



MSc in Human Resources and Psychology
Department of Business Administration

**Icelandic for foreign employees: A comparison of
online and classroom training**

An experiment on foreign employees learning Icelandic

August, 2022

Name of student: Kristjana Björk Magnúsdóttir

Kennitala: 031177-5299

Supervisor: Freyr Halldórsson

Abstract

Foreigners moving to Iceland and entering the labor market have increased significantly in the last few years. It is essential to learn the language in the country you live in to faster integrate into society. This experiment aims to answer if the Icelandic language learning outcome improves among the foreign employees having Icelandic classroom courses onsite straight after work, online Icelandic courses during working hours compared to having no Icelandic courses. The researcher created three groups of foreign employees. Two experimental groups, one received Icelandic language courses in classroom setting, the second one received Icelandic language courses online, and the control group received no Icelandic language course. All three groups were pre-and post-tested by doing a status assessment both in writing and by oral test in the Icelandic language. The participants also received a questionnaire with background questions at the beginning of the experiment. At the end of the experiment, the experimental groups received a training evaluation questionnaire. One of the policies in the organization is that all foreign employees should learn the Icelandic language. The result indicated that there was a significant difference in simple grammar score between classroom and online group but not in advanced grammar or oral. All the groups scores from the Icelandic language assessment improved except for the classroom group, the score decreased slightly in advanced grammar. Further implications are discussed, and suggestions for future research.

Keywords: Icelandic teaching, Online teaching, Foreign citizens, Employees, Training methods, Foreign labor market

Declaration of Research Work Integrity

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in the candidature of any degree. This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Other sources are acknowledged by giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

By signing the present document, I confirm and agree that I have read RU's ethics code of conduct and fully understand the consequences of violating these rules regarding my thesis.

15.09.2022, Reykjavík

031177-5299

Krishana B. Magnúsdóttir

Date and place

Social Security Number

Signature

Acknowledgment

This master essay is 30 credit (ECTS) final project for an MSc degree in Human Resource and Organizational Psychology at Reykjavík University. This thesis was written during the summer semester of 2022, but the experiment lasted from February to May 2022. The mentor was Freyr Halldórsson, a professor at Reykjavík University, who came up with valuable and good tips for the essay. He receives my sincerest thanks. I want to thank my family and friends for their patience and understanding and my employer for allowing me to do this experiment in the workplace.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Literature review	8
2.1 Foreigners in the labor market	9
2.1.1 <i>The immigration legislation on the labor market – moving to Iceland</i>	10
2.2 Icelandic language learning for foreigners.....	11
2.2.1 <i>European Language Framework</i>	12
2.2.2 <i>Institutions and companies offering Icelandic language courses</i>	12
2.2.3 <i>Educational institution curriculum</i>	14
2.2.4 <i>Legislation regarding foreigners learning Icelandic</i>	14
2.3 Previous research and theory on Icelandic language teaching.....	15
2.3.1 <i>Online training vs. classroom training</i>	17
2.3.2 <i>theories of learning</i>	18
2.3.3 <i>Training Evaluation</i>	18
3. Method	19
3.1 Participants	19
3.2. Procedure.....	19
3.3 Measures – Learning outcome	20
3.4 Questionnaire with background questions	21
3.5 Questionnaire with training evaluation questions	21
3.6 Data collection	22
4. Result.....	23
4.1 Pretest result between groups.....	23
4.2 Answer to the research question and hypothesis.....	24
4.3 Training groups (Online and Classroom) vs. Control group (None)	25
4.4 Classroom training vs. Online training	25
4.5 Training satisfaction.....	25
4.6 Pre- and post-test scores within the groups.....	26
4.7 Supplemental analysis.....	28
Discussion.....	28
5.1 Summary	28
5.2 Conclusions	32
Reference	33
Appendix A: Consent for use of data.....	40
Appendix B: Questionnaire with backgrounds questions.....	41

Appendix C: Evaluation questionnaire	44
Appendix D: Example for the Icelandic language assessment	46

List of tables

Table 1. Mean, SD, between all variables used in the study.....	24
Table 2. Mean, Standard Deviation, and One-Way ANOVA. Analysis of Variance in Pretest scores between groups.....	25
Table 3. Mean, Standard Deviation, and One-Way ANOVA. Analysis of Variance in differences in learning outcome in Simple grammar, Advanced grammar, and Oral between groups.....	25
Table 4. Means, SD, between variables Attendance, Living in Iceland, Self-assessment, Differ in simple grammar, Differ in advanced grammar and Differ in oral for Classroom group.....	28
Table 5. Means, SD, between variables Attendance, Living in Iceland, Self-assessment, Differ in simple grammar, Differ in advanced grammar and Differ in oral for None Group.....	28
Table 6. Means, SD, between variables Attendance, Living in Iceland, Self-assessment, Differ in simple grammar, Differ in advanced grammar and Differ in oral for None Group.....	29

1. Introduction

The rapid increase of foreigners living in Iceland and participating in the labor market are growing yearly. In March 2010 were 15,006 foreigner on the labor market,

but in July 2022 it had more than doubled or 42.638 foreigners were on the labor market (Statistic Iceland, 2022a). It is getting more accessible for foreigners to move between countries to seek work or other opportunities. Foreigners play an essential role in society and the economy in Iceland. During the last three decades, there has been a positive population trend due to foreigners moving to Iceland (Þórðardóttir, 2011). The increase in foreigners in Iceland and the need for them in the labor market has caused many organizations to start offering their foreign employees Icelandic language courses during working hours or straight after work. A professor in Iceland wrote an article in the paper saying that 53% of members in the second biggest union in Iceland are foreigners, and therefore it should be implemented in the union contract that employer must provide Icelandic learning during working hours (Rögnvaldsson, 2022). Today many educational institutions and educational providers in Iceland are also provide Icelandic language courses during working hours but it is more selection of courses in the evening. This experiment started in the fall of 2021 in an organization in Iceland that began to offer foreign employees Icelandic language courses onsite straight after work in a classroom. It had been tried before but stopped because it was difficult for the employees to attend the classes. From fall 2021 and until December 2021 the same happened. Employees registered in the Icelandic courses missed out a lot of classes. The reason was that employees were tired or had other responsibilities to take care of after work and therefore skipped the lesson. The restrictions from the government because of the Covid -19 pandemic and the employees and teacher's illness also influenced the teaching. In addition, only 15 participants can attend class at the same time due to the size of the classroom. The organization has always offered foreign employee grants to attend Icelandic language course in the evening with an educational institution. Although the organization had been offering to pay for Icelandic language courses for foreign employees that wanted to attend Icelandic course with educational institutions after work, not many were taking advantage of it. One possible reason is that not all of foreign employees own a car to get between places, another reason could be that they have children at home they need to care for, a third reason could be that it is difficult to find the right Icelandic language course to attend. Two of the findings in the research done by Hoffmann et al., (2021) regarding adult immigrants perspective on Icelandic courses as a second language were that the courses were not tailored to the foreign individual's practical needs and the lack of availability of courses in rural areas.

A few researches have studied classroom courses vs. online courses regarding language learning. Participants in the classroom course were more positive and satisfied with the instructor and the quality of the course, although the two courses didn't have any differences in learning outcomes (Johnson et al., 1999; Schutte, 1997). More studies have shown that it is no significant differences in learning outcomes, but it has been significant differences in usefulness and participation. Choosing an online course offers better scheduling than other alternatives (Arbaugh, 2000; Salcedo, 2010; Tallent-Runnels et al., 2006). Educational provider organizing the learning in this experiment is using the formative assessment to set up the teaching. The formative assessment has proven to be effective in learning. One factor in formative assessment is finding out the learner's needs and where the learner is going (Wiliam, 2000). Same as was done in this experiment.

This experiment analyzes if it is a similar learning outcome in the classroom, online, or no Icelandic language course offered for a foreign employee working in a large organization. It would be more convenient both for the employee and the organization if it were the same outcome. If the foreign employees could learn the Icelandic language online, it would be easier to schedule the courses for them around their work schedule. Research on second language started around 1960s. Since then, it has grown rapidly. Some researchers have been looking into the distinction between second language and foreign language in what is learnt and how it is learnt. Second language is recognized as a communication for foreigners that live in a country where other languages than their mother tongue is spoken. While foreign language learning takes place where individuals want to learn the language but it doesn't play major role in the community (Ellis et al., 1994). Foreigners learning a second language are more exposed to the language both in the workplace and in their daily lives while individuals learning foreign language are not exposed to the language. In this research employees are being trained in a second language. In today's world it is common to find individuals who speak more than one language in this multilingual world. Foreign language learning is not only about teaching vocabulary and grammar to students but also about teaching them to use the knowledge in practice and to be able to express thoughts and ideas. Focus is on communication in language learning (Zhang, 2010). There is not much known about the learning outcome of teaching the Icelandic language online versus in the classroom, which hopefully this research will aim to answer.

The research question in this thesis is: Will participating in Icelandic language courses in a classroom, online, or having no Icelandic course provide the same learning outcomes for a foreign employee working in Iceland?

H₁: Learning outcomes will improve more for the training groups (online and classroom) compared to the control group?

H₂: Learning outcome will improve more for traditional classroom training than online training?

H₃: Training satisfaction will be greater for traditional classroom training compared to online training?

The researcher hopes that the result from this experiment will be that the H_0 : will not be rejected, and that the learning outcomes will not differ much between classroom versus online Icelandic language learning.

