

François Cooren and Consuelo Vasquez
Communication Department
Université de Montréal
Pavillon Marie-Victorin
90 Vincent-d'Indy
Outremont QC H2V 2S9
Canada
f.cooren@umontreal.ca

Evaluation of the 2009 ICA Conference in Chicago

| | |
|--|----|
| Evaluation of the 2009 ICA Conference in Chicago | 1 |
| Conference evaluation | 2 |
| Attendance | 2 |
| Survey implementation | 3 |
| Overall evaluation | 4 |
| Role at the conference | 6 |
| Attendance and Enjoyment of Events | 7 |
| Divisions and Interest Groups: Attendance and Membership | 11 |
| Evaluation of logistics, events and location | 14 |
| Future Programming | 16 |
| Personal details | 19 |
| Additional Comments | 22 |
| Appendix A: Exact answers to Q15 | 24 |
| Appendix B: Exact answers to Q20 | 26 |
| Appendix C: The questionnaire | 33 |

Conference evaluation

Each year ICA conducts an evaluation survey among delegates who attended the annual conference. To ensure comparability across conferences, each year's survey is closely based on that of previous years. The survey was administered online, this year using the online survey tool Tradewinds. The web survey did not collect any personal, IP or other identifying information.

The ICA office emailed all delegates at the Chicago conference a request to complete the survey on June 24, 2009. Two follow-up emails were sent to everyone on July 7 and July 26. The web survey was available for completion from June 24 to July 31.

Attendance

The Chicago conference was very well attended. With 2,197 registrants, it was the second best attendance just after the 2005 New York conference.

| Year and Location | Attendance | Survey N | Response Rate |
|----------------------|------------|----------|---------------|
| 2009- Chicago | 2 197 | 475 | 22 |
| 2008 – Montreal | 2108 | 559 | 27 |
| 2007 – San Francisco | 2134 | 730 | 34 |
| 2006 – Dresden | 1888 | 730 | 39 |
| 2005 – New York | 2238 | 716 | 32 |
| 2004 – New Orleans | 1814 | 127 | 6 |
| 2003 – San Diego | 1854 | 754 | 41 |
| 2002 – Seoul, Korea | 1159 | 251 | 22 |
| 2001 – Washington | 1677 | 318 | 28 |
| 2000 – Acapulco | 1118 | 284 | 15 |
| 1999 – San Francisco | 1581 | 158 | 10 |
| 1998 – Jerusalem | 857 | 195 | 23 |
| 1997 – Montreal | 1339 | 287 | 22 |
| 1996 – Chicago | 1404 | -- | -- |
| 1995 – Albuquerque | 1329 | -- | -- |
| 1990 – Dublin | 1250 | -- | -- |

Survey implementation

The response rate was lower than in the past three years: 475 people responded to the web survey, a response rate of 22%. The range of N for the questionnaire was 286 to 471 (with a low of 286 for the question about the conference events that participants wish they had attended).

While the response rate was not high, the make-up of the respondents seemed to echo that of the conference attendees. Thus, for example, the different regions of residence were fairly well represented in the survey, with a slight oversampling of Europe, Australia/New Zealand, and an undersampling of North America, although the bulk of the respondents (63%) were still from North America (for details see question 18 of the survey).

Data were transferred to and analyzed in Excel. The report follows the order of the survey questions (see Appendix B for the full questionnaire) and compares the answers with those of the past three conferences (Montreal, San Francisco and Dresden). Introduced last year was the ability to distinguish not only between students and faculty but between senior and junior faculty. In relevant questions we analyzed the differences across professional ranking, comparing the responses of students, senior faculty and junior faculty.

Overall evaluation

Q1. How much did you enjoy each of the following aspects of the conference?
(7 point scale from 1=not at all to 7=very much)

| | Chicago* | Montreal | SF | Dresden** |
|--|----------|----------|-----|-----------|
| Location | 6.1 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 5.8 |
| Organization, preparation and information | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.5 |
| Overall quality of all sessions** | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.3 |
| Social atmosphere, meeting with colleagues | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.5 |
| Social program, events and outings | 5.0 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 5.1 |
| Accessibility and convenience of travel to the conference city and hotel | 6.2 | 5.6 | 6.0 | 4.9 |
| Accessibility of AV equipment in all rooms | 5.7 | 5.5 | 5.7 | N/A |
| Average | 5.7 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 5.3 |

*Range of sample size for these items was 444-471.

**In the Dresden survey, this question read "Quality of the program, good speakers, papers, etc." In the San Francisco survey it was changed to "Overall quality of all sessions" to improve clarity of the question.

Overall evaluations of the Chicago conference ranged from 5.0 to 6.0. General evaluations of the Chicago conference were slightly higher than they were for Montreal (except for the accessibility and convenience of travel that presents a higher evaluation from 5.6, in Montreal to 6.2, in Chicago). Like in previous conferences, respondents were, on average, most positive about the conference location. Like in Montreal and San Francisco, respondents were least positive about the social program, events and outings. There were no significant differences between the overall evaluations of students, junior faculty and senior faculty.

Q2. When you decided to attend the Chicago conference, how important were the following motivations for you personally? (7 point scale from 1-not at all to 7-very important)

| | Chicago* | Montreal | SF | Dresden |
|---|----------|----------|-----|---------|
| Improve my academic record through paper presentation or other activities | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 5.3 |
| Job market (i.e., get in touch with potential employers/employees/colleagues) | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| Keep up with recent research | 5.9 | 6.0 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| Seek opportunities for research cooperation | 4.8 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| Meet or socialize with colleagues, friends | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| Travel to an interesting place | 4.5 | 5.2 | 5.1 | N/A |

*n=466-471

Of the six motivations, only one was more important in Chicago than in previous conferences (improve one's academic record). The order of the motivations, however, remained the same. Keeping up with recent research and socializing with colleagues and friends remained the top motivations for attending the conference, followed by improving one's academic record, travelling to an interesting place and seeking opportunities for research cooperation. The job market remained, on average, at the bottom of the list. The result of this item in Chicago was the lowest in the past four years (3.1).

An analysis of the relationship between the motivations for attending the Montreal conference and the respondents' professional rank suggests that there were statistically significant differences between students, junior faculty and senior faculty with regards to four of the six motivations (improving one's academic record, socializing with colleagues and friends, job market and seek opportunities for research). Improving one's academic record and the job market were more important motivations for students and junior faculty than for senior faculty. For students, improving one's academic record was, on average, the most important motivation (unlike the overall scores, where it was only in the third place) and was highly more important than for junior faculty and senior faculty. Meeting or socializing with colleagues and friends was more important for junior and senior faculty than for students. For senior faculty it was, on average, the most important motivation.

Motivations for attending the conference by professional rank

| | Students* | Junior Faculty** | Senior Faculty*** |
|---|-----------|------------------|-------------------|
| Improve my academic record through paper presentation or other activities | 6.2 | 6.1 | 4.8 |
| Job market (i.e., get in touch with potential employers/employees/colleagues) | 4.4 | 2.8 | 2.0 |
| Keep up with recent research | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.9 |
| Seek opportunities for research cooperation | 4.5 | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| Meet or socialize with colleagues, friends | 5.5 | 5.9 | 6.1 |
| Travel to an interesting place | 4.7 | 4.2 | 4.6 |

*n=154-158; **n=123-124; ***n=143-145

Role at the conference**Q3. Which of the following roles did you play in the Chicago conference?** (check all that apply)

| | Chicago* | Montreal | SF | Dresden |
|---|----------|----------|-----|---------|
| Award winner | 9% | 9% | 7% | 7% |
| Chair | 22% | 20% | 21% | 18% |
| Discussant | 12% | 12% | 14% | 14% |
| Divisional/Interest Group/ICA officer, committee or Board Member | 8% | 9% | 8% | 8% |
| Paper Reviewer | 33% | 30% | 26% | 23% |
| Preconference (organizer, presenter) | 9% | 10% | 6% | 4% |
| Presenter (paper, panel, poster; includes non-presenting co-author) | 79% | 77% | 78% | 76% |
| Volunteer (student, staff) | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% |
| Attendee (any sessions or meetings, but not any of the prior roles) | 34% | 27% | 32% | 31% |
| Other (please specify) | 2% | 1% | 2% | 3% |

* n=470

Like in previous conferences, presenting research was the major role played by the participants. There was a small increase in the percentage of reviewers and in conference attendees that did not play any other role.

