manage Eastern and Western Christians in one organization?</i>	4
<b>Mennel et al.:</b> <i>PARAMPAMPIN – Children and the Caribbean</i>	9
<b>Pawlata &amp; Wiedenhofer:</b> <i>The Linguistic Landscape of Graz: A sociolinguistic approach</i>	2
<b>Penz &amp; Dong:</b> <i>China and US climate change cooperation: Intercultural, ecolinguistic aspects</i>	0
<b>Simons et al.:</b> <i>Intercultural competence in business and educational contexts</i>	5
<b>Tekin:</b> <i>My way is long, my life is short: Refugees of Basmane</i>	6
<b>Wolf:</b> <i>Developing questionnaires for journalists</i>	6

*Organisers' comment: Not all forms were submitted in time for the closing ceremony in which prizes were offered. On the basis of available forms, the first prize was offered to Lucia Mennel, the second to Irina Wolf and the third to Joke Simons. On the basis of the above more extensive data, the second prize should have been shared by Nezaket Tekin and Irina Wolf; otherwise the prizes were correctly distributed.*

## 2. The conference in general

### a) What was the best thing about cAIR10, in your opinion?

- Contact with people from different disciplines
- The opportunity to learn different ideas about different cultures
- Excellent organization
- Working groups, intersection among people
- Hope against hope!
- The diversity of the participants
- To get so much information + different point of views
- Keynotes, some very professional
- The intention (to produce synergy)
- Interesting talks
- Inter/transdisciplinarity
- International communication + interdisciplinary approaches
- Participants and the support team
- Organisation and variety of presentations
- Some very professional keynotes
- Volunteer Group. Enthusiasm and commitment of organisers
- Very good time scale, opportunities for talk together
- Perfect organisation!
- The variety and diversity of topics; if you focus on one, usually it's "integration", "migration"

*Organisers' comment: Thank you! We worked hard to earn these comments!*

### b) What was the worst thing about cAIR10? (Please do tell us!)

- Not enough time for presentations
- The subjects are diverse, make it hard to focus deeply on one issue
- No microphone-amplifier-loudspeaker system in room 1
- Too little attention to economic aspects
- Too much patronizing, partly low quality key-note-speakers, chairs are quite overwhelmed
- Not enough time to discuss the presentations
- Too academic
- Incompetence of some chairs
- The exclusive admission procedure
- Nothing; the competitive approach "Best submission", "best poster", ...
- Mensa menu for 8€
- No horrible things, but I expected participation of the groups listed in a booklet p.3-5

- Not enough practice - high on theory
- Military drill
- Local lack of interest
- Food, workshops
- Cafeteria food (lunch) - bad and expensive, evaluation form should be improved (esp. no.1)

*Organisers' comment: Most people were grateful for our policy of running everything exactly on time because it meant that everyone got the time allotted to them. The underlying principle was fairness. We believe that the time allotted for presentations (20 minutes talking time for regular presentations) was just right – if we had allowed longer, fewer people would have attended the whole conference or there would have been more presentations in parallel with smaller audiences. We agree that the conference was too academic, i.e. that practice and practitioners were neglected. We also agree that economic aspects of interculturality were neglected. In both cases we hope that a future conference will address these issues. We agree that the content was too diverse and therefore suggest that a future cAIR focus on a more specific topic area. We hope that future conference organizers will find the other comments useful.*

**c) To what extent is cAIR10 bringing together practice and research in interculturality?**

rating	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
frequency	0	2	0	3	0	6	1	4	3	0	2

Please explain:

- Only one real practitioner
- It really provided me with some ideas
- Hardly any non-academic speakers
- Perhaps more practice needs to be highlighted
- The idea is clearly to do that, anyway – at this early stage, many efforts should be still done
- Where was the part of practice?
- NGO's were not encouraged in a way favourable for their goals
- More research practise than intercultural encounters + challenges of "real practice"
- Real practice missing
- It was more theoretic than practical
- The papers showed the relevance to practice

*Organisers' comment: In any future cAIR we will need a better balance between practice and research on all levels: organizers, host institutions, keynotes etc. At cAIR10 we strove for this balance, but our progress was limited because (i) we and our institution were academic, (ii) local NGOs were often too busy to help us – although many still did, and (iii) it was difficult for us to find and contact leading international NGOs based only on information in the internet (academic networks seemed to us to be more global and visible).*

**d) To what extent is cAIR10 contributing to better intercultural communication and less racism?**

rating	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
frequency	0	1	0	1	0	3	1	5	4	4	2

Please explain:

- I feel it's mainly academic
- By stressing the advantages of learning from various cultures
- Raising awareness
- I see an enormous potentiality in this sense, and achievements as well
- Partly too abstract. Must be motivated and mentored
- Racism can only be achieved "in the streets" => importance of practitioners
- cAIR could hardly reach an audience
- Awareness raising, integration of div. cultural + disciplinary backgrounds
- Real practice missing: Theoretical (meta)approaches overrepresented
- Through dialogue + through raising awareness.
- Hopefully
- Raising awareness, informing
- 10 is not possible – it takes time

*Organisers' comment: The goal of improving intercultural communication and reducing racism could presumably be achieved by a series of conferences and accompanying publicity and publications. But it is generally not possible to demonstrate a direct contribution.*

