

Survey for the Linked Data Workshop held at the British Library, 27-28 May 2010

The results of the survey (carried out using SurveyMonkey) indicate that the presentations were well received and the event overall was seen as very positive. People enjoyed the networking opportunities and discussing an emerging technical area.

26 out of the 50 participants responded.

Please rate the Introduction to Linked Data and the Case Studies:							
Answer Options	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Introduction to Linked Data & RDF (Nigel Shadbolt)	14	11	1	0	0	1.50	26
Case Study 1: A Linked Data Journey with the BBC	18	8	0	0	0	1.31	26
Case Study 2: Swedish Media Database and Linked	3	13	10	0	0	2.27	26
Case Study 3: Ontology-based approaches to providing a	6	13	7	0	0	2.04	26
<i>answered question</i>							26
<i>skipped question</i>							0

Please rate the Group Discussions:							
Answer Options	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Group Discussion 1 (Interoperable Digitised Content -	4	9	9	0	0	2.23	22
Group Discussion 2 (Improve scholarly communications -	4	15	3	0	0	1.95	22
Group Discussion 3 (linked data from library metadata -	6	5	9	1	1	2.36	22
<i>answered question</i>							24
<i>skipped question</i>							2

Please rate other aspects of this event:							
Answer Options	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Overall agenda	17	8	1	0	0	1.38	26
Networking opportunities	17	7	2	0	0	1.42	26
Dinner	13	12	1	0	0	1.54	26
Event location & venue	19	6	1	0	0	1.31	26
Food served at event	10	10	6	0	0	1.85	26
<i>answered question</i>							26
<i>skipped question</i>							0

What did you enjoy or value the most about this event?	
Answer Options	Response Count
<i>answered question</i>	17
<i>skipped question</i>	9

- | Number | Response Text |
|--------|--|
| 1 | discovering new possibilities for my particular case. Very useful. |
| 2 | Chance to network and talk to others in the industry who are also doing the same thing. |
| 3 | Collaborative atmosphere; nice colleagues |
| 4 | Introduction to a new topic; chance to meet and discuss digital library issues with new colleagues. The pre-reading was very valuable to my experience of the meeting. |
| 5 | Presentation of case studies by experts, and the same experts accessibility in small group and individual discussions. |
| 6 | Networking, intelligent discussion. education. |
| 7 | I enjoyed most the chance to listen to and talk with people working on semantic web projects. I also appreciated the recommended readings, which helped me get my bearings. |
| 8 | The overall interest of participants in the topic. Many of them were really committed to active participation and exchange of ideas. |
| 9 | First-class networking opportunities, good presentations, excellent opportunities for discussion and exploration. |
| 10 | A solid introduction to the practical aspects of linked data that did not get too bogged down in technologies. |
| 11 | the 'just do it attitude' of getting actions created on the day. |
| 12 | gaining more familiarity with an important concept |
| 13 | The questions and issues seen and foreseen by attendees were very valuable guidance. In addition, it was important to me to understand the ontologies problem, and in this respect my knowledge was greatly increased. |
| 14 | The buzz around the British Library and the opportunity to meet interesting people |
| 15 | Three aspects:
- The timing in terms of linked data 'coming-of-age' just now
- The good choice of relevant speakers
- The participants were engaged and actively seeking ways of making progress |
| 16 | RDF discussions |
| 17 | I now understand much better how linked data might be used to provide real value |

Do you have any suggestions for improving this event?

Answer Options	Response Count
	13
<i>answered question</i>	13
<i>skipped question</i>	13

Number	Response Text
1	Starting a little later on the first day and ending a little later on the second would have been a bit easier for those travelling.
2	The meeting room was very crowded, making logistics and networking a bit difficult.
3	More time given to discussing the hurdles and possible solutions.
4	A bit more time on the merits of different software tools for creating and using linked data would have been helpful. Also, I would have liked a bit more analysis of the problems of sameness and definition. To what extent does the linked data model depend on precise definition and accurate use of the terms represented by URIs? How significant are problems of terminological ambiguity, e.g., a common species name that identifies one species in one community and two species in another? What drives the choice between the creation of new URIs to mark fine distinctions vs. the use multiple simpler URIs to make such distinctions?
5	Maybe have a more stable online support (wiki, up-to-date website) prior to the workshop. Most the information was circulated by mails. Unless you want to keep it restricted to a smaller audience, which could be understandable (cf above positive point on commitment of participants)...
6	1) A slightly larger room that allowed for a variety of layouts (not just chairs in rows facing the lectern) may have helped the discussion sessions. 2) Feedback for Prof. Shadbolt: I found much of his presentation spot-on. However, I fear he lost his audience when he started discussing OWL, RDFs, and the rest of the Semantic Web alphabet soup. I believe a stronger focus on the four high-level principles of Linked Data -- and how these could be applied to the library sciences -- would have made a stronger case to this particular audience.
7	I would have liked to have more specific recording of the names of individuals who showed interest in projects. The show of hands was far to fast to capture the interest, and there was no active recording of future commitments in the discussion sessions.
8	further methods towards getting actions out of people.
9	Perhaps there may be opportunities for hands on work, to bring some problem data with and learn new tools or techniques for management, crunching, cross-coding etc. Other than hands-on ideas, simply hold this event more often. The topic is fluid, the tools are changing quickly and great communication among people and institutions is a must to coordinate.
10	It was a difficult job for you to satisfy both technical and non-technical people. You just about did it but maybe it needs thinking about for the future.
11	Getting an overview over different kind of ontologies and LinkedData sources and what kind of data they provide would be of great help for practical beginners. This would identify potential partners for collaboration as well.
12	Longer time for group discussions
13	The workshops could be better structured. Given an open forum, it is too easy for participants to focus on irrelevant use-cases or on problems that are insoluble. A more careful approach to structuring the workshops would avoid this

Will you attend events of this type in the future?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	76.9%	20
No	0.0%	0
Maybe	23.1%	6
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Please add any further comments about this event or Ideas for

Answer Options	Response Count
	8
<i>answered question</i>	8
<i>skipped question</i>	18

Number	Response Text
1	Had to leave early; for me personally the functional aspects were more of interest than the technical background.
2	There seems to be interest in further exploration of rights and policy issues concerning digital resources.
3	Thank you!
4	I answered maybe only because of travel budgets. Where the event is will determine if we can attend.
5	I'm grateful to the British Library for hosting and to my institution for supporting our participation.
6	with the W3C group for 'linkeddata in libraries' starting up today, it would seem this topic is on the rise and so a revisit of the same group to follow up actions would be nice?
7	In the world of tech, when protocols are under development, there is usually a series of confabs called a "bake-off." The idea is that everyone shows up with some code and data examples (some nasty) and everyone tries to exchange some data with everyone else at least once to get an N^2 result. In regards to Linked Data, it may be helpful to see how EADs and other data types work from different libraries when attempting to bring into RDF format from multiple cultures and technologies. Just a thought for the future.
8	You did an excellent job - particular thanks to Hannah!