



Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education T@SK project

Towards increased awareness, responsibility and shared quality in social work

585626-EPP-1-2017-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

EAC/A03/2016

Grant Agreement: 2017 – 2881 / 001 - 001

WP 3.1

**Analysis of the satisfaction questionnaires administered
at the T@sk project Meetings**

PI University of Florence



Track of changes

Date	Version	Comments	Author/s
21/01/2020	Draft	Initial version of the document	Sandro Landucci
4/03/2020		Revision first draft	Sandro Landucci Giorgia Bulli
10/05/2020		Final version	Sandro Landucci Giulia Mascagni

Editors P1

Sandro Landucci

Giulia Mascagni

Giorgia Bulli

Analysis of the satisfaction questionnaires administered at the T@sk project Meetings

The number of respondents to the questionnaires that have been administered at the end of each of the *three Training Sessions* and the *two Consolidation Trainings* conducted within the T@sk project till now, are the following:

- 23 for the first Training Session in Tirana (May 2018);
- 25 for the second Training Session in Scutari (October 2018);
- 50 for the third Training Session in Elbasan (December 2018);
- 14 for the First Consolidation Training in Florence (June 2019);
- 12 for the Second Consolidation Training in Lisbon (December 2019).

The clear reduction of attendance between the Training and Consolidation sessions is easily explained by the fact that the second session took place in the EU partner's countries and that they were mainly addressed to the primary beneficiaries of the project (i.e. academic staff) of the Albanian partner units. A fact that also explains why the respondents to the questionnaires administered at Consolidation sessions are not distinguished according to their role (academic staff, professional social workers, members of NGOs and students)

Tab. 1 Distribution of the attendance by role.

	Num.	%		
		Acad. staff	SW/NGOS	Other (stud.)
Tirana Mar 18	23	87	13	0
Shkodar Oct 18	25	88	0	12
Elbasan Jan 19	50	54	18	28
Florence Jun 19	14	100	0	0
Lisbon Dec 19	12	100	0	0

Mean time of attendance within each Meeting

The average attendance of the meeting (calculated as number of sessions attended by each respondent on the total of sessions scheduled for each Meeting) grows steadily from 0,80 of the first training session to 0,85 of the second and 0,94 of the third. The two Consolidation Meetings show even higher rates – Florence 0,99 and Lisbon 0,98 – due to the fact these sessions took place abroad, and attendants didn't have to adjust their presence with their ordinary job commitments as

when meetings took place at their workplace. Also the standard deviation of this variable shows an evolution towards the homogeneity of ratings. All in all, the growth of the attendance among the three meetings can be greeted as a sign of a growing involvement into the activities of the project.

Clarity

The evaluation questionnaires are mainly composed of simple rating items asking to evaluate an aspect of the Meeting with a score going from 1 (min.) to 9 (max.). In general, the data show a general tendency to give high ratings. So, any of the following considerations on the results has to rely on small differences, whose significance (taking also into account the small number of cases) is only that of some hunches about the respondents' level of satisfaction.

The first item was about the clarity of the training activities and other interventions within the sessions;

Tab.2

	Mean Clarity (general)	Mean Clarity (Always Present)	Mean Clarity (Somet. Present)	Mean Clarity AS	Mean Clarity SW	Mean Clarity OT
Tirana Mar 18	7,45	8,13	7,07	7,47	7,33	6,00
Shkodar Oct 18	8,28	8,54	8,00	8,23		8,67
Elbasan Jan 19	8,18	8,39	7,84	7,70	8,44	8,93
Florence Jun 19	8,14					
Lisbon Dec 19	8,75					
	Clarity Stand.Dev. (gen)					
Tirana Mar 18	1,53					
Shkodar Oct 18	0,83					
Elbasan Jan 19	1,29					
Florence Jun 19	1,12					
Lisbon Dec 19	0,43					

The mean clarity ratings show a tendential growth in time. The first Training Meeting has the lowest rating while the last Meeting receives the highest. Differentiating by level of attendance, the mean rating of the group that has attended all the sessions is always higher than that of those who attended only part of them; taking into consideration different roles, we see that the training session Tirana '18 has received lower scores on clarity by "Social workers" (i.e. professional social workers and workers in NGO) and students ("Others") than by Academic staff members; the other two Training meeting show the contrary tendency, with a higher mean score given by Social workers and Students. The Meetings that show the lower ratings are also those that show a higher Standard Deviation (This means that lower mean ratings are due to a few quite low individual ratings): this is a tendency present in all of the Questionnaires' scores.

