

## 2003 European Conference Attendee Survey Summary of Findings

NOTE: References to the U.S. Conference refer to the 2002 attendee survey results. Please refer to the report entitled *ICF 2002 Conference Evaluation Final Report* dated November 2002 for details.

### Respondent Profile

- ✓ A total of 79 responses were received. Respondents are located in 16 countries, the most popular being the U.K. (17 responses), the U.S. (11), Germany (9), France (8), and Switzerland (7). Most (68.4%) were ICF members before the Conference, reporting a median membership length of two years, slightly lower than the three years reported by 2002 U.S. Conference attendees. An additional 5.1% joined at the Conference.
- ✓ Nearly 61% say coaching is their primary job, reporting from six months to 15 years of professional experience (median of four years, same as U.S. attendees). Executive coaching is the most popular primary coaching area by a small margin, followed closely by life/personal coaching and corporate/organizational coaching. Note that a significant number did not report their primary area (see below).

	2003 European Conference		2002 US Conference	
	Primary area of involvement	All important areas	Primary area of involvement	All important areas
Executive coaching	29.1%	63.3%	28.1%	65.8%
Life/personal coaching	21.5%	58.2%	35.1%	68.4%
Corporate/organizational coaching	20.3%	58.2%	13.6%	57.5%
Small business coaching	7.6%	32.9%	12.3%	51.3%
Career/transition coaching	3.8%	53.2%	3.9%	53.5%
No response	17.7%	7.6%	7.0%	2.2%

### Attendance Patterns

- ✓ Responses are about equally divided between repeat attendees (57%) and first-time attendees (43%). About one-third of the repeat attendees participated in both the 2001 and 2002 European Conferences. Most (63.3%) did not attend a pre-conference workshop. Of the 28 who did attend, 12 attended the full day, 12 attended the half-day with Merrill Anderson, and four attended the half-day with Michael J. Gelb.

- ✓ Those not attending the pre-conference workshop cite several barriers, the most common being time, funds, a lack of awareness of the event, and programmatic content (see attached comments).

### Conference Satisfaction

- ✓ Respondents were generally satisfied with Conference events and activities. Peak scores are seen for Dinner on the Island, which receives an average satisfaction score of 4.4 out of a possible 5. Several other events/activities receive average scores of 4.0 or greater (see below).

	2003 European Conference				Average satisfaction score	2002 US
	Satisfaction			Did not attend/no response		Average satisfaction score
	Low	Moderate	High			
First Timers Orientation	2.5%	3.8%	12.6%	81.0%	3.9	3.7
Opening Reception	20.3%	20.3%	46.8%	12.7%	3.5	4.1
Exhibitors Reception	1.3%	22.8%	44.3%	31.6%	3.8	4.1
Closing Ceremony and Gala Banquet	1.3%	5.1%	24.0%	69.6%	4.3	4.4
Dinner on the Island	1.3%	5.1%	50.7%	43.0%	4.4	N/A
Adventure-Based Learning Opportunities (Friday)	1.3%	2.5%	11.4%	84.8%	3.9	
Volunteer Support	5.1%	15.2%	62.0%	17.7%	4.2	
Conference Schedule (Timetable)	7.6%	13.9%	72.1%	6.3%	4.0	

NOTE: "Low satisfaction" are the percentage selecting either of the lowest two ranking points; "high satisfaction" are the percentage selecting either of the highest two ranking points; "moderate" are the percentage selecting the midpoint. "Average score" based on a 1 to 5 scale where 1 = "not at all satisfied" and 5 = "highly satisfied." Non-responses and non-attendees excluded from average score calculations.

- ✓ The respondents were most pleased with networking opportunities, leisure opportunities and social events at the Conference, assigning each an average satisfaction score of 4.2 out of a possible 5. Educational programmes and business opportunities are, however, less favorably reviewed: each receive an average score of 3.7, making them the lowest-rated features examined. Registration procedures also were problematic for some. Although most (62.1%) were pleased with registration, a noticeable number (8.9%) were not, bringing the average score down to a 3.9. In comparison, the U.S. Conference registration scored a 4.4 (see table on following page).

	2003 European Conference				Average satisfaction score	2002 US Average satisfaction score
	Satisfaction			Did not attend/no response		
	Low	Moderate	High			
Advertising the conference from ICF	6.3%	13.9%	72.2%	7.6%	4.0	4.1
Registration procedures	8.9%	22.8%	62.1%	6.3%	3.9	4.4
Educational programmes	10.1%	21.5%	51.9%	16.5%	3.7	4.2
Networking opportunities	3.8%	11.4%	82.3%	2.5%	4.2	4.2
Leisure opportunities	2.5%	7.6%	67.1%	22.8%	4.2	N/A
Social events	0.0%	10.1%	72.2%	17.7%	4.2	4.0
Business opportunities	7.6%	27.8%	48.1%	16.5%	3.7	N/A
Overall value for the money	7.6%	22.8%	64.5%	5.1%	3.9	4.0

NOTE: "Low satisfaction" are the percentage selecting either of the lowest two ranking points; "high satisfaction" are the percentage selecting either of the highest two ranking points; "moderate" are the percentage selecting the midpoint. "Average score" based on a 1 to 5 scale where 1 = "not at all satisfied" and 5 = "highly satisfied." Non-responses and non-attendees excluded from average score calculations.