2. Literature review

A foreigner is an individual born abroad as well as both parents born abroad along with grandparents born abroad. Second generation of foreigner are individuals born in Iceland but both parents born abroad (Stjórnarráð Íslands, n.d.). More foreigners follow variety in culture, gender identity, language, and nationality and it has started to color the country. The key for individuals moving between countries is integration and inclusion. To create stability of economies and long-term well-being and to help the society and economy to thrive, everybody in the society needs to be supported (European Commission, 2020). In order for a foreigner to adapt quicker to society and relate to different cultures, it is essential to learn the language in the country you live in. This fact has encouraged individuals to learn foreign languages for centuries. The environment is getting more global, and for a foreigner to succeed, language learning is crucial so not to hamper the integration of foreigners (LeLoup & Ponterio, 1995). To have employees with various backgrounds will lead to a more competitive labor market both in the private and public sectors and is beneficial for the whole community (European Commission, 2020). For the reader to gain an understanding of what is involved in this thesis, we will review research and theories of foreigners in the labor market, Icelandic language teaching for foreigners, online as well as classroom learning and training evaluation. Finally, the thesis covers both challenges that foreigners have when going into the labour market and for foreigner learning the Icelandic language.

2.1 Foreigners in the labor market

Foreign nationals registered in Iceland in end of second quarter 2022 were 59,490 total or an increase of 8,6% since December 2021 (Statistic Iceland, 2022b). Most of the foreigners coming to Iceland to work are from Europe, and in 2021 it was total of 42,967 foreign individuals. Most of the foreigners come from East Europe, and Polish citizens in December 2021 were 20,553 or 5,5% of the population (Statistic Iceland, 2022c). According to statistics in Iceland, 15,128 foreign citizens were on the labor market in the second quarter of 2010, which increased every year until the first quarter in 2019, when it started to decrease. The reason for the decrease could be because of the Covid 19 pandemic. In second quarter 2021 it started to increase again and, in July 2022 it had more than doubled or 42.638 foreigners were on the labor market with legal residence in Iceland were on the labor market or 11,2% of the population in Iceland (Statistic Iceland, 2022a).

Initially, it was mostly jobs in the seafood industry that got foreigners to move to Iceland. However, in recent years it has changed to the travel and construction industries. From 1998 to 2001, foreigner moving to Iceland exceeded 6,500 deported. Foreigner were not taken jobs from Icelanders rather hired in jobs Icelanders didn't want to work in (Director of Labor, 2018). Foreigners create value for society by paying taxes to the Icelandic government, and the income from the taxes is used to build up the community. If it weren't for the foreigners, the economy would not have grown as fast as it has done. Therefore foreigners play an essential part in the Icelandic society and economy (Bergmann, 2008). Not all foreigners that moved to Iceland initially intended to seek citizenship, and many meant to live in Iceland only as long as their wages were better than those available in their home country (Wojtyńska & Skaptadóttir, 2021).

National economic forecast in March (2022), says Iceland's unemployment rate will decrease in 2022. Statistic Icelandic labor market research for the year 2021 shows that the employee participation rate had risen by about 1,4% between years. Demand for labor in Iceland has increased and is expected to grow more to meet an increase in demand. It looks like the population in Iceland needs to increase significantly to keep up with the demand for labor. Therefore, we expect that foreigners coming to Iceland will increase (Statistic Iceland, 2022e). The government agency Statistics Iceland does not count the workers coming to Iceland to work for a short term only. Multicultural Center carried out a study that showed that 62% of foreign workers that participated in the study signed an employment contract without understanding it. The whole contract or

part of it. Also, the employer applies for the work permits, not the employee, which creates an unequal relationship between the worker and the employer (Skúladóttir, 2006). Most foreigners learning Icelandic think it is a complex language to learn. Research that Þóra Christiansen and Erla S. Kristjánsdóttir did in the year 2016 provided an insight into and analyzed how foreign individuals with a university degree and working in the labor market in Iceland were experienced living in Iceland. The focus was on their communication and negotiation position. The main result showed that participants in the research experience a weak negotiating position because of their Icelandic language skills. It would limit their ability to apply for a job and their access to a network and social capital.

2.1.1 The immigration legislation on the labor market – moving to Iceland

There are different legislations that apply for foreigners moving to Iceland and it depends on the purpose of the stay and whether the person is from a country in the European Economic Area or from a country outside of it. The main principle is that all foreigners who want to work in Iceland must have a work- and residence permit to work in this country. A few exceptions are from that principle and are mostly based on the Agreement on the European Economic Area. A foreigner national from EEA/EFTA who plan to stay in Iceland for more than three months do not need a resident permit but need to register their right to stay in Iceland with the Registers Iceland (Stjórnarráð Íslands, n.d.). If an employer wants to hire a foreigner, the employer must fill out an application regarding a work permit according to the Act on the Employment Rights of Foreigner, nr. 97/2002, and Regulation nr. 339/2005 about Employments Rights of Foreigner. Residence permit according to Act On Foreigners No. 80/2016. The employer is responsible for filling out those applications.

Iceland signed the EEA agreement in 1992, which established Icelandic relations with the European Union. The free movement of persons is one of the core rights guaranteed in the European Economic Area (EEA), the extended Internal Market which unites all the EU Member States and three EEA EFTA States – Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway. The legislation on the free movement of persons aims at eliminating all obstacles to the freedom of movement and to give the same rights to nationals of an EEA State and their family members within the EEA by eliminating any discrimination on the basis of nationality. It is perhaps the most important right for individuals, as it gives citizens of the 30 EEA countries the opportunity to live, work, establish business, and study in any of these countries (European Economic Area (EEA), 2022). The EEA

came into force in 1994, and with it, the citizens of the EEA member states did not need a resident permit to work in Iceland but were required only to register at the National Register of Iceland (The Director of Immigration, n.d.). The European Economic Area (EEA) brings together the EU Member States and three of the EFTA States (Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway). It was established by the EEA Agreement, an international agreement that enables these three EFTA States to participate fully in the Single Market. It covers the four freedoms, i.e., the free movement of goods, capital, services and persons, plus competition, and state aid rules and horizontal areas related to the four freedoms. The objective of the EEA Agreement is to create a homogenous European Economic Area. All relevant EU legislation in the field of the Single Market is integrated into the EEA Agreement so that it applies throughout the whole of the EEA, ensuring uniform application of laws relating to the Single Market (European Economic Area (EEA), 1994).

Nordic citizens and citizens from the EEA area can seek employment in Iceland without much red tape or other official permits. The common Nordic labor market was founded with an agreement signed in 1954. The agreement grants Nordic citizens permission to settle and work in other Nordic countries without any problems (Oldgard, 2019). A family member of EEA/EFTA has the right to a permanent residence in Iceland and does not need to apply for it. The main rule is that Foreigner who has had continuous legal residence in Iceland for four years minimum has the right to an unrestricted work permit (The Director of Immigration, n.d.).

2.2 Icelandic language learning for foreigners

Icelandic is the primary language in Iceland. The Icelandic language is considered one of the cornerstones of Icelandic culture, largely due to its strong literary heritage. The language has changed very little from when the country was settled in the ninth and tenth centuries (Iceland Language, 2022). There has been a rapid increase of foreigners to Iceland in recent years, creating a need for Icelandic language courses. There aren't any rules that say that a foreigner needs to learn Icelandic or attend an Icelandic language course before starting to work in Iceland. Still, a report from the Director of Labor stated that long-term unemployment among foreign staff has a strong connection with their knowledge of Icelandic (Director of Labour, 2022). There has been little standardization of courses teaching the Icelandic language. The reason for that is that the educational system is not systematized, and the government doesn't have much oversight of formal language training in Iceland. Therefore teachers have more

freedom to tailor their needs to particular groups of participants (Skaptadóttir & Innes, 2017). Lack of standardization leads to a lack of evaluation at the start or the end of the course. Participants with different proficiency levels learn together, leading to challenges (Hoffmann et al., 2021).

2.2.1 European Language Framework

Most educational providers in Iceland are using the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages according to a report done in 2014 by Ministry of Education. European Language Framework for language was introduced at the beginning of the 21st century, to standardize the description of language skills within and between languages and make it easier for educational institutions and employers to evaluate candidate's skills in language for education admission or employment. It divides students into three areas (A, B, C) which is then divided into six levels, A1, A2; B1, B2; C1, C2 – A is a basic user, B is independent user, and C is a proficient user. Each level describes what the student should be able to do in reading, listening, speaking, and writing. In Appendix 1, a simple description of each level is indicated. For instance, students completing level one should be able to (1) understand and answer simple questions about themselves and their family; (2) understand and produce a simple conversation about their work; (3) use time concepts, numbers, and vocabulary to explain everyday activities; and (4) use terms for body parts and illness in conversations about health (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, 2022).

2.2.2 Institutions and companies offering Icelandic language courses

Icelandic language courses for adults have existed since the 2000s. In the beginning an official program or curriculum wasn't established. Teachers of Icelandic language courses didn't have any requirements, and the teachers had different educational backgrounds, professional experience, or any training in adult language education strategies (Innes, 2020). There aren't many researcher regarding Icelandic language learning until 2008 when a particular curriculum was presented. Icelandic teaching for foreigners falls under secondary education and is therefore followed up with assessments and quality checks according to the regulation on adult education. Also, when creating the curriculum, the reference framework of the Council of Europe for foreign languages (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) was used as a reference. The curriculum was created as a requirement by the Ministry of Education (Menntamálaráðuneytið, 2008).