Intensity of activity

Another item asked about the degree of intensity, i.e. the level of attention and commitment required by the Meeting's activities;

Tab.3

	Mean intensity (gen)	Mean Intensity (A.P.)	Mean Intensity (S.P.)	Mean Intensity AS	Mean Intensity SW	Mean Intensity OT
Tirana Mar 18	6,95	7,13	6,86	7,00	6,67	8,00
Shkodar Oct 18	6,64	7,62	5,58	6,82		5,33
Elbasan Jan 19	6,94	7,19	6,16	6,59	7,44	6,79
Florence Jun 19	8,14					
Lisbon Dec 19	6,25					
Intensity Stand.Dev. (gen)						
Tirana Mar 18	1,36					
Shkodar Oct 18	1,67					
Elbasan Jan 19	2,04					
Florence Jun 19	1,19					
Lisbon Dec 19	1,48					

These ratings don't show any regularity along time; the Florence '19 Consolidation Meeting stands out as the harder (8,14), with the other 4 Meetings scores grouped around 6,6-7,0. Quite obviously, those who attended all the Meetings' sessions show a higher intensity rate than those who attended less. The ratings registered by role of the attendants show no regular pattern.

Work climate

A third item was about the evaluation of the work climate, considered as the level of affective "warmth" (friendliness, kindness, cooperation) experienced by the respondent during the sessions:

Tab.4

	Mean work climate (gen)	Mean Work Climate (A.P.)	Mean Work Climate (S.P.)	Mean Work Climate AS	Mean Work Climate SW	Mean Work Climate OT
Tirana Mar 18	7,09	7,38	6,93	7,05	7,33	7,00
Shkodar Oct 18	8,52	8,62	8,42	8,45		9,00
Elbasan Jan 19	8,34	8,61	7,89	7,96	8,56	8,93
Florence Jun 19	8,79					
Lisbon Dec 19	8,92					
Work Climate Stand.Dev. (gen)						
Tirana Mar 18	1,73					
Shkodar Oct 18	0,90					
Elbasan Jan 19	1,23					
Florence Jun 19	0,56					
Lisbon Dec 19	0,28					

This score shows a lower point for the first Training Meeting – Tirana '18 – than it grows sensibly at the second Training meeting, remaining quite high in the following Meetings. For this item, the two Consolidation meetings have the highest ratings. Those who attended regularly always show a higher mean score than those who didn't; with one exception, the work climate mean scores by the Academic staff are lower than those of Social workers and Students.

Usefulness of the Meeting

A fourth item asked about the level of usefulness of the training activities for the professional needs and goals of the attendant;

Tab.5

	Mean Usefulness (gen)	Mean Usefulness (A.P.)	Mean Usefulness (S.P.)	Mean Usefulness AS	Mean Usefulness SW	Mean Usefulness OT
Tirana Mar 18	7,05	6,63	6,79	7,00	7,33	6,00
Shkodar Oct 18	8,24	8,31	8,17	8,14		9,00
Elbasan Jan 19	8,00	8,39	7,37	7,22	9,00	8,86
Florence Jun 19	8,15					
Lisbon Dec 19	8,50					
	Work Climate Stand.Dev. (gen)					
Tirana Mar 18	2,28					
Shkodar Oct 18	1,14					
Elbasan Jan 19	1,62					
Florence Jun 19	0,77					
Lisbon Dec 19	0,76					

Also this item shows a clearly lower mean rating for the first Training Meeting, and, somewhat paradoxically, its usefulness has a higher mean score among those who attended only partly. With one exception (regarding again the first Training Meeting), the usefulness of the Meetings is considered higher by Social workers and Students than by the Academic Staff.

Overall Satisfaction

The last item of the Questionnaires asked the rating of the general level of satisfaction each respondent felt about the Meeting:

Tab.6

	Mean Global Satisfaction (gen)	Mean Global Satisfaction (A.P.)	Mean Global Satisfaction (S.P.)	Mean Global Satisfaction AS	Mean Global Satisfaction SW	Mean Global Satisfaction OT
Tirana Mar 18	7,64	7,88	7,50	7,53	8,33	6,00
Shkodar Oct 18	8,25	8,50	8,00	7,82		8,67
Elbasan Jan 19	8,16	8,61	7,42	7,59	8,67	8,93
Florence Jun 19	8,46					
Lisbon Dec 19	8,83					
	Global Satisfaction Stand.Dev. (gen)					
Tirana Mar 18	1,43					
Shkodar Oct 18	1,05					
Elbasan Jan 19	1,38					
Florence Jun 19	0,84					
Lisbon Dec 19	0,37					

The lower level of the first Meeting mean rating stands out even for this item; as in the case of the Work climate item, the general satisfaction score is higher for the last two Consolidation Meetings. Those who attended to the entire Meeting show a higher global satisfaction than those who attended only partly. With one exception (Students at the Tirana '18 Meeting) even in this case the mean score of Social Worker and Students is higher than that of the Academic.