- ✓ The Free Mentoring Programme and the Balance Track receive the most positive feedback, each with average satisfaction scores of 4.3 or greater. However, these two educational tracks also received the lowest level of participation. Participation rates among the other tracks are noticeably higher, with average satisfaction scores between 3.8 and 3.9 (see below).

	2003 European Conference				Average satisfaction score
	Satisfaction			Did not attend/no response	
	Low	Moderate	High		
Corporate Development Track	5.1%	26.6%	48.1%	20.3%	3.8
Practice Development Track	5.1%	16.5%	41.8%	36.7%	3.8
Personal Development Track	3.8%	13.9%	49.4%	32.9%	3.9
Special Interest Workshops	8.9%	5.1%	36.7%	49.4%	3.9
Balance Track	0.0%	6.3%	29.1%	64.6%	4.3
Free Mentoring Programme	2.5%	2.5%	35.5%	59.5%	4.4

NOTE: "Low satisfaction" are the percentage selecting either of the lowest two ranking points; "high satisfaction" are the percentage selecting either of the highest two ranking points; "moderate" are the percentage selecting the midpoint. "Average score" based on a 1 to 5 scale where 1 = "not at all satisfied" and 5 = "highly satisfied." Non-responses and non-attendees excluded from average score calculations.

## Future Preferences

- ✓ The Bookstore and experienced coaching sessions top the list of suggestions for additional emphasis for future Conferences, each selected by more than 60% as warranting “more” emphasis. As with the U.S. respondents, very few suggest ICF decrease emphasis on an area to any appreciable extent, with average scores for every area examined above 3.0 (where 3 = the same emphasis). A different picture emerges when respondents narrow their recommendations for greater ICF emphasis down to a single choice. Interest in the bookstore drops significantly, with organizational/corporate coaching sessions and coaching demonstrations top-ranked (see below).

	2003 European Conference					2002 US	
	Future emphasis			No preference	Single most important to emphasize	Avg. score	Average score
	Less	Same	More				
Executive coaching sessions	5.1%	34.2%	46.8%	13.9%	11.4%	3.8	3.7
Organizational/corporate coaching sessions	5.1%	34.2%	49.4%	11.4%	21.5%	3.7	3.7
Life/personal coaching sessions	8.9%	46.8%	19.0%	25.3%	7.6%	3.3	3.4
Experienced coaching sessions	2.6%	21.5%	60.7%	15.2%	13.9%	4.0	3.9
New coaches sessions	11.4%	30.4%	17.7%	40.5%	2.5%	3.3	3.4
Coaching demonstrations	2.5%	35.4%	46.9%	15.2%	17.7%	3.8	3.8
Formal/planned networking opportunities	3.8%	43.0%	36.7%	16.5%	3.8%	3.6	3.7
Informal/free-form networking opportunities	1.3%	54.4%	31.6%	12.7%	0.0%	3.6	3.5
Social events	8.9%	60.8%	16.5%	13.9%	1.3%	3.1	3.3
Bookstore	1.3%	15.2%	68.4%	15.2%	5.1%	4.3	3.4
Exhibits	7.6%	48.1%	26.6%	17.7%	0.0%	3.3	3.6

NOTE: “Less emphasis” are the percentage selecting either of the lowest two ranking points; “more emphasis” are the percentage selecting either of the highest two ranking points; “same” are the percentage selecting the midpoint. “Average score” based on a 1 to 5 scale where 1 = less emphasis, 3 = same emphasis, and 5 = more emphasis.

- ✓ Having a list of attendees available at registration is the most common suggestion for improving Conference networking opportunities. Other popular suggestions include a quieter ambient environment (i.e., less noise so people can easily converse) and more exercises/structured events (see attached list of comments).
- ✓ Books, coaching tools, software, and assessment tools are the most popular suggestions when respondents describe the types of exhibits they would like to see at future conferences (see attached list of comments).

### **Future Attendance**

- ✓ About one-third (32.9%) say they will “definitely” attend the 2004 Conference, virtually the same value reported in the 2002 U.S. Conference survey. Most (59.5%) are unsure at this time. Only 2.5% (two individuals) say they definitely will not attend. Decreased cost is the dominant theme when respondents describe what ICF could do to encourage them to attend in 2004. Other issues voiced include a high quality/“big name” keynote speaker, better quality programmatic content, better Conference organization, greater focus on advanced topics/demonstrations, and a more convenient location (see attached list of comments).
- ✓ Networking, general inspiration, and new ideas are the most common themes when respondents describe their biggest gain from the 2003 Conference (see attached list of comments).
- ✓ The survey closed by asking respondents to provide any overall comments or suggestions regarding the 2003 Conference. While there is much positive feedback and appreciation, the responses do not have the same “passion” as those offered in the U.S. Conference survey – the European Conference did not appear to have a major focal point for the comments as the U.S. Conference did with the Benjamin Zander keynote. Suggestions for improvements mirror the issues previously raised, such as the need for an attendee list, better education/speaker quality, improved organization, and more corporate-oriented programming (see attached list of comments).