In 2014 the Ministry of Education and Children hired a company in Iceland to do a report on Icelandic language learning for foreign citizens. In the report, 15 recognized educational providers who are teaching the Icelandic language are evaluated. The purpose of the report was twofold, first, administration of the Icelandic language teaching and second, the implementation of the Icelandic language teaching by those who provide the service and if they are having expected results. The educational companies in the report are from all over Iceland: In the Capital area are: Mímir símenntun, Betri árangur, Retor and Námsflokkar Hafnarfjarðar and Málaskóli Lingva. In East Iceland are: Austurbrú. In North Iceland are, Farskólinn, SÍMEY, Þekkingarnet Þingeyinga. In west Iceland are: Fræðslumiðstöð Vestfjarðar, Símenntunarmiðstöð Vesturlands. In south Iceland are: Fræðslunetið, Miðstöð símenntunar á Suðurnesjum, Viska- fræðslu- og símenntunarmistöð Vestmannaeyja and Saga Akademía.

Málaskóli Lingva is out of business and Námsflokkar Hafnarfjarðar, Þekkingarnet Þingeyinga and Símenntunarmiðstöð Vesturlands didn't have any Icelandic courses scheduled for fall 2022. All educational providers in the report use the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages learning. Four, Icelandic language course providers that are offering both online Icelandic language courses and in classroom are: Mímir – símenntun, Akademía, Retor and The Tin Can Factory (which was not in the report). Another Icelandic language course provider, Múltíkúlt that was not in the report is offering Icelandic courses for foreigners but only in classroom (Jónsson et al., 2015).

The University of Iceland and the University of Akureyri were also not in the report but are both also offering Icelandic language teaching for foreigners, and the University of Iceland offers more intensive courses by offering a complete BA program in Icelandic as a second language. The University of Iceland also runs an online language program called “Icelandic Online”, which teaches the basics of Icelandic, and is a good introduction to a foreigner before arriving in Iceland. In addition, they offer classes called Plus courses which offer a tutor for more advanced Icelandic teaching.

Tungumálatorg is a webpage where the book “Íslenska fyrir alla” can be accessed and is available for everyone free of charge. Educational providers use this book in the Icelandic language teaching. The chapters in the book are also available in audio format. The researcher thought it was challenging to use the webpage, and if you don't know any Icelandic, it will probably be even more challenging. However if employees are

taught how to use this webpage it could be a very affordable way for them to learn Icelandic (Jónsdóttir et al., 2022).

According to the report all educational providers in the report are following the curriculum of the Ministry of Education and Culture. Most educational providers create lessons plans, but they are prepared in different ways. Still, the lessons plans are always based on the curriculum. Each participant in the Icelandic language course needs to have a least 75% attendance in the course for the educational provider to get a grant from the Ministry of Education. Organizations and accredited educators can apply for a grant at Rannís if they are provided their foreign employees with organized Icelandic language lessons. The foreign employee must have legal residence in Iceland for the employer to have the right to apply for a grant. The organizations will also need a contract with an accredited educator to handle the courses in order to be able to apply for a grant. The Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor allocates the grants (Íslenskukennsla fyrir útlendinga, 2022).

2.2.3 Educational institution curriculum

The educational institution hired for the teaching in this experiment has included in their curriculum, instruction, and study evaluation policy that it is essential that the needs of each individual student or group are considered each time and encourages diverse teaching methods. The teacher must regularly perform a self-assessment to reflect on their teaching methods. A study done by Cohen and Cavalvanti (1990), examined teacher self-assessment and found that there was a strong link between teacher self-assessment and actual performance in content, vocabulary, organization, grammar and mechanics, at least in the university with English as a foreign language context (Montgomery & Baker, 2007). It is also important to get feedback from the students regarding both the quality of teaching and the teaching methods for each course. Theories on formative assessment are a guideline where there is an ongoing study assessment. The educational institution encourages constant feedback from teachers to students on their assignments over the semester. Hopefully, this will lead students to better understand their position and find if there is room for improvement in their studies (Mímir, 2020).

2.2.4 Legislation regarding foreigners learning Icelandic

An amendment to the Act on Laws regarding foreigners, No. 80, entered into force on the 20th, of April 2022. In the case a foreigner has had legal residence in Iceland continuously for four years and attends courses in the Icelandic language course a

minimum of 150 hours, they can apply for a permanent residence permit. Also, if a foreigner wants to receive an Icelandic citizenship or residence visa, it is essential to learn Icelandic according to regulation no. 1129/2008 last updated 12th, February 2014. The reason for this update in the law was because Ministry thought it was beneficial for the foreigner to learn Icelandic and a choice for learning about their rights and duties. This act does not demand foreign individual to attend Icelandic language course, just that they are given information about available courses. Foreigner from outside the European Economic Area (EEA) and European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries, are in this, specifically, foreigners whose nationality is not of one of the EU countries, Iceland, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, or Norway, are required to attend classes to obtain a permanent residence permit. A residence permit allows the holder to remain in Iceland indefinitely (Regulation no.53, 2003).

Act nr. 97 2002, On the Employment Rights of Foreigner section nr. 14. Employer and trade union shall provide the employee with temporary work permit information regarding basic Icelandic language courses for foreigners and community education or other education that can be available to the employee or his family. Art. 145 C.4. says that the goal is to strengthen the quality and supply of Icelandic language teaching for immigrants so they can use Icelandic for active participation in society. The Ministry of Education and Culture is responsible for coming up with improvements and quality criteria based on an Icelandic teaching audit (European Commission, 2020).

2.3 Previous research and theory on Icelandic language teaching

Almost all foreigners that move to Iceland do not know how to speak, write or understand the Icelandic language when they start working. Language difficulties, limited network and also lack of knowledge, and employer underestimation of education make foreign employees often feel excluded and hindered, which can often lead to discrimination (Barak & Levin, 2002; Salmonsson & Mella, 2013; Ngo & Este, 2006).

Organizations are investing a lot of money in training their employees. The reason for training is to gain a competitive advantage by increasing employees knowledge which is often said to distinguish successful companies from those companies that are not successful. By training their employees, the organizations are more likely to have more positive human resources outcomes, more significant performance outcomes, add knowledge to the organization, and be better at their current position (Tharenou et al., 2007). Training is essential to help individuals add understanding to the organization and be better at their current jobs. Individuals are

receiving training to gain new knowledge and skills to improve performance (Gupta, 1992). Martin et al., (2014), defined training methods as a collection of systematic procedures, acts, or methods designed to impact KASAs in the participants to increase job performance directly. Their definition of training is that the trainer doesn't need to be included since some of the methods can use instructions through a source other than a person. One of the areas that require a deeper investigation is how technology is and will affect all types of training methods. Workplaces are being changed by technology, and most workplaces have multiple generations which all require training, but each has its focus, expectations, and perspective about that training (Tyler, 2007). The challenge is to update the training to reflect changes in the technology and understand how to use the technology to meet the range of needs and expectations of the learners.

Learning and reaction to online courses have become increasingly important and necessary. It is gaining more acceptance to have internet-based instructions as an alternative and a supplement to classroom instructions for management education (Alavi et al., 1997; Rahm & Reed, 1997). Many studies have been focusing on perceived learning outcomes and student satisfaction. The Covid-19 pandemic impacted formal functioning across the world in various activities that include learning and education, and the learning environment has been shifting towards online education during the pandemic of Covid-19 (Baber, 2020). More educational institutions in Iceland are starting to offer online language courses for foreigners therefore, therefore it is interesting to research if the learning outcome in the online Icelandic language course is better or worse than in classroom language courses. Few types of research have studied classroom courses vs. online courses, but not many researchers have studied it in Iceland when it comes to learning outcome. In most of the studies, there are no significant differences in learning outcomes of an online course versus classroom course, but it is a significant difference in usefulness and participation. Choosing an online course is due to better scheduling than other factors (Arbaugh, 2000; Salcedo, 2010; Tallent-Runnels et al., 2006). A research showed that the main motivation for language learners is their attitude, how much effort they are willing to put into the language learning, belief both in people around them, and their ability to perform in the language learning environment. Participants in one research also preferred classroom courses rather than online courses (Alhamami, 2018). Which is the same as was found out in this experiment.

2.3.1 Online training vs. classroom training

Online learning takes place on the internet and the web. Most authors describe it as a learning experience using some technology (Moore et al., 2011). A significant advantage of online training is the flexibility of the schedule, and participants can access the material again if needed. It is also easier to use programs such as Google translate to help with understanding the material. Participants in the online courses can also listen to the slides as many times as they like. Participants can use their smartphones, tablet computers, or computers to learn. Online courses also have lower costs, more participants can enrol in each course. The disadvantage of an online course is that it is not as easy to ask the teacher for help, and it will take more time to get feedback, and participants need to have a smartphone or computer at home and access to the internet. These factors can be expensive for a foreigner, so the educational institution or workplace needs to think about those factors before planning an online course. In addition, technical difficulties can arise that foreigners need help to solve. In order for the online training to be successful, participants need to be motivated and independent because there is less interaction between the participant and the teacher than in classroom environment (Murday et al., 2009). Some teachers think teaching with technology can be a complicated and difficult task regarding social and contextual factors (Zhang et al., 2011).

In classroom learning there is more closeness between the teacher and the participants. It is easier to ask for help understanding the material and the assignments. Easier to practice the oral language by talking in the Icelandic language during class. Corporate language learning is about focusing on communication and effective factors in language learning. Therefore introducing it to classroom language learning is worthwhile for teacher and scholars (Zhang, 2010). For foreigners that are beginning to learn Icelandic it is better to learn in the classroom because they need a lot of assistance. Classroom learning compared to computer-assisted learning showed no significant differences in learning (Salcedo, 2010). A lot of restrictions in the environment because of Covid-19, like mass restrictions, have made it challenging to have classroom teaching with many individuals. Organizations need continuous training for their employees to gain knowledge and remain competitive (Sheikh, n.d.). Traditional training is training that is mainly instructor focused. That means that the trainer and the organization are responsible for what the employee learns. The instructor must identify what should be learned and appropriate training methods and evaluate if it was effective training or the

employee skills acquisition received from the learning activity. For training to be practical, regardless of the training methods, it needs to be based on the training design process (Noe, 1986).

