


CSCW 2011 Survey

Q1 Including CSCW 2011, I have attended CSCW


Answered: 122 Skipped: 2



Answer Choices	Responses	
1 time	67.21%	82
2 times	13.93%	17
3 times	5.74%	7
4 times	1.64%	2
5 or more times	11.48%	14
Total		122

Q3 I saw the following CSCW publicity items (check all that apply):

Answered: 122 Skipped: 2




Answer Choices	Responses
Email	68.03% 83
Web site	87.70% 107
Facebook group	38.52% 47
Fliers distributed at affiliated conferences	24.59% 30
Communication of the ACM magazine advertisement	20.49% 25
Interactions magazine advertisement	12.30% 15
Crossroads magazine advertisement	4.92% 6
Total Respondents: 122	

CSCW 2011 Survey

Q4 I am a

Answered: 119 Skipped: 5




Answer Choices	Responses	
Student	42.02%	50
Industry researcher	20.17%	24
Practitioner	3.36%	4
Academic researcher	34.45%	41
Total		119

CSCW 2011 Survey

Q5 I am a

Answered: 120 Skipped: 4




Answer Choices	Responses
Female	35.83% 43
Male	64.17% 77
Total	120

CSCW 2011 Survey


Q6 Define your work location

Answered: 119 Skipped: 5



Country	Percent	Number
Argentina	0,85%	1
Australia	2,54%	3
Austria	0,85%	1
Canada	2,54%	3
China	21,19%	25
Croatia	0,85%	1
France	1,69%	2
Germany	0,85%	1
Hong Kong	1,69%	2
India	0,85%	1
Indonesia	0,85%	1
Israel	1,69%	2
Italy	0,85%	1
Japan	5,08%	6
Korea, South	2,54%	3
Netherlands	1,69%	2
Portugal	0,85%	1
Singapore	4,24%	5
Sweden	0,85%	1
Switzerland	0,85%	1
United Kingdom	2,54%	3
United States of America	44,07%	52
TOTAL		118


State (for US only)



Country	Percent	Number
California	41,18%	21
Georgia	1,96%	1
Illinois	1,96%	1
Indiana	5,88%	3
Maryland	1,96%	1
Massachusetts	3,92%	2
Michigan	3,92%	2
Minnesota	1,96%	1
New Jersey	7,84%	4
New York	5,88%	3
North Carolina	1,96%	1
Pennsylvania	5,88%	3
Washington	15,69%	8
TOTAL		51

**Q7 What role did you play at CSCW 2011?
(Please check all that apply.)**


Answered: 121 Skipped: 3



Answer Choices	Responses	
Attendee	66.12%	80
Presenter/Organizer	49.59%	60
Student Volunteer	17.36%	21
Workshop Participant	28.93%	35
Sponsor	0.83%	1
Committee Member - CSCW 2011	9.09%	11
Committee Member - CSCW 2012	6.61%	8
Tutorial Participant	9.92%	12
Other (please specify)	15.70%	19
Total Respondents: 121		

Q8 The majority of my CSCW costs were paid by


Answered: 121 Skipped: 3



Answer Choices	Responses	
A grant	34.71%	42
My company/university	55.37%	67
Myself	9.92%	12
Total		121

Q9 For the factors below, indicate which are important in determining your ability to get funding/support to attend CSCW:

Answered: 120 Skipped: 4




	Yes	No	Total
I have a contribution to the CSCW conference that is included in the ACM Digital Library	83.49% 91	16.51% 18	109
I participate in the CSCW conference in a way that is not included in the ACM Digital Library (e.g., workshop, panel, tutorial)	61.86% 60	38.14% 37	97
Approval of my management/professor/organization	79.00% 79	21.00% 21	100
I manage funding decisions on my own	45.98% 40	54.02% 47	87

CSCW 2011 Survey

Q10 Schedule and Logistics

Answered: 120 Skipped: 4




	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
The conference daily start time was appropriate:	47.06% 56	52.10% 62	0.84% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	119	1.54
The 2.0 hour lunch break was useful:	47.06% 56	37.82% 45	13.45% 16	1.68% 2	0.00% 0	119	1.70
The Hyatt Regency Hangzhou conference center facilities worked well for CSCW 2011:	45.83% 55	39.17% 47	10.83% 13	3.33% 4	0.83% 1	120	1.74
The CSCW 2011 conference Identity/Design generated interest in the conference:	24.79% 29	34.19% 40	35.04% 41	5.98% 7	0.00% 0	117	2.22
The timing of the conference in the calendar year (around March) works well for me:	30.83% 37	46.67% 56	13.33% 16	7.50% 9	1.67% 2	120	2.02
The overlap with CHI in submitting and reviewing papers was a problem for me	16.10% 19	27.97% 33	32.20% 38	18.64% 22	5.08% 6	118	2.69