Attendance and Enjoyment of Events

Q4. Which of the following events at the Chicago conference did you attend (other than those for which you had a formal role such as presenter/committee member)? (check all that apply)

| | Chicago* | Montreal | SF | Dresden |
|--|----------|----------|-----|---------|
| Divisional/interest group panel | 74% | 70% | 74% | 70% |
| Theme panel (not a plenary) | 54% | 44% | 57% | 59% |
| Opening plenary session (not including Poster session or ICA Business meeting)** | 22% | 14% | 40% | 58% |
| Mini-plenaries | 25% | 12% | --- | --- |
| Cross-unit sessions | 23% | --- | --- | --- |
| Plenary poster session | 26% | 39% | 28% | 40% |
| ICA Business meeting with presidential address | 20% | 21% | 19% | 14% |
| Affiliate organizational panel | 5% | 9% | 7% | 7% |
| Division/interest group business meeting | 54% | 54% | 51% | 43% |
| Division/interest group reception | 54% | 52% | 50% | 49% |
| University/institutional reception | 34% | 38% | 39% | 29% |
| First night's ICA reception | 51% | 51% | 49% | 41% |
| Pre-conference workshop | 8% | 19% | 16% | 8% |
| Neighborhood tours | 6% | --- | --- | --- |
| New members' orientation | 5% | 7% | 4% | 5% |
| Internet (Wireless) Cafe | 29% | --- | --- | --- |
| Closing reception | 14% | --- | --- | --- |
| Closing Plenary | 13% | --- | --- | --- |

* n=455

** The Opening plenary session (Filmmaker-in-Residence) included in the Montreal survey is here associated to the question concerning the Opening plenary session. In the Chicago conference survey, five new questions were added, concerning the participation to cross-unit sessions, neighborhood tours, Internet (Wireless) Cafe, Closing reception and Closing plenary. The survey did not address the questions concerning the graduate student reception nor the graduate student lounge, which were included in the Montreal survey, since these topics were addressed in the student's survey.

Most survey respondents attended divisional/interest group panels, followed by division/interest group business meetings, division/interest group receptions, and the first nights' ICA reception. The percentage of respondents who reported attending the opening plenary session was lower than in the previous conferences. However, this question did not include the mini plenaries, which might explain the low attendance to the opening plenary session (22%) and the increasing attendance at the mini-plenaries. There was also a substantial increase in the percentage of attendees in the theme panels and a slight decrease in the attendance at affiliate organizational panels.

Q5. How much did you enjoy each of the following events offered at the conference?

(7 point scale from 1-not at all to 7-very very much)

| | Chicago | Montreal | SF |
|--|---------|----------|-----|
| Divisional/interest group panel | 6.1 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Theme panel (not a plenary session) | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
| Opening plenary session (not including Poster session or ICA Business meeting) | 5.2 | 4.6 | 5.6 |
| Mini-plenaries | 5.8 | 5.3 | --- |
| Cross-unit sessions | 5.9 | --- | --- |
| Plenary poster session | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.2 |
| ICA Annual Awards Ceremony, with presidential address | 5.3 | 6.0 | 5.1 |
| Affiliate organizational panel | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.4 |
| Division/interest group business meeting | 5.7 | 5.9 | 5.6 |
| Division/interest group reception | 5.9 | 6.0 | 5.9 |
| University/institutional reception | 5.9 | 6.0 | 6.1 |
| Opening reception | 5.7 | 5.2 | 5.7 |
| Pre-conference workshop | 5.9 | 5.6 | 5.8 |
| Neighborhood tours | 5.0 | --- | --- |
| New members' orientation | 4.6 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| Internet (Wireless) Café | 5.4 | --- | --- |
| Closing reception | 5.7 | --- | --- |
| Closing Plenary | 5.8 | --- | --- |

The top five ranked events that participants enjoyed were divisional/interest group panels, the cross-unit sessions, divisional/interest group receptions, the university/institutional receptions and the preconference workshop. The least enjoyed event was the new members' orientation, followed by the neighborhood tours and the affiliate organizational panel.

For most of the Chicago conference events, the level of enjoyment was lower than the level of enjoyment at the Montreal conference. The most significant increase was in levels of enjoyment of the Mini-plenary. The most significant decrease was in levels of enjoyment of the ICA business meeting with presidential address, attaining a result similar to the San Francisco conference. It is interesting to recall that in the Montreal conference the evaluation of this event was highly enjoyed and presented a significant increase with respect to San Francisco.

The table below represents the level of enjoyment of the different events by the respondent's professional rank, and the number of respondents in each subgroup (student/junior faculty/senior faculty) who attended the different events. In the majority of the conference events (except for the poster session, the first and closing reception, new members' orientation, internet (wireless café) and neighborhood tours) there was a higher number of senior faculty than students or junior faculty. The most pronounced differences in the level of attendance are in the opening plenary session, the ICA business meeting with presidential address and the preconference workshop, where the number of senior faculty was almost twice the number of students or junior faculty.

The level of enjoyment of the different events was similar among students, junior faculty and senior faculty. Significant differences were found in one event that was enjoyed more by students: the new members' orientation.

Enjoyment and attendance of events by professional rank

| | Students | Junior Faculty | Senior Faculty |
|--|------------|----------------|----------------|
| Divisional/interest group panel | 6.0 (115)* | 6.1 (101) | 6.1 (123) |
| Theme panel (not a plenary session) | 5.7 (86) | 5.8 (67) | 5.9 (90) |
| Opening plenary session (not including poster session or ICA Business meeting) | 5.1 (27) | 5.2 (27) | 5.4 (46) |
| Mini-plenaries | 5.8 (44) | 5.8 (31) | 6.0 (64) |
| Cross-unit sessions | 5.9 (50) | 5.6 (32) | 6.0 (62) |
| Plenary poster session | 5.0 (56) | 5.6 (45) | 5.3 (45) |
| ICA Annual Awards Ceremony, with presidential address | 4.3 (27) | 5.8 (24) | 5.9 (40) |
| Affiliate organizational panel | 4.9 (18) | 5.3 (18) | 5.1 (24) |
| Division/interest group business meeting | 5.7 (76) | 5.6 (75) | 5.9 (91) |
| Division/interest group reception | 5.7 (81) | 5.8 (65) | 6.1 (85) |
| University/institutional reception | 5.8 (48) | 5.7 (44) | 6.0 (66) |
| Opening reception | 5.7 (78) | 5.5 (38) | 5.8 (71) |
| Pre-conference workshop | 5.5 (19) | 5.9 (21) | 6.2 (35) |
| Neighborhood tours | 5.1 (18) | 3.9 (13) | 5.6 (14) |
| New members' orientation | 5.0 (24) | 4.1 (8) | 3.9 (9) |
| Internet (Wireless) Cafe | 5.4 (58) | 5.3 (45) | 5.5 (46) |
| Closing reception | 5.7 (39) | 5.3 (21) | 5.7 (36) |
| Closing Plenary | 5.6 (31) | 5.7 (23) | 6.0 (42) |

* The number in parenthesis represents the number of respondents in each sub-group that attended and rated the events.

One of the findings suggested here points to the tendency of students attending association-wide events less than they attended other kinds of niche-oriented programming.

Q6. Were there events at the Chicago conference that you did not attend but that you wish you had attended? (check all that apply)

| | Chicago | Montreal* | San Francisco |
|--|---------|-----------|---------------|
| Divisional/interest group panel | 16% | 11% | 15% |
| Theme panel (not a plenary or miniplenary session) | 9% | 10% | 13% |
| Opening plenary session (not including Poster session or ICA Business meeting)** | 20% | 24% | 16% |
| Mini-plenary (Friday and Saturday, noon-1:15 pm)** | 13% | 10% | --- |
| Cross-unit sessions | 10% | --- | --- |
| Plenary poster session | 12% | 12% | 15% |
| ICA Business meeting with presidential address | 22% | 21% | 16% |
| Affiliate organizational panel | 4% | 4% | 5% |

| | Chicago | Montreal* | San Francisco |
|--|---------|-----------|---------------|
| Division/interest group business meeting | 18% | 22% | 22% |
| Division/interest group reception | 15% | 19% | 23% |
| University/institutional reception | 13% | 11% | 18% |
| First night's ICA reception | 17% | 31% | 26% |
| Pre-conference workshop | 14% | 21% | 18% |
| Neighborhood tours | 17% | --- | --- |
| New members' orientation | 7% | 16% | 16% |
| Internet (Wireless) Café | 6% | --- | --- |
| Closing reception | 30% | --- | --- |
| Closing Plenary | 20% | --- | --- |

* n=283

The closing reception was the event that most respondents said they would have liked to attend, followed by the ICA Business meeting with presidential address and the opening plenary session.

Divisions and Interest Groups: Attendance and Membership

Q7. Please indicate the divisions or interest groups whose sessions you attended in any role (check all that apply):

| | Chicago* | Montreal | San Francisco |
|---|----------|----------|---------------|
| Information Systems | 15% | 14% | 15% |
| Interpersonal Communication | 12% | 14% | 17% |
| Mass Communication | 41% | 42% | 47% |
| Organizational Communication | 12% | 17% | 19% |
| Intercultural Communication | 9% | 9% | 17% |
| Political Communication | 31% | 31% | 34% |
| Instructional and Developmental Communication | 4% | 7% | 7% |
| Health Communication | 18% | 19% | 22% |
| Philosophy of Communication | 18% | 17% | 18% |
| Communication and Technology | 32% | 29% | 27% |
| Popular Communication | 19% | 17% | 17% |
| Public Relations | 9% | 12% | 13% |
| Feminist Scholarship | 11% | 12% | 12% |
| Communication Law and Policy | 10% | 8% | 8% |
| Language and Social Interaction | 8% | 10% | 8% |
| Visual Studies | 9% | 10% | 9% |
| Journalism Studies | 25% | 22% | 24% |
| Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies | 5% | 4% | 6% |
| Intergroup Communication | 4% | 4% | 6% |
| Ethnicity and Race in Communication | 8% | 11% | 12% |
| Game Studies | 10% | 10% | 11% |
| Global Communication and Social Change | 15% | 17% | --- |
| Communication History | 12% | 7% | --- |

* n=453

The Mass Communication division was, as in past conferences, the most well attended division at the Chicago conference, followed by Communication and Technology, Political Communication and Journalism Studies (a slight difference in order with respect to the two precedent conferences). The most significant decrease was in Organizational Communication.