2.3.2 theories of learning

The educational institution used to conduct the Icelandic status assessments and set up the teaching for the Icelandic language lessons uses formative assessment for their education. Formative assessment is said to be a successful way to open up a bigger perspective of desirable changes in classroom learning. It has been shown to be particularly effective because of interactive feedback, which is a critical feature in determining the quality of how much is learned. Previous work on formative assessment focuses on five main types of activity. The first activity is to share success criteria with the students. The next is to emphasize on classroom questioning, comment-only marking, teacher and student self-assessment, and formative use of summative tests (Black et al., 2003; Wiliam, 2009). In order to understand and provide a better theoretical ground for a formative assessment, Wiliam & Thompson, (2007) drew on Ramaprasad, (1983) three key processes in learning and teaching, which are beginning to find out where the learners are in their knowledge, established where they are going and find out what needs to be done to get them to that place. Those factors are primarily the responsible of the teacher, the teacher is responsible for designing and implementing the learning environment to be effective, and the learner is responsible for learning. Cognitive theories and theories of behaviorism are often used in language learning. Cognitive emphasizes on the even contribution of external and internal factors (Ellis et al., 1994). Theory of behaviorism know as psychology as the study of transfer looks at the effect on one habit on learning and two sorts of transfer is crucial. (Johnson, 2017).

2.3.3 Training Evaluation

Foreigners learn the language in the country they live in, so they can create a new identity that makes them fit and feel comfortable with their new life. However, to achieve these goals, it is essential that the courses are well structured and organized (Colliander et al., 2018). It is important to have a good training evaluation of the course. Participants must be asked about their perspectives and satisfaction of the course in order for the educational providers to fulfill the participants needs (Rouiller & Goldstein, 1993). Regarding the choice of evaluation criteria, the most popular is Kirkpatrick's (1959, 1976, 1996) four-level training evaluation model (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001;). The four levels in Kirkpatrick's model are reaction, learning, behavior,

and result criteria. Only the first two are used in this experiment. Reaction criteria is a self-reported measure representing the trainee's effective feelings, impressions, and attitudinal response to the training program, and to do that, use self-report measures. This criterion has been criticized since it does not measure how much the participant learned from the training or if it will change the job-related behaviors, performance, or the utility the organization gains from the training (Colquitt et al., 2000; Noe & Schmitt, 1986; Winfred et al., 2010). Learning criteria, in contrast, are measures of learning and are usually indexed by goals and quantifiable learning outcomes by using a test of declarative knowledge learned, usually in the form of exams, as in this experiment in the form of Icelandic language pre- and posttests. Applying the reaction and learning criteria to the teaching evaluation can distinguish between the participant response to the instructor or teaching of the course and the number of participants learning that occurred during the period. Therefore, when the participants complete the training, a training evaluation is done to collect the outcome of the training to determine whether it was effective. Also, to get feedback from the trainee to improve their courses and provide an effective learning environment and experience. Information collection is important to determine if the outcome was due to training or other factors. It is, therefore, essential to choose carefully which training evaluation design to use to get a higher degree of confidence when it comes to changes in outcomes of interest due to training (Noe, 2020).

3. Method

3.1 Participants

The participants were 30 foreign employees working at the organization (17 women and 13 men ages 21 to 60 years). The participant came from eight countries, Vietnam, Philippines, Poland, China, Thailand, Latvia, Czechia, and Serbia. Participants were divided into three groups of 10 individuals.

3.2. Procedure

Data collection for this experiment took place in an organization in Iceland from January 2022 until the end of May 2022. Participants were randomly divided into three groups, but each group tried to have similar ages and genders. In each group, there were 10 employees that scored A1 on the Common European Language Framework.

1. The first group received in classroom Icelandic language course (n=10), defined as employees taking an Icelandic language course onsite after work on Tuesdays, between 16:15-17:15 with a teacher.
2. Group two received an online Icelandic language course (n=10), defined as employees taking an online course during working hours. Two to three employees pr. day from 9:00-10:00, 10:00-11:00 and 13:00-14:00 individually. Inna was used for the online Icelandic language course, and the teacher used mostly PowerPoint slides with sounds (the teacher talked into the slides). The participant received assignments from the book *Islenska 2* or the teacher.
3. Group three received no Icelandic language course (n=10), defined as employees that did not receive any Icelandic language teaching during this period.

Written confirmation from the participant was collected at the beginning of the experiment, stating that the participant permitted the researcher to use the result from the tests and questionnaires in the thesis. At the beginning of the experiment, all 30 participants received a questionnaire with background questions to find out if participants were using the Icelandic language in talking with coworkers, or outside of work with family or friends, and also asked how long they had lived in Iceland. The researcher filled out the questionnaire with the participant and told them why they were asked those questions. Participants were told that they were participating in an experiment, and at the end of the experiment, they had to take another assessment in writing, talking, and understanding Icelandic. Participants in the online and classroom groups also received training from the educational institution on how to use the internet to study and how to use the system used for the online training. The training program took approximately three hours before the experiment started. All participants had to take pre-and post-assessment in writing, understanding, and speaking in Icelandic and received a score according to the Common European Language Framework. Participants took the assessments at the beginning and after the experiment. The pre-and post-test was done by the educational institution used to teach the Icelandic courses. At the end of the experiment, the online group and classroom group received a training evaluation questionnaire after the lessons.

3.3 Measures – Learning outcome

A test of Icelandic language in writing, reading, listening and speaking were used to measure the learning outcome for participants. The written test was divided into simple grammar and advanced grammar. The first eight questions in the written assessment

were to measure how strong participant were in writing simple grammar. The highest score individual could have from that part was 28 points. Questions 9 to 16 were to measure the how strong individual was in writing advanced grammar, and the highest score individual could have from that part was 39 points. The oral part was to measure how strong individual were in listening and speaking Icelandic. Oral part was rated in four parts: First part was vocabulary which was rated from 0-4, Zero was none, and four was varied. Second part was grammar rated from 0-4, 0 was disrupting errors, and four was few errors. Third part was pronunciation, rated from 0-4, zero was incomprehensible, and four was comprehensible. Fourth and last part was flow, rated from 0-4, zero was hesitates a lot, and four hesitates a little. The highest score for the oral part was 16 points.

3.4 Questionnaire with background questions

A Questionnaire with background questions was used to find out how long participant had lived and worked in Iceland, how much Icelandic language participants were using in their daily life and how strong participant rated themselves in writing and speaking Icelandic. Questions one and two, contained biographical information about the participant. Questions three and four how long the participant had lived in Iceland or worked. Questions 5, 6, and 7 were on the 5-point scale from never to always, one being never and five being always, measuring how much Icelandic participants are talking in day-to-day basics. Questions 8 and 9, and 10 were on the scale 0-10, zero being the lowest and 10 being the highest, asking participants to self-assess how confident they felt they were in speaking and writing Icelandic and how confident they thought they were when learning by using technology. Question 11 was to analyze if the participant had taken Icelandic course/s before. If participants answered that question with a yes, they needed to answer question number 12 about how many courses they had taken.

3.5 Questionnaire with training evaluation questions

At the end of the experiment, participants in the online and classroom group receive a training evaluation questionnaire with 11 questions. Evaluation questionnaires were used to find out how satisfied participant were with the course, the facility and the teacher. In question one, participants were asked to mark whether they took an online course or classroom course. Questions 2 to 10 participants responded on scale from zero (highly disagree) to five (strongly agree). In question 11, participants were asked if they wanted to take the Icelandic language course again the same way, and if the answer was no, then they needed to answer question 12 why they didn't want to do it. The

researcher asked the questions in the training evaluation face-to-face to get a deeper understanding of their experience of the Icelandic language course. The researcher followed the questions on the questionnaire but also asked participants questions regarding what could have been done better during the training, both regarding facility, material, and the teaching.

3.6 Data collection

Pearson correlation was used to determine if there were a correlation between the variables used in the study. One Way ANOVA was used to see if there was a significant difference in the pretest between all groups. One Way ANOVA was used to reveal if we could reject the H_0 hypothesis. An Independent t-test was conducted to answer hypothesis H_1 , H_2 , and H_3 . Pearson correlation was computed to determine if there was a relationship between the background's variables, Attendance, Self-assessment and How long have you lived in Iceland and the scores from the simple grammar test, advanced grammar test and oral test. Independent t-test was used to determine if the classroom group or the online group were more satisfied with the Icelandic language course.

All participants in the experiment took the pretest in the Icelandic language, simple and advanced grammar, but only 28 participants took the posttest. One outlier was removed from the classroom group results due to a significant decrease in score between the pre- and posttest. In talking and understanding the Icelandic language, 29 participants took the pretest, but only 27 took the posttest. There were, 29 participants that answered the background questions. The one participant that didn't answer was from the None group, that didn't receive any Icelandic learning. Only 13 participants answered the training evaluation questions. Therefore, two participants were excluded from the pre- and posttest in the Icelandic language written test in, simple, and advanced grammar and four participants were excluded from the talking and understanding the Icelandic language pre- and posttest. First, the researchers inserted the data into an Excel spreadsheet and then to statistical software, SPSS, that was used to analyze the data.