CSCW 2011 Survey

Q11 CSCW 2011 in Hangzhou, China was the first time the conference was held outside of North America:


Answered: 121 Skipped: 3



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Stongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
I liked having the conference located in Asia	52.07% 63	40.50% 49	5.79% 7	1.65% 2	0.00% 0	121	1.57
I met new researchers as a result of being located in Asia	44.17% 53	35.00% 42	14.17% 17	5.83% 7	0.83% 1	120	1.84
The travel expense of coming to China made it difficult for me to attend CSCW	7.44% 9	23.14% 28	20.66% 25	26.45% 32	22.31% 27	121	3.33
I would like CSCW to be held outside of North America again	44.17% 53	41.67% 50	12.50% 15	0.83% 1	0.83% 1	120	1.73

Q13 The papers and notes showcased important CSCW research contributions.


Answered: 116 Skipped: 8



Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	28.45%	33
Agree	58.62%	68
Neutral	10.34%	12
Disagree	2.59%	3
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0
Total		116

Q14 Paper and Notes Presentations:


Answered: 114 Skipped: 10



	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:	19.47% 22	43.36% 49	31.86% 36	4.42% 5	0.88% 1	113
Thinking of the Notes presentations (15-minute slots) that I attended, the percentage of them I found satisfying was:	12.96% 14	53.70% 58	25.00% 27	7.41% 8	0.93% 1	108

Q15 In general, I think that the level of details provided in the presentations at the conference is:


Answered: 115 Skipped: 9



Answer Choices	Responses
Just right: Presenters provide enough details without being overwhelming	69.57% 80
Too much: I can read the paper if I want more depth	15.65% 18
Too little: Most presentations are shallow and would benefit from additional detail	8.70% 10
No opinion	6.09% 7
Total	115

Q16 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: 115 Skipped: 9




Answer Choices	Responses
This is about the right amount of time for Papers presentations	71.30% 82
Papers should have a 20-minute slot (15 minute presentation, 5 minute Q&A)	23.48% 27
Papers should have a 15-minute slot (10 minute presentation, 5 minute Q&A)	3.48% 4
Papers should have more than a 30 minute slot to develop the topics in more detail	1.74% 2
Total	115

CSCW 2011 Survey

Q18 Conference Program: Please rate the following conference sessions according to how relevant and interesting they were to the CSCW community:

Answered: 114 Skipped: 10




	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor	Didn't attend	Total	Weighted Average
Opening plenary by Jack Ma	44.25% 50	35.40% 40	7.96% 9	4.42% 5	0.88% 1	7.08% 8	113	1.73
Closing plenary by Genevieve Bell	26.79% 30	34.82% 39	12.50% 14	5.36% 6	1.79% 2	18.75% 21	112	2.02
"Awareness and Affect Across Distance" Panel (Monday at 4:30)	4.63% 5	17.59% 19	6.48% 7	2.78% 3	3.70% 4	64.81% 70	108	2.53
"Uncommon Culture?" Panel (Wednesday at 9:00)	10.09% 11	16.51% 18	5.50% 6	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	67.89% 74	109	1.86
"CSCW Horizon: Studying the Social (Tuesday at 11:00)	16.51% 18	28.44% 31	4.59% 5	0.92% 1	0.92% 1	48.62% 53	109	1.86
"CSCW Horizon: Reflections in/of CSCW" (Wednesday at 11:00)	20.19% 21	23.08% 24	2.88% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	53.85% 56	104	1.63
Showcase sessions	11.32% 12	33.02% 35	12.26% 13	0.00% 0	0.94% 1	42.45% 45	106	2.07
Video sessions (Wednesday at 9:00)	9.35% 10	18.69% 20	13.08% 14	0.93% 1	0.00% 0	57.94% 62	107	2.13
Interactive Papers	17.59% 19	37.04% 40	14.81% 16	4.63% 5	0.00% 0	25.93% 28	108	2.09
Demos	18.52% 20	31.48% 34	14.81% 16	5.56% 6	0.00% 0	29.63% 32	108	2.11

CSCW 2011 Survey

Q19 Conference Program:

Answered: 113 Skipped: 11




	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	17.86% 20	25.89% 29	23.21% 26	16.07% 18	8.93% 10	8.04% 9	112
The CSCW Town Hall Meeting was effective for eliciting community feedback.	17.43% 19	28.44% 31	13.76% 15	2.75% 3	0.92% 1	36.70% 40	109

CSCW 2011 Survey

Q21 Preconference events:


Answered: 109 Skipped: 15



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Stongly Disagree	Do not know	Total	Weighted Average
Within the set of workshops there was at least one topic that interested me.	41.28% 45	29.36% 32	8.26% 9	3.67% 4	1.83% 2	15.60% 17	109	2.42
Within the set of tutorials, there was at least one topic that interested me.	21.70% 23	16.98% 18	18.87% 20	5.66% 6	1.89% 2	34.91% 37	106	3.54


