INTRODUCTION

ASSC 14 took place on 24th-27th June, 2010, hosted by the University of Toronto, Canada. The first day included eight optional tutorials, followed by the presidential address. Following this were three days of keynotes, symposia, concurrent and poster sessions, as well as the ASSC student mentor scheme meetings. Social events included an opening night reception, student social, conference dinner (and “poor man’s” dinner), and after party. Again, there were a large number of graduate students and new attendees, and the atmosphere of the conference was friendly and integrative, particularly during poster sessions. While more detailed analysis will be given below, a brief introduction and summary of the main points about ASSC 14 is given here. While this personal introduction is likely to be biased, many points made here are echoed in the results of the survey, and should (hopefully) serve to make their interpretation easier. This introduction should also make it easier to see the successes and problems of ASSC 14 in light of other ASSC conferences.

Overall, the conference seemed to be a great success, with a truly interesting mix of researchers from a variety of fields (and of a variety of ages). The diversity of the ASSC meetings is clearly one of its highlights, and should be continued, both in inviting a range of speakers, but also in selecting the range of symposia topics, concurrent sessions, and posters. Expanding the range and number of talks in neuroscience, (developmental) psychology, and computational approaches to consciousness, as well as including talks on the methodology of pursuing a science of consciousness, seems to be necessary. The key to incorporating this diversity lies in making all talks and topics as relevant as possible to a science of consciousness, which has so far been achieved with a range of success. The talks by Nicola Clayton and Robert Knight, and the symposia on the Bayesian brain and neurophysiological approaches to consciousness, were especially impressive, so more talks in these areas (or indeed by these speakers) would be welcome at future meetings.

However, care must also be taken in selecting the kind of philosophical talks that are accepted to the conference, borne out by many of the comments below. Philosophical talks are often viewed as
unnecessary and unenlightening by researchers from other fields, and those who do find them valuable often fail to engage with the scientific approaches pursued by other researchers. This can result in two largely independent sets of researchers attending the conference, and indeed attending very different and mutually exclusive sets of talks. However, as several survey respondents took care to note, the conference is aimed at the scientific study of consciousness, so philosophical content should address this. Philosophical talks that successfully incorporate empirical data or that discuss methodological issues within the science of consciousness, that are also relevant and accessible to scientific researchers, should perhaps be favoured over philosophical talks that are less empirically motivated or informed. This would lessen the current divide between the philosophers and other researchers, and make for a more coherent and integrated conference.

The social events were not as successful as at previous events (e.g. Berlin). The mentoring scheme was (again) largely a success, but students would prefer a longer meeting with their mentor. The opening reception was functional but short, and with disappointing food and drink on offer. The conference banquet was generally seen as bad value for money. While the continuation of the separate “poor man’s dinner” (begun last year in Berlin) does provide people with a cheap (and fun) alternative, it might be more appropriate to plan to make the banquet cheaper (perhaps subsidized for students) and better value, so that many more people can attend it. The student social was a success, but a bigger venue is required if the same format is going to be run next year. Few attended the after party (largely due to travel or bad weather). Overall, the quality and quantity of food and drink seemed poorer than in previous years, and was of especial concern given the high price of registration, particularly to those with dietary requirements. However, this did not prevent people from enjoying the socializing at the conference.

The format of the conference worked well, and while some complained about the concurrent sessions being too short (20 minutes including discussion), more thought it acceptable (or preferable). Many also felt that philosophical talks should not be given more time than scientific talks. (I did not notice any deterioration in the quality of talks due to this time restriction, and heard no complaints from other attendees at the time). The poster sessions were very crowded, and the format of the poster sessions in Berlin seemed to work better. Also, the conference program lacked abstracts for all of the talks and posters this year, which in hindsight was clearly a mistake. Previous conferences provided a full set of abstracts, which is incredibly useful both at the conference and later as a reference guide. Future conferences should ensure that all abstracts are printed within the conference program, or inform delegates how they can print their own copy before coming to the conference. Accommodation at the Chestnut Hotel was deemed to be acceptable to poor, with many strongly critical comments; so a better hotel would be a priority for future conferences, preferably with free wifi for conference delegates. More detailed results and analysis, along with recommendations for next year’s conference, are given below.
Demographics

Total responses and response rate were down over last year. Last year, 71% of attendees (those with email addresses) visited the survey and, of those, 87% completed it. This year 59% visited the survey and 71% completed it. Analysis of the possible reasons for this will be found in the section under Questionnaire Response below.

Of the 112 respondents this year, the largest group, notably, are the student members. Student members and full voting members, together, make up 72% of respondents. These numbers help explain responses to the second question, relating to primary involvement in the conference: here, 42% of respondents were presenting posters, followed by 35% speaking in a concurrent session, for a total of 77% of respondents.

In terms of background, the psychologists were best represented (37%), followed, in nearly equal numbers, by the philosophers (25%) and neuroscientists (24%), for a total of 86% of respondents. Those in the “other” category included a mathematician, a physicist, a neuroengineer/philosopher, a student of psychology, and a psychiatrist.

Nearly half of respondents came from North America, and nearly all of the rest came from Europe. Despite the conference being held in Taipei two year ago, respondents from Asia were significantly underrepresented. Meanwhile, roughly two thirds of respondents had their conference participation funded for them. (Of those in the “other” category, four were funded in whole or in part by the ASSC.)
What is your main involvement with the conference? Please select the response that is most relevant.

- Tutorial presenter: 5 (4%)
- Keynote speaker: 3 (3%)
- Plenary speaker in a symposium: 6 (5%)
- Speaker in concurrent session: 35 (31%)
- Presenter of a poster: 42 (38%)
- Interested observer: 21 (19%)

Please choose the best response that describes you.

- I am a computer scientist: 0
- I am a neuroscientist: 27
- I am a clinician: 4
- I am a philosopher: 28
- I am a psychologist: 41
- I am an interested member of the community: 1
- Other, please specify: 5
Past Conference Attendance

Roughly in line with last year, around half of the participants were attending their first ASSC meeting. Nearly a third attended last year’s meeting in Berlin, while a fifth of respondents attended Taipei. Six of the respondents, or five percent, attended the very first ASSC meeting in Los Angeles in 1997. All thirteen previous conferences were represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSC13: Berlin (2009)</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSC12: Taipei (2008)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC11: Las Vegas (2007)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC9: Caltech (2005)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC8: Antwerp (2004)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC7: Memphis (2003)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC6: Barcelona (2002)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC5: Durham, North Carolina (2001)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC4: Brussels (2000)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC3: London, Ontario (1999)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC2: Bremen (1998)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC1: Los Angeles (1997)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is my first ASSC meeting</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which ASSC meetings have you attended in the past? Please select all that apply.

- ASSC12: Taipei (2008)
- ASSC11: Las Vegas (2007)
- ASSC5: Durham, North Carolina (2001)
- ASSC1: Los Angeles (1987)
- This is my first ASSC meeting
CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Pre-Conference Tutorials

Tutorials were rated mainly good to excellent, though the cost (as well as travel arrangements) prevented many from attending. Comments about specific tutorials are difficult to generalize from. That said, a few people complained that the tutorials were too introductory, or badly organized, or should have contained a broader range of empirical work.

Reactions to the tutorials were markedly different from each other. Inclusion of a “very poor” category (selected only twice, once each in two tutorials) may have made it easier or more comfortable for people, in some cases, to select “poor”.

- Both speakers were enthusiastic on their presentation; so, overall, it was a good session and helpful to me.
- Good session overall. A broader range of empirical work could have been represented (research from only one lab was showcased).
- It was too basic about the SDT. More specific information would be [sic] prefer.
- Well prepared, suitably technical, but sometimes glossed over a little on the problems.
- Excellent speaker. Great material. One fundamental issue prevented me from rating this tutorial an “excellent” rating: not enough detail on the dependent and independent measures, the statistical issues (if any) of multicollinearity, stability of the estimates.
- The presenters attempted to included too much material such that they were unable to spend the necessary time to explain anything. As a consequence it became little more than an opinion piece - them telling us their opinion with little or know explanation of why.
- It was too basic. The terminology used was confusing. The use of the term ‘representation’ across disciplines was not covered. The objections to representation as necessary to the nature of the mind poorly defended
- Bit more detail with a bit less coverage perhaps.
- I would have liked the tutorial to be more structured and to dwell longer on basic questions around representation. The way it was, discussion set in at a very high and technical level and took place mostly among few participants with excellent backgrounds.
- It was ok but it was basically just a slightly extended version of the review paper that they had sent out for us to read prior to the session.
Overall morning tutorial ratings:

How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

- Excellent: 12 (24%)
- Good: 27 (53%)
- Fair: 8 (16%)
- Poor: 8 (16%)
- Very poor: 4 (8%)

Legend:
- Green: I did not attend any of the morning tutorials.
- Blue: Signal detection theory and distinguishing conscious vs. unconscious / Michael Sredlucz and Halwain Lau.
- Red: Neural basis of suppression, repression and dissociation / Heather Berlin and Michael C. Anderson.
- Yellow: What are mental representations, and do the mind need them? / Paola Droege.
- Orange: Decoding visual and mental content from human brain activity / Frank Tong.

Which (if any) of the morning tutorial sessions did you attend on Thursday?
Tutorial One

How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

- Excellent: 5 (23%)
- Good: 13 (59%)
- Fair: 1 (5%)
- Poor: 3 (14%)
- Very poor: 0

Tutorial Two

How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

- Excellent: 3 (27%)
- Good: 4 (30%)
- Fair: 4 (30%)
- Poor: 0
- Very poor: 0
Tutorial Three

How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

- Excellent: 2 (25%)
- Good: 5 (62%)
- Fair: 1 (12%)
- Poor: 0
- Very poor: 0

Tutorial Four

How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

- Excellent: 2 (20%)
- Good: 5 (50%)
- Fair: 2 (20%)
- Poor: 1 (10%)
- Very poor: 0
Overall Afternoon Tutorial Ratings:

**Which of the afternoon tutorials on Thursday did you attend?**

- T5: Attention and consciousness. / Neodrug: Tsuchiya and Alex Mayer.
- T7: Informational measures of consciousness: Integration, causality and state structures / Igor Aleksander and David Garnez.
- T8: Train your brain! Understanding and applying the neurofeedback technique / Kerstin Hoedlmoser and Manuel Schabus.
- I did not attend any of the afternoon tutorials.

**How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?**

- Excellent: 9 (23%)
- Good: 10 (41%)
- Fair: 10 (26%)
- Poor: 3 (8%)
- Very poor: 1 (3%)
Tutorial Five

How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

- Excellent: 4 (20%)
- Good: 9 (45%)
- Fair: 6 (28%)
- Poor: 2 (10%)

Tutorial Seven

How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

- Excellent: 3 (33%)
- Good: 3 (33%)
- Fair: 2 (22%)
- Poor: 1 (11%)

1 Tutorial Six was cancelled.
Tutorial Eight

How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

- Excellent: 2 (20%)
- Good: 4 (40%)
- Fair: 3 (30%)
- Poor: 1 (10%)
- Very poor: 0

Those who did not attend any tutorials:

Why not?
- Expense: 19 (44%)
- Travel schedule: 6 (14%)
- Not interested in any of the tutorial topics: 4 (9%)
- Other, please specify: 21 (49%)
Keynote Talks

While the keynotes were generally well-rated, the introductory comments by Olivia Carter as well as the keynotes by Nicola Clayton, Robert Knight, and Morris Moscovitch were the best received. Talks by Yann Cohan (the William James Prize winner), Mohan Matthen, and Thomas Metzinger were rated lower. In general, the more science-oriented talks were rated above the more philosophy-oriented talks, as reflected in the comments.

