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Questionnaire Results

Patterns countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patterns name

Zsanett Juhász
Rita Vargalyte
Livia Kalocsa
Duparc
Veronica Broomes
Maria Margonska
Nándor Balikó
Aldona, Rita
Andrea Szokoly
Graça
Carla Pereira
Laszlo Batho
Livia Farago
Mariann Moncsek
Katarzyna Palarz-Plewińska
Bea Szedlmayer
Anna Pitt
What is your opinion regarding the logistics and organisation of the meeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How was the balance between leisure time and meeting work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you rate the supporting material (written, audio, image, devices)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack of material / poor quality

How do you access the active learning opportunities for practicing?

1 0 0%
2 5 26%
3 6 32%
4 4 21%
5 4 21%

* 

No opportunities 
Usefull opportunities

Do you consider you had achievements: new information, new skills, new products?

1 0 0%
2 3 16%
3 3 16%
4 10 53%
5 3 16%

How do you evaluate the monitoring of the program?
### How do you evaluate the monitoring of unexpected challenges?

- **1** 1 5%
- **2** 6 32%
- **3** 6 32%
- **4** 5 26%
- **5** 1 5%

### Do you consider that the meeting goals were met?

- **1** 1 5%
- **2** 6 32%
- **3** 9 47%
- **4** 1 5%
- **5** 2 11%
How do you evaluate the communication, ethnic interconnectivity, and established contacts?

![Bar chart showing evaluation results]

1 1 5%
2 5 26%
3 2 11%
4 6 32%
5 5 26%

*1 2 3 4 5
Poor Very good

How do you rate the suitability of the venue / value for money?

![Bar chart showing evaluation results]

1 0 0%
2 0 0%
3 1 5%
4 6 32%
5 12 63%

1 2 3 4 5
No good Very good
How do you rate the supportiveness (travel arrangements, accommodation requirements, diets)?

1 0 0%
2 0 0%
3 1 5%
4 6 32%
5 12 63%

How do you evaluate the tourist attractions & local characteristics?

1 0 0%
2 0 0%
3 2 11%
4 5 26%
5 12 63%
Please add any comments you consider pertinent

- The meeting focused only on practical-technical issues, so we could not really know each other, share experiences and could not define a common framework for the project. All these issues are to be clarified till and during the following project meeting.
- The organiser of the visit failed to provided any networking opportunity and as a result we had no chance to socialize or even get to know each other.
- With clearer goals out the outset, I think I would have felt more able to achieve the goals within the time frame. I didn't feel that I understood enough about what the project was aiming to achieve by the end of the workshop, and so I didn't come away knowing I'd met the goals. From a learning experience, however, I found it very useful and have tried to put some of the new theories learnt into practice.
- I found the experience interesting and worthwhile but would have liked a clearer understanding of what we were trying to achieve over the four days, as I left with a feeling that we could have achieved more if we had not been stumbling a bit blindly trying to work out the goals. I found it an excellent cultural experience and one I learnt from and I've been able to apply the learning in my own practice. I would have liked to have gained more of a sense of achievement in terms of useful output for the project.
- I especially welcome the special potentials to be able to work together with collegues from other countries on how to make language learning in general more accessible for a wider range of society. I am glad to have the possibility to learn about collegues knowledge and experiences as well as to share my knowledge and experiences in the fields of 'economic' foreign language learning and teaching. I hope to be able to coorperate in the future as well.
- Should have more time to know each other.
- The 1st meeting was quite infomative, we have got a lot information about neurodidactics. The practical part was not very successful, some tasks were not clear. Sometimes it was not clear what was the purpose of the task. Inspite of that we hope we all together will managed to to reach project goals.
- I would suggest to mix more nationalities with different kind of tasks, maybe for exchanging experiences... not just the audio editing.