Q1 Including CSCW 2012, I have attended CSCW

Answered: 245 Skipped: 1



Answer Choices	Responses	
1 time	**54.29%**	133
2 times	**19.18%**	47
3 times	**8.98%**	22
4 times	**4.90%**	12
5 or more times	**12.65%**	31
Total		**245**

Q2 How likely are you to attend another CSCW in the future.?

Answered: 245 Skipped: 1



Answer Choices	Responses	
Very Unlikely	**3.27%**	8
Unlikely	**2.86%**	7
Not Sure	**15.10%**	37
Likely	**42.45%**	104
Very Likely	**36.33%**	89
Total		**245**

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

Answered: 232 Skipped: 14



Answer Choices	Responses	
Email	**74.57%**	173
Web site	**88.36%**	205
Facebook group	**21.12%**	49
Fliers distributed at affiliated conferences	**20.26%**	47
Communication of the ACM magazine advertisement	**7.33%**	17
Interactions magazine advertisement	**5.60%**	13
Crossroads magazine advertisement	**1.29%**	3
Total Respondents: 232		

Q4 I am a

Answered: 244 Skipped: 2



Answer Choices	Responses	
Student	**38.93%**	95
Industry researcher	**12.70%**	31
Practicioner	**4.51%**	11
Academic researcher	**43.85%**	107
Total		**244**

Q5 I am a

Answered: 241 Skipped: 5



Answer Choices	Responses	
Female	**46.06%**	111
Male	**53.94%**	130
Total		**241**

Q6 Define your work location

Answered: 241 Skipped: 5



Country	Percent	Number
Argentina	0,43%	1
Australia	0,43%	1
Austria	0,85%	2
Brazil	0,85%	2
Canada	6,81%	16
China	1,70%	4
Croatia	0,43%	1
Denmark	0,43%	1
Estonia	0,43%	1
Finland	1,28%	3
France	1,28%	3
Germany	1,70%	4
Greece	0,43%	1
India	0,85%	2
Ireland	1,28%	3
Italy	1,28%	3
Japan	1,70%	4
Korea, South	0,43%	1
Netherlands	0,43%	1
Norway	2,13%	5
Singapore	0,43%	1
Sweden	0,43%	1
Switzerland	0,43%	1
Ukraine	0,43%	1
United Kingdom	2,13%	5
United States of America	71,06%	167
	TOTAL	235

State (for US only)



Country	Percent	Number
California	19,16%	32
Colorado	1,20%	2
District Of Columbia	1,20%	2
Georgia	2,40%	4
Illinois	5,99%	10
Indiana	2,99%	5
Iowa	0,60%	1
Maryland	1,80%	3
Massachusetts	4,79%	8
Michigan	2,40%	4
Minnesota	1,20%	2
Nebraska	0,60%	1
New Jersey	2,40%	4
New Mexico	0,60%	1
New York	13,17%	22
North Carolina	2,99%	5
Ohio	0,60%	1
Oklahoma	0,60%	1
Oregon	1,20%	2
Pennsylvania	10,78%	18
Texas	2,99%	5
Utah	0,60%	1
Virginia	2,40%	4
Washington	17,37%	29
	TOTAL	167

Q7 What role did you play at CSCW 2012? (Please check all that apply.)

Answered: 245 Skipped: 1



Answer Choices	Responses	
Attendee	**76.73%**	188
Presenter/Organizer	**55.10%**	135
Student Volunteer	**9.80%**	24
Workshop Participant	**35.10%**	86
Sponsor	**1.63%**	4
Committee Member – CSCW 2012	**10.20%**	25
Committee Member – CSCW 2013	**8.57%**	21
Other (please specify)	**5.31%**	13
Total Respondents: 245		