Q22 I participated in the following workshops:

Answered: 49 Skipped: 75



- W1: The Second International Workshop on Social Recommender Systems
- W4: Tinkering, Crafts and Inventive Leisure Practices
- W6: Socializing Technology Among Seniors in Asia
- W7: Designing Social and Collaborative Systems for China
- W5: Mobile Collaboration in the Developing World
- W8: Social Media for Development
- W9: Collaborative Privacy Practices in Social Media
- W10: The Eleventh International Workshop on Collaborative Editing Systems
- W11: CSCW in China: State of the Art


CSCW 2011 Survey




Workshop										
	W1: The Second International Workshop on Social Recommender Systems	W4: Tinkering, Crafts and Inventive Leisure Practices	W6: Socializing Technology Among Seniors in Asia	W7: Designing Social and Collaborative Systems for China	W5: Mobile Collaboration in the Developing World	W8: Social Media for Development	W9: Collaborative Privacy Practices in Social Media	W10: The Eleventh International Workshop on Collaborative Editing Systems	W11: CSCW in China: State of the Art	Total
workshop attended:	22.92% 11	12.50% 6	4.17% 2	6.25% 3	10.42% 5	6.25% 3	12.50% 6	10.42% 5	14.58% 7	48
workshop not attended:	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	14.29% 1	0.00% 0	28.57% 2	14.29% 1	28.57% 2	14.29% 1	7
I found the workshop a valuable experience that was worth my investment of time										
	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total				
workshop attended:	12.50% 6	2.08% 1	0.00% 0	45.83% 22	39.58% 19	48				
workshop not attended:	28.57% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28.57% 2	42.86% 3	7				

Q23 I participated in the following tutorials:

Answered: 26 Skipped: 98



- T2: People, Devices and Settings: Introducing Experience Design
- T8: Operational Transformation Theory and Practice: Empowering Real-world Collaborative Ap...
- T5: Mobile UX Essentials
- T1: Newcomer's Guide to CSCW: Vision, Problems, and Research From Past to Future



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


Tutorial					
	T2: People, Devices and Settings: Introducing Experience Design	T8: Operational Transformation Theory and Practice: Empowering Real-world Collaborative Applications	T5: Mobile UX Essentials	T1: Newcomer's Guide to CSCW: Vision, Problems, and Research From Past to Future	Total
Tutorial attended:	36.00% 9	12.00% 3	16.00% 4	36.00% 9	25
Tutorial attended:	16.67% 1	16.67% 1	66.67% 4	0.00% 0	6
Tutorial attended:	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 3	3

CSCW 2011 Survey

I found the tutorial a valuable experience that was worth my investment of time						
	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Total
Tutorial attended:	8.33% 2	50.00% 12	33.33% 8	4.17% 1	4.17% 1	24
Tutorial attended:	33.33% 2	0.00% 0	33.33% 2	33.33% 2	0.00% 0	6
Tutorial attended:	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	4

Q24 The Doctoral Colloquium was a valuable experience that was worth my investment of time.


Answered: 101 Skipped: 23



Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	10.89%	11
Agree	6.93%	7
Neutral	6.93%	7
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.99%	1
Not Applicable (did not participate)	74.26%	75
Total		101

Q26 Concerning the Conference Social Networking Functions:


Answered: 109 Skipped: 15



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
There were enough opportunities to network and interact with my colleagues.	35.78% 39	51.38% 56	9.17% 10	3.67% 4	0.00% 0	109
Conference Breaks provided effective opportunities to meet and interact with colleagues.	44.04% 48	43.12% 47	10.09% 11	2.75% 3	0.00% 0	109
The Demos & Interactive Papers Reception (Monday night) provided a good opportunity to interact with the presenters.	37.04% 40	37.96% 41	23.15% 25	0.93% 1	0.93% 1	108
The Conference Reception (Tuesday night) provided a good opportunity to interact with colleagues.	22.22% 24	38.89% 42	25.00% 27	7.41% 8	6.48% 7	108

Q28 Rate the likelihood of planning to attend future CSCW conferences:


Answered: 105 Skipped: 19



	Very likely to attend	Somewhat likely to attend	Undecided	Somewhat unlikely to attend	Very unlikely to attend	Total
CSCW 2012: Seattle, WA area	39.05% 41	21.90% 23	21.90% 23	11.43% 12	5.71% 6	105
CSCW 2013: Location to be determined	23.76% 24	29.70% 30	40.59% 41	4.95% 5	0.99% 1	101

Q31 Other conferences I typically attend or submit to:

Answered: 79 Skipped: 45



Answer Choices	Responses	
CHI	87.34%	69
GROUP	34.18%	27
ECSCW	25.32%	20
UIST	20.25%	16
UbiComp	24.05%	19
DIS	11.39%	9
Total Respondents: 79		