4. Result

Table 1 shows the correlation, means, and SD between the variables used in the study.

Table 1

Means, SD, between all variables used in the study

Variable	Mea		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	n	sd												
1 Simple grammar pretest	22.9	2.7												
2 Advance grammar pretest	20.3	7.8	.62*											
3 Oral pretest	10.1	3.4												
4 Simple grammar posttest	24.0	2.8	.57*	.65*										
5 Advanced grammar posttest	21.1	7.1	.56*	.76*		.56*								
6 Oral posttest	11.4	2.8			.25									
7 Differ simple grammar	1.09	2.5												
8 Differ advanced grammar	0.73	5.2	-.45*	.04	-.14	.48*	.00	.02						
9 Differ oral	1.23	3.3												
10 How long have you lived in Iceland?	8.28	2.0	.05	.02	.64**	.22	.04							
11 Course satisfaction	3.08	0.7	-.24	-.46*	.07	-.29	.23	.13	-.06					
12 Attendance	9.55	4.8												
13 Self-assessment in Icelandic	8.79	3.4	.05	.02	.64**	.22	.04	*	.20	.03				
14 How long have you lived in Iceland?	8.28	2.0	-.29	.22	.18	.15	.06	.21	.49*	-.24	.04			
15 Course satisfaction	3.08	0.7	.73*	.39	-.14	.64*	.23	.19	.15	.24	.36	-.09		
16 Attendance	9.55	4.8												
17 Self-assessment in Icelandic	8.79	3.4	.27	.12	.34	.00	.40	.04	-.33	.43	.30	-.07	.31	
18 How long have you lived in Iceland?	8.79	4	-.49*	-.16	.43*	.39	.11	.15	.09	.09	.28	-.50*	-.47	.03

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

4.1 Pretest result between groups

A One-way ANOVA was used to reveal if there were a significant difference between the groups in the pretest before the Icelandic language learning started. A series of One-way ANOVA tests revealed no significant difference between groups in pretest score for simple grammar ($F(2, 24) = .58, p = .57$), advanced grammar ($F(2, 25) = .02, p = 0.98$), or oral ($F(2, 23) = .57 = p = .57$) (see Table 2).

Table 2

Mean, Standard Deviation, and One-Way ANOVA. Analysis of Variance in Pretest scores between groups

Measure	Classroom		Online		None		<i>F</i>	η^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Simple grammar								
pretest score	22.57	2.56	22.45	2.71	23.70	3.06	.58	-.03
Advanced grammar								
pretest score	20.81	7.80	20.30	8.04	20.15	8.43	.02	-.08
Oral pretest score	09.19	2.88	10.22	4.21	11.00	3.16	.57	-.03

Note. Training groups, (Classroom and Online vs. control group None. Significant at the *($p < .05$) level.

4.2 Answer to the research question and hypothesis

A One-way ANOVA was computed to test the learning outcome between the pre-and post-test scores in simple grammar, advanced grammar, and oral to answer the research question if there was a significant difference in learning outcome between the groups. As seen in table 3, a One-way ANOVA test revealed a significant difference between groups in simple grammar ($F(2, 24) = 4.07, p = .03$), no significant difference in advanced grammar ($F(2, 25) = .96, p = .40$), and no significant difference in oral ($F(2, 23) = .49, p = .62$). We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis when it comes to learning outcome in simple grammar, but we do not reject the null hypothesis when it comes to learning outcome in advanced grammar and oral. In conclusion, there is a significant difference in learning outcome in the simple grammar between groups but not in advanced grammar and oral.

Table 3

Mean, Standard Deviation, and One-Way ANOVA. Analysis of Variance in differences in learning outcome in Simple grammar, Advanced grammar, and Oral between groups

Measure	Classroom		Online		None		<i>F</i>	η^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Learning outcomes in								
simple grammar	3.21	1.95	0.60	1.45	0.10	3.12	4.07*	.01
Learning outcomes in								
advanced grammar	-1.44	5.56	1.60	4.19	1.60	5.89	.96	.04

Learning outcomes in

Oral	1.81	4.16	1.61	3.66	0.33	2.06	.49	.07
------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-----	-----

* $p < .05$

4.3 Training groups (Online and Classroom) vs. Control group (None)

An independent samples t-test was conducted to answer the hypothesis, H_1 : *Learning outcomes will improve more for the training groups (online and classroom) compared to the control group?* The result revealed there was not a significant difference in simple grammar learning outcome between the Training ($M = 1.68$, $SD = 2.09$) and Control group ($M = 0.10$, $SD = 3.12$); $t(25) = 1.58$, $p = .06$. There was not a significant difference in advanced grammar learning outcome between the Training ($M = 0.25$, $SD = 4.94$) and Control group ($M = 1.6$, $SD = 5.89$); $t(26) = -.65$, $p = .52$. There was no significant difference in oral learning outcome between Training ($M = 1.71$, $SD = 3.78$) and Control group ($M = 0.33$, $SD = 2.06$); $t(24) = .101$, $p = .32$. These results suggest that there are no significant differences in simple grammar, advanced grammar and learning outcome between the Training and Control group.

4.4 Classroom training vs. Online training

An Independent samples t-test was conducted to answer the hypothesis, H_2 : *Learning outcome will improve more for traditional classroom training than online training?* The result revealed there was a significant difference in simple grammar learning outcome between the classroom group ($M = 3.2$, $SD = 1.95$) and Online group ($M = 0.6$, $SD = 1.45$); $t(15) = 3.18$, $p = .01$. There was not a significant difference in advanced grammar learning outcome between Classroom group ($M = -1.44$, $SD = 5.56$) and Online group ($M = 1.6$, $SD = 4.19$); $t(16) = -1.32$, $p = .20$. There was no significant difference in oral learning outcome between the Classroom ($M = 1.81$, $SD = 4.16$) and Online group ($M = 1.61$, $SD = 3.66$); $t(15) = .11$, $p = .92$. These results suggest that there are significant differences in simple grammar learning outcome, having Icelandic learning in classroom vs. online. There is no significant difference in learning outcomes in advanced grammar and oral Icelandic learning in classroom vs. online.

4.5 Training satisfaction

An Independent samples t-test was conducted to answer hypothesis H_3 : *Training satisfaction will be greater for traditional classroom training compared to online training?* The result revealed there was no significant difference in the scores for classroom group ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.52$) and online group ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 0.90$); $t(11) =$

-1.14, $p = .28$. These results suggest that there is no difference in course satisfaction between the groups.

4.6 Pre- and post-test scores within the groups

A paired-sample t-test was conducted to compare scores for the Classroom group in learning outcomes in simple grammar, advanced grammar, and oral before and after learning. There was a significant difference in simple grammar before ($M = 22.57$, $SD = 2.56$) and after Icelandic language learning ($M = 25.79$, $SD = 2.83$), $t(6) = -4.35$, $p = .01$. There was no significant difference in advanced grammar before ($M = 20.81$, $SD = 7.80$) and after Icelandic language learning ($M = 19.38$, $SD = 7.66$), $t(7) = .73$, $p = .49$. There was no significant difference in oral score before ($M = 9.19$, $SD = 2.88$) and after Icelandic learning ($M = 11.00$, $SD = 2.07$), $t(7) = -.13$, $p = .26$. Conclusion the learning outcome for the Classroom group improved significantly in simple grammar but not in advanced grammar and oral Icelandic learning.

A paired-sample t-test was conducted to compare scores in learning outcomes in the Online group for simple grammar, advanced grammar, and oral before and after learning. There was no significant difference in simple grammar before ($M = 22.45$, $SD = 2.71$) and after Icelandic language learning ($M = 23.05$, $SD = 3.29$), $t(9) = -1.31$, $p = .22$. There was no significant difference in advanced grammar before ($M = 20.30$, $SD = 8.04$) and after Icelandic language learning ($M = 21.90$, $SD = 8.03$), $t(9) = -1.21$, $p = .26$. There was no significant difference in oral score before ($M = 10.22$, $SD = 4.21$) and after Icelandic learning ($M = 11.83$, $SD = 3.08$), $t(9) = -1.20$, $p = .22$. Conclusion the Icelandic learning did not have significant differences in learning outcome for the Online group in simple grammar, advanced grammar or oral.

A paired-sample t-test was conducted to compare scores in learning outcomes in the None group for simple grammar, advanced grammar, and oral from the beginning to the end of the experiment. There was no significant difference in simple grammar in the beginning ($M = 23.70$, $SD = 3.06$) and end of the experiment ($M = 23.80$, $SD = 1.80$), $t(9) = -.10$, $p = .92$. There was no significant difference in advanced grammar in the beginning ($M = 20.15$, $SD = 8.43$) and in the end of the experiment ($M = 21.75$, $SD = 6.25$), $t(9) = -.86$, $p = .41$. There was no significant difference in oral score in beginning ($M = 11.00$, $SD = 1.05$) and end of the experiment ($M = 11.33$, $SD = 3.46$), $t(8) = -.49$, $p = .64$. Conclusion the None group did not improve significantly in Icelandic language during the experiment.

4.7 Result from the backgrounds- and evaluations variables

A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to determine the relationship between the variables, attendance, living in Iceland, self-assessment in Icelandic, differ in simple grammar, differ in advanced grammar, and differ in oral between the groups. Table 4 shows the result from the Classroom group. Table 5 shows the result from the Online group and Table 6 shows the result from the None group. The None group didn't receive any Icelandic learning therefore the variable attendance is not in the table. Table 4 reveals that there was a significant strong positive relationship in the Classroom group between living in Iceland and oral.