Q8. Please indicate the divisions or interest groups of which you are a member (check all that apply):

| | Chicago* | Montreal | SF | Dresden |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------|-----|---------|
| Information Systems | 9% | 10% | 13% | 12% |
| Interpersonal Communication | 8% | 11% | 12% | 11% |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mass Communication | 31% | 32% | 33% | 33% |
| Organizational Communication | 11% | 15% | 16% | 15% |
| Intercultural Communication | 6% | 8% | 15% | 14% |
| Political Communication | 20% | 18% | 21% | 22% |
| Instructional and Developmental Communication | 3% | 5% | 5% | 4% |
| Health Communication | 14% | 14% | 16% | 13% |
| Philosophy of Communication | 10% | 10% | 9% | 9% |
| Communication and Technology | 20% | 20% | 18% | 17% |
| Popular Communication | 9% | 10% | 8% | 8% |
| Public Relations | 6% | 9% | 10% | 10% |
| Feminist Scholarship | 7% | 7% | 8% | 7% |
| Communication Law and Policy | 6% | 4% | 5% | 5% |
| Language and Social Interaction | 5% | 6% | 6% | 6% |
| Visual Studies | 6% | 5% | 5% | 7% |
| Journalism Studies | 14% | 13% | 12% | 15% |
| Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies | 5% | 4% | 3% | 3% |
| Intergroup Communication | 3% | 3% | 4% | 3% |
| Ethnicity and Race in Communication | 5% | 7% | 6% | 5% |
| Game Studies | 5% | 6% | 5% | 4% |
| Global Communication and social Change | 7% | 9% | --- | --- |
| Communication History | 7% | 6% | --- | --- |
| Children, Adolescents, and the media | 10% | 7% | --- | --- |

* n=432

Participation from the various divisions and interest groups remained relatively stable in comparison to previous conferences (except for the Organizational Communication division that decreased its membership, which could also explain the decrease in the attendance to the division's sessions).

If responses are any indication, divisional and interest group sessions are drawing interest from non-members, since in all cases the percentage of respondents who attended the events of the division/interest group (question 7) was higher than the percentage of respondents who were members of these divisions/interest groups. The question, however, is whether there are differences between the different divisions/interest groups in the ratio of attendance and membership. That is, between divisions/interest groups whose events are attended primarily by their members (in this case we would expect a ratio close to 1 between the number of people who attended divisional events and the number of members), and divisions whose events tend to attract people outside of the division/interest group (in this case we would expect higher ratios). The table below represents the ratio between the number of attendees at divisional/interest group events at the Chicago conference (based on question 7) and divisional/interest group membership (based on question 8). We can see, for example, that events of the Popular Communication and of the Global Communication and Social Change divisions are attended by more than twice the size of its membership, whereas Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies as well as Organizational Communication are located at the other end of the spectrum, with almost the same number of attendees and members (a ratio of 1.1 and 1.2, respectively). Other divisions/interest groups that attract broader audiences than their members are Games Studies, Journalism Studies, Philosophy of Communication, Feminist Scholarship, Communication History, Information Systems,

Intercultural and Development Communication, Political Communication, Communication and Technology, Language and Social Interaction, and Ethnicity and Race in Communication.

The ratio between the number of attendees at divisional/interest group events at the Chicago conference and divisional/interest groups membership

| | ratio |
|---|-------|
| Information Systems | 1.7 |
| Interpersonal Communication | 1.6 |
| Mass Communication | 1.4 |
| Organizational Communication | 1.2 |
| Intercultural and Development Communication | 1.7 |
| Political Communication | 1.7 |
| Instructional and Developmental Communication | 1.4 |
| Health Communication | 1.4 |
| Philosophy of Communication | 1.8 |
| Communication and Technology | 1.7 |
| Popular Communication | 2.2 |
| Public Relations | 1.6 |
| Feminist Scholarship | 1.8 |
| Communication Law and Policy | 1.6 |
| Language and Social Interaction | 1.7 |
| Visual Studies | 1.6 |
| Journalism Studies | 1.9 |
| Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies | 1.1 |
| Intergroup Communication | 1.4 |
| Ethnicity and Race in Communication | 1.7 |
| Game Studies | 2.0 |
| Global Communication and social Change | 2.2 |
| Communication History | 1.8 |

Evaluation of logistics, events and location

Q9. How much do you agree with the following descriptions of logistics at the Chicago conference?
(7 point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree)

| | Chicago* | Montreal | SF | Dresden |
|---|----------|----------|-----|---------|
| Chicago was a stimulating conference location | 5.9 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 5.5 |
| The Chicago Marriott Downtown Magnificent Mile was a good conference site | 5.7 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 4.8 |
| The local organizing committee did a good job of providing special events throughout the conference | 5.4 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 5.4 |
| The wireless cyber cafe was useful to me | 4.5 | --- | --- | --- |
| The layout of the meeting rooms made it easy to get to sessions | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 4.5 |
| The meeting rooms were comfortable | 5.0 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 4.1 |
| Audio visual needs were met effectively | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.7 |
| The flash drive program was convenient | 4.4 | --- | --- | --- |
| The printed program was easy to follow | 5.5 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.5 |

* n=427-464

Satisfaction with the logistics of the conference ranged from 4.4 to 5.9. The Chicago conference was considered better than previous conferences with respect to the hotel as a good conference site and the satisfaction of the audiovisual needs. The conference was considered less satisfying than both the Montreal and San Francisco conferences in relation to the printed program, and slightly less satisfying than the Montreal conference in terms of the layout of the meeting rooms. It was considered slightly more satisfying than the Montreal conference in relation to the special events, the comfort of the meeting rooms. No significant differences were found across the evaluations of students, junior faculty and senior faculty.

Many of the qualitative comments in question 20 addressed the problem with the elevators and the layout of the meeting rooms. The innovation of the flash drive program was also acknowledged as an interesting idea. However, its use during the conference was questioned, the hard copy of the program being easier to consult. There were also some environmental issues with respect to the use of this device.

The qualitative comments confirm the general agreement that Chicago was an interesting location for the conference and less expensive than Montreal. However, some comments addressed the repetition of this location (which is also the NCA site for conference).

Q10. How much do you agree with the following descriptions of events at the Chicago conference?
(7 point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree, including the option of "not applicable")

| | Chicago | Montreal | SF | Dresden |
|---|---------|----------|-----|---------|
| Too many interesting programs were scheduled opposite to one another | 5.3 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 4.5 |
| The pre-conference workshops were stimulating and valuable additions to ICA | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 4.2 |
| The plenary sessions were valuable | 5.3 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.9 |
| The theme sessions were valuable | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 5.0 |

| | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| The cross-unit program was valuable | 5.7 | --- | --- | --- |
| The mini-plenary sessions were valuable | 5.8 | 5.0 | --- | --- |
| The quality of the papers I heard at panels was first-rate | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 4.6 |
| The quality of the posters I saw at the poster plenary was first-rate | 5.1 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 4.3 |
| Adequate time was available for audience discussions at the end of sessions | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 4.0 |
| I was bothered by the number of no shows among panelists on the program | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 4.3 |
| The book exhibit area was very useful to me | 5.2 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 4.4 |
| The calls inviting submissions for publication in the Chicago theme book were straightforward. | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.6 | --- |
| Publication of the theme book based on the Chicago conference should be a valuable resource to communication researchers | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.7 | --- |
| Having a closing plenary on the last day was a good idea | 4.7 | --- | --- | --- |
| Having a closing reception on Sunday night was a good idea | 4.9 | --- | --- | --- |
| Having the ICA business meeting and the award ceremony as separated events was a good idea | 5.1 | --- | --- | --- |

Levels of satisfaction with the conference events seem to have gone up over the past three years (from Dresden to San Francisco, from San Francisco to Montreal and from Montreal to Chicago), with the only exceptions being a slight decrease in satisfaction with the call for submissions to the theme book and its being a valuable resource to communication researchers. Notably, satisfaction with the mini-plenary sessions increased substantially from the Montreal to the Chicago conference, while remaining exactly the same in relation to the quality of posters and the time for audience discussion. The most satisfying elements of the Chicago conference were the mini-plenary session, the theme sessions and the cross-unit program.