**e) How could the aims of cAIR be better formulated?**

- By stressing dialogue and communication, cf. intercultural wars (Samuel P. Huntington)
- Maybe coordinating intersections between/among groups with complementary aims
- One topic!
- Concentrate on specific topics
- More precise, concise, concrete
- I don't think that your emphasis on racism had such a positive outcome
- A complex issue...no idea at the moment
- Real practice is a must
- I think the way they have been formulated is fine!
- There is always a possibility to become better

*Organisers' comment: On the basis of these comments we were unable to improve our formulations. The interesting points about dialogue, communication, awareness raising, and group coordination (networking?) refer to means, not ends. They could be emphasized in future texts on the methods of cAIR.*

**f) Should cAIR become an international conference series?**

rating	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
frequency	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	2	2	12

*Organisers' comment: This is strong support for the cAIR concept. Thank you!*

Please explain:

- “Intercultural” includes “international”
- A lot of intersectional contributions covering aspects of interculturality on a world scale
- Brings top experts together

If so, in what way should future conferences differ from cAIR10?

- There should be a concrete “subject” of the conference
- Some scholars from developing countries
- Less talk about aims and more about world views, ideologies, ethnic groups, religions.
- More politically oriented events, offering a deep experience into cultural/traditional heritage
- More space for discussion
- Concentrate on specific topics. Less would be more
- More open to “non-Western”, “practitioners”, and non-academic submissions
- Each conference should have a specific topic
- Maybe consider putting new contacts/networks to use and do it elsewhere next year!
- Integration of community leaders + practitioners from diverse fields + countries
- Themes and professionally organized workshops should be organized and announced
- More practitioners - across all ed. & country ...not simply academics
- Focus on special subjects/ specialization
- Wider network, greater participation
- More practitioners and officials
- Longer workshops (25 min is not enough)
- Shouldn't differ much

*Organisers' comment: We invite the organisers of a future cAIR to consider the above comments cAIRfully!*

### **3. About yourself**

a) **Sex:** female 14, male 6

b) **Primary work:** practitioner 8, researcher 12

c) **What is the main reason that you decided to attend cAIR10?**

- Present the result of my research

- It's in English. Diversity. (Disadvantage is also an advantage)
- To experience the discussion, clarify some terms and enjoy myself.
- To learn and promote teaching and learning about diversity
- Interest in interculturality, exchange of opinions, experience
- Compare research
- Info about research state of the art and networking
- General interest
- Interesting topic
- Share my findings with other researchers and find a fresh approach to my subject
- Presentation, interdisciplinary encounters, diverse approaches
- Meet practitioners, get new ideas
- Personal interest
- Vision: Realizing aims expressed in the web
- Transculturality
- Invitation
- To present our project, networking, get new ideas

**d) How much did you gain personally or professionally from cAIR10?**

*nothing at all*

*enormously*

rating	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
frequency				1	1	2	4	2	6	2	2

*Organisers' comment: We are glad that the peak response was so high!*

Please explain:

- Frankly speaking, some issues are unfamiliar to me
- This is the first time I address such problems; I found the dialogue and intersection with other people very constructive
- Most of the presentations were too close to research + government
- O.K.
- I believe that some of the contacts I made can be really useful and prolific in the near future.
- Networking, interchange + international communication
- I still didn't get answers to my questions but I learned many new things
- I could practice talking in front of a group, could get new/different opinions/ideas

**d) What useful idea(s) did you get about applying research to practice in your specific area?**

- Cultural diversity in education
- That concepts should be clarified, that the discussion contributions should be shorter and more stringent, that women are better in the field than men, that it is important to always keep in mind the interdependence of culture and politics.

- Some practical realizations, learning projects
- None, nothing new
- To want more on the discussion in Canada
- Lived diversity needs to include language diversity
- A complex question
- Ideas for staff training + development
- Contacts/communication
- Interdisciplinarity, transculturalism, organized methods
- To be more aware of the work of different groups and people
- Creating an “intercultural garden”; linking my project with other projects

#### **4. Any further comments?**

- It's my first time being in an international meeting. For lacking at such experience, I may not be able to provide some constructive ideas. However, thank you very much. I do benefit from this meeting.
- Very impressive organisational skills displayed! Good timing of talks/ very friendly staff. Well done & congratulations
- Great job, excellent student group! Will come again!
- Equipment to be improved, esp. rooms 2+3, notebook not at the side of the speakers.
- Some presentations had to suffer from an organization that can/should be improved.
- Thanks!
- I don't like this competitive approach in research. That is why I don't want to mark the best presentation and poster.
- If you organize this conference again, please give more time for the presentations and don't interrupt people when they almost finish their talk, this is very impolite and I'm disappointed.
- Everything seemed very well planned and I think it was really positive that you kept such a tight control of time: people really have to be really concise and keep to their subject!
- Very well organized conference with a transparent selection and important feedback system. Congratulations!
- It was a great decision to apply and to come for cAIR10. This financial & time investment will be very profitable for me. People showing time limits should stand at the very back of a room. The presenter looks at the back.
- Beyond the borders of politeness: Unprofessional chairs deducting their time of speech on the one of the speakers; very disturbing for public (& speakers); the military drill just to respect a timetable implanted structurally without mercy. Keep cooler next time ☺.
- Keep it up!
- Thank you organizers and student assistance very much indeed!
- Excellent conference, very friendly staff. I do not believe that a change of word order “Research meets practice” would have attracted more practitioners; apart from that, in “applied research” research comes first – maybe they weren't that committed.

*Organisers' comment: We ask the organisers of any future cAIR to consider these ideas.*