Table 4

Means, SD, between the variables Attendance, Living in Iceland, Self-assessment, Differ in simple grammar, Differ in advanced grammar, and Differ in oral for Classroom group

Variable	Mean	sd	1	2	3	4	5
1 Attendance	8.30	4.81					
2 How long have you lived in Iceland	9.00	1.70	.07				
3 Self-assessment in Icelandic	8.10	3.96	-.09	.51			
4 Differ in oral	1.81	4.16	.17	.85**	.15		
5 Differ in simple grammar	3.21	1.95	-.29	.23	-.28	.42	
6 Differ in advanced grammar	-1.44	5.56	.12	-.063	.31	.16	-.18

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5 reveals that there is a significant negative relationship in the Online group between attendance and differ in oral, there is a significant positive relationship between attendance and differ in advanced grammar and there is significant negative relationship between differ in simple grammar and self-assessment in Icelandic language.

Table 5

Means, SD, between the variables Attendance, Living in Iceland, Self-assessment, differ in simple grammar, differ in advanced grammar, and differ in oral for Online group

Variable	Mean	sd	1	2	3	4	5
Attendance	10.80	4.87					
How long have you lived in Iceland	7.80	2.15	-.03				
Self-assessment in Icelandic	8.60	3.06	.13	.31			
Differ in oral	1.61	3.66	-.69*	-.38	-.58		
Differ in simple grammar	0.60	1.44	-.28	.26	-.69*	.54	
Differ in advanced grammar	1.60	4.19	.69*	-.21	.09	-.41	-.20

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 6 reveals that there is a significant positive relationship in the None group between self-assessment in Icelandic language and how long have you lived in Iceland, significant positive relationship in the None group between differ in simple grammar and self-assessment in Icelandic language.

Table 6

Means, SD, between the variables Attendance, Living in Iceland, Self-assessment, differ in simple grammar, differ in advanced grammar, and differ in oral for None group

Variable	Mean	sd	1	2	3	4
1 How long have you lived in Iceland	8.00	2.18				
2 Self-assessment in Icelandic language	9.78	3.38	.92**			
3 Differ in oral	0.33	2.06	-.30	-.33		
4 Differ in simple grammar	0.10	3.12	.61	.80**	-.17	
5 Differ in advanced grammar	1.60	5.90	-.21	-.17	.55	.16

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

4.7 Supplemental analysis

A Pearson correlation was also computed to determine the relationship between pre- and post-test for the group that didn't receive any training to find out the reliability of the Icelandic language tests. For simple grammar the result indicates a non-significant low positive relationship between pretest and posttest, ($r(10) = .26$, $p = .47$). For advanced grammar the result indicates a significant positive relationship between pretest and posttest, ($r(10) = .72$, $p = .02$). In oral the result indicates a significant positive relationship between pre- and posttest, ($r(9) = .81$, $p = .01$). To sum up, there was not a significant difference in simple grammar between pre- and posttest which does indicate low reliability of the test. There was a significant positive relationship between pre- and post-test in advanced grammar and oral, indicating a rather high reliability of the tests.

Discussion

5.1 Summary

The result of this experiment was that the H_0 : hypothesis was rejected for simple grammar or that learning simple grammar in the classroom is more successful for participants than learning simple grammar online. For advanced grammar and speaking Icelandic, the H_0 : hypothesis was not rejected, or it didn't matter whether learning Icelandic in a classroom, or online or having no Icelandic learning the result didn't

show significant differences. When calculating the results in SPSS an outlier was removed from the classroom group in simple grammar due to the participant's score between the pre-and post-test decreases significantly or 15 points. The researcher found it difficult to explain but perhaps because of the low reliability of the pre-and post-test or that the participant cheated on the pretest or due to lack of motivation. Therefore, the participants were removed from the group when calculating the result. If it is analyzed further, it shows that learning simple grammar in the Icelandic language gives better results in classroom learning than online. This could be because participants are more active during the class and ask more questions or they are better at understanding the material used for learning. Research has shown that group work in a second language classroom is better adapted to individual needs, and the climate is more positive. Participants are more involved in the lesson, and at a more personal level, so it seems reasonable to believe that group work motivates the classroom learner (Long & Porter, 1985). As for the result of the oral learning one possibility might be that the participants in the classroom learning were more self-conscious practicing speaking in front of the teacher and other students vs. with friends and family outside of the classroom. As for the result of the advanced grammar although there was no significant difference, the online group scored higher possible due to being able to work at their own pace and having more resources available for them online. The classroom group might have scored lower in advanced grammar due to spending more time on simple grammar. The result from the "*H₁: Learning outcomes will improve more for the training groups (online and classroom) compared to the control group?*" The result showed that was no significant difference between the groups that participated in the language learning and the group that didn't receive any training. The result didn't indicate significant differences between the group's scores in simple grammar, advanced grammar or oral. One of the reasons for this result could be because of the few participants in each group. Another reason could be that the learning group had more participants than the group that didn't receive any learning, also if the examination period were extended until Christmas, a different result could perhaps occur. The *H₂: "Learning outcome will improve more for traditional classroom training than online training?"* The result showed that it was the case for simple grammar learning but not for advanced grammar or oral Icelandic learning. According to an employer of the educational institution that organized the course for this research the reason could be that the participants in the classroom are closer to the teacher and are asking more questions if something is not

clear. The result from the *H₃*: “*Training satisfaction will be greater for traditional classroom training compared to online training?*” The result showed that it was no difference in satisfaction between the classroom group and online group. Research done by Johnson et al., (1999); Schutte, (1997) showed different result or that participants in a classroom course were more positive and satisfied with the quality of the course and the instructor.

There are additional considerations when interpreting the result of previous studies and planning for future studies. For example, the small sample size of the groups, the educational institution organizing the teaching was doing online teaching for the first time. The teacher was an experienced teacher in a classroom but was doing online Icelandic language education for the first time. The participants were also learning the Icelandic language online for the first time. The experiment was set up on short notice, and a few unforeseen complications during the period could affect the result of this experiment. For example, Covid 19 pandemic, a lot of shortening working days resulting in canceled lessons. Consideration is whether this would be the result if the groups were larger, and the period was longer. It would be interesting to expand the experiment in the future, for one more period to see if we would get the same outcome. In future research it would be interesting to do more research on the material used for teaching Icelandic and how it is taught. Another factor that could have an effect is that the participants are not strong in using technology for learning.

This result wasn't as the researcher hoped the outcome of this experiment would be. Having Icelandic teaching online or computer-based is more convenient for the organization and the employee. Having Icelandic language learning online could solve the problem that the Icelandic learning will be more tailored to the participant's needs and when it comes to facility and transport, which were two of the dissatisfaction in research done by Hoffmann et. A., (2021). Therefore, if online Icelandic learning could be tailored to the needs of the individuals and some additional technology used to analyze the oral learning, it would hopefully be more successful when it comes to learning outcomes. In order to improve the online learning perhaps additional assessments could be added to the course material. This way the teacher can evaluate the need of the online learner, and the participants can get more feedback from the teacher based on their individuals test results. perhaps some robot used for the oral learning, it would be more successful when it comes to learning outcomes.

By conducting the correlation on the pre- and posttest on the group that didn't receive any training to try to measure the reliability of the tests, an indication is that the test used to measure the status of the Icelandic language could be improved. Another factor is that the pretest took place in the middle of the Covid 19 pandemic, and around 120 employees attended. For the written part, the employees were divided into three areas of about 20 employees in each area at a time. It wasn't easy to monitor all the employees. Therefore, it is possible that they were helping each other or using their smartphones. The written posttest took place in a medium-sized meeting room, and only 6 participants took the test at a time. Researcher sat in the room the whole time, and none of the participants could use their smartphones or talk to each other during the test. The oral part took place one-on-one and was done by employees from the educational provider in charge of the teaching. Four employees of the educational institution came to the organization to do the oral test on the employees. You can question if all the four employees from the educational institution did rate the employees the same way in the oral test. It might have been better to have one employee taking the oral test while another one monitoring the process or have the same person both take the pre-and post-test to get a more accurate result. That would be called relative reliability, where individuals have the same position in repeated measurements (Bruton et al., 2000). The reliability of the tests could have influenced the result of the experiment.

The educational institution uses formative assessment when planning the courses but is the teacher using the method when teaching? Some of the students in the online group said they were missing feedback from the teacher for the assignments. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the teacher to provide feedback which is important for teaching and learning. The current literature goes as far as saying that it is necessary for improvement and learning and influential in creating learners responsive to their learning and important in enhancing the teacher teaching (Black et al., 2004).

When the researcher asked the participants the questions on the evaluation questionnaire, it was also interesting to hear what they had to say. Only one participant gave relatively low scores. The other gave rather high scores. Some of the participants didn't have very good attendance at the course. When the researcher asked the reason for their low attendance, the answer was that they went home earlier or that they needed to take care of something or were too tired to attend class. Some participants in the classroom group said it would have been nicer to have the lessons on Teams so they could participate from home when they couldn't attend the class. All participants that

answered the training evaluation said they liked the teacher. One participant from the online group, the youngest participant, said they preferred having Icelandic language learning in a classroom. Another participant in the online group said that work came first, and it was difficult to attend the course after work because of family issues. When the researcher asked what the best way would be to learn Icelandic language the participant wanted to do it the same way next time. One participant in the classroom course said that they thought it was too much talk during classroom learning and not enough writing.

5.2 Conclusions

Icelandic language learning is important for the foreign individual to fit into society. The result of this experiment shows that foreign employees at the organization seem to be interested in learning the Icelandic language. Learning outcome of simple grammar showed that learning simple grammar in the classroom is more effective than learning simple grammar online. According to the educational institution organizing the learning, it is better for beginners to learn the Icelandic language in a classroom. It is better to teach the foreigners that are beginning to learn the Icelandic language by using more conversations rather than writing in a textbook. An interview with Lina Elíasbet Hallberg a Swedish women living in Iceland says it is difficult for a foreigner to find the right Icelandic language course to attend, and that the government doesn't seem to be too interest in the Icelandic language teaching, only writing a report about it (Másson, 2022). Therefore, the organization where the experiment takes place is eager to find a good way for foreign employees to learn the Icelandic language. The result showed that learning simple grammar is better in the classroom so the solution will be to still offer classroom learning for the foreigners that are beginners but keep on developing the online learning, and only foreigners that are more advanced in speaking and writing Icelandic will attend the online learning. Since technology has been advancing rapidly, it has become necessary to use it in the education sector (Cavus, 2015). One educational provider is implementing a learning management system to use for their online teaching. Organizations using the same learning management system can access their material, and the employees can learn the Icelandic language using the system. This could be an ideal way to develop online Icelandic language learning and move it entirely online. Future researcher could be to keep on measuring the improvement in online learning but also when it comes to material and teaching.

Reference

- Act On Foreigners No. 96. (2002). <https://www.althingi.is/lagas/nuna/2002096.html>
- Act On Foreigners No. 97. (2002). <https://www.government.is/library/04-Legislation/Foreign%20Nationals%20Right%20to%20Work%20Act%20as%20ame%202018.pdf>
- Act On Foreigners No. 80. (2016). <https://www.althingi.is/lagas/nuna/2016080.html>
- Alavi, M., Yoo, Y., & Vogel, D. R. (1997). Using Information Technology to Add Value to Management Education. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(6), 1310–1333. <https://doi.org/10.5465/257035>
- Alhamami, M. (2018). Beliefs about and intention to learn a foreign language in face-to-face and online settings. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(1–2), 90–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1387154>
- Arbaugh, J. B. (2000). Virtual Classroom versus Physical Classroom: An Exploratory Study of Class Discussion Patterns and Student Learning in an Asynchronous Internet-Based MBA Course. *Journal of Management Education*, 24(2), 213–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105256290002400206>
- Baber, H. (2020). *Determinants of Students' Perceived Learning Outcome and Satisfaction in Online Learning during the Pandemic of COVID-19* (SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 3679489). Social Science Research Network. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3679489>
- Barak, M. E. M., & Levin, A. (2002). Outside of the corporate mainstream and excluded from the work community: A study of diversity, job satisfaction and well-being. *Community, Work & Family*, 5(2), 133–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800220146346>
- Bergmann, E. (2008). Íslenskt þjóðerni og óttin við innflytjendur. *Hugvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands*. https://www.academia.edu/4901843/Íslensk_þjóðerni

- Black, P., Harrison, C., & Lee, C. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2004). Working inside the Black Box: Assessment for Learning in the Classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(1), 8–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170408600105>
- Bruton, A., Conway, J. H., & Holgate, S. T. (2000). Reliability: What is it, and how is it measured? *Physiotherapy*, 86(2), 94–99. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9406\(05\)61211-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9406(05)61211-4)
- Cavus, N. (2015). Distance Learning and Learning Management Systems. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 872–877. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.611>
- Christiansen, Þ., & Kristjánsdóttir, E. S. (2016). „Veggurinn er alltaf til staðar“: Upplifun háskólamenntaðra innflytjenda af samskiptum og samningsstöðu gagnvart vinnuveitendum. *Íslenska Þjóðfélagið*, 7(1), 5–22.
- Colliander, H., Ahn, S. E., & Andersson, P. (2018). Actions and Conceptions: Exploring Initial Literacy Teaching Practice for Adults. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 17(5), 306–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2018.1465344>
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training
- ¹Classroom lernarnig vestus ²motivation: A meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 678–707. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.678>
- Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. (2022). In *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Common_European_Framework_of_Reference_for_Languages&oldid=1094518361.
- Director of Labor. (2018). Erlendir ríkisborgarar á íslenskum vinnumarkaði á árunum 2012-2017. Director of Labor. <https://vinnumalastofnun.is/media/2002/erlendir-rikisborgarar-2012-2017-endanlegt.pdf>
- Ellis, R., Ellis, P. R., & Ellis (taalkunde), R. R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language*

¹ Salcedo, “Comparative Analysis Of Learning Outcomes In Face-To-Face Foreign Language Classes Vs. Language Lab And Online.”

² Salcedo.

- Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- European Commission. (2020). *Action plan on Integration and Inclusion 2021-2027*. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/bb47d489-a2b1-11eb-9585-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-HTML>
- European Economic Area (EEA). (1994). *EEA Agreement | European Free Trade Association*. <https://www.efta.int/eea/eea-agreement>
- European Economic Area (EEA). (2022). *Free Movement of Persons | European Free Trade Association*. <https://www.efta.int/eea/policy-areas/persons>
- Gupta, R. (1992). Training versus development. *Training and Development Journal*. https://www.academia.edu/3175899/Training_versus_development
- Hofmann, L., Innes, P., Wojtyńska, A., & Skaptadóttir, U.D. (2021). Adult immigrants' Perspective on Courses in Icelandic as a Second Language: Structure, Content, and Inclusion in the Receiving Society. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 1-16. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15348458.2021.1988855>
- Iceland.org. *Iceland Language: Languages of Iceland - Iceland.org*. (2022, February 14). <https://www.iceland.org/culture/language>
- Innes, P. (2020). Icelanders' opinions on the role of the state in teaching Icelandic to foreigners. *Responsibility and Language Practices in Place*, 4, 175.
- Johnson, K. (2017). Learners and their errors. In *An Introduction to Foreign Language Learning and Teaching* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Johnson, S. D., Aragon, S. R., Shaik, N., & Palma-Rivas, N. (1999). *Comparative Analysis of Online vs. Face-to-Face Instruction*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED448722>
- Jónsdóttir, S., Halldórsdóttir, Þ., & Leós, B. (2022). *Tungumálatorg, Íslenska fyrir alla*. <http://tungumalatorg.is/ifa/um-vefinn/>
- Jónsson, A., Pálsson, A., & Gylfason, Þ. F. (2015). *Úttekt á íslenskukennslu fyrir útlendinga: Mars 2015* (p. 42). <https://www.stjornarradid.is/verkefni/fleiri-rit/rit/2015/06/08/Uttekt-a-islenskukennslu-fyrir-utlendinga-mars-2015/>
- LeLoup, J. W., & Ponterio, R. (1995). *Addressing the Need for Electronic Communication in Foreign Language Teaching*.

- Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group Work, Interlanguage Talk, and Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 207–228.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3586827>
- Másson, S. (2022, September 8). „Íslenska ríkið er gott í að skrifa skýrslur en svo gerist ekki neitt“.[The Icelandic Government is good in writing reports but then nothing happens!]. visir.is. <https://www.visir.is/g/20222308224d>
- Menntamálaráðuneytið. (2008). *Námskrá, Íslenska fyrir útlendinga—Grunnnám*.
https://mms.is/sites/mms.is/files/namskra_islenska_utlendinga.pdf
- Mímir. (2020). *Mímir's School curriculum guide* (p. 7).
<https://www.mimir.is/static/files/myndir/skolanamskra-enska.pdf>
- Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002>
- Moore, J. L., Dickson-Deane, C., & Galyen, K. (2011). e-Learning, online learning, and distance learning environments: Are they the same? | Elsevier Enhanced Reader. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 14(2), 129–135.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.10.001>
- Murday, K., Ushida, E., & Chenoweth, N. A. (2009). *Learners' and teachers' perspectives on language online: Computer Assisted Language Learning: Vol 21, No 2*. 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220801943718>
- Ngo, H. V., & Este, D. (2006). Professional re-entry for foreign-trained immigrants | SpringerLink. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 7, 27–50.
- Noe, R. A., & Schmitt, N. (1986). The influence of trainee attitudes on training effectiveness: Test of a model. *Personnel Psychology*, 39(3), 497–523.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1986.tb00950.x>
- Oldgard, J. (2019, May 6). *Samningur um sameiginlegan norrænan vinnumarkað | Norraent samstarf*. <https://www.norden.org/is/treaties-and-agreements/samningur-um-sameiginlegan-norraenan-vinumarkad>
- Rahm, D., & Reed, B. J. (1997). Going Remote: The Use of Distance Learning, the World Wide Web, and the Internet in Graduate Programs of Public Affairs and

- Administration. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 20(4), 459–474.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3380685>
- Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. *Behavioral Science*, 28(1), 4–13.
- Rannsóknamiðstöð Íslands. (n.d.). *Íslenskukennsla fyrir útlendinga*. (2022).
 Rannsóknamiðstöð Íslands.
<https://www.rannis.is/sjodir/menntun/islenskukennsla-fyrir-utlendinga/>
- Regulation on Foreigner no.53. (2003). Stjórnarráð Íslands.
<https://www.stjornarradid.is/efst-a-baugi/frettir/stok-frett/?NewsID=4ccb7d20-c77d-11e6-8342-a4db302334b0>
- Regulation on work permits for foreigners nr. 339. (2005).
<https://island.is/reglugerdir/nr/0339-2005>
- Regulation about changes on regulation no. 1129. (2008). Ministry of Justice.
<https://www.reglugerd.is/reglugerdir/eftir-raduneytum/domsmalaraduneyti/nr/18964>
- Rouiller, J. Z., & Goldstein, I. L. (1993). The relationship between organizational transfer climate and positive transfer of training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 4(4), 377–390. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920040408>
- Rögnvaldsson, E. (2022, September 9). *Íslenskukennslu á vinnutíma inn í kjarasamninga!*
 [Icelandic learning into union contracts]. Visir.is.
<https://www.visir.is/g/20222309353d>
- Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). THE SCIENCE OF TRAINING: A Decade. *Annu. Rev. Psychol*, 52, 471–499.
- Salcedo, C. S. (2010). Comparative Analysis Of Learning Outcomes In Face-To-Face Foreign Language Classes Vs. Language Lab And Online. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 7(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v7i2.88>
- Salmonsson, L., & Mella, O. (2013). Cultural demands on skilled immigrants, a devaluation of human capital: The case of immigrant physicians in Sweden. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 3(1), 3–9.
- Schutte, J. G. (1997). *Virtual Teaching in Higher Education: The New Intellectual Superhighway or Just Another Traffic Jam?* 6.
- Skaptadóttir, U. D., & Innes, P. (2017). *Immigrant Experiences of Learning Icelandic and*

Connecting with the Speaking Community. <https://doi.org/10.1515/njmr-2017-0001>

Skúladóttir, Á. (2006, March 1). *Foreign workers in Iceland—Living on the fringe of society—Nordic Labour Journal* [Article]. Nordic Labour Journal.

<http://www.nordiclabourjournal.org/nyheter/nyheter-2006/foreign-workers-in-iceland-2014-living-on-the-fringe-of-society>

Statistic Iceland. (2022a). *Register based employment by months, sex, age and origin 2005-2022*. Statistics Iceland.

https://px.hagstofa.is/pxen/pxweb/en/Samfelag/Samfelag_vinumarkadur_vinnuafskraargogn/VIN10001.px/table/tableViewLayout1/?rxid=5a3c2f66-3879-47fd-8d3d-7b8819c98d03

Statistic Iceland. (2022b). *Population by municipality, sex, citizenship and quarters 2010-2022*. Statistics Iceland.

https://px.hagstofa.is/pxen/pxweb/en/Ibuar/Ibuar_mannfjoldi_1_yfirlit_arsfjordingustolur/MAN10001.px/table/tableViewLayout1/?rxid=13f6d72a-a73a-4edf-9ee9-26c9d791c985

Statistic Iceland. (2022c). *Population born abroad by background, sex and country of birth 1996-2021*. Statistics Iceland.

https://px.hagstofa.is/pxen/pxweb/en/Ibuar/Ibuar_mannfjoldi_3_bakgrunnur_Uppruni/MAN43004.px/table/tableViewLayout1/?rxid=754f9128-917d-4527-85be-23d24c3f4cf6

Statistics Iceland. (2022d). *Economic forecast*. Statistic Iceland.

<https://www.static.e.is/publications/news-archive/economic-forecast/economic-forecast-11881/>

Statistics Iceland. (2022e). *Economic forecast*. Statistic Iceland.

<https://www.static.e.is/publications/news-archive/economic-forecast/economic-forecast-11881/>

Stjórnarráð Íslands. (n.d.). *Að flytja til Íslands*. Retrieved September 12, 2022, from

<https://www.stjornarradid.is/verkefni/utlendingar/ad-flytja-til-islands/>

Tallent-Runnels, M. K., Thomas, J. A., Lan, W. Y., Cooper, S., Ahern, T. C., Shaw, S.

M., & Liu, X. (2006). *Teaching Courses Online: A Review of the Research*.

Review of

Educational Research, 76(1), 93–135.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076001093>

Tharenou, P., Saks, A. M., & Moore, C. (2007). A review and critique of research on training and organizational-level outcomes -. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17(3), 251–273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.07.004>.

The Director of Immigration. (n.d.) *Permanent residence permit*. The Directorate of Immigration. <https://utl.is/index.php/en/permanent-residence-permit-xyz>

Tyler, K. (2007). The tethered generation. *HR Magazine*, 52(5), 40.

Wiliam, D. (2000). Formative Assessment in Mathematics. 6, 1, 19–22.

Wiliam, D., & Thompson, M. (2007). *Integrating assessment with instruction: What will it take to make it work? CA Dwyer (Editör), The future of assessment: shaping teaching and learning (53-82)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wiliam, D. (2009). *Content then process: Teacher learning communities in the service of formative assessment*. Solution Tree Press.

Winfred, A. J., Tubre, T., Don S, P., & Edens, P. S. (2010). Teaching Effectiveness: The

relationship between reaction and learning evaluation criteria. *Educational Psychology*, 23(3), 275–285.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0144341032000060110>

Wojtyńska, A., & Skaptadóttir, U. D. (2021). Reproduction of marginality: The labour market position of unemployed foreign citizens during economic recession in Iceland. *Migration*

Studies, 9(3), 702–720. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnz037>

Zhang, M., Lundeberg, M., Koehler, M. J., & Eberhardt, J. (2011). Understanding affordances and challenges of three types of video for teacher professional development. *Teaching*

and Teacher Education, 27(2), 454–462.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.09.015>

Zhang, Y. (2010). Cooperative Language Learning and Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 81–83.

<https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.1.81-83>

Þórðardóttir, S. E. (2011). *Erlendir ríkisborgarar á íslenskum vinnumarkaði* [Foreign citizens on the Icelandic labor market]. (p. 38).

https://www.byggdastofnun.is/static/files/Skyrslur/Erlendir_ríkisbogarar-juni_2011.pdf

Appendix A: Consent for use of data

03.01.2022

|

Rannsókn um íslenskukennslu

Með undirritun þessa skjals veiti samþykki fyrir því að öll gögn sem ég hef svarað sem viðkemur íslenskukennslu félagsins megi vera notuð til greiningar í rannsókninni.

Undirskrift

Nafn og kennitala

Appendix B: Questionnaire with backgrounds questions

A Questionnaire with background questions

1. Gender
 - Women
 - Men
 - Non-gender-specific

2. Age
 - 20 years and younger
 - 21-30 years old
 - 31-40 years old
 - 41-50 years old
 - 51-60 years old
 - 61-70 years old

3. How long have you lived in Iceland?
 - 0-1 year
 - 1-2 years
 - 2-3 years
 - 3-4 years
 - 4-5 years
 - 5-6 years

- 6-7 years
- 7-8 years
- 8-9 years
- 9-10 years
- 10 years or longer

4. How long have you worked for the organization?

- 0-2 years
- 1-2 years
- 2-3 years
- 3-4 years
- 4-5 years
- 5-6 years
- 6-7 years
- 7-8 years
- 8-9 years
- 9-10 years
- 10 years or longer

5. Do you speak Icelandic with coworkers?

- Never
- Seldom
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

6. Do you speak Icelandic with supervisors?

- Never
- Seldom

Sometimes

Often

Always

7. Do you speak Icelandic outside of work?

Never

Seldom

Sometimes

Often

Always

8. On a scale 1-10, how strong are you in talking Icelandic?

One being the lowest and ten being the highest score

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

9. On a scale 1-10, how strong are you in writing Icelandic?

One being the lowest and ten being the highest score

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

10. On a scale 1-10, how strong are you in using computers to study?

One being the lowest and ten being the highest score

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

11. Have you taken an Icelandic course before?

Yes

No

12. If you answered question 11 with yes, how many courses have you taken?

Appendix C: Evaluation questionnaire

Icelandic course

Dear participant

The organization is constantly trying to improve our results, therefore your assessment is very valuable. We kindly ask you to answer the following questions regarding your participation in the Icelandic course.

- Online Icelandic teaching
 - Classroom Icelandic teaching
1. I am very satisfied with the course?
 - Highly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither disagree or agree
 - Agree
 - Highly Agree

 2. The course met my expectations?
 - Highly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither disagree or agree
 - Agree
 - Highly Agree

 3. The course will benefit me in my work?
 - Highly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither disagree or agree
 - Agree
 - Highly Agree

 4. The course was useful to increase my skills?
 - Highly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither disagree or agree
 - Agree
 - Highly Agree

Question regarding the instructor?

5. I was happy with my instructor?
 - Highly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither disagree or agree
 - Agree
 - Highly Agree

6. The instructor was well prepared?
 - Highly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither disagree or agree
 - Agree
 - Highly Agree

7. The instructor encourage questions or discussions?
 - Highly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither disagree or agree
 - Agree
 - Highly Agree

8. The instructor used various teaching methods?
 - Highly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither disagree or agree
 - Agree
 - Highly Agree

Course framework

9. The presentation and content of the material was exemplary?
 - Highly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither disagree or agree
 - Agree
 - Highly Agree

10. Do you want to take the Icelandic language course again in the same way next year?
 - Yes
 - No






11. If your answer was no why not?

Appendix D: Example for the Icelandic language assessment

Stöðumat í íslensku

Sýnidæmi

Hvað eru þau að gera? Krossaðu (X) við rétt svar

<input type="checkbox"/> Þær eru að leika <input type="checkbox"/> Þær eru að hlaupa <input type="checkbox"/> Þær eru að baka <input type="checkbox"/> Þær eru að lesa		<input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að lesa <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að skrifa <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að synda <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að spila	
<input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að vaska upp <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að þrifa <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að baka <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að borða		<input type="checkbox"/> Þau eru að vaska upp <input type="checkbox"/> Þau eru að syngja <input type="checkbox"/> Þau eru að dansa <input type="checkbox"/> Þau eru að drekka	
<input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að borða <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að baka <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að skrifa <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að leika		<input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að lesa <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að hlusta <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að keyra <input type="checkbox"/> Hann er að flytja	