Q8 Changes in the CSCW Review Process

Answered: 243 Skipped: 3



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
The two-round review process improved the conference:	**25.32%** 59	**36.91%** 86	**33.91%** 79	**2.15%** 5	**1.72%** 4	233	2.18
Paper quality is more important than acceptance rate:	**41.98%** 102	**43.62%** 106	**10.70%** 26	**1.65%** 4	**2.06%** 5	243	1.78
Acceptance rates for papers submissions should be kept low – about 25% at most – regardless of the quality of the submissions:	**4.60%** 11	**13.81%** 33	**33.05%** 79	**31.38%** 75	**17.15%** 41	239	3.43
The CSCW community should identify different metrics other than acceptance rate to communicate the strength of the conference to interested parties (e.g., tenure committees):	**36.25%** 87	**43.75%** 105	**15.42%** 37	**2.92%** 7	**1.67%** 4	240	1.90
The papers at CSCW 2012 were of a quality equal to or higher than the papers at previous CSCW conferences:	**15.84%** 35	**28.05%** 62	**48.87%** 108	**6.33%** 14	**0.90%** 2	221	2.48
I will volunteer to review for CSCW 2013:	**34.47%** 81	**42.55%** 100	**16.17%** 38	**5.11%** 12	**1.70%** 4	235	1.97

Q9 Types of Research Contributions in the CSCW Program

Answered: 242 Skipped: 4



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Stongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
4-pages Notes are a valuable-size research contribution:	**22.51%** 52	**46.75%** 108	**23.81%** 55	**6.06%** 14	**0.87%** 2	231	2.16
It would be better to do away with the Notes category and the traditional submission length limit of 10 pages and instead let authors submit papers of a length they feel is appropriate for the research (as the UIST conference has done) along with a justification of any additional space they use:	**14.53%** 34	**24.36%** 57	**31.62%** 74	**26.07%** 61	**3.42%** 8	234	2.79

Q11 Paper and Notes Presentations:

Answered: 235 Skipped: 11



	100% - 81%	80 % - 61%	60 % - 41%	40 % - 21%	20 % - 0%	Total
Thinking of the Papers presentations (25-minute slots) that I attended, the percentage of them I found satisfying was:	**9.83%** 23	**41.03%** 96	**35.04%** 82	**12.39%** 29	**1.71%** 4	234
Thinking of the Notes presentations (15-minute slots) that I attended, the percentage of them I found satisfying was:	**12.62%** 27	**41.12%** 88	**29.91%** 64	**13.08%** 28	**3.27%** 7	214

Q13 Conference Program:Please rate the following conference sessions according to how relevant and interesting they were to the CSCW community:

Answered: 239 Skipped: 7



	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor	Didn't attend	Total	Weighted Average
Opening plenary by Yochai Benkler	**31.36%** 74	**33.47%** 79	**7.63%** 18	**3.81%** 9	**3.81%** 9	**19.92%** 47	236	1.94
Closing plenary by Marietta Baba	**12.12%** 28	**19.05%** 44	**6.06%** 14	**3.90%** 9	**3.90%** 9	**54.98%** 127	231	2.30
Paper & Notes Review Process Session (Monday at 2:00)	**5.26%** 12	**17.54%** 40	**7.02%** 16	**1.32%** 3	**0.00%** 0	**68.86%** 157	228	2.14
"Impact of CSCW" Session (Monday at 4:00)	**7.36%** 17	**18.61%** 43	**7.36%** 17	**1.30%** 3	**0.87%** 2	**64.50%** 149	231	2.15
Video session (Wednesday at 11:00)	**1.76%** 4	**9.25%** 21	**6.61%** 15	**0.00%** 0	**1.32%** 3	**81.06%** 184	227	2.47
Interactive Posters	**16.95%** 40	**50.85%** 120	**12.71%** 30	**4.66%** 11	**0.85%** 2	**13.98%** 33	236	2.09
Demos	**5.96%** 14	**34.47%** 81	**14.47%** 34	**5.53%** 13	**1.28%** 3	**38.30%** 90	235	2.38

Q14 Conference Program:

Answered: 238 Skipped: 8



	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	**15.13%** 36	**26.05%** 62	**17.65%** 42	**15.97%** 38	**15.55%** 37	**9.66%** 23	238
The CSCW Town Hall Meeting was effective for eliciting community feedback.	**11.64%** 27	**29.74%** 69	**15.09%** 35	**1.72%** 4	**0.43%** 1	**41.38%** 96	232

Q16 Preconference events:

Answered: 222 Skipped: 24



	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.	**40.99%** 91	**24.77%** 55	**3.60%** 8	**4.50%** 10	**0.00%** 0	**26.13%** 58	222	2.76

