


CSCW 2010 Survey

Q1 Including CSCW 2010, I have attended CSCW


Answered: 149 Skipped: 2



Answer Choices	Responses
1 time	48.32% 72
2 times	15.44% 23
3 times	12.08% 18
4 times	4.03% 6
5 or more times	20.13% 30
Total	149

Q2 I saw the following CSCW publicity items (check all that apply):

Answered: 143 Skipped: 8




Answer Choices	Responses	
Email	69.93%	100
Web site	91.61%	131
Facebook group	40.56%	58
Flyers distributed at affiliated conferences	30.07%	43
Communication of the ACM magazine advertisement	11.19%	16
Interactions magazine advertisement	8.39%	12
Total Respondents: 143		

CSCW 2010 Survey

Q3 I am a

Answered: 149 Skipped: 2




Answer Choices	Responses	
Student	42.95%	64
Industry researcher	18.79%	28
Practitioner	2.01%	3
Academic researcher	36.24%	54
Total		149

CSCW 2010 Survey

Q4 I am a

Answered: 145 Skipped: 6




Answer Choices	Responses
Female	39.31% 57
Male	60.69% 88
Total	145

CSCW 2010 Survey


Q5 Define your work location

Answered: 147 Skipped: 4



	Country	Responses
Australia	2,70%	2
Austria	9,46%	7
Bulgaria	1,35%	1
Canada	12,16%	9
Denmark	2,70%	2
Finland	1,35%	1
France	1,35%	1
Germany	8,11%	6
Greece	1,35%	1
Ireland (Republic)	1,35%	1
Israel	1,35%	1
Italy	1,35%	1
Japan	1,35%	1
Korea, South	1,35%	1
Malta	1,35%	1
Mexico	1,35%	1
Netherlands	2,70%	2
Spain	1,35%	1
Sweden	1,35%	1
Switzerland	1,35%	1
United Kingdom	29,73%	22
United States	13,51%	10
TOTAL		143

CSCW 2010 Survey




	state	Number
California	23,81%	25
Colorado	3,81%	4
Connecticut	0,95%	1
district of Colombia	0,95%	1
Georgia	2,86%	3
Illinois	6,67%	7
Indiana	0,95%	1
Iowa	0,95%	1
Maryland	0,95%	1
Massachusetts	6,67%	7
Minnesota	0,95%	1
New Jersey	3,81%	4
New York	8,57%	9
North Carolina	3,81%	4
Pennsylvania	9,52%	10
Texas	0,95%	1
Utah	0,95%	1
Virginia	3,81%	4
Washington	14,90%	15
	TOTAL	105

CSCW 2010 Survey

Q6 What role did you play at CSCW 2010? (Please check all that apply.)


Answered: 150 Skipped: 1



Answer Choices	Responses
Attendee	71.33% 107
Presenter/Organizer	54.67% 82
Student Volunteer	12.00% 18
Workshop Participant	39.33% 59
Sponsor	3.33% 5
Committee Member - CSCW 2010	12.67% 19
Committee Member - CSCW 2011	7.33% 11
Other (please specify)	5.33% 8
Total Respondents: 150	

Q7 The majority of my CSCW costs were paid by

Answered: 150 Skipped: 1




Answer Choices	Responses
A grant	34.00% 51
My company/university	52.00% 78
Myself	14.00% 21
Total	150

CSCW 2010 Survey

Q8 Schedule and Logistics


Answered: 150 Skipped: 1



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
The conference daily start time was appropriate:	58.00% 87	36.00% 54	3.33% 5	2.00% 3	0.67% 1	150	1.51
The 2.5 hour lunch break was useful:	51.70% 76	28.57% 42	13.61% 20	5.44% 8	0.68% 1	147	1.75
The Savannah Marriott Conference center facilities worked well for CSCW 2010:	23.33% 35	51.33% 77	16.00% 24	6.67% 10	2.67% 4	150	2.14
The CSCW 2010 conference Identity/Design generated interest in the conference:	12.50% 18	24.31% 35	51.39% 74	8.33% 12	3.47% 5	144	2.66
The timing of the conference in the calendar year (around February) works well for me:	18.79% 28	46.98% 70	18.12% 27	12.08% 18	4.03% 6	149	2.36

Q10 The papers and notes showcased important CSCW research contributions.

Answered: 143 Skipped: 8




Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	26.57%	38
Agree	55.94%	80
Neutral	12.59%	18
Disagree	2.10%	3
Strongly Disagree	2.80%	4
Total		143

CSCW 2010 Survey

Q11 Paper and Notes Presentations:


Answered: 140 Skipped: 11



	100% - 81%	80% - 61%	60% - 41%	40% - 21%	20% - 0%	Total
Thinking of the Papers presentations (30-minute slots) that I attended, the percentage of them I found satisfying was:	14.29% 20	50.00% 70	27.14% 38	6.43% 9	2.14% 3	140
Thinking of the Notes presentations (15-minute slots) that I attended, the percentage of them I found satisfying was:	14.49% 20	45.65% 63	30.43% 42	6.52% 9	2.90% 4	138

Q12 In general, I think that the level of details provided in the presentations at the conference is:


Answered: 144 Skipped: 7



Answer Choices	Responses
Just right: Presenters provide enough details without being overwhelming	77.78% 112
Too much: I can read the paper if I want more depth	9.72% 14
Too little: Most presentations are shallow and would benefit from additional detail	4.86% 7
No opinion	7.64% 11
Total	144

Q13 Currently, Full Papers are given a 30-minute slot (about 20 - 25 minutes for presentation and 5 - 10 minutes for questions and answers). I think:

Answered: 141 Skipped: 10




Answer Choices	Responses
This is about the right amount of time for Papers presentations	76.60% 108
Papers should have a 20-minute slot (15 minute presentation, 5 minute Q&A)	19.15% 27
Papers should have a 15-minute slot (10 minute presentation, 5 minute Q&A)	2.84% 4
Papers should have more than a 30 minute slot to develop the topics in more detail	1.42% 2
Total	141

CSCW 2010 Survey

Q15 Conference Program: Please rate the following conference sessions according to how relevant and interesting they were to the CSCW community:


Answered: 141 Skipped: 10



	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor	Didn't attend	Total	Weighted Average
Opening plenary by Clay Shirky	28.06% 39	35.25% 49	10.07% 14	9.35% 13	1.44% 2	15.83% 22	139	2.06
Closing plenary by Mimi Ito	12.23% 17	28.06% 39	9.35% 13	5.76% 8	2.16% 3	42.45% 59	139	2.26
"What's up with Culture?" panel (Monday at 14:30)	7.46% 10	11.19% 15	5.97% 8	3.73% 5	2.99% 4	68.66% 92	134	2.48
"Tapping the Social Web for CSCW Research" panel (Monday at 16:30)	9.16% 12	14.50% 19	4.58% 6	3.05% 4	0.76% 1	67.94% 89	131	2.12
"Mulching Youth and Technology" panel (Tuesday at 16:30)	9.16% 12	9.92% 13	4.58% 6	3.05% 4	0.76% 1	72.52% 95	131	2.14
The "Red Balloon" Session (Tuesday at 11:00)	9.02% 12	10.53% 14	8.27% 11	0.75% 1	0.00% 0	71.43% 95	133	2.03
CSCW Horizon: Questions for CSCW (Tuesday at 14:30)	6.67% 9	14.07% 19	5.93% 8	2.22% 3	1.48% 2	69.63% 94	135	2.27
CSCW Horizon: New Horizons with Massive Data (Wednesday at 11:00)	5.15% 7	15.44% 21	5.15% 7	6.62% 9	0.00% 0	67.65% 92	136	2.41
The Video Session (Wednesday at 9:00)	5.30% 7	12.12% 16	1.52% 2	0.76% 1	0.76% 1	79.55% 105	132	2.00
Interactive Posters	20.00% 27	48.15% 65	16.30% 22	1.48% 2	2.22% 3	11.85% 16	135	2.07
Demos	15.56% 21	41.48% 56	12.59% 17	2.22% 3	2.22% 3	25.93% 35	135	2.11

Q16 Conference Program:


Answered: 141 Skipped: 10



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Didn't attend	Total
The Madness session was an effective way for me to learn about the content of the conference	27.86% 39	37.86% 53	8.57% 12	5.00% 7	5.71% 8	15.00% 21	140
Having Integrated Demonstrations (Mate, the game; Sense-Making and Credibility of Health Information on the Social Web; Building a Shared Understanding of CSCW using Saturate) throughout the conference was valuable.	9.49% 13	30.66% 42	17.52% 24	5.11% 7	0.00% 0	37.23% 51	137
The CSCW Town Hall Meeting was effective for eliciting community feedback.	8.70% 12	20.29% 28	10.14% 14	0.72% 1	0.72% 1	59.42% 82	138

Q18 Preconference events: Within the set of workshops there was at least one topic that interested me.


Answered: 142 Skipped: 9




Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	42.25%	60
Agree	28.87%	41
Neutral	5.63%	8
Disagree	0.70%	1
Strongly Disagree	0.70%	1
Do not know	21.83%	31
Total		142

Q19 For the workshops I attended:


Answered: 61 Skipped: 90



CSCW 2010 Survey



CSCW 2010 Survey




I found the workshop a valuable experience:						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
W1: Collective Intelligence in Organizations: Toward a Research Agenda	72.73% 8	18.18% 2	9.09% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	11
W4: Revisiting Research Ethics in the Facebook Era: Challenges in Emerging CSCW Research	62.50% 5	25.00% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	12.50% 1	8
W6: Fun, seriously?	16.67% 1	66.67% 4	16.67% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	6
W7: New Frontiers in Telepresence	55.56% 5	44.44% 4	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	9
W8: Handovers and Handoffs: Collaborating in Turns	50.00% 3	16.67% 1	33.33% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	6
W10: Collaborative Information Retrieval	50.00% 3	50.00% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	6
W11: The Changing Dynamics of Scientific Collaborations	66.67% 8	25.00% 3	8.33% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	12
W12: CSCW Research in Healthcard: Past, Present and Future	80.00% 8	10.00% 1	0.00% 0	10.00% 1	0.00% 0	10
The workshop was relevant to the CSCW community						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
W1: Collective Intelligence in Organizations: Toward a Research Agenda	84.62% 11	15.38% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	13
W4: Revisiting Research Ethics in the Facebook Era: Challenges in Emerging CSCW Research	88.89% 8	11.11% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	9
W6: Fun, seriously?	80.00% 4	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5
W7: New Frontiers in Telepresence	100.00% 8	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	8

CSCW 2010 Survey

W8: Handovers and Handoffs: Collaborating in Turns	60.00% 3	40.00% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5
W10: Collaborative Information Retrieval	87.50% 7	12.50% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	8
W11: The Changing Dynamics of Scientific Collaborations	83.33% 10	16.67% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	12
W12: CSCW Research in Healthcard: Past, Present and Future	100.00% 9	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	9
The workshop was interesting to the CSCW community						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
W1: Collective Intelligence in Organizations: Toward a Research Agenda	91.67% 11	8.33% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	12
W4: Revisiting Research Ethics in the Facebook Era: Challenges in Emerging CSCW Research	75.00% 6	12.50% 1	0.00% 0	12.50% 1	0.00% 0	8
W6: Fun, seriously?	40.00% 2	40.00% 2	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5
W7: New Frontiers in Telepresence	100.00% 8	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	8
W8: Handovers and Handoffs: Collaborating in Turns	60.00% 3	0.00% 0	40.00% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5
W10: Collaborative Information Retrieval	66.67% 4	33.33% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	6
W11: The Changing Dynamics of Scientific Collaborations	75.00% 9	25.00% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	12
W12: CSCW Research in Healthcard: Past, Present and Future	88.89% 8	11.11% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	9

Q20 The Doctoral Colloquium was a valuable experience that was worth my investment of time.


Answered: 131 Skipped: 20



Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	6.11%	8
Agree	0.00%	0
Neutral	0.76%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Not Applicable (did not participate)	93.13%	122
Total		131

Q22 Concerning the Conference Social Networking Functions:

Answered: 136 Skipped: 15




Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------	-------

CSCW 2010 Survey

There were enough opportunities to network and interact with my colleagues.	41.18% 56	50.74% 69	6.62% 9	1.47% 2	0.00% 0	136
The "Ask Me About" tag on the badge was a good technique for starting conversations.	3.73% 5	11.19% 15	29.10% 39	36.57% 49	19.40% 26	134
Conference Breaks provided effective opportunities to meet and interact with colleagues.	21.80% 29	67.67% 90	9.77% 13	0.00% 0	0.75% 1	133
The Demos & Interactive Posters Reception (Monday night) provided a good opportunity to interact with the presenters.	44.03% 59	44.78% 60	8.21% 11	2.24% 3	0.75% 1	134
The Conference Reception (Tuesday night) provided a good opportunity to interact with colleagues.	44.96% 58	37.21% 48	13.18% 17	3.10% 4	1.55% 2	129

Q24 Rate the likelihood of planning to attend future CSCW conferences:


Answered: 140 Skipped: 11



	Very likely to attend	Somewhat likely to attend	Undecided	Somewhat unlikely to attend	Very unlikely to attend	Total
CSCW 2011: Hangzhou, China	12.95% 18	25.18% 35	16.55% 23	15.11% 21	30.22% 42	139
CSCW 2012: Seattle, WA area	53.28% 73	27.74% 38	10.22% 14	4.38% 6	4.38% 6	137

Q26 Other conferences I typically attend or submit to:

Answered: 121 Skipped: 30



Answer Choices	Responses	
CHI	93.39%	113
GROUP	47.11%	57
ECSCW	21.49%	26
UIST	14.05%	17
UbiComp	16.53%	20
DIS	14.05%	17
Total Respondents: 121		