Many thought the William James Prizewinner's paper was interesting, but that the talk itself was average.

- Incredibly interesting topic.
- Great topic, but rather disjointed talk.
- Spent too much time talking about the history of hypnosis and not enough time on his own study. The presentation of the results was very unclear.
Reasonable but not the best James' prize lecture I have seen.

Reactions to Thomas Metzinger's talk were mixed, with some very positive reactions, but many negative comments from non-philosophers who complained about the inaccessibility of the talk (also noted by some philosophers). More accessible philosophy talks are clearly a priority for many attendees.

- The speaker made no attempt to make the talk accessible to non-philosophers. Other speakers such as Ned Block did a much better job.
- Pretty accessible to neuroscience audience. It nicely decomposed the concepts of "self" and made it testable by neuroscientists in the future. This kind of philosopher's talk is always welcomed....
- Poorly structured, very dense, difficult to follow, many unexplained concepts.
- If this was specifically aimed at non-philosophers then I guess I would have been suddenly lost after 5 minutes instead of 10 minutes for a "proper" talk. Still too many giant leaps in the argument for me.

Nicola Clayton's talk was the best rated, and comments show that both the content and presentation were rated highly. One criticism was that it was not explicitly tied to consciousness. However, given the popularity of other talks on animal behaviour and consciousness at past meetings (e.g., Tomasello in Berlin, J.D. Smith at Oxford), more keynotes in this area are recommended.

- Her presentation style was meticulous.
- This was a fascinating talk. I loved it. It's relevance was a bit questionable to the topic of the conference, but I found it riveting nonetheless.
- Very interesting. There's definitely a point in considering evidence from animal behaviour. She made some effort to link it to questions about human consciousness.
- ...Raised some interesting issues for ASSC from outside the typical ASSC specialisations.

Mohan Matthen's talk was not particularly well attended and reactions were fairly equally mixed. Some clearly felt his talk was excellent, many (presumably non-philosophers) questioned the relevance of this style of philosophy at the ASSC.

- Playing around with definitions and intuitions.
- Not really appropriate for this forum.
- Dr. Matthen's talk was wonderful. I have a special interest in the topic of his talk, so it was quite a treat. I felt that the topic was highly relevant, as well.

Again, Morris Moscovitch's talk was not well attended (sometimes due to problems surrounding the G20), but was rated higher.

- Excellent and interesting.
- Extraordinary complete and tied together many concepts and data. Excellent.
Robert Knight’s talk was generally very highly rated, though some attendees were sorry to miss it because of travel arrangements.

- Not much new with this.
- Very complete and extraordinarily excellent. He was interesting, good sense of humor, and the high frequency gamma wave data was well explained.
- Interesting methods talk. I don’t think he made an effort to try and say something about consciousness. I happen to know what he was talking about, but I am sure many were rolling their eyes.
- Fascinating talk, even to those with little knowledge of neuroscience (such as myself). I thoroughly enjoyed this talk, and he made a point of relating the talk to the topic of the conference. Great way to finish the conference.
- Best talk of the conference!

General Comments

General comments and suggestions about the keynote talks focus on the role of philosophy, the diversity of talks, and the relevance of talks to the ASSC. While some comments call for better quality or more philosophy talks, many also seriously question the role of philosophy talks at the ASSC, especially where they are not explicitly linked to empirical data. A greater range of speakers would also be welcomed, including those working on clinical populations, NCCs and neuroscience, consciousness from a developmental point of view, and other fields not previously considered. Concrete suggestions for speakers included Dennett and Susan Schneider. Some also suggested having shorter keynotes. Overall, a more diverse array of (new) speakers is recommended, along with attempts to ensure that philosophical talks are accessible and relevant to scientific studies of consciousness.

- We really need some better philosophy talks.
- Some more rigour in the philosophical talks would be great.
- A diversity of speakers we haven’t heard before is important but I wish they make more efforts to link their work with SSC lines of thought.
- Generally high quality, but philosophy talks are increasingly outdated and irrelevant to this conference, I feel. Should be phase [sic] out.
- Look around outside the little in-crowd that you all pass the baton among. There are good ideas that are not being heard. Try to recruit from neighboring fields for new perspectives. Look for speaker quality – not academic notoriety.
- Get new faces.
- Should always be absolutely focused on the problem of consciousness itself.
- I thought there was a good spread of speakers, lots of interesting material!
• *More philosophers next year!* 

**Plenary Symposia**

Plenary sessions were likewise generally well received, with talks receiving an average 55% excellent or good rating (though non-attendance for the last three sessions was notably high). Some concerns were expressed about speakers not always integrating their presentations well, particularly with regard to the tie-in to Buddhist philosophy was singled out as excellent by a couple of the respondents.
Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Charles, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block. Reactions were generally positive; this was the best attended and most highly rated of all the symposia, though there were several comments on the relevance of the philosophical talk in this section (by Dickie).

- I felt the third philosopher’s talk is disconnected from the others’. It may have been better to have the three speakers speak more and have some time for discussion at the end.
- Very interesting session, good talks
- I was particularly interested and impressed by Hakwan Lau’s talk.

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunne, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter. This symposium was generally rated as “good”, though a number of comments noted the variability of the quality of the presentations.

- Fine integration of humanity studies and science of Buddhism. Maybe the only symposium actually facing the phenomenological aspect of consciousness.
- Liked the evidence-based parts, but too much theory and speculation here.
- Good to consider new issues.

Symposium 3: Crowding, Blink and Attention: What Can They Tell Us About Consciousness? - Timothy Vickery, David Whitney, Ramakrishna Chakravarthi (chair), and Mark Nieuwenstein. This symposium was generally rated as “good”, but had the lowest attendance of the symposia.

- I wanted to hear more ‘bold’ statement or conjecture on the nature of crowding and its relationship with ‘phenomenal awareness’ in the periphery. As to the link between crowding and attention blink, it wasn’t discussed enough so that it left a bit of impression that they are not really a related phenomenon.
- Very strong, fascinating symposium. But chair an awful hog, who squeezed out the time and questions for last speaker. Should have been a better time-keeper.

Symposium 4: Neurophysiological Approaches Within the Scientific Study of Consciousness - Naotsugu Tsuchiya, Alexander Maier (chair), and Melanie Wilke. Again attendance was low, presumably because it was the last day of the conference. The symposium was rated as “good” to “excellent”. In line with suggestions elsewhere, more talks in this area (with this quality of speakers) is recommended.

- Really very good indeed. High quality content and excellent presentations.
- Excellent talks all of them. Keynotes from some of these people next year would be great.
- Incredibly strong data, and the best symposium of the conference.
General comments included making the symposia accessible to non-specialists, and again limiting philosophical talks not directly related to empirical data. Suggestions for future symposia include evolutionary and developmental approaches to consciousness, AI, functions of consciousness, and computational modeling of consciousness.

- I found many interesting posters on arousal and the level of consciousness. That maybe a good topic in the future.
- I’d like to see more on developmental approaches (baby consciousness) and evolutionary approaches.
- I have to say that this year the quality of symposia was rather poor.

Concurrent Talks

Concurrent talks were mostly rated “good”, and most found the reduced time from 30 to 20 minutes for presentations acceptable. Comments tended to support an equal time for philosophy and science talks, as they force speakers to be concise. That said, others commented that it did not leave enough time for a clear presentation of ideas or discussion. One suggestion was to have longer time slots for theoretical talks (including philosophy) than reports of data; however, this would probably make the timetable unworkable. Several people commented that the talks could be better grouped. Several also suggested having fewer and longer talks of a higher standard.
• I don't think that 20 minutes is too short for the philosophy talks. Philosophers, like everyone else, need to be concise.

• Have more concurrent sessions at the same time with longer talks. Twenty minutes was not sufficient for my talk or adequate feedback. Given the expense of attending and the joy of presenting I was unhappy with the amount of time for presenting and only had time for a few very short classificatory questions. Overall 20 minutes was simply inadequate.

• The talks were just too short, period. I’d say fewer talks in general, and back to the old time limits.

• I disagree with giving philosophy talks more time than scientific talks. Philosophers need to train themselves to summarize relevant information in the same way scientists are forced to learn. Once again, this conference focuses on the scientific study of consciousness, and therefore philosophers that decide to participate should adjust to the parameters of a standard scientific conference.

• Better fit the contents in each concurrent talks. Don’t put informational theorists with neurobiological data and philosophy. Select more new empirical findings, or propose less concurrent talks. Better being qualitative than quantitative.
Poster Sessions

The poster sessions were very well attended, with the overall quality of the posters being rated as “good”. Comments centered on improving the quality of the posters, having more room and time for poster sessions, and having coffee breaks in the same room as the posters. Several people suggested providing tips on how to create posters. (The ASSC website already has this information, but it should be better advertised to poster presenters.)
• Too many posters. The second day I couldn’t finish seeing everything I wanted to see.
• The rooms were very cramped.
• I found myself often debating with philosophers at posters who had a series of what is to them “logical statements” leading them to a conclusion, but that unfortunately did not have enough knowledge about how neuron and the brain in general work to come up with proper statements. All poster abstracts, from either scientist or philosopher authors, should pass through a scientific peer review.
• Make more time for poster session. Get food and coffee in the same room with posters.
• Coffee breaks should be amongst the posters. Would give more time, less crowding, and more exposure to the posters!
• More space for the poster sessions is imperative. Perhaps a more competitive abstract selection process would benefit the session also.
• If not done already, send links to tips on easy-to-read posters and graphs.

FOOD AND LODGING

Opening Reception

The opening reception was generally rated “fair” to “good”. Comments include making a wider variety of food available (e.g. vegetarian/vegan), and having better quality (and more quantity) of food and drink. The use of drinks tickets was deemed unnecessary. A self-service bar has worked well in past meetings and could be easily used again.

• It’s a shame that once the tickets were used up there was no cash bar – things wound down too quickly (also, the red wine was terrible).
• The chestnut is a shabby venue.
• Food allergies were not addressed.
• Red wine was essentially undrinkable.
• Please cater for vegetarians or vegans better. Virtually nothing for vegans to eat.
• Missable.
• It would have been nice if the organizers had suggested somewhere for everyone to go after the opening reception.
Conference Banquet / “Poor Man’s Dinner”

Fewer than half of the survey respondents went to the conference banquet. The quality of food and drink was rated mostly “fair”, but with poor value for money. There were quite a few specific negative comments about it. The consensus seemed to be that while the company was memorable, the food was not! The magicians were well appreciated though! Comments included making the banquet cheaper, particularly to students; choosing a better (closer) location; having a later finish; providing more vegetarian and vegan options; and serving better quality food.

The “poor man’s dinner” was better attended by survey respondents, and seemed to be mostly successful. There were more vegan/vegetarian options; it was much cheaper; and the location was more convenient. However, it could be better advertised. Some commented (also borne out by conversations had at the conference) that splitting the social events in two is not ideal, and that a cheaper banquet that all could attend would be a better idea.
Did you attend the conference banquet on Saturday night?

- No: 85 (58%)
- Yes: 47 (42%)

How did you find the quality of the food and wine at this year's banquet?