Q17 I participated in the following workshops:

Answered: 101 Skipped: 145





Workshop	W1: Personal Information Management in a Socially Networked World	W2: Data-Intensive Collaboration in Science and Engineering	W3: Collective Intelligence as Community Discourse and Action	W5: Mixed Reality Games	W6: Design, Influence, and Social Technologies: Techniques, Impacts and Ethics	W7: Brainstorming Design for Health: Helping Patients Utilize Patient-Generated Information on the Web	W8: Collaboration and Crisis Informatics (CI)	W9: Exploring collaboration in challenging environments: From the car to the factory and beyond	W10: The Future of Collaborative Software Development	W11: Reconciling Privacy with Social Media	W12: Mastering Data-Intensive Collaboration through the Synergy of Human and Machine Reasoning	W13: DUET 2012: Dual Eye Tracking in CSCW	W14: The Twelfth International Workshop on Collaborative Editing Systems	W15: Learning from Marginali Users: Reciproci in HCI4D
workshop attended:	**4.95%** 5	**6.93%** 7	**9.90%** 10	**7.92%** 8	**9.90%** 10	**9.90%** 10	**7.92%** 8	**1.98%** 2	**9.90%** 10	**9.90%** 10	**1.98%** 2	**5.94%** 6	**5.94%** 6	**6.9**
workshop attended:	**0.00%** 0	**7.69%** 1	**0.00%** 0	**0.00%** 0	**7.69%** 1	**0.00%** 0	**0.00%** 0	**0.00%** 0	**7.69%** 1	**7.69%** 1	**30.77%** 4	**0.00%** 0	**7.69%** 1	**30.7**

I found the workshop a valuable experience that was worth my investment of time	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
workshop attended:	**9.09%** 9	**2.02%** 2	**5.05%** 5	**25.25%** 25	**58.59%** 58	99
workshop attended:	**0.00%** 0	**7.69%** 1	**23.08%** 3	**30.77%** 4	**38.46%** 5	13

Q18 The Doctoral Colloquium was a valuable experience that was worth my investment of time.

Answered: 223 Skipped: 23



Answer Choices	Responses	
Strongly Agree	**4.04%**	9
Agree	**3.59%**	8
Neutral	**4.48%**	10
Disagree	**0.00%**	0
Strongly Disagree	**0.00%**	0
Not Applicable (did not participate)	**87.89%**	196
Total		**223**

Q20 Concerning the Conference Social Networking Functions:

Answered: 235 Skipped: 11



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
There were enough opportunities to network and interact with my colleagues.	**36.91%** 86	**49.79%** 116	**8.58%** 20	**3.43%** 8	**1.29%** 3	233
Conference Breaks provided effective opportunities to meet and interact with colleagues.	**35.90%** 84	**50.43%** 118	**8.12%** 19	**4.70%** 11	**0.85%** 2	234
The Demos & Interactive Poster Reception (Monday night) provided a good opportunity to interact with the presenters.	**44.80%** 99	**41.63%** 92	**11.76%** 26	**1.81%** 4	**0.00%** 0	221
The Conference Reception (Tuesday night) provided a good opportunity to interact with colleagues.	**37.84%** 84	**38.29%** 85	**13.51%** 30	**7.66%** 17	**2.70%** 6	222

Q22 Rate the likelihood of planning to attend future CSCW conferences:

Answered: 228 Skipped: 18



	Very likely to attend	Somewhat likely to attend	Undecided	Somewhat unlikely to attend	Very unlikely to attend	Total
CSCW 2013: San Antonio, TX, US	**32.46%** 74	**36.84%** 84	**21.93%** 50	**7.46%** 17	**1.32%** 3	228
CSCW 2014: location to be determined	**22.55%** 46	**35.78%** 73	**35.29%** 72	**4.90%** 10	**1.47%** 3	204

Q25 Other conferences I typically attend or submit to:

Answered: 183 Skipped: 63



Answer Choices	Responses	
CHI	**89.62%**	164
GROUP	**28.96%**	53
ECSCW	**18.03%**	33
UIST	**16.39%**	30
Ubicomp	**12.57%**	23
DIS	**18.03%**	33
Total Respondents: 183		