There were no significant difference between students, junior faculty and senior faculty.

Q11. Has the fact that the 2009 conference took place in Chicago, IL, USA, made it easier for you to participate, more difficult, or did it make no difference compared with previous conferences?

| | Chicago* | Montreal | San Francisco | Dresden |
|----------------|----------|----------|---------------|---------|
| Easier | 53% | 24% | 38% | 32% |
| More Difficult | 3% | 17% | 12% | 31% |
| No difference | 44% | 59% | 50% | 36% |

* n=447

The percentage of respondents who indicated that the Chicago conference was more difficult to attend was much lower than the three previous conferences. The percentage of respondents who indicated that the Chicago conference was easier to attend was, consequently higher than the previous three conference.

Future Programming

All the questions in this section (11-16) were added to the survey this year. Question 12 was largely based on the categories developed in last year's report, whereas questions 13-16 examine members' interest in- and position on particular programming ideas.

Q12. Division and Interest Groups provided a variety of activities and services for their members at the ICA conference. Of the following types of activities and services, which would you like to see more of? (check all that apply)

| Activity | Interest (% of respondents) |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Cross-divisional/joint events | 42% |
| Different session types | 34% |
| Outside-of-conference activities | 17% |
| Professional activities (networking facilitation, workshops, preconferences, mentoring sessions) | 63% |
| Social events (receptions, dinners, newcomer social events, informal gatherings) | 61% |

n=393

Professional activities and social events are the two types of activities that respondents would most like to see more of, followed by cross-divisional/joint events and difference session types. Less than a fifth of the respondents were interested in outside conference activities.

Q13. How much did you enjoy each of the following events offered at the conference? (7 point scale from not at all to very much, including the option of "not applicable")

| | |
|---|-----|
| Cross-divisional/interest group programming, discussing topics of shared interest | 5.8 |
| Programming devoted to academic professionalism | 5.0 |
| Programming devoted to developing media skills for academics | 4.4 |
| Programming devoted to fellowship opportunities | 4.9 |
| Programming devoted to grant-making opportunities | 5.1 |
| Programming devoted to junior career opportunities | 4.7 |

n=363-386

Of the six events offered at the conference, respondents mostly enjoyed cross-divisional programming. Next was programming devoted to grant-making opportunities, followed by programming devoted to academic professionalism. The respondents less enjoyed the programming devoted to media skills for academics.

An analysis of the relationship between the level of enjoyment in the different events offered at the conference and the respondents' professional rank suggests that all of the events were better appreciated by students than they were to senior faculty and junior faculty. The table below presents the distribution in each group to Q13.

While cross-divisional programming was of most interest to all groups, for students the second most interesting item was programming devoted to academic professionalism, compared with programming devoted to grant-making opportunities among junior and senior faculty.

| | Students* | Junior Faculty** | Senior Faculty*** |
|---|-----------|------------------|-------------------|
| Cross-divisional/interest group programming, discussing topics of shared interest | 5.9 | 5.7 | 5.8 |
| Programming devoted to academic professionalism | 5.3 | 4.9 | 4.7 |
| Programming devoted to developing media skills for academics | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.3 |
| Programming devoted to fellowship opportunities | 5.1 | 4.8 | 4.7 |
| Programming devoted to grant-making opportunities | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.0 |
| Programming devoted to junior career opportunities | 5.1 | 4.8 | 4.1 |

*n= 125-130; **n=99-106; ***n= 106-118

Q14: ICA is trying to become greener. How much do you agree with the following statements?
(7 point scale from not at all to very much, including the option of “not applicable”)

| | |
|--|-----|
| I would be willing to give up the printed program for a flash drive. | 3.7 |
| I liked the idea of having a recyclable conference bag. | 5.8 |
| I would be interested in having major sessions podcasted. | 5.1 |
| I would prefer video podcasts over audio podcasts. | 5.0 |

n=442-452

Of the four statements corresponding to ICA's 'going green' the one that was mostly supported was the idea of having a recyclable conference bag. In the qualitative comments, some respondents did also address this question but did not agree about the usefulness of a conference bag (being it recyclable or not). The idea of having major sessions podcasted was also well supported, followed by the video podcasting (versus the audio podcast). This idea was also suggested in the qualitative comments.

The response to the idea of the flash drive program as replacing the hard copy one is not conclusive. Comments about this subject point out the usefulness of the flash drive after the conference but do not support giving up the printed program. The environmental issue concerning the flash drive program was also pointed out in one comment, which questioned the 'greenness' of this device. There was also a suggestion in having the conference papers on the flash drive.

Q15: Are there other types of programming that you would like to see in future conferences?
(for the exact answers to this question see Appendix A).

Many of the answers to this question did not address the topic of types of programming but were more concerned with schedule, audio/visual equipment, social event, and further on. These answers were interpreted with the additional comments (see additional comments related to Q20). What follows concerns specifically the topic of Q15.

Suggested themes:

- environment and popular eco-discourse
- entertainment and media industries
- more exciting topics covered in interpersonal communication
- Developing programming with the experts in various areas of human communication

Suggested type of session

- Scientific research reports session
- More poster session
- Pre-conference session for first-time presenters
- Cross-discipline debates.
- ICA Madness, akin to CHI Madness--the author of every paper in every session gets an opportunity to do a 25-second promo of their paper during an all-ICA morning meeting.
- Graduate student interest group
- Discussions to develop research agendas, to explore emerging problems in our field that are under researched, and debates on controversial issues.
- Roundtable sessions
- Job fair
- Debate-style panels devoted to NARROW issues of interest.

Suggested type of social event:

- (More) networking/social events just for graduate students.
- Joint planning by division - new member breakfasts, co-organized coffe-break
- (More) social activities for new members (not necessarily graduate students).
- Large scale parties, sponsored by multiple organizations

Personal details**Q16. Are you...**

| | Chicago | Montreal* | SF | Dresden |
|---|---------|-----------|-----|---------|
| Student (undergrad, master, Ph.D., postdoc, prospective) | 34% | 35% | 33% | 31% |
| Junior Faculty (untenured and/or assistant professor)** | 27% | 25% | | |
| Senior Faculty (including also emeritus, dept. chair, dean, university administrator, etc.)** | 31% | 35% | 58% | 58% |
| Researcher (coordinator, scientist, director, administrator, not faculty or student) | 5% | 3% | 5% | 7% |
| Non-University Professional (journalist, publisher, librarian, government official, foundation) | 1% | 1% | 2% | 2% |
| Other | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% |

* n= 462

** The "faculty" category of previous surveys was divided this year to junior and senior faculty.

Around one third of the respondents were students, another third were senior faculty members and around one fourth of the respondents were junior faculty members. The remaining 7% were researchers, non-university professionals and "other" (e.g., media activists or people who belong to several categories). Over the past years there has been a gradual increase in the percentage of students among the respondents, the Chicago conference presents however a slight decrease with respect to the Montreal conference. The percentage of faculty members oscillated between 58% and 60% over the past four conferences.

Q17. What is your gender?

| | Chicago* | Montreal | SF | Dresden |
|--------|----------|----------|-----|---------|
| Female | 55% | 56% | 54% | 48% |
| Male | 45% | 43.5% | 46% | 50% |
| Other | 0.4% | 0.5% | --- | --- |

*n= 461

55% of the respondents were women, a slightly lower percentage than in Montreal conference, but still higher than in San Francisco and Dresden. As the table below demonstrates, the percentage of women was much higher among student than among junior faculty and senior. 69.6% of students were women compared to 43.5% of junior faculty and 44.4% of senior faculty.

| | Students | Junior Faculty | Senior Faculty |
|--------|----------|----------------|----------------|
| Female | 69.6% | 43.5% | 44.4% |
| Male | 29.7% | 55.6% | 55.6% |
| Other | 0.6% | 0.8% | 0% |

Q18. Where do you currently reside?

| | Chicago* | Montreal | SF | Dresden |
|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----|---------|
| Africa | 1% [0,6%]** | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Asia/Pacific | 5%[4,6%] | 6% [4%] | 5% | 6% |
| Australia/New Zealand | 2%[1,3%] | 3% [2%] | 2% | 3% |
| Central and South America | 1%[0,5%] | 1% [1%] | 0% | 0% |
| Europe | 26%[18,9%] | 22% [18%] | 23% | 31% |
| Middle East | 2%[1,6%] | 2% [2%] | 1% | 2% |
| North America | 63%[72,4%] | 66% [73%] | 69% | 57% |

* n= 460

** The percentages in parentheses represent the actual representation of the different regions at the conference, based on ICA registration data.

The distribution of respondents by regions was similar to previous conferences and largely in accordance with the distribution of conference attendees by region, with a slight oversampling of Europe, Australia/New Zealand, and an undersampling of North America. 63% of the respondents were from North America, a little more than a fourth of the respondents were from Europe, and the remaining 11% were from other parts of the world.