- Very poor: 3 (9%)
- Poor: 9 (28%)
- Fair: 14 (41%)
- Good: 7 (21%)
- Excellent: 1 (3%)
The cost of this year’s banquet was CANS 70. How would you rate the value of the banquet, all things considered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you attend the "poor man’s banquet" instead?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Banquet Comments

• Maybe this is just the way of the universe, but these banquets always seem overpriced for the food/drink you actually get. Of course, there’s the cost of the venue too, I suppose, and the caterers, etc.
• The food was really not befitting of the price.
• As with the student social, I thought the banquet was pitched just right. Not too formal, good opportunities to mix both before and after eating (the magic was a great idea).
• I enjoyed the company (excellent rating) but food value for money was very poor (more like a cafeteria lunch than a $70 dinner). Banquets are usually a rip off but this doesn’t have to be the case (I can recall two small conference held in expensive cities were conference dinners were substantially more affordable - they simply booked a large restaurant; no buses to remote locations...). Furthermore, I’d suggest making banquet dinners more affordable to students (discounted rates).
• Location not too bad though a bit of a drive, value for money very poor indeed.
• The location was lovely and special. The magicians a welcome divertissement.
• The food was really bad and 10.30 is a very early end. Did not understand why we had to drive for this far for a fairly ordinary event and location.
• A school bus trip to a buffet with 2 complementary drinks does not constitute a banquet. But the close-up magic was good.
• If you had catered in Pizza and burgers for $15 a head, it would have been a better value.

“Poor Man’s Dinner” Comments

• I was disappointed not to be able to attend the main banquet, especially after I heard of how much of a success it was, and the magic show afterwards, which I would really have liked to attend. This restricted number of places to the banquet which ended up splitting us into sub-groups is a main failure of the socials organization to my eyes. Again, a larger venue should have been retained.
• Great fun, good food, nice company!
• The place was unfortunately not very exceptional. Appeared to be simply the closest one... Disappointing!!
• This was a good night, well organized and at a convenient location.
• Same noise problem as the regular banquet. You can only hear the person directly adjacent to you. Smaller tables, more widely spaced might be better.
• I would have preferred to have gone to the official banquet, but was not aware of it because as a tutorial presenter I did not have to register.
After Party

Most survey respondents did not attend the after party, but those who did mostly rated it as “good”. The weather (pouring rain) and distance from the conference venue, combined with travel arrangements on the last day of the conference, could account for this. However, the venue was also quite small, and it was not advertised in the conference program.
Accommodation

Two thirds of survey respondents stayed in the conference hotel (the Chestnut), and opinions were split over the adequacy of the quality and price value of the hotel. Comments from those who were happier with the accommodation indicated that although the hotel was of low quality, the low price and location made up for this. However, many others were very unhappy with the accommodation, complaining that it was dirty, badly maintained, and did not have a free wifi connection. A better quality hotel with free wireless internet access is strongly recommended in the future.

The difference in satisfaction levels between those who did and those who did not stay in the conference hotel is quite striking.
Overall satisfaction with accommodation:

Satisfaction levels of those who stayed in the conference hotel:

Were you happy with the price and quality of your accommodation?

Yes: 56 (50%)
No: 56 (50%)

Were you happy with the price and quality of your accommodation?

Yes: 27 (36%)
No: 48 (64%)
Satisfaction levels of those who did not stay at the conference hotel:

**Conference Hotel Comments:**

- The service was bad, responses to questions and requests were either very slow or entirely forgotten, and the security arrangements were bizarre and over the top (e.g., using the key in the elevator).
- The worst accommodation I have ever seen. None came to clean the room. Almost everything in the room is not clean including bath towels, no internet, no TV ... It is not a hotel. Really not professional!
- Price was OK for downtown TO, but the security aspect was a real drag, and the lack of WI-FI in particular was unacceptable.
- The price was fine, the accommodation, features, quality and general atmosphere of the "hotel" were not. Calling the conference accommodation a hotel is stretching the meaning of that word.
- Breakfast was ok, but room was pretty shabby and was not cleaned the entire time I was there. The only advantage of the hotel was its location.
- Too expensive for the quality of the room. Although the location is very convenient (being at the same place as the conference).
- The rooms were not great: not very clean, poorly furnished and the modem for the internet was not very handy (!).
GENERAL FEEDBACK

Format of the Conference

Most people were happy with the relative distribution of philosophy, psychology, and neuroscience at the conference, and were in favour of mixing these disciplines in symposia and concurrent talks. There were roughly equal numbers of comments requesting more talks from each of these disciplines, several requesting more on computational approaches, and again several comments to decrease the amount of philosophy at the conference. Also, the placement of the neurophysiology session on the last day was questioned, given the lack of talks in this area on other days, as many people left early.

Suggestions for the format of the conference included having longer lunches (possibly provided by the ASSC), longer poster sessions, more tutorial sessions, more concurrent sessions, a longer conference overall (by one day). There were also suggestions about changing the timing of the conference, though presumably there will always be clashes with other conferences.

![Graph showing feedback on relative representation of topics]

**Were you happy with the relative representation in the conference of philosophy, psychology and neuroscience?**

- Yes: 88 (78%)
- No: 24 (21%)

Comments:
• I felt intermixing philosophy, psychology and neuroscience for talks, rather than having a separate concurrent session, was a great success. I think all the abstracts should be rated equally, without giving who the authors or his/her affiliation. The high ranked abstracts should get the talks. This seems the way the talks were selected this year, and I’m happy with it.
• Recent academia requires more than one field for getting information, therefore, interchanging different fields of research can bring more creative ideas.
• I felt the computational branches of these disciplines were under represented - but I’m fully aware that that was is line with most of the attendants inclinations.
• Not much psychology in the symposia and concurrent sessions; it was restricted to the posters.
• But most of the neuroscience keynotes and symposiums where on sunday - maybe there could have been a spread of the speakers from dif disciplines - the best concurrent sessions included speaker from all disciplines.
• Though I am a philosopher myself I am finding it increasingly harder to see what excitement philosophy brings to this event.
• I think the amount of philosophy should be reduced and the amount of neuroscience increased. The disciplines have different priorities, and the philosophers are already well represented at other conferences e.g. Towards a Science of Consciousness, whereas this conference is the only serious one available to people researching the neuroscience of consciousness.

Topics and Speakers for Future Conferences

• Consciousness and cognitive control; consciousness and emotion.
• Enactivism.
• Developmental and computational approaches. Methodology.
• Philosophy of science.
• Work with clinical populations. Split-brain data.
• Externalism: Riccardo Manzotti.
• Synthetic Phenomenology: Ron Chrisley.
• The Mental Stance: David Gamez.
• Connectedness: Murray Shanahan, Olaf Sporns.
• Schizophrenia and Self-Consciousness: Chris Frith, John Dylan-Haynes, Tononi, Dehaene, Mike Anderson.
• Metacognition: Flavell, Farthing, Andreas Demetriou.
• Pentti Haikonen, M. Pessiglione, Marcel Kinsbourne, Dennett, Lau, Tong, Rees, Laureys, Koch, Naccache.
ASSC-15 Kyoto

One question on the survey asked whether or not, given the potential for long days at the Kyoto conference, there should be a half-day break at some point. Respondents were asked to rank the following choices, or say “definitely not”:

- No break necessary.
- Break after first full day of conference.
- Break after second full day of conference.
- Break after close of conference, before two days of post-conference workshops.

The most popular choice was “break after second full day of conference”, earning 53% of first- and second-place choices and only 22% “definitely not”.

---

ASSC Conference Report 2010

ASSC-15 Kyoto will have two days pre-conference and two days post-conference workshops. Because of the potential for long days, the local organizers are planning a half-day break at some point during the week. Please rank your preferences from 1 (most preferred) to 4 (least preferred) -- one first choice, one second, one third, and one fourth -- or for any of the options choose “definitely not”.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1st Place</th>
<th>2nd Place</th>
<th>3rd Place</th>
<th>4th Place</th>
<th>Definitively Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No break necessary</td>
<td>44 (39%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
<td>18 (16%)</td>
<td>23 (31%)</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break after first full day of conference</td>
<td>30 (27%)</td>
<td>26 (23%)</td>
<td>27 (24%)</td>
<td>22 (20%)</td>
<td>12 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break after second full day of conference</td>
<td>25 (22%)</td>
<td>23 (21%)</td>
<td>22 (19%)</td>
<td>24 (21%)</td>
<td>28 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break after close of conference, before two days of post-conference workshops</td>
<td>19 (17%)</td>
<td>24 (21%)</td>
<td>37 (33%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
<td>29 (26%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments on the Questionnaire Itself

From the limited comments on this year’s questionnaire, it appeared that it was adequate, though could be made shorter.

- Try to avoid double barrelled questions. Try survey monkey, this questionnaire refused to load in a recent version of Mozilla…. I was forced to use Internet Explorer to complete the survey.
- Provide a chance to go back.
- On each page of the questionnaire, put the current page number out of the total # of pages....

Final Thoughts or Suggestions

Many positive suggestions were made which would be useful for next year’s organizers. Many commented that a print-out of the conference program, including all the abstracts, was necessary, especially given the difficult in getting online at the conference venue, and that the organisers had not made it clear that abstracts would not be available this year. The unfortunate timing with the G20 conference was also brought up, so other similar events should be avoided in future! Coffee should be made more freely available at tutorials, and more (and more varied) food would be appreciated.

- The abstracts should definitely be included in the printed conference program, even though it might approach telephone-book size. I still use the program from Berlin from time to time as a reference to look things up.... Overall atmosphere of the conference was great.
- Include the abstracts in the printed program. The cost of the conference was, I was told, more than last year but failed to provide lunch?
- For crying out loud make coffee available at the tutorials! They aren’t cheap and it is a tough task to concentrate at 9am in the morning with jetlag, and to keep it up for 3 hours with just one 5 minute break without any coffee! Put the abstracts back in the program - they were sorely missed this year. The lack of abstracts, lack of coffee, poor banquet, and shoddy accommodation made this event feel like poor value for money.
- Some small stuff: check out the conference site before you book it; print participants’ affiliation on the name tag; put the abstracts back into the program. but most importantly, you’re doing a GREAT job and I want to thank all of you who put so much work into this important conference!
- The abstracts shouldn’t have been excluded, They serve as a good reference and provide a more detailed information about the talks and poster presentations. It is very hard to decide which concurrent session to attend based only on the titles of the talks.
- There was no coffee at the tutorials! This is a problem, a lot were jet-lagged, and many just need coffee to function. So I found that to be a major problem.
STUDENTS

Mentoring Program

The mentoring program ran again this year and was positively received, particularly by the students. It has established itself as a central focus of the student experience at ASSC conferences. Over half of students attending the conference participated; most participants (students and mentors) said that they would like to participate again next year.

Comments mostly focused on requests for more meeting time, fewer students per mentor, and better food options at the lunch (e.g., for vegetarians/vegans). Mentors were generally happy with the arrangements, though a mismatch in research interests occasionally led to some students dominating the conversation.

- It’s a terrific way for students to meet senior folks in the field. I only wish we had more time to meet with our mentors.
- It was interesting, although there was limited time with the mentor, and with three other students per mentor, there was little time for all of us to ask questions.
- Two of the students had interests directly aligned to my own, which made for interesting conversation. The third was still in coursework and had not chosen an area of research. It might be wise to put all general interest students in one group.

The mentoring program matches interested early-career students to relevant senior academic researchers. Did you participate in the mentoring program, either as a mentor or as a student?
Potential mentors only: participating vs. not participating

The mentoring program matches interested early-career students to relevant senior academic researchers. Did you participate in the mentoring program, either as a mentor or as a student?

- **No**: 40 (87%)
- **Yes**: 6 (13%)

Students only: participating vs. non participating

The mentoring program matches interested early-career students to relevant senior academic researchers. Did you participate in the mentoring program, either as a mentor or as a student?

- **No**: 25 (54%)
- **Yes**: 21 (46%)
All survey respondents:

Would you be interested in participating next year?

- Yes: 64 (70%)
- No: 28 (30%)

Non-participants only (i.e., did not participating in 2010 mentoring program):

Would you be interested in participating next year?

- Yes: 39 (60%)
- No: 26 (40%)
Participants only (i.e., did participate in 2010 mentoring program):

Would you be interested in participating next year?

Yes

No

21 (46%)

2 (7%)

25 (93%)

Mentors only (participating and non-participating):

Would you be interested in participating next year?

Yes

No

25 (54%)

21 (46%)
Students only (participants and non-participants):

Were you interested in participating next year?

- Yes: 39 (85%)
- No: 7 (15%)

Participants – students and mentors:

Were you satisfied with your assignment?

- Yes: 22 (81%)
- No: 5 (19%)
- Comments:
Mentor participants only:

Were you satisfied with your assignment?

Yes: 6 (100%)

No: (0%)

Student participants only:

Were you satisfied with your assignment?

Yes: 10 (76%)

No: 5 (24%)
Mentors only:

How would you rate the mentor lunch on Friday?

- Excellent: 2 (33%)
- Good: 2 (33%)
- Fair: 2 (33%)
- Poor: 
- Very poor: 

Students only:

How would you rate the mentor lunch on Friday?

- Excellent: 3 (14%)
- Good: 8 (38%)
- Fair: 8 (38%)
- Poor: 2 (10%)
- Very poor: 
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Student Social

The student social was generally rated “good” to “excellent”, though a significant number of people did not attend, possibly due to the distance of the bar from the conference venue, and some slight confusion over who was invited. A larger venue is suggested for future meetings.

The idea of making senior researchers get free beer off students seemed to go down well, though there were some queries over the function of a “student” social in this case, and the use of conference money in this way (i.e., instead of lowering student conference fees, having a cheaper banquet, providing more food at other social events). Several comments suggested that the amount of food offered was too little (in line with criticisms from student socials in other years).

Students:

• Non-students also participated, which was good in terms of socializing. But due to the more numbers of participants, the supply of food was late and not enough.
• There was lots of talk about the ridiculous alcohol-budget for the student social - we’d be better of with lower registrations fees and less free drink. Also was unclear what the point of the student social was if non-students were also invited.
• The pitcher idea was simply great. Also to make in invitation for others to join explicit. It was a great night! (Just short)
• This event was good, but I am not sure that non-students should be encouraged to attend. My understanding is that in previous years this has not been the case, and that it provided a good opportunity for students to talk without feeling that they should be trying to talk to the non-students present.
• There wasn’t enough room and not everyone could have a seat. It didn’t change the quality of the event for me, but it might be something to look at for next year.
• ’Twas good beer and spectacular company, but needed a large venue (people had to stand). Also, if there’s anywhere that has vegan appetizers, that would be good, too.

Mentors:

• I was very impressed with the idea of giving only students coupons for beer. Great idea! I got to meet a large number of students, which was most rewarding for everyone. It was kind of crowded with not enough seats for everyone at the beginning (more successful than expected?) and too noisy later on around 11PM which is when I left. Maybe a bigger venue next time?
• I liked the idea about the pitchers and I liked the fact that it was explicitly open to everybody.
Students only:

How would you rate the student social?

Non-student attendees only:

How would you rate the student social?
Student Perspectives on the Banquet

- Too expensive for an ordinary food, especially given the number of amazing food venues cheaper and better in Toronto. Some people suggested in the day after that the banquet was a fundraising opportunity for the association which, if true, is deplorable.
- One might expect something beyond freezer bread and prepackaged salad for 60 bucks...
- Too little food, especially for vegetarians, and no second servings. Desert was gone before I could get some. Far away, not easy to join the poor man’s dinner afterwards – but the bar was okay.
- The place was wonderful, but the price was too high for the quality of the food that was nothing special at all. A more economical proposal would motivate more people for attending the banquet. I would also choose regional specialties for the menu.

Did you attend the conference banquet on Saturday night?

- No: 33 (72%)
- Yes: 13 (28%)
Student Perspectives on the “Poor Man’s Dinner”

- Great fun.
- A very enjoyable time!
- Good food (happily, they had vegan options!), though I believe there were some language-barriers that resulted in incorrect orders.
- This was a good night, well organized and at a convenient location.

Did you attend the conference banquet on Saturday night?

- Yes: 13 (28%)
- No: 33 (72%)
Appendix A: The Questionnaire
ASSC14 Toronto Conference Survey

What is your membership status with the ASSC?

- Full voting member.  [Skip to 2]
- Regular member (non-voting).  [Skip to 4]
- Student member.  [Skip to 2]
- Non-Member.  [Skip to 2]

What is your main involvement with the conference? Please select the response that is most relevant.

- Tutorial presenter.
- Keynote speaker.
- Plenary speaker in a symposium.
- Speaker in concurrent session.
- Presenter of a poster.
- Interested observer.

Please choose the best response that describes you.

- I am a computer scientist.
- I am a neuroscientist.
- I am a clinician.
- I am a philosopher.
- I am a psychologist.
- I am an interested member of the public.
- Other, Please Specify
Page 1 - Question 4 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

In which region do you live?

- North America
- South America
- Europe
- Africa
- Asia
- Australia or New Zealand

Page 1 - Question 5 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

How was your conference participation funded?

- Grant or scholarship.
- Faculty travel budget.
- Self-funded.
- Other, please specify

Page 1 - Question 6 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets) [Mandatory]

Which ASSC meetings have you attended in the past? Please select all that apply.

- ASSC12: Taipei (2008)
- ASSC11: Las Vegas (2007)
- ASSC9: Caltech (2005)
- ASSC5: Durham, North Carolina (2001)
- ASSC1: Los Angeles (1997)
- This is my first ASSC meeting

Page 2 - Question 7 - Yes or No [Mandatory]

The mentoring program matches interested early-career students to relevant senior academic researchers. Did you participate in the mentoring program, either as a mentor or as a student?

- Yes [Skip to 3]
- No [Skip to 4]
- Comments on the program:

Page 2 - Question 8 - Yes or No [Mandatory]

Would you be interested in participating next year?

- Yes
- No
Were you satisfied with your assignment?

- Yes
- No
- Comments:

How would you rate the mentor lunch on Friday?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

Do you have any comments on the lunch (for example, anything that could be done better or differently)?

Which (if any) of the morning tutorial sessions did you attend on Thursday?

- T1: Signal detection theory and distinguishing conscious vs. unconscious / Michael Snodgrass and Hakwan Lau. [Skip to 5]
- T2: Decoding visual and mental content from human brain activity / Frank Tong. [Skip to 5]
- T3: Neural basis of suppression, repression and dissociation / Heather Berlin and Michael C. Anderson. [Skip to 5]
- T4: What are mental representations, and does the mind need them? / Paula Droege. [Skip to 5]
- I did not attend any of the morning tutorials. [Skip to 6]
- I did not attend any of the morning or afternoon tutorials. [Skip to 8]

How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

Do you have any specific comments on the session?

Which of the afternoon tutorials on Thursday did you attend?

- T5: Attention and consciousness: Two distinct brain processes / Naotsugu Tsuchiya and Alex Maier. [Skip to 7]
☐ T7: Informational measures of consciousness: Integration, causality and state structures / Igor Aleksander and David Gamez. [Skip to 7]
☐ T8: Train your brain! Understanding and applying the neurofeedback technique / Kerstin Hoedlmoser and Manuel Schabus. [Skip to 7]
☐ I did not attend any of the afternoon tutorials. [Skip to 9]

Page 7 - Question 16 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal) [Mandatory]
How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 7 - Question 17 - Open Ended - Comments Box
Do you have any specific comments on the session?

[Skip Unconditionally to 9]

Page 8 - Question 18 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets)
Why not?

☐ Expense.
☐ Travel schedule.
☐ Not interested in any of the tutorial topics.
☐ Other, please specify

[Skip Unconditionally to 9]

Page 9 - Question 19 - Rating Scale - Matrix [Mandatory]
How would you rate the overall quality and relevance of the keynote talks you attended?

Opening Welcome: Olivia Carter
Comments:

William James Prize Winner:
Comments:

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?
Comments:

Keynote 1: Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children
Comments:

Keynote 2: Mohan Matthen - Image and Message in Sensory States
Comments:

Keynote 3: Morris Moscovitch - Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: A Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective
Comments:

Keynote 4: Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex
Comments:
Do you have any general comments about the keynote talks you attended, or any suggestions for future keynote speakers?

Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Candelier, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block.

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunn, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter.

Symposium 3: Crowding, Blink and Attention: What Can They Tell Us About Consciousness? - Timothy Vickery, David Whitney, Ramakrishna Chakravarthi (chair), and Mark Nieuwenstein.

Symposium 4: Neurophysiological Approaches Within the Scientific Study of Consciousness - Naotsugu Tsuchiya, Alexander Maier (chair), and Melanie Wilke.

Do you have any general comments about the symposia you attended, or suggestions for future symposia topics?

Overall, how would you rate the quality of the concurrent talks you attended?

The concurrent talks were reduced this year from 30 to 20 minutes. Did you find 20 minutes to be...

Did you attend either of the poster sessions?
Overall, how would you rate the quality of the posters you saw?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the quality and presentation of the posters in future meetings?

How would you rate the overall quality of the opening reception?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you have any comments about this year’s reception or suggestions for next year?

How would you rate the student social?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you have any comments or suggestions about the social?

Did you attend the conference banquet on Saturday night?

| Yes [Skip to 16] | No [Skip to 17] |
Page 16 - Question 34 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

How did you find the quality of the food and wine at this year's banquet?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

Page 16 - Question 35 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The cost of this year’s banquet was CAN$ 70. How would you rate the value of the banquet, all things considered?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

Page 16 - Question 36 - Open Ended - Comments Box

Do you have any comments on this year's banquet or any suggestions for next year?

---------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------

[Skip Unconditionally to 18]

Page 17 - Question 37 - Yes or No

Did you attend the “poor man's banquet” instead?

- Yes
- No
- Comments:

---------------------------------------------------------------

Page 18 - Question 38 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

How would you rate the After Party which took place on Sunday night?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent
- Did not attend

Page 19 - Question 39 - Yes or No [Mandatory]

Did you stay in the conference hotel?

- Yes
- No

Page 19 - Question 40 - Yes or No [Mandatory]

Were you happy with the price and quality of your accommodation?

- Yes
- No
- Why or why not?
Were you happy with the relative representation in the conference of philosophy, psychology and neuroscience?

- Yes
- No
- Comments:

Are there either specific topics or speakers that you recommend for future conferences?

Do you recommend any changes in the format of the conference: for example, the length of the conference, the days of the week on which it is held, the length and timing of sessions, and so on?

ASSC15 Kyoto will have two days pre-conference and two days post-conference workshops. Because of the potential for long days, the local organizers are planning a half-day break at some point during the week. Please rank your preferences from 1 (most preferred) to 4 (least preferred) -- one first choice, one second, one third, and one fourth -- or for any of the options choose “definitely not”.

- No break necessary.
- Break after first full day of conference.
- Break after second full day of conference.
- Break after close of conference, before the two days of post-conference workshops.

Do you have any suggestions on how to improve this questionnaire for next year?

Do you have any other final thoughts or suggestions? (...On the printed conference program, which was shortened this year to exclude the abstracts; on the overall atmosphere of the conference; or on anything else.)
Thank you for participating in the ASSC14 conference questionnaire. Your responses are very valuable toward helping us create better meetings in the future. If you have any questions about this questionnaire, please contact the Conference Committee chair, Joel Parthemore (Joel.E.Parthemore@sussex.ac.uk).

For more information about ASSC, please click the link below. <http://assc.caltech.edu>
The survey for ASSC14 is no longer open. Please contact conference committee chair Joel Parthemore (Joel.E.Parthemore@sussex.ac.uk) with any questions or comments. Thank you.
Appendix B: Open Comment Responses in Full¹

¹ A sample of the open comment responses is provided in each section of the main report.
MENTORING PROGRAM

(7) The mentoring program matches interested early-career students to relevant senior academic researchers. Did you participate in the mentoring program, either as a mentor or as a student?