ICA registration data show that conference registrants came from 56 countries (compared with 51 in Montreal, 47 in San Francisco and 52 in Dresden). The 20 countries with the most representatives were:

| Country | Chicago | Montreal | SF | Dresden |
|----------------|---------|----------|------|---------|
| United States | 1536 | 1409 | 1528 | 971 |
| Germany | 88 | 75 | 102 | 297 |
| United Kingdom | 69 | 64 | 61 | 62 |
| Netherlands | 68 | 67 | 54 | 84 |
| Canada | 41 | 130 | 43 | 24 |
| Belgium | 34 | 25 | 21 | 14 |
| Israel | 29 | 33 | 22 | 35 |
| Singapore | 28 | 33 | 18 | 23 |
| Sweden | 26 | 27 | 28 | 31 |
| Switzerland | 23 | 26 | 27 | 32 |
| Australia | 21 | 26 | 27 | 28 |
| Spain | 20 | 11 | 8 | 15 |
| Denmark | 18 | 20 | 15 | 15 |
| Hong Kong | 17 | 17 | 12 | 1 |
| China | 15 | 8 | 13 | 26 |
| Norvey | 15 | - | - | - |
| Mexico | 14 | 15 | 19 | 9 |
| Korea | 12 | 9 | 25 | 33 |
| Finland | 9 | 13 | 13 | 15 |

| Country | Chicago | Montreal | SF | Dresden |
|-------------|---------|----------|----|---------|
| New Zealand | 8 | 12 | 6 | 22 |

Attendance from Germany increased at the Chicago conference, being the second largest representation. The data also revealed significant changes with respect to Norway whose representation increased to 15. Canada's representation decreased in a third with respect to the Montreal conference getting much closer at the Chicago conference to the San Francisco conference result. The Chicago conference had the higher country representation, 56 countries, over the past four conferences.

Additional Comments

Q20. Please add any additional comments you have about the Chicago conference in the box below and/or suggestions about other types of programming you would like to see at future conferences (for the exact answers to this question see Appendix B).

Participants appreciated the following aspects of the Chicago conference:

- The location: these comments confirm the quantitative analysis. However, some respondents did state being 'tired', 'bored' of Chicago, highlighting the repetitiveness of this location for ICA's and other organizations conference (i.e. NCA).
- The conference hotel: The majority of the comments with respect to the hotel were positive. However the issue of slow elevators was highlighted several times.
- The theme for the conference: keywords. This theme was considered as being relevant, appealing and opened.
- Closing plenary session: People enjoyed the idea of a closing plenary session. However, some respondent stated that the theme for this session was not pertinent.
- The presidential address: Some respondents pointed out the quality and relevance of the presidential address.
- The poster session: Many comments point out the interesting dynamic of this type of session and the good quality of the presentations.
- The flash driver program. This innovation was considered interesting but much more useful after than during the conference.

However, they considered that there was room for improvement in the following areas:

a) Hotel and meeting rooms

- The size of some meeting rooms (Public relation, Communication and history, Children, Adolescents, and the Media sessions).
- The layout of the rooms. Many respondent highlighted the difficulty in finding the meeting rooms in the hotel.

b) AV equipment and internet access (see also question 9, p. 12)

- Wifi access in the hotel not restrained to the wireless cafe.
- Free internet access with computer stations.

c) Programming, sessions, presentations

- Scheduling: Concerning this topic the improvements addressed mostly pointed out time issues (the conference being too long but the time for session being too short) and the overlapping of sessions. The timing of some sessions, as the closing plenary or the poster session, scheduled at lunch or dinner time, was also addressed.
- Guidance on the role of presenter, chair and respondent

Participants disagreed on the following issues:

- The quality of the conference (presentations, papers, keynotes): Many respondents pointed out a low quality of the conference. However, there are some positive remarks that highlight the accurate selection process and, consequently, point out the high quality of some sessions (particularly, the poster session).
- The theme of the closing plenary. Some comments question the choice of the keynote speaker for this plenary session arguing the theme (and the keynote speaker) was not representative of an international communication organization. The change of topic was considered to be awkward.

Other suggestions:

- Podcasting, blogging of the conference.
- Flash drive program on Internet
- More international participation, ICA being too US centered
- Free dinner events for socialization (2 or 3 during the conference)

Appendix A: Exact answers to Q15

- I believe that LSI papers should have 15 minutes (or even 20), followed by 5 minutes for discussion. Many LSI sessions that I attended allowed only 10-12 minutes for papers. This doesn't work well for much LSI work, as it takes time to outline fine details of interaction.
- A program that could be downloaded in the cell phone (iPhone application?)
- Cross division kickball?
- Fewer themes, fewer panels, more scientific research reports less social criticism and pontificating.
- A move to more poster session to avoid concurrent sessions. I volunteered for poster sessions for two papers and neither was scheduled for a poster session.
- The theme sessions on key words in the field were excellent and drew combinations of scholars who work with similar concepts in different ways. Excellent theme sessions.
- Instead of the flash drive, you can simply rely on the Internet. Is a flash drive ecologically really better than paper? How much energy does it cost to produce a flash drive?
- Support a Twitter account / now, we did it by ourselves
- Please, cut the waste of money on conference bags
- More themes on the environment and popular eco-discourse
- There doesn't seem to be too much programming that deals with entertainment. That is such a huge part of people's daily lives. Also, I would like to see more programming about the media industries themselves. I think many academics are comfortable with very little knowledge of the real media world - and that's where our students want to be!
- iPhone app?
- To be honest, there are almost an overwhelming number of events as it is...on the other hand, a pre-conference session for first-time presenters might be helpful -- I'd be happy to conduct a workshop on how to present research without boring the audience to tears.
- I would like to see more exciting topics covered in interpersonal communication. It is always the same old same old in those sessions, where many of the other divisions at ICA put out some really fascinating and groundbreaking stuff. I learned more about IPC from non-IPC groups than I did at the IPC panels.
- I didn't know about a lot of the programming b/c it was too inconvenient to have to have my computer handy in order to find out what was going on at any given time. I didn't know about the book (referenced in an earlier question) and i didn't know about grant/fellowship/media use professional development sessions. Those seem like they'd have been quite useful.
- More cross-discipline debates.
- I would like to see more podcasting and blogging and webconferencing of events.
- The conference is too long. I would prefer a shorter meeting with a fuller schedule (morning, afternoon, and after dinner sessions).
- ICA Madness, akin to CHI Madness--the author of every paper in every session gets an opportunity to do a 25-second promo of their paper during an all-ICA morning meeting.
- Honestly, I didn't realize there were as many different (and new) types of programming as there were; it would be great if there was a grad student interest group to whose members certain programs could be advertised more heavily (e.g., the fellowship and grant-making opps, the jr career opps, etc.). And more networking/social events just for grad students so we could meet grad students from other schools.
- Joint planning by organizational communication and public relations - new member breakfasts, co-organized coffe-break - PR+org-com
- I think that the flash drives are a great idea! that being said, I also think that there should be paper versions available strategically throughout the hotel to allow participants to leaf through them any time. for example, you could attach them like phonebooks, so that they are functional yet not able to be stolen/removed.
- More social activities for new members (not necessarily graduate students).
- Developing programming with the experts in various areas of human communication would be very important. Let us focus on expertise instead of a democratically skewed focus.
- Discussions to develop research agendas, to explore emerging problems in our field that are under researched, and debates on controversial issues. I also strongly believe it's time for a REAL BUSINESS MEETING where members can debate and pose resolutions, etc. Just inviting members to the board meeting does not assure member participation on any meaningful level.
- less papers/sessions but better ones

- Roundtable sessions can be interesting.
- It would be great if the printed program separates into a few pieces based on dates. Then, we can carry only one of them on a particular day.
- I'm afraid choosing flash drive was a mistake as it took so long to scroll through all events to scan upcoming choices. I ended up missing sessions because I couldn't see them clearly.
- Job fair
- Active career booths with representatives from member institutions, such as those featured at NCA and AEJMC - particularly valuable in this difficult job market - and noticeably absent at ICA.
- Skip the conference bag all together.
- I'd like to comment on the flash drive issue, actually. The flash drive is ineffective unless you are walking around with your laptop on and out of the bag. Many conference attendees want to find sessions on the fly, or double check locations quickly, and a flash drive does not facilitate that. However, I love and use my ICA flash drive after the conference, and it is a good advertising device for the organization. I'd hate to see it go away, but I don't think I can sacrifice the printed program, either.
- Job fairs
- Debate-style panels devoted to NARROW issues of interest. We have a variety of panels now that address very broad issues with little cross-engagement; these are of limited utility to active researchers.
- Large scale parties, sponsored by multiple organizations (instead of multiple small parties hosted by single, small org.). Larger size should attract more people and provide better opportunities for networking.

- 'The venue, while it had a wonderful location, was awful. For example, you could not easily get between rooms. Also, a .pdf version of the program on the flash drive would have helped.
- 'The room layout was pretty good but the stairs were hidden and were a bit odd and the escalators were a total pain since they skipped a floor. However there were a lot of spaces with chairs to sit and rest or talk, which is vital. The Montreal space didn't have that. Informal socializing (communicating!) is important, so we need a lot of spaces in which to do it.
- 'Construction near the hotel made getting around tedious. Hard to know these issues in advance.
- 'Great conference overall! The elevators were the worst part--they took forever.
- 'The downside to the hotel was the wait for the elevators. I'm sure you will hear that from others!
- 'Great location for the hotel. Elevators slow but otherwise good!
- 'It is ridiculous to wait 10-15 minutes to get on an elevator. Maybe this was not the best choice of hotel or the hotel was not prepared to serve a major conference. Internet in rooms would be a great addition. Perhaps there is a way to negotiate that in the future so it's free or at a discount for conference participants? I know that will be the case in Singapore, but at \$165 a room that's not very helpful, given my limited travel budget.
- 'Food services in the hotel were terrible! Restaurant was closed a LOT and Starbucks was the only alternative. A list of places to eat in the neighborhood would have been a big help.
- 'Marriott Hotel conference center was freezing and a maze, with horrible public spaces and no windows or natural light anywhere, really a depressing place to be, but this seems to be the case with all ICA hotels probably because the conference is far too big.
- 'Guide for Boystown tour was super. WiFi in cafe not so much, very hard to connect. Hotel layout confusing. But, overall, a fantastic conference experience.
- 'the rooms facing Michigan Avenue were very noisy at night when ambulances disturbed people's sleep throughout the night-time.
- 'It was difficult to find a way to reach a right room for a session, especially for those small sessions on different floors from the main floor. We should have had more signs (or helpers) which could show us how to get other floors or other session rooms.

Meeting Rooms

- Our division's (PR) main session room was way too tiny for the numbers of people who attended;
- 'In the big conference rooms, there were no electricity sockets, so a laptop was useless. Currently, such rooms are problematic, since many of us write down sessions directly to the laptop.
- Also, some sessions were in rooms that were far too small! If a well-known person is speaking, it should be in a big room even if it's not a very popular division. For instance, when Michael Schudson spoke for the communication history division, the room was so packed it was a fire hazard!!
- 'The conference rooms without windows were awkward!
- 'The Children Adolescents and Media sessions were in a room that was too small.
- 'The Children, Adolescents, and the Media sessions held in the small room were often overcrowded with numerous attendees sitting on the floor.

Sessions

- 'I think the poster session could be organized more effectively. I would put posters from divisions with many shared members (say mass comm and political comm) closer to each other
- 'In the future, please do not organize sessions with more than four papers! The presentations in sessions with 5 or 6 presenters are too short to be meaningful, and because most presenters in such sessions cannot stick to their time limit, there is no time for discussion, which obviously irritates most of the attendants. I'd rather have a lower acceptance rate than having to attend or present in these horrible high density sessions.
- Eliminate more talking-head panels and substitute with poster sessions and high impact sessions. 'While I understand that all of the chairs and discussants are volunteers (having been one), I still would suggest that they receive some guidance about their roles. In most sessions, the discussants were excellent. However, in a few, they seemed to take on the role of reviewer, publicly taking to task the presenters. Since the papers were already peer-reviewed, this seemed inappropriate and even peevish.

- 'Please make sure that poster sessions are given same weight in scheduling as other sessions -- pre-conference poster session scheduled against lunch. I wouldn't have bothered coming if I had known that. Also, possibly give those in pre-conference poster sessions opportunity to display their posters and compete in main poster session. Overall content seemed a little weaker than last years sessions - more that I found I could take or leave rather than "must see" sessions as in past. At least we were in a great tourist city, and overall, I had a good time!
- 'Having panels after the last keynote was a weak idea.
- The divisional receptions could be more effectively arranged (than putting dish trays in a hallway) to cultivate a stronger atmosphere for connections/networking. Having receptions in the hallway is not a good idea because people tend to be in a leaving mode and don't want to bother each other for in-depth conversations.
- 'The US-centric framing of the opening plenary was rather odd, unless of course you were showcasing issues from the host country.
- 'I participated in the poster presentation session but as a first timer felt at a disadvantage mainly because I followed the rules about font size, dimensions, etc. (which limited how much information especially text I put on my poster). Others clearly ignored those same guidelines and were rewarded for doing so. Either have the rules (and don't reward those who clearly do not adhere to them) or don't!
- Our chair did not communicate with the panelists before the conference and we did it for him. He did not read our papers, so he was not able to conduct a discussion or questions.

Quality

- The quality of the conference presentations was above ICA average, there were much fewer mediocre (and below) papers than usual. The selection process must have been good this time. The overall theme - keywords - made more sense than the usual theme fields because it was interesting to a larger audience and actually contributed something to our knowledge. Congratulations to Barbie Zelizer for a great conference!
- 'My impression was a conference made up of an extremely widely scattered projects of presenters. The basics of communication study and theory do not seem to be of interest to the younger members of the ICA. This proliferation of so many different kinds of foci may be an endangerment to the future of ICA. It is amazing to me when I talk to many of the younger members of ICA, that they know little to nothing about the early developments of ICA of the many experts who are now gone or getting older. I suppose this is the fate of all professionals, but it makes one want to join other groups that are smaller and much more powerful. I was actually bored with most of it. Thankfully, I met some bright and forgotten folks.
- 'i would like to see a variety of papers/panels. a valuable question to add would have been not "there were too many interesting programs at the same time", but rather "there were no panels of interest offered".
- 'The poster session was awful. Too many posters, it was lunch time when everybody schedule for socials, and the distribution of the space was boring and did not encourage people to go and interact. Besides, some people presenting did not take them seriously and brought pieces of paper stapled on the board, etc. Very low professional quality.
- 'I was not impressed with the program at first. But, after attending the poster session ONLY, I wished I had attended other sessions during the Chicago Conference. I look forward to submitting at future ICA Conferences

Closing plenary session

- 'I was annoyed by the change of topic of the speaker at the closing plenary. It had no relevance whatsoever for non-US-citizens and hardly any relevance for the conference theme. For a supposedly international conference, that was very disappointing.
- The Sunday closing reception was a good idea, but people came hungry because food was served at the other reception (in abundance, even!). You might make it clear what is being served so people don't show up empty-stomached and leave tipsy.
- 'Thanks for a well-organised and professional conference. But, closing plenary Naomi Klein had nothing to do with media. Next year, please secure a closing plenary that does not change topic on a whim - nor such a light weight compared to the original program.

- 'The choice of an ideologue like Naomi Klein for a featured speaker was completely inappropriate for the Int'l Communication Association
- Enjoyed final plenary w Naomi Klein. ICA always a pleasure.

Schedule

- The awards ceremony should be shortened. Not some much time should be devoted to fellows, especially with a presidential address in the same session.
- 'Too many divisional business or social meetings were scheduled the same hour as panel sessions. These should come AFTER all sessions are completed.
- 'The last session slot was timed very badly. Nobody showed up!
- 'I love the Awards Ceremony and Presidential Address being together -- it really makes a nice, memorable occassion.
'I think no matter what, you are going to have people that are very interested in 2 panels that occur simultaneously. However, if the panel chair would keep the presentation order the same as it is listed in the program, that would help people tremendously. I had several instances where I left one session to go to another, only to discover when I got there that the person going 3rd or 4th that I wanted to see had gone 1st, and I missed them. That was very frustrating.
- 'Concerning the closing plenary: it was a very good session and idea. However, i thought is was unfortunate that there were still session planned after the closing plenary as many people already left and i can imagine its feels a bit strange to be presenting after the closing plenary.
- 'I think Sunday should be the last day of a conference, ending at noon.
- 'This was an excellent conference overall. My main dissatisfaction was that I was not able to attend all of the interesting programs I wanted to see. I do have two scheduling complaints. First the ICA business meeting was moved to a different room without adequate notice and without posting a sign at the room listed in the program. I looked for the meeting, asked around, and never found it. Second, a history of communication panel with highly prominent speakers was scheduled in a tiny room that could hold only a fraction of the people who showed up.
- I also think that Monday morning panels should be canceled, unless a major keynote speaker is schedule AFTER the last panel. The panels should also be extended from 1 hour and 15 minutes to 1 hour and 30 minutes.
- Too many sessions, not enough audience anywhere. Too many disparate topics. Maybe the divisions should have their own annual conferences in smaller, more dialogic contexts and have a general ICA only every few years? Not sure any more if general ICA is a good use of my travel resources. Too unfocused and alienating. I want to talk more to people doing things closer to my own work in greener contexts. Life is too short for any more horrible conference centers!
- i was VERY annoyed that (multiple times, PR division session were scheduled against each other.

Audio Visual Equipment/material & Internet Access

- 'I never received the password to download papers from the website. Where can this be found?
- 'Easier access to the Web Cafe would be helpful, as wireless within the Hotel was not easily/inexpensively available.
- 'What about making conference papers available on a flash drive?
- 'A/V provision was inadequate. At one of my papers the system crashed twice. The low turnout for many many papers is a poor reflection on the conference attendees.
- 'I would like to see a small printed schedule (just like the initial pages showing the time and place of each panel) in addition to the flash drive. That way I could look up where I wanted to go with my computer but check where the next session I wanted to attend was without having to boot up. I think that's a good compromise between being green and efficient.
- ICA suggested it was going to do some podcasting of events in Chicago and then we heard nothing and apparently nothing happened. Some of us even contacted ICA about this but received no response. We need to be better capturing audio and video of conference events to put on association website for others to consume (lots of missed opps in this sense).
- Not having free Internet access throughout the building was a real challenge (the rooms were already expensive enough without having to pay extra for Internet access in our rooms, something that comes free even at a Holiday Inn).

- 'Need to be very clear about equipment needed - had a projector - but no adapter to allow hook up with a Macintosh. Two presenters in our session had no visuals at all because of this.
- there should be a spot with computer stations available to ICA attendees (rather than having a wireless cybercafe).
- cyber cafe was a good idea, but had some problems with this one.

Flash drive program

- 'Great conference, shame about flash drive not working - needs to be divided by division as well as day perhaps.
- 'I regretted selecting the program book on flash drive - it is really inconvenient during the conference (although it is helpful now)
- "Distributing the conference program on a flash drive is a wonderful idea, and I opted for it myself. However, the organization of files on the drive was not helpful at all. It seemed that organizers simply loaded files and folders that had been created in preparation for the print program onto the drive. This made it very difficult to locate information on the flash drive. In the future, I would recommend organizing files on the flash drive in a way that facilitates navigation.
- I don't think the flash drive program will work, as we need a printed version with us when we walk around.
- 'I realize that technology is encroaching upon every area of our lives, but PLEASE don't stop distributing the convention program in hard copy!
- 'A: the environmental damage done by a flash drive is very likely greater than that done by a printed book.
B: a recyclable bag is a much bigger waste and environmental harm than a reusable canvas bag people could use for their groceries for 20 years.
'flash drive program is a great idea for reference afterwards, but during the conference, nothing compares with hard copy.
- 'I initially liked the idea of having the program on a flash drive. However, it turned out not to be useful while at the conference. It was difficult to find information and could not be easily referred to during attendance of panels.
- 'Need a searchable program available online BESIDES all academic - for keyword searches and such. Really liked the bag and usb drive ideas.
- 'The flash drive program, nice as it was, was not convenient since it meant turning on one's computer. Sometimes I found I just needed to peek at a print program. Until it's very easy to get online (both at the site w/ wireless and in terms of technology available/accessible to participants), I'm afraid the print program will be a necessary evil. Also, the flash drive uses plastic (!) and electricity.
Flash drive was a great idea!

Preconferences

- 'There were not enough spaces on the pre conference workshop that I wanted to attend which was a shame. I would have really enjoyed attending.

Language

- 'Please do not start accepting submissions in other languages than English.
- 'Intervenciones en diferentes lenguas y servicio de traducción simultánea.

General Conference Comments

- 'as a PR division member, i was VERY annoyed that (1) the book vendors had NO public relations textbooks available for review; (multiple times, PR division session were scheduled against each other.
- 'well done folks!
- 'I'm sorry not to be able to comment on more items, but I was only able to stay overnight due to other obligations. I have every reason to believe that the Chicago conference was an excellent one. I'd like to mention that, after having attended ICA for 15 years, I still find it difficult to meet new people. I would very much appreciate having organized dinners at local restaurants as some conferences do.
- 'Global Comm & Social Change event at Latino youth radio station was excellent.

- 'ICA is still my preferred international conference
- Vendor turnout was very low - not too useful. Why Memorial Day weekend? Expensive to fly and stay. Shift days.
- 'I thought it was a great conference. It was more enjoyable than other conferences I have been to in terms of being welcoming and in terms of the quality of work.
- 'Don't schedule the conference over a popular holiday weekend when travel rates are higher
- 'I have never before been to a conference where attendees were not served any coffee or lunch, and I find this surprising for a communication conference. The literature that I've read says that people have an easier time meeting each other over food and drink. I ended up having to pay US\$10.00 for lunch everyday anyway and would have preferred to have paid a higher conference fee. The conference would be a lot friendlier if the organizers provided meals during which people could socialise. Everything else was great.
- 'Thank you all at the ICA for organizing these inspiring conferences. And a great thanks to the local organizers too!
- 'Great conference! Will only attend ICA conferences as long as they're in the U.S. If out-of-the-country, I will not attend.
- 'Memorial weekend in a packed city for ICA conference seems to be a bad idea.
- 'It's a nicely organized conference. I made a lot of connections and had a lot of fun. Thanks for the great work!
- 'I don't know much about conference planning, so this might be a ridiculous question! But...is there any way to find hotel sites that have parking (preferably free)? In a place like Chicago, many people have options for staying off-site...but in Chicago it cost an arm and a leg to park. Why not take the meeting to a suburb? I guess that makes it hard for commuters who rely on public transpo. Just a thought. Thanks for a great conference!
- 'It might be a good idea to let participants share their impressions throughout the conference and probably at the closing reception with volunteers reciting or even singing about the conference. It will be more fun. I know it from my experience.
- 'I enjoy and find ICA conferences generally valuable but this one was a better than usual ICA conference.
- Excellent event, as always!
- 'Patrice Buzzanell's Presidential Speech was thoughtful and moving.
- I was promised to have the receipt emailed to me. When it didn't, I emailed 4 different people at ICA- did not hear back from one! I finally got a rude person on the phone that provided me with the info.
- 'Food offers great opportunities for people to meet and socialize. You must offer dinner receptions (free of charge) at least three times during the conference.
- The organizing committee did a very good job - THANKS!!!
- 'ICA should make more consistent efforts to internationalize. Travel grants and waivers of registration fees for participants from developing countries would be essential.
- More importantly, the Chicago conference was hands-down the best conference experience I've had, and I think the two most important factors were my interest group's programming (comm history) and the cross-divisional panels and events.
- 'Thanks to our hard working staff - you guys and women are awesome.
- 'I did not know the details about the programming of fellowship opportunities before the conference and misses them.
- 'It would be great if there would be a babysitting service in the same location of the conference for those academics and students with kids (especially international and single students who don't have families to take care of children as in the case of others).
- 'ICA CONFERENCE DOES NOT ALWAYS MAKE PROVISION FOR MEMBERS TO BE IN ATTENDANCE. IMAGINE, I PAID THE CONFERENCE FEE BUT ICA REFUSED TO SEND ME AN INVITATION LETTER BECAUSE I WAS NOT GOING TO PRESENT A PAPER. I JUST LOST MY MONEY FOR NOTHING.
- 'The closing reception should be free.
- But the conference had a nice atmosphere and I was pleasantly surprised that I enjoyed visiting Chicago as much as I did. However, I felt that there were fewer international participants this year compared to last year in Montreal

Other Comments

- 'There are far too many panels/programs that reflect a socio-political orientation rather than communication scholarship (which was the original charter of this organization). ICA has lost its focus and direction, and is losing its most valuable members. ICA has become a mostly political, rather than a scholarly, organization. For example, regarding the 2010 Singapore conference, we were told that Singapore has a very vibrant gay scene, but that ICA members should be careful about bringing drugs (e.g., marijuana, heroin) into the country due to its strict drug laws. I'm not kidding. This is what Francois announced at the division business meeting I attended.
- 'Everything is too US centred.
- 'Singapore is too far. It is both physically and politically repulsive. Why not just have a conference in HELL? No one will attend.
- Is the conference going off-continent (outside North America) every 3 years now instead of every 4? If this is the case, that needs to be made clearer to members.
- '(1) The web-survey's formatting is seriously screwed up. Radio check boxes that flow across multiple lines for Likert scale questions are NOT gonna help you get accurate results.
(2) As always, ICA's interest in assessing the rank/gender/nationality of attendees -- but NOT race/ethnicity -- is a bit weird. I know racial categories aren't consistent across national borders, but their omission in that context makes it seem as if ICA doesn't give a rat's ass about racial/ethnic diversity. All the more so because ICA *is* a very white conference...
- Please try to be more available to your members!
- 'This eval qs is TOO long. I gave up after a while
- 'For me a conference bag is useless...
- 'I have been to two ICA conferences. I enjoy presenting and giving/getting feedback from other scholars. However, I think there are many people running around that place whose heads will explode if they get any bigger. I am more impressed by scholars who are humble and down to earth. Let's promote more of that.
- The ICA needs to have much greater international orientation - it still remains a largely American association. Greater efforts are required to further internationalize the 'International' Communication Association, especially in part of Asia - India and China -where media and communication studies is a growing field.
- 'This survey is my first time in knowing about the theme book publication.
Regarding the CAM interest group, it is difficult to understand that a person working at an industry level and not in an academic position manage this group.

Appendix C: The questionnaire

ICA 2009 Conference Evaluation

This survey asks for your reactions to the recent ICA conference in Chicago, IL, USA, May 21-25, 2009. As with prior conference evaluation surveys, we hope to learn how to improve the format and organization of future ICA conferences. By answering these questions you will help make ICA's annual event as attractive, effective, and well-organized as possible.

Completing this web questionnaire will take you only a few minutes. In most cases you just have to click a button on the screen to make your selection. If you feel you cannot answer a question (not applicable, no opinion) just leave it open.

Your responses are completely confidential. This web survey does NOT collect ANY information about you, your computer, your institution, or your institution's server.

1. How much did you enjoy each of the following aspects of the conference?

1=Not at All - 7=Very Much

- a. Location
- b. Organization, preparation and information
- c. Overall quality of all sessions
- d. Social atmosphere, meeting with colleagues
- e. Social program, events and outings
- f. Accessibility and convenience of travel to the conference city and hotel
- g. Accessibility of AV equipment in all rooms

2. When you decided to attend the Montreal conference, how important were the following motivations for you personally?

1=Not at All - 7=Very Much

- a. Improve my academic record through paper presentation or other activities
- b. Job market, (i.e., get in touch with potential employers/employees/colleagues)
- c. Keep up with recent research
- d. Seek opportunities for research cooperation
- e. Meet or socialize with colleagues, friends
- f. Travel to an interesting place

3. Which of the following roles did you play in the Chicago conference? (Check all that apply.)

- Award Winner
- Chair
- Discussant
- Divisional/Interest Group/ICA officer, committee or Board Member
- Paper Reviewer
- Preconference (organizer, presenter)
- Presenter (paper, panel, poster; includes non-presenting co-author)
- Volunteer (student, staff)
- Attendee (any sessions or meetings, but not any of the prior roles)

- Other (please describe): []

4. Which of the following events at the Chicago conference did you attend (other than those for which you had a formal role, such as presenter/committee member)? (Check all that apply.)

- Divisional/interest group panel
- Theme panel (not plenary session)
- Opening plenary session (not including Poster session or ICA Business meeting)
- Mini-plenaries
- Cross-unit sessions
- Plenary poster session
- ICA Annual Ceremony with presidential address
- Affiliate organizational panel
- Division/interest group business meeting
- Division/interest group reception
- University/Institutional reception
- Opening reception
- Pre-conference workshop
- Neighborhood tours
- New members orientation
- Internet (Wireless) Café
- Closing Reception
- Closing Plenary

5. How much did you enjoy each of the following events offered at the conference?

0=Not Applicable 1=Not at All - 7=Very Much

- Divisional/interest group panel
- Theme panel (not a plenary session)
- Opening plenary session (not including poster session or ICA Business meeting)
- Mini-plenaries
- Cross-unit sessions
- Plenary poster session
- ICA Annual Awards Ceremony, with presidential address
- Affiliate organizational panel
- Division/interest group business meeting
- Division/interest group reception
- University/Institutional reception
- Opening reception
- Pre-conference workshop
- Neighborhood tours
- New members orientation
- Internet (Wireless) Café
- Closing reception
- Closing Plenary

6. Were there events at the Montreal conference that you did not attend but that you wish you had attended? (If so, check all that apply. If not, please continue on to the next question.)

- Divisional/interest group panel
- Theme panel (not a plenary session)
- Opening plenary session (not including poster session or ICA Business meeting)

- Mini-plenaries
- Cross-unit sessions
- Plenary poster session
- ICA Annual Awards Ceremony, with presidential address
- Affiliate organizational panel
- Division/interest group business meeting
- Division/interest group reception
- University/Institutional reception
- Opening reception
- Pre-conference workshop
- Neighborhood tours
- New members orientation
- Internet (Wireless) Café
- Closing reception
- Closing Plenary

7. Please indicate the divisions or interest groups whose sessions you attended in any role. (Check all that apply.)

- Children, Adolescents, and the Media
- Communication and Technology
- Communication History
- Communication Law and Policy
- Ethnicity and Race in Communication
- Feminist Scholarship
- Game Studies
- Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies
- Global Communication and Social Change
- Health Communication
- Information Systems
- Instructional and Developmental Communication
- Intercultural and Development Communication
- Intergroup Communication
- Interpersonal Communication
- Journalism Studies
- Language and Social Interaction
- Mass Communication
- Organizational Communication
- Philosophy of Communication
- Political Communication
- Popular Communication
- Public Relations
- Visual Studies

8. Please indicate the divisions or interest groups of which you are a member. (Check all that apply.)

- Children, Adolescents, and the Media
- Communication and Technology
- Communication History
- Communication Law and Policy
- Ethnicity and Race in Communication
- Feminist Scholarship

- Game Studies
- Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies
- Global Communication and Social Change
- Health Communication
- Information Systems
- Instructional and Developmental Communication
- Intercultural and Development Communication
- Intergroup Communication
- Interpersonal Communication
- Journalism Studies
- Language and Social Interaction
- Mass Communication
- Organizational Communication
- Philosophy of Communication
- Political Communication
- Popular Communication
- Public Relations
- Visual Studies

9. How much do you agree with the following descriptions of logistics at the Chicago conference?

1=Strongly Disagree - 7=Strongly Agree

- a. Chicago was a stimulating conference location.
- b. Le Chicogo Marriot Downtown Magnificent Mile was a good conference site.
- c. The local organizing committee did a good job of providing special events throughout the conference.
- d. The wireless cyber café was useful to me.
- e. The layout of the meeting rooms made it easy to get to sessions.
- f. The meeting rooms were comfortable.
- g. Audio visual needs were met effectively.
- h. The flash drive program was convenient.
- i. The printed program was easy to follow.

10. How much do you agree with the following descriptions of events at the Montreal conference?

0=Not Applicable 1=Not at All - 7=Very Much

- a. Too many interesting programs were scheduled opposite one another.
- b. The pre-conference workshops were stimulating and valuable additions to ICA.
- c. The keynote and plenary sessions were valuable.
- d. The mini-plenary sessions were valuable.
- e. The theme sessions were valuable.
- f. The quality of the papers I heard at panels was first-rate.
- g. The quality of the posters I saw at the poster plenary was first-rate.
- h. Adequate time was available for audience discussions at the end of sessions.
- i. I was bothered by the number of no shows among panelists on the program.
- j. The book exhibit area was very useful to me.
- k. The calls inviting submissions for publication in the Chicago theme book were straightforward.
- l. Publication of the theme book based on the Chicago conference should be a valuable resource to communication researchers.
- m. Having a closing plenary on the last day was a good idea.
- n. Having a closing reception on Sunday night was a good idea.
- o. Having the ICA business meeting and the award ceremony as separated events was a good idea.

11. Has the fact that the 2009 conference took place in Chicago, IL, USA, made it easier for you to participate, more difficult, or did it make no difference compared with previous conferences?

- Easier
- No difference
- More difficult

12. Division and Interest Groups provided a variety of activities and services for their members at the ICA conference. Of the following types of activities and services, which would you like to see more of? (check all that apply)

- Social events (receptions, dinners, newcomer social events, informal gatherings)
- Professional activities (networking facilitation, workshops, preconference, mentoring sessions)
- Different session types
- Outside-of-conference activities
- Cross-divisional/joint events

13. How much did you enjoy each of the following ne events offered at the conference?

0=Not Applicable 1=Not at All - 7=Very Much

- Cross-divisional/interest group programming, discussing topics of shared interest
- Programming devoted to academic professionalism
- Programming devoted to developing media skills for academics
- Programming devoted to fellowship opportunities
- Programming devoted to grant-making opportunities
- Programming devoted to junior career opportunities

14. ICA is trying to become greener. How much do you agree with the following statements?

0=Not Applicable 1=Not at All - 7=Very Much

- I would be willing to give up the printed program for a flash drive
- I liked the idea of having a recyclable conference bag
- I would be interested in having major sessions podcasted
- I would prefer video podcasts over audio podcasts.

15. Are there other types of programming that you would like to see in future conferences?

[]

We would like to ask a few questions about you. This helps us to understand diversity in needs, experience and preferences, and to see how well the survey responses match the overall ICA membership.

16. Are you...

- Junior Faculty (untenured and/or assistant professor)
- Senior Faculty (including also emeritus, dept. chair, dean, university administrator, etc.)
- Researcher (coordinator, scientist, director, administrator, not faculty or student)
- Student (undergrad, master, Ph.D., postdoc, prospective)

- Non-University Professional (journalist, publisher, librarian, government official, foundation)
- Other (please describe)

Please describe other position

[]

17. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Other

18. Where do you currently reside?

- Africa
- Asia/Pacific
- Australia/New Zealand
- Central and South America
- Europe
- Middle East
- North America

19. Please add any additional comments you have about the Montreal conference in the box below and/or suggestions about other types of programming you would like to see at future conferences.

[]

.....After this final response, present:

Thank you for your participation!

Please click the arrows below to FINISH and EXIT this survey to ensure that your survey responses will be sent to ICA.

Please note that, because this survey is anonymous, there will be two reminder emails sent out to everyone. If you have already completed the survey, please just delete those reminder emails.

A summary and analysis of this 2009 ICA Conference Evaluation will be available through the ICA Newsletter, the Website, and the Singapore 2010 Conference Website.