<students>
1. Absolutely fantastic! I was able to meet with Robert Knight for lunch on the final day and I learned an incredible amount. Worth the airfare to Toronto from Sydney!
2. It seems that the mentor mainly tried to search for students for his future research, rather than genuinely helping students according to the students' own interesting research subject.
3. The time is too short.
4. It's a terrific way for students to meet senior folks in the field. I only wish we had more time to meet with our mentors.
5. I found it to be a really good opportunity to meet a senior researcher and ask questions. However, an hour for lunch with a group of people (five in my case) is not a lot of time. So, a little more time would be nice.
6. Brilliant opportunity, but I think it should be extended, with more senior researchers available, and a broader range of subjects
7. My group was very focused on concrete publishing advice and such whereas I would have like to start a conversation about content.
8. Having a natural scientist as a mentor was not that helpful for a philosopher as there are huge differences in the fields and careers.
9. I'm very happy to have participated in the mentoring programme. I think that it is an excellent opportunity for new students in the field to meet senior researchers, and wish that other conferences would have similar events.
10. A bit short, but an excellent idea and opportunity :)
11. It was extremely helpful. Keep up the great work!
12. It was interesting, although there was limited time with the mentor, and with three other students per mentor, there was little time for all of us to ask questions.
13. Interesting, but not particularly useful. We were 3 mentees assigned to 1 mentor, with less than an hour to meet and chat.
14. Interesting for meeting people. Not very useful in any other respect
15. I found the mentor lunch to be very helpful, but wish it would have been longer.

<mentors>
1. Excellent idea, should be extended!
2. I was a mentor. I thought it was useful for the students.
3. A good opportunity to meet new scholars. The lunch was a bit short, however.
4. Great experience.
5. I was a mentor

(9) Were you satisfied with your assignment?

<students>
1. The mentor did not pay attention to me once he listened to my research. He kept talking to the rest students, which made me feel an outsider.
2. I met with a very eminent person in my field working on issues I'm very interested in.
3. But I was lucky to have someone very experienced in a subject of extreme importance to my research. In the Berlin conference the same didn't happen.
4. very
5. Although the mentor was a great guy, and talking to him was fun, the conversation lacked relevance to my field – which was foreseeable given the difference in backgrounds.
6. I was assigned to my first option, so was very satisfied. My mentor was engaged and open to questions.

<mentors>
1. Two of the students had interests directly aligned to my own, which made for interesting conversation. The third was still in coursework and had not chosen an area of research. It might be wise to put all general interest students in one group.
Do you have any comments on the lunch (for example, anything that could be done better or differently)?

<students>
1. Once the mentor chose the students based on the students' research summary, he must evenly react to the three students, and prepare to provide certain helpful information for the benefit of students, not for his own research.
2. One student somewhat dominated the conversation, but that isn't something so much the ASSC can control for.
3. Maybe a little more variation.
4. One hour was too brief at the end.
5. I think that it was a bit short but otherwise I think the fault where by no mean the organization. I was very happy that an email was send out with the others research interests on before hand.
6. Food was great, and it was perfect that there were vegan/vegetarian options. I would recommend it again.
7. Better lunch and more time.
8. 1.5 hrs. Maybe a few optional guidelines for how to begin (e.g., everyone at the table introduces themselves)
9. No
10. I would suggest that more time is allotted to the event.
11. A longer time period and perhaps a less formal setting.
12. A more formal lunch would have been nice. There was no coffee!

<mentors>
1. Slightly better vegetarian option.
3. A bit more preparation, e.g. perhaps students could send in topics they would like to discuss before hand.

MORNING TUTORIALS

Do you have any specific comments on the session?

<T1>
1. Lau was an excellent speaker.
2. Both speakers were enthusiastic on their presentation; so, overall it was a good session and helpful to me.
3. Great, I really learned a lot.
4. The presentation style seemed somewhat fragmented. Otherwise, it was a great tutorial.
5. It was too basic about the SDT. More specific information is prefer.
6. The presenters attempted to included too much material such that they were unable to spend the necessary time to explain anything. As a consequence it became little more than an opinion piece - them telling us their opinion with little or know explanation of why.

<T2>
1. Well prepared, suitably technical, but sometimes glossed over a little on the problems.
2. Excellent speaker. Great material. One fundamental issue prevented me from rating this tutorial an "excellent" rating: not enough detail on the dependent and independent measures, the statistical issues (if any) of multicollinearity, stability of the estimates.

<T3>
1. Since two people presented different but overlapping research, the session was more effective.
2. Good session overall. A broader range of empirical work could have been represented (research from only one lab was showcased).

<T4>
1. I would have liked the tutorial to be more structured and to dwell longer on basic questions around representation. The way it was, discussion set in at a very high and technical level and took place mostly among few participants with excellent backgrounds.
2. It was too basic. The terminology used was confusing. The use of the term 'representation' across disciplines was not covered. The objections to representation as necessary to the nature of the mind poorly defended
AFTERNOON TUTORIALS

(17) Do you have any specific comments on the session?

<T5>
1. It was ok but it was basically just a slightly extended version of the review paper that they had sent out for us to read prior to the session.
2. Just one more (interesting) symposium. Nothing really tutorial-like. But should it?
3. Bit more detail with a bit less coverage perhaps.
4. Perhaps a bit more time spent on future directions and suggestions for other researchers would be particularly beneficial.
5. Nao did a good job, and he provided the e-pdf later that helps us in understanding.
6. Very interesting but could have been more time for discussion.
7. Far too much content for the session, poorly explained, poor interaction with the audience, glossing over very many conceptual complexities, and the Maier interlude in the middle was a pointless waste of time for a tutorial.

<T7>
1. Of course it was excellent - I delivered it. I have no way of going back to cancel the answer to your last question.
2. I was one of the presenters.
3. It was great to get additionally the materials on CD. It was interesting to get to know this theory better as a philosopher – and both tutors did a great job of conveying the topic.

<T8>
1. Too practical with not enough explanation - but I'm still glad I attended.
2. Since it is tutorial, it shall provide more details of the procedure of setting-up equipment and the introduction to the tools.

KEYNOTES

(19) How would you rate the overall quality and relevance of the keynote talks you attended?

<1>
William James Prize Winner:
I believe the winner's paper was good. But I wish the committee will in the future also evaluate the likelihood of the candidate to deliver a good talk. This one was pretty bad.

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?
Too long. And rather poor complexity-to-substance ratio (to me; sorry if it sounds too harsh).

Keynote 2: Mohan Matthen - Image and Message in Sensory States
Not exciting enough.

<2>
Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?
Pretty accessible to neuroscience audience. It nicely decomposed the concepts of "self" and made it testable by neuroscientists in the future. This kind of philosopher's talk is always welcomed in ASSC!

<3>
William James Prize Winner:
Incredibly interesting topic.

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?
Hard to follow.

Keynote 1: Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children
Her presentation style was meticulous.

Keynote 2: Mohan Matthen - Image and Message in Sensory States
Very good and clear speaker.
Keynote 3: Morris Moscovitch - Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: A Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective

Excellent and interesting.

Keynote 4: Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex

Mind blowing!

Keynote 3: Morris Moscovitch - Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: A Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective

I planned to attend, but the turmoil surrounding the G20 meeting made it virtually impossible for me to attend the Sunday meeting.

Opening Welcome: Olivia Carter

Sorry -- missed a lot of the conference due to sickness.

William James Prize Winner:

My flight was late; made me miss this one

Keynote 2: Mohan Matthen - Image and Message in Sensory States

meaningless playing around with definitions and intuitions

William James Prize Winner:

Spent too much time talking about the history of hypnosis and not enough time on his own study. The presentation of the results was very unclear. The axes of the graphs were not even labelled.

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?

The speaker made no attempt to make the talk accessible to non-philosophers. Other speakers such as Ned Block did a much better job.

Keynote 1: Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children

Very interesting talk and well presented

Keynote 4: Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex

A very interesting and well presented talk.

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?

Too technical, despite my decent knowledge of philosophy.

Keynote 3: Morris Moscovitch - Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: A Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective

Not much new with this

William James Prize Winner:

Good work, but I expected something more relevant to consciousness research.

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?

Maybe it went over my head, but I missed the point. Too fast, too sketchy, too erratic. Often unclear what the speaker was trying to say.

William James Prize Winner:

not the presenter's fault, but his presentation style made the information difficult to digest.

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?

far too complex

Keynote 4: Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex

best talk of the conference!
Keynote 1: Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children
Very interesting. There's definitely a point in considering evidence from animal behaviour. She made some effort to link it to questions about human consciousness.

Keynote 3: Morris Moscovitch - Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: A Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective
Very insightful.

Keynote 4: Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex
Interesting methods talk. I don't think he made an effort to try and say something about consciousness. I happen to know what he was talking about, but I am sure many were rolling their eyes.

Opening Welcome: Olivia Carter
Her pronunciation was quite different from Americans, so it was hard to understand some of her talk.

Keynotes were mostly excellent except one or two duds.

William James Prize Winner:
Difficulty with the accent. The powerpoint did look interesting.

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?
Boring as Hell. When will professors learn to give a good talk - not a lecture?

Keynote 1: Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children
Great Talk

Keynote 3: Morris Moscovitch - Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: A Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective
Excellent

Keynote 4: Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex
Outstanding

Keynote 3: Morris Moscovitch - Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: A Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective
Extraordinary complete and tied together many concepts and data. Excellent.

Keynote 4: Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex
Very complete and extraordinarily excellent. He was interesting, good sense of humor, and the high frequency gamma wave data was well explained.

Opening Welcome: Olivia Carter
A bit hard to decode the accent

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?
Hard to follow

Keynote 1: Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children
Shortage of models: observations only

Keynote 2: Mohan Matthen - Image and Message in Sensory States
Well trodden stuff

Keynote 4: Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex
Well delivered
William James Prize Winner:  
It was me...

William James Prize Winner:  
Great topic, but rather disjointed talk.

Presidential Address:  Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?  
If this was specifically aimed at non-philosophers then I guess I would have been suddenly lost after 5 minutes instead of 10 minutes for a 'proper' talk. Still too many giant leaps in the argument for me.

Keynote 1:  Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children  
Fabulous accessible talk that raised some interesting issues for ASSC from outside the typical ASSC specialisations.

William James Prize Winner:  
Reasonable but not the best James' prize lecture I have seen.

Presidential Address:  Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?  
Excellent as expected

Keynote 4:  Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex  
Really good - shame it was right at the end, I along with others had to leave halfway through in order to get to the airport

Keynote 4:  Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex  
A bit too long for a tired audience at the end of the conference

Presidential Address:  Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?  
Bit long and impenetrable. Shame since ideas are great

Keynote 2:  Mohan Matthen - Image and Message in Sensory States  
Not really appropriate for this forum.

Presidential Address:  Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?  
Not understandable at all

Opening Welcome:  Olivia Carter  
Good introduction to ASSC and succinct.

William James Prize Winner:  
Fascinating topic and a good speaker. Excellent choice.

Presidential Address:  Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?  
Too complicated, especially for non-philosophers.

William James Prize Winner:  
It would be great if the speaker spoke with as much enthusiasm as I'm sure he actually has for the research... findings were fascinating.

Presidential Address:  Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?  
Too long and steps of argument not spelt out clearly enough
Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?
poorly structured, very dense, difficult to follow, many unexplained concepts

Keynote 1: Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children
excellent didactics

Opening Welcome: Olivia Carter
Functional

William James Prize Winner:
Very interesting data, presented clearly

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?
Incomprehensible and way too long.

Keynote 1: Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children
Excellent presentation, but I would have loved for her to mention consciousness just once, even in a highly speculative way, in a consciousness conference!

Keynote 3: Morris Moscovitch - Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: A Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective
Great content, presented clearly

Keynote 4: Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex
Missed end to catch plane, but fantastic, revelatory stuff by what I did see.

William James Prize Winner:
Too much history and too little new, relevant, and innovative research.

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?
Too much jargon and too few concrete examples to reinforce or correct audience comprehension.

Keynote 1: Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children
Excellent.

Presidential Address: Thomas Metzinger - What is a First-Person Perspective?
I thought Dr. Metzinger's talk was fascinating and inspiring. The 'big picture' character of his talk was perfect as a way of introducing the conference. My only concern is that it might have been a bit inaccessible to those unfamiliar with his work. Some of the terminology he used, e.g., was a bit idiosyncratic.

Keynote 1: Nicola S. Clayton - Do Animals Make Shopping Lists? Prospection and Planning by Crows and Children
This was a fascinating talk. I loved it. It's relevance was a bit questionable to the topic of the conference, but I found it riveting nonetheless.

Keynote 2: Mohan Matthen - Image and Message in Sensory States
Dr. Matthen's talk was wonderful. I have a special interest in the topic of his talk, so it was quite a treat. I felt that the topic was highly relevant, as well.

Keynote 4: Robert T. Knight - Oscillatory Dynamics in the Human Cortex
Fascinating talk, even to those with little knowledge of neuroscience (such as myself). I thoroughly enjoyed this talk, and he made a point of relating the talk to the topic of the conference. Great way to finish the conference.
Do you have any general comments about the keynote talks you attended, or any suggestions for future keynote speakers?

1. We really need some better philosophy talks.
2. Maybe 1 hour is a bit long. 40-50 min maybe better.
3. Some more rigour in the philosophical talks would be great.
4. Keynote talks, as well as all other presentations, especially those of Philosophers, should still have main scientific focus, since this is the Association for the SCIENTIFIC Study of Consciousness. Philosophy plays an essential role in science, but in a scientific meeting of this sort, any philosophical discussion should focus more in an analysis around current scientific data rather than mere book concepts that do not have a direct tie with the latest scientific findings.
5. All the keynotes were excellent -- I reserved a 5 for the talks that I found particularly interesting.
6. A diversity of speakers we haven't heard before is important but I wish they make more efforts to link their work with SSC lines of thought.
7. Look around outside the little in-crowd that you all pass the baton among. There are good ideas that are not being heard. Try to recruit from neighboring fields for new perspectives. Look for speaker quality - not academic notoriety.
8. Give the location of the speakers and poster presenters. Coffee breaks could be amongst the posters. Would give more room and time.
10. Keynote speakers should be reminded that they should sound keynotes rather than deliver an assembly of previously given papers.
11. I would like to hear an NCC neuroscientific keynote next year
12. Should always be absolutely focussed on the problem of consciousness itself.
13. More researchers working with clinical populations.
14. I thought there was a good spread of speakers, lots of interesting material!
15. was a good mix of topics and specialties
16. More philosophers next year!
18. I propose a keynote regarding consciousness (nature, development, etc) under a psychological point of view
19. Dan Dennett??
20. Shorter talks.
21. When there was a broad synthesis of ideas, then the keynote talk was interesting. If the keynote talk concentrated on a narrow topic, like the usual conference presentations, then it was hard to be interested.
22. Generally high quality, but philosophy talks are increasngly outdated and irrelevant to this conference, I feel. Should be phase out.

How would you rate the plenary symposia you attended?

Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Charles, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block.
I felt the third philosopher's talk is disconnected from the others'. It may have been better to have the three speakers speak more and have some time for discussion at the end.

Symposium 3: Crowding, Blink and Attention: What Can They Tell Us About Consciousness? - Timothy Vickery, David Whitney, Ramakrishna Chakravarthi (chair), and Mark Nieuwenstein.
I wanted to hear more 'bold' statement or conjecture on the nature of crowding and its relationship with 'phenomenal awareness' in the periphery. As to the link between crowding and attention blink, it wasn't discussed enough so that it left a bit of impression that they are not really a related phenomenon.

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunne, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter.
This is the area I was the most interested in. Unfortunately, there was not much new for me because it overlapped much with material presented at the Mind and Life Summer Research Institutes for the past two years that I attended.
Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Charles, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block.

Except Dickie's empty philosophizing

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunne, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter.

Dunne's talk was excellent; Lutz was reading from his slides, slowly

Symposium 3: Crowding, Blink and Attention: What Can They Tell Us About Consciousness? - Timothy Vickery, David Whitney, Ramakrishna Chakravarthi (chair), and Mark Nieuwenstein.

got locked outside the security perimeter

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunne, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter.

Fine integration of humanity studies and science of Buddhism. Maybe the only symposium actually facing the phenomenological aspect of consciousness.

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunne, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter.

Although Dr. John Dunne is not a neuroscientist, his speech in relation to Buddhist philosophy was fresh and impressive in some sense. But, it was strange to see that once Dr. Antoine Lutz finished his talk, he tossed all questions to Dr. John Dunne without responding any question by himself.

Symposium 4: Neurophysiological Approaches Within the Scientific Study of Consciousness - Naotsugu Tsuchiya, Alexander Maier (chair), and Melanie Wilke.

Alexander Maier's research data were clear. I do not get why Naotsugu changed his presentation topic... he shouldn't do such a way.

Symposium 4: Neurophysiological Approaches Within the Scientific Study of Consciousness - Naotsugu Tsuchiya, Alexander Maier (chair), and Melanie Wilke.

Excellent talks all of them. Keynotes from some of these people next year would be great

Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Charles, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block.

Very interesting session, good talks

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunne, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter.

Good but quality of talks did not quite live up to expectation

Symposium 4: Neurophysiological Approaches Within the Scientific Study of Consciousness - Naotsugu Tsuchiya, Alexander Maier (chair), and Melanie Wilke.

Really very good indeed. High quality content and excellent presentations

Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Charles, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block.

Dickie's talk was confused and didn't really fit...

Symposium 4: Neurophysiological Approaches Within the Scientific Study of Consciousness - Naotsugu Tsuchiya, Alexander Maier (chair), and Melanie Wilke.

Fascinating stuff!

Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Charles, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block.

Very interesting and stimulating.
Symposium 4: Neurophysiological Approaches Within the Scientific Study of Consciousness - Naotsugu Tsuchiya, Alexander Maier (chair), and Melanie Wilke.
Very impressive! Highlight.

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunne, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter.
Slagter's talk (alone) was excellent.

Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Charles, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block.
Great interplay among presenters.

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunne, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter.
Good to consider new issues.

Symposium 4: Neurophysiological Approaches Within the Scientific Study of Consciousness - Naotsugu Tsuchiya, Alexander Maier (chair), and Melanie Wilke.
Difficult for the non-expert to understand.

Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Charles, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block.
I was particularly interested and impressed by Hakwan Lau's talk.

Symposium 3: Crowding, Blink and Attention: What Can They Tell Us About Consciousness? - Timothy Vickery, David Whitney, Ramakrishna Chakravarthi (chair), and Mark Nieuwenstein.
I cannot rate this since I presented in this symposium

Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Charles, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block.
Far too many assumptions assumed for one theory or another - evidence doesn't support such pigeonholing yet.

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunne, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter.
Liked the evidence-based parts, but too much theory and speculation here.

Symposium 3: Crowding, Blink and Attention: What Can They Tell Us About Consciousness? - Timothy Vickery, David Whitney, Ramakrishna Chakravarthi (chair), and Mark Nieuwenstein.
Very strong, fascinating symposium. But chair an awful hog, who squeezed out the time and questions for last speaker. Should have been a better time-keeper.

Symposium 4: Neurophysiological Approaches Within the Scientific Study of Consciousness - Naotsugu Tsuchiya, Alexander Maier (chair), and Melanie Wilke.
Incredibly strong data, and the best symposium of the conference

Symposium 1: Conscious Awareness, Perceptual Decision making and the Bayesian Brain - Stanislas Dehaene, Lucie Charles, Hakwan Lau (chair), Imogen Dickie, and Ned Block.
Interesting, but difficult discussion. I didn't entirely understand the debate.

Symposium 2: Possible Contributions of Research on Meditation to the Neuroscience of Consciousness - John D. Dunne, Antoine Lutz (chair), and Heleen Slagter.
I found this a valuable contribution to the conference. I quite enjoyed the talks and found them highly relevant.
(22) Do you have any general comments about the symposia you attended, or suggestions for future symposia topics?

1. Functions of consciousness
2. Robotics/artificial intelligence & consciousness. I found many interesting posters on arousal and the level of consciousness. That maybe a good topic in the future.
3. The first and fourth symposia were fantastic the first especially in terms of the interplay between Ned and the other speakers.
4. No, I enjoyed all.
5. I'd like to see more on developmental approaches (baby consciousness) and evolutionary approaches.
6. As a philosophy student, and not a scientist, I found some of the science talks a bit obscure. I imagine some scientists found some of the philosophy talks equally difficult. People should strive to be as clear and nontechnical as possible.
7. More speakers who have data of some type.
8. I popped in and out of various symposia. It might be good to go back to computational models at some time.
9. I have to say that this year the quality of symposia was rather poor. Specifically the quality of presentations was rather poor!
10. As ASSC is such a diverse society a tutorial introduction to each symposium is a great help. I don't think this is a formal requirement and, although it sometimes happens anyway, I wonder if it is worth explicitly asking organisers to provide one.
11. A symposium on the science of consciousness would be good. Could invite people like David Chalmers and Bruno Latour. I would be happy to organize it.
12. We need more empirical data! This meeting is getting too much about secondary philosophical commentaries.

(25) Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the quality and presentation of the concurrent talks? For example, some people felt that the 20 minutes was too short for the philosophy talks. One solution would be to give the philosophy talks more time, at the cost of having fewer of them.

1. More time - selection according to longer abstracts, as they can be misleading as to the quality of the talk
2. Quality over quantity, always. The array of talks were impressive. The rooms were not equally comfortable (able to hear speaker clearly).
3. I disagree with giving more time to some specializations, such as philosophy. Everybody could argue that they need more time. It is part of the challenge to summarize what one has to say within the 20' allotted, and practice it. I suspect that many speakers did not practice their talk beforehand because many seemed to run out of time, i.e. they just had time to give their intro, e.g. the background material, and then rushed through the novel part of their contribution, which is a shame. A simple rehearsal (preferably in front of a critical audience) would prevent this kind of problems.
4. Twenty minutes was too short for some of the philosophy talks. Views weren't able to be presented clearly as a result. Many of the details had to be kept very general, which made the aim and thesis of some of the talks difficult to properly grasp.
5. Have more concurrent sessions at the same time with longer talks. Twenty minutes was not sufficient for my talk or adequate feedback. Given the expense of attending and the joy of presenting I was unhappy with the amount of time for presenting and only had time for a few very short classificatory questions. Overall 20 minutes was simply inadequate.
6. I disagree with giving philosophy talks more time than scientific talks. Philosophers need to train themselves to summarize relevant information in the same way scientists are forced to learn. Once again, this conference focuses on the scientific study of consciousness, and therefore philosophers that decide to participate should adjust to the parameters of a standard scientific conference.
7. I don't think that 20 minutes is too short for the philosophy talks. Philosophers, like everyone else, need to be concise.
8. maybe
9. The talks were just too short, period. I'd say fewer talks in general, and back to the old time limits.
10. You could perhaps offer a couple of different duration options. A science talk simply reporting a new result, can sometimes be shorter than a more theoretically oriented talk. You don't necessarily have to draw the line between philosophy and science talks.
11. (1) As a scientist, I think that 20 minutes should be just right for a science talk. Keep it that way; I'm happy for philosophy talks to be longer. (2) This year, I found myself jumping from one concurrent session to another more than any other previous conference. More can probably be done to group together talks that share a common theme, even if very broad, rather than somewhat incoherent collections of topics. Also, the number of cancellations seemed unusually high. Last minute changes to the timing of talks that did happen, made it even more difficult to jump between sessions (I arrived at a different session to find out I missed part of a talk I wanted to hear since exact timing was changed such that existing speakers made use of the canceled talk time).
Philosophy is not the only field which needs more time, I mean, every talk needs more than 20 minutes. If you increase the presentation time, it might be better increasing the time in the same way to the other fields, or just stick to the 20 minutes.

15 minutes forces the speaker to get to the point quickly and summarize. It's a good thing.

The 20 min limit is perfect for all the talks. The keynote speaker talks are perfect length.

I have heard excellent brief philosophy talks. I would make no concessions.

Make sure that the chairs have a question themselves if nobody wants to be the first to ask. I think concurrent sessions of different length (e.g. longer philosophy talks) is a bad idea. First of all, it is unfair that some people get longer than others, but I can't see how it would not mess up the program: Either you would have to start talks at different times, which would prevent people from changing sessions between talks, or you have to put all philosophy talks at the same times forcing people to choose talks they might not be interested in...

Exactly.

No, 20 minutes should be enough for philosophers.

I would have liked more concurrent talks and less of the organized sessions, which I did not attend when they were quite far from my interests.

Fewer talks per session would be better. In fact 4 30 min slots per session would be good, but with each 20 min talk plus 10 min discussion.

I believe this to be okay, but it should be the case that there is more time to discuss in philosophy. Actually, the short time slot constrains philosophers to make their argument clearer. I believe this to be a good thing. Just the question time was very often to short. 17 minutes talks + 8 minutes discussion is in my eyes perfect for the ASSC-philosophy section

Many of the speakers were amateurs, i.e., did not use the microphone to advantage, slurred and unmodulated speech, trying to get the trying episode over as soon as possible, etc. A tutorial on auditory presentation, a la Ned Block, may actually be needed, or at least raise the issue with the speakers!

I think the duration is perfect as it is; maybe there could be a small improvment in the gathering of subjects.

I found most philosophical talks long.

Choose abstracts that propose a focused topic. Give clear instructions to speakers that talks should convey one or two points only and should not summarize a book or dissertation project (or even a chapter).

I agree

better fit the contents in each concurrent talks. Don't put informational theorists with neurobiological data and philosophy. Select more new empirical findings, or propose less concurrent talks. Better being qualitative than quantitative

Extending the philosophy talks seems like a good idea, although it may then be unfair for the scientists. Philosophy talks really cannot be condensed well to be less than 20 minutes long.

yes. compression is a virtue, but you cannot endlessly compress talks. I would go for fewer but longer talks. i'm not a fan of the general tendency of scientific conferences to become denser. I would definitely advocate a policy of being more selective in picking talks, but giving them more time. maybe it is an idea to let presenters decide for themselves whether they need 20 or 30 min. who knows, maybe not everybody would just automatically grab the "bigger is better" option.

I disagree. 20 minutes seems to be sufficient time to present any ideas that are relevant. any longer, it would be hard to maintain an interest. We already have keynotes and symposia for longer talks. 20 minutes would allow more speakers to present their findings. I guess the philosophers will have to practice more at presenting their findings more concisely (after all everyone would like more time to present their stuff).

Many talks not up to standard - need better quality control. I'd much prefer fewer talks of high quality. Don't care about length, care about quality of data.

20 minutes is too short. There is no time for the talk and no time for discussion. 30min. is a better compromise between number of talks and exposition time.

No. The talks given by philosophers should be equivalent. 20 minutes encourages concise talks.

20 minutes included Q&A, so talks were only 15 minutes which was a bit tight. Total session of 25 minutes (talk + Q&A) would be better, though it would mean fewer talks which would be a cost.

We should keep the length of all conc talks equal no matter of which field. But we should go back to 30 min.

(28) Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the quality and presentation of the posters in future meetings?

Too many posters. The second day I couldn't finish seeing everything I wanted to see.

I felt that the time allotted to poster presentations was too little.

The posters were excellent. The rooms were not big enough to accommodate them. It would have been better to have all presenters in one room and to not have had some presenters against the wall.

The aisles were too narrow and caused crowding in front of some posters, and difficult navigation everywhere. Bigger rooms are obviously the solution here.

The rooms were very cramped.
More rigour in the philosophical posters presented. A more critical review process might improve the quality of accepted posters.

More time for the poster sessions. In the second session I didn't get a chance to attend many of the posters that I had wanted to.

I found myself often debating with philosophers at posters who had a series of what is to them "logical statements" leading them to a conclusion, but that unfortunately did not have enough knowledge about how neuron and the brain in general work to come up with proper statements. All poster abstracts, from either scientist or philosopher authors, should pass through a scientific peer review.

No - the mix of quality is fine and fosters good discussion.

Not enough food for the price of registration.

Be slightly more selective with the posters, and make sure that the number of posters doesn't grow too much in the future. When there are too many posters in one session, I generally feel dissuaded from attending.

Some science posters contained too much information.

Can I suggest that specific time be provided for the poster presenter to see other posters? As the poster presenter, I couldn't see other posters because I couldn't leave my poster section.

Allow for bigger poster boards (4'x6"). Make more room for people to get through the crowded isles. Lose the velcro. Free bar?

Coffee breaks should be amongst the posters. Would give more time, less crowding, and more exposure to the posters!

Make more time for poster session. Get food and coffee in the same room with posters.

Posters range from the excellent to the awful. Having some excellent ones should be the target. Q21 cannot be answered as a collective issue. Yes there were about 3 excellent posters.

Longer time. More space.

First of all, there wasn't nearly enough space this year - the poster sessions were cramped, uncomfortable and hot. I also like poster sessions with refreshments (beer, soda, pretzels etc) - they attract more people and are more informal. Poster presentation can be pretty tough and sometime pretty dispiriting, I'd try to do more to make it attractive and fun. Having said all this (sorry about being rather critical) there were a handful of truly excellent posters with great presenters, both philosophical and empirical.

Quite a few of the posters were substantially higher quality than quite a few of the talks!

Place together posters of related themes, be them in a philosophical or neuroscientific perspective.

More room between the rows. It was hard to pass through. More fresh air in the rooms.

I don't think it is fair to put the poster session last. It is common for participants to leave a bit early and when the poster session is last this punishes a very high number of poster presenters. Better to have a couple of keynotes last.

1.5 hour is enough.

One room was too crowded and hot.

It was much too loud and crowded

longer session is needed than the one on the sunday.

Make area less crowded. Have the coffee, etc nearby - not on another floor.

The format was good and should be duplicated. There was enough space to move around and the sound was manageable. Good to have the sessions mid-day rather than in the evening.

If not done already, send links to tips on easy-to-read posters and graphs.

Many of the posters were difficult to follow.

The poster sessions could be held in a larger room or a hallway if possible. The rooms were too small, warm and crowded, and it was difficult to hear the presenters.

It would be nice to have sample posters that are well laid out at the ASSC website. They might help serve as templates to students who are new to poster-making. I saw several posters, with quite interesting topics, that were not well laid out - with tons of text, not enough graphics. Such posters push people away rather than attract them.

Poster sessions generally very good, but room tiny and cramped. PLEASE give more physical space for poster room and people to move around next time.

More space for the poster sessions is imperative. Perhaps a more competitive abstract selection process would benefit the session also.

(30) Do you have any comments about this year's reception or suggestions for next year?

the chesnut is a shabby venue

No suggestions.

Food allergies were not addressed

The food was not particularly good.

Good food and drink helps more interaction. It is very necessary.

Kyoto offers many culinary possibilities.

It's a shame that once the tickets were used up there was no cash bar - things wound down too quickly (also, the red wine was terrible).
Missable.
It would have been nice if the organizers had suggested somewhere for everyone to go after the opening reception.
No drinks tickets and self-service would be quicker and less hassle all round...(like in Berlin)
Red wine was essentially undrinkable
I like the drink coupons. 2 is more than sufficient and makes planning easier.
More vegan options.
I was not sure that having drinks tokens was really necessary, although I haven't been to previous meetings, so I don't know if there is some reason for doing so. Also, the room was quite large, so mingling might have in fact been easier in a room that was somewhat smaller.
Please cater for vegetarians or vegans better. Virtually nothing for vegans to eat.

**STUDENT SOCIAL**

(32) Do you have any comments or suggestions about the social?

<students>
1  Loved the free beer!
2  Adrienne was hot.
3  Non-students also participated, which was good in terms of socializing. But due to the more numbers of participants, the supply of food was late and not enough.
4  Perhaps a bigger space.
5  There wasn't enough room and not everyone could have a seat. It didn't change the quality of the event for me, but it might be something to look out for next year.
6  There was lots of talk about the ridiculous alcohol-budget for the student social - we'd be better of with lower registrations fees and less free drink. Also was unclear what the point of the student social was if non-students were also invited.
7  The pitcher idea was simply great. Also to make in invitation for others to join explicit. It was a great night! (Just short)
8  nice but too far away. thanks for the beers though
9  'Twas good beer and spectacular company, but needed a larger venue (people had to stand). Also, if there's anywhere that has vegan appetizers, that would be good too.
10  This event was good, but I am not sure that non-students should be encouraged to attend. My understanding is that in previous years this has not been the case, and that it provided a good opportunity for students to talk without feeling that they should be trying to talk to the non-students present.
11  I did not attend because it was the weekend of G20, and the student social was too far away from the hotel.
12  Thanks for the free food and drinks!

<non-students>
1  I was very impressed with the idea of giving only students coupons for beer. Great idea! I got to meet a large number of students, which was most rewarding for everyone. It was kind of crowded with not enough seats for everyone at the beginning (more successful than expected?) and too noisy later on around 11PM which is when I left. Maybe a bigger venue next time?
2  wasn't clear it was open to all... maybe missed an announcement; arrived late...
3  It seemed just right to me - lots of opportunity to mix and talk, great atmosphere, good location. Opportunity to buy you choice of food and drink in addition to what was supplied (what was supplied was just fine for me, but I know people who could take the opportunity of a more substantial meal without having to leave the social). So, really great social!
4  Good idea to give students free beer, good location
5  I liked the idea about the pitchers and I liked the fact that it was explicitly open to everybody.
6  Outdoors was ideal. Smaller plates of food, more evenly distributed.

(36) Do you have any comments on this year's banquet or any suggestions for next year?

<students>
1  Too expensive for an ordinary food, especially considering the number of amazing food venues cheaper and better in Toronto. Some people suggested in the day after that the banquet was a fundraising opportunity for the association, which, if true, is deplorable.
2  one might expect something beyond freezer bread and prepacked salad for 60 bucks...
3 Too little food, especially for vegetarians, and no second servings. Desert was gone before I could get some. Far away, not easy to join the poor man's dinner afterwards – but the bar was okay.
4 The place was wonderful, but the price was too high for the quality of the food that was nothing special at all. A more economical proposal would motivate more people for attending the banquet. I would also choose regional specialties for the menu.

<non-students>
1 I guess organizing these kinds of event is difficult. Don't like the drinks tickets. Easy to lose them.
2 Maybe this is just the way of the universe, but these banquets always seem overpriced for the food/drink you actually get. Of course, there's the cost of the venue too, I suppose, and the caterers, etc.
3 The food was really not befitting of the price.
4 I enjoyed the company (excellent rating) but food value for money was very poor (more like a cafeteria lunch than a $70 dinner). Banquets are usually a rip off but this doesn't have to be the case (I can recall two small conference held in expensive cities were conference dinners were substantially more affordable - they simply booked a large restaurant; no buses to remote locations...). Furthermore, I'd suggest making banquet dinners more affordable to students (discounted rates).
5 If you had catered in Pizza and burgers for $15 a head, it would have been a better value.
6 Again, Kyoto offers opportunities for good Japanese food.
7 As with the student social, I thought the banquet was pitched just right. Not too formal, good opportunities to mix both before and after eating (the magic was a great idea). So another big success.
8 Location not too bad though a bit of a drive, value for money very poor indeed
9 I had many better meals for a much cheaper price in restaurants in Toronto. It was just not a memorable meal, and poor value for money.
10 The food was really bad and 10.30 is a very early end. Did not understand why we had to drive for this far for a fairly ordinary event and location.
11 As I can not understand the above rate regarding the specific question, I would like to say that the price was good but it was not analogous to the quality of the place as well as to the quality of food.
12 A school bus trip to a buffet with 2 complementary drinks does not constitute a banquet. But the close-up magic was good.
13 the location was lovely and special. the magicians a welcome divertissement.
14 It was a good way to mingle with everyone there. I think it was a success.

(37) Did you attend the "poor man's banquet" instead?

<students>
1 Great fun.
2 A very enjoyable time!
3 Good food (happily, they had vegan options!), though I believe there were some language-barriers that resulted in incorrect orders.
4 This was a good night, well organized and at a convenient location.

<non-students>
1 Great fun, good food, nice company!
2 sadly not, I was unaware of it at the time
3 I was disappointed not to be able to attend the main banquet, especially after I heard of how much of a success it was, and the magic show afterwards, which I would really have liked to attend. This restricted number of places to the banquet which ended up splitting us into sub-groups is a main failure of the socials organization to my eyes. Again, a larger venue should have been retained.
4 but not long... the place was unfortunately not very exceptional. Appeared to be simply the closest one... Disappointing!!
5 I would have preferred to have gone to the official banquet, but was not aware of it because as a tutorial presenter I did not have to register.
6 Same noise problem as the regular banquet. You can only hear the person directly adjacent to you. Smaller tables, more widely spaced might be better. Much cheaper though!
7 It was good but a room was a bit small.
8 Great food, good social
Were you happy with the price and quality of your accommodation?

<conference hotel>

1. The price was good... The hotel was not. The service was bad, responses to questions and requests were either very slow or entirely forgotten, and the security arrangements were bizarre and over the top (e.g., using the key in the elevator).
2. The worst accommodation I have ever seen. None came to clean the room. Almost everything in the room is not clean including bath towels, no internet, no TV ... It is not a hotel. Really not professional!
3. It was just okay.
4. I guess the price was reasonable for a standard issue room. The room however failed to meet that lofty mark....
5. Very poor quality for 95$ per night. There was no service. I even needed to ask to change the towels.
6. Nice to be at the same location as the conference, but a little too expensive.
7. The price was OK for downtown TO, but the security aspect was a real drag, and the lack of WI-FI in particular was unacceptable.
8. Room was very dirty (e.g., hair in the bathroom) and the place was falling apart. Bits and pieces of the wallpaper were falling off. Bed was threadbare.
9. The price was fine, the accommodation, features, quality and general atmosphere of the "hotel" were not. Calling the conference accommodation a hotel is stretching the meaning of that word.
10. Smelly rooms and hallways, but probably good value in central Toronto.
11. I understand that the hotel was listed as modest accommodations but the rooms were filthy and had obviously not been properly cleaned for quite some time.
12. This is a close one. Price was OK, maybe hard to beat with that location, but no TV, no coffeemaker, no nothing in the room.
13. Not such a great hotel, but the price was reasonable.
14. Far too expensive for the quality of room.
15. The hotel was very basic, but this was reflected in the fair price, considering alternatives in Toronto.
16. Price was good, quality was very bad.
17. The room of conference hotel was not clean and gave off strange odor. I had hard time to get bathroom towels even though I requested it to the front desk several times. The lack of wireless internet service at the room was awfully inconvenient. It was not pleasant memory of staying in Chestnut hotel.
18. Dingy rooms, no tv, no free internet, no free parking, once a weeks maid service. What exactly was the $94 for?
19. This was the dirtiest hotel I have ever seen. I could not wait to leave. Horrible.
20. Smell is bad.
21. It was very convenient. Lack of a bar where people could meet.
22. But no wifi was strange. As was mingling with teens in summer camp.
23. The hotel was not very clean. Locations was excellent.
24. High price, moderate quality. Looked more like a student dorm!
25. The rooms were a bit poorly maintained but comfortable enough. The hotel was in a good location and was a very good price.
26. Breakfast was ok, but room was pretty shabby and was not cleaned the entire time I was there. The only advantage of the hotel was its location.
27. Rattling air conditioning with no windows that could be opened.
28. That was just about the worst hotel I have stayed in.
29. The room was a bit shabby, but the low price makes up for that.
30. No wireless and a view to a pile of garbage was maybe a little underimpressing.
31. The quality of the accommodation was appalling. It was terrible value for money. My room was not clean when I arrived. No cleaner came in during the entirety of my stay. The lights were all incredibly dim, so it was not bright enough at night. It was mean of them to charge us for internet, and outrageous to make us scramble around on the floor to connect the modem ourselves and then go through a slow bureaucratic procedure to join their ethernet network. One of the cables didn't even work, so I had to go through a lengthy procedure to get a replacement. In this era, it should be quick, easy and free to get online. The air-conditioning malfunctioned, and made loud noises, so I had to sleep with earplugs. This is cheap, student accommodation, and should not be used for conferences.
32. Mouldy and raunchy rooms. Bad ventilation.
33. It was a cheap rate so the lack of quality is fine. But in our day and age we got to have easy internet access not some archaic modem system (it took me a few hours to work around the silly virus checker). Internet access is also needed in the conference rooms.
34. From a senior scientist perspective rooms were poor and the price too high given the quality.
35. OK since included good bkfst.
36. It was certainly inexpensive, but the rooms were spartan and ill-kempt.
37. The rooms were not great : not very clean, poorly furnished and the modem for the internet was not very handy (!).
The price was good and the room adequate, basically. The toilet had to be fixed twice and the lamp had no knob, but the staff was able to fix these problems.

...for the most part. They could have cleaned the bathrooms a bit better though. And unfortunately, no-one from ResNet (IT people for internet) ever got back to me, despite having left multiple messages. But I know that the hotel was completely booked, and ResNet was very busy.

They did not change towels at all during my stay of 5 days, and no kettle in a room so that I cannot have any tea or coffee in a room.

It was cheap and poor quality, but I am only there to sleep which I could do because it was quiet, despite the G20 summit!

my room had been a student's room, the furniture was cheap and crappy, the wallpaper and carpet stained, almost dirty, the amenities the bare minimum. to pay over 90$ for such a room is ridiculous.

The price was reasonable, but the service and level of cleanliness was poor.

Too expensive for the quality of the room. Although the location is very convenient (being at the same place as the conference).

Hotel room awful - would have complained about lots of things if had paid this money myself for a holiday hotel. For instance, no one came in once to clean room or empty bins throughout whole week.

There was no room service, what is not nice considering the price

Too much like a student dorm (which, essentially, it was), i.e., a bit raucous and run-down in appearance.

Quality was very poor.

Too many bad things to mention, but to stay in this room for 90$ a night is ridiculous.

The chestnut residence was a very poor choice. I imagine the attendees wouldn't have minded footing a higher costs for an improved venue.

A bit tacky, but given the relatively low price was OK. Breakfast was quite nice. Lots of choice.

The hotel was a dump. It was dirty, low standard and not on the level of what you expect at the ASSC. The prize for this quality was disturbing, considering that 94 $ was supposed to be a discount prize! Impossible to imagine that students actually have to live there.

for the price the quality of the room was very poor (shabby, dirty, broken seat, no service,...)

<others not staying at the conference hotel>

I live in Toronto, so I stayed at home and commuted.

I stayed with a friend for free.

I found a really nice B&B with excellent quality and small price

Decent B&B cheaper and much better than the conference hotel

It was overpriced, quite far away from conference venue and the air conditioning was broken

I am a Toronto resident and stayed at home

n/a

(41) Were you happy with the relative representation in the conference of philosophy, psychology and neuroscience?

neuroscientific representations should be increased.

I felt the computational branches of these disciplines were under represented - but I'm full aware that that was is line with most of the attendants inclinations

I felt intermixing philosophy, psychology and neuroscience for talks, rather than having a separate concurrent session, was a great success. I think all the abstracts should be rated equally, without giving who the authors or his/her affiliation. The high ranked abstracts should get the talks. This seems the way the talks were selected this year, and I'm happy with it.

I thought there should have been more psychology and neuroscience

I went to the Las Vegas 2007 conference and I remember there was more scientific data presented. I found this year's conference poor in the amount of scientific data presented compared to the amount of data-unrelated presentations.

I would have preferred to see some material dealing with quantum consciousness, but I am a physicist.

I miss computational and mathematical input.

not enough neuroscience

Not much psychology in the symposia and concurrent sessions; it was restricted to the posters.

but most of the neuroscience keynotes and symposiums where on sunday _ maybe there could have been a spread of the speakers from dif disciplines – the best concurrent sessions included speaker from all disciplines
I think the amount of philosophy should be reduced and the amount of neuroscience increased. The disciplines have different priorities, and the philosophers are already well represented at other conferences e.g. Towards a Science of Consciousness, whereas this conference is the only serious one available to people researching the neuroscience of consciousness.

Though I am a philosopher myself I am finding it increasingly harder to see what excitement philosophy brings to this event.

Though I am a philosopher myself I am finding it increasingly harder to see what excitement philosophy brings to this event.

The component of philosophy is much more less this year. This reduces the intellectual stimulation of the conference.

I think that psychology ghad not represented as much as it would worth to be.

Too much philosophy, with nothing new (if at least there were some novel argument that could be used to the scientific study of consciousness?) too much meditation and sexy subjects that don't tell us much about the mechanisms of consciousness.

It was ok but 4 days were too long to attend.

There did not seem to be enough catering by the speakers to those from the other disciplines. Perhaps things could be better integrated.

More neuroscience please, less philosophy!

There were too many philosophy presentations relative to the others.

I would appreciate more psychology.

(42) Are there either specific topics or speakers that you recommend for future conferences?

consciousness and cognitive control
n/a
I'm not sure if these topics have been covered in past conferences, but: the relationship between emotion and consciousness; enactivism.

Olfactory Consciousness
I noticed that the topic of split brains was absent in the conference, although it is full of unsolved questions that can give us light into the nature of consciousness. It may be relevant to bring an expert in this field who is actively collecting data, for future conferences.

There was not enough psychology
developmental approaches
anesthesia
Some topics of consciousness in connection to computer science might be interesting.
Quantum consciousness.
Panpsychism and the philosophy of science. I have heard all the HOT talks I will ever want.
Yes. Emphasize the need to address the real problems of consciousness instead of addressing toy problems.
Riccardo Manzotti - externalism Ron Chrisley - Synthetic Phenomenology Pentti Haikonenen - whatever he likes David Gamez - the mental stance Murray Shanahan - connectedness Olaf Sporns - Connectedness
M. Pessiglione, Paris
Schizophrenia and Self-Consciousness Chris Frith John Haynes Tononi Daheane! Mike Anderson
The philosophy of the science of consciousness. A machine consciousness session or invited speaker would also be interesting.
As mentioned previously, more work with clinical populations.
More on methodology would be useful - bridges a gap between the sciences and philosophy too.
time and consciousness
As i mentioned before, I think that there should be more extended represantaion of psychological theories and studies regarding consciousness. As for speakers, I propose, Flavell, Farthing, or Andreas Demetriou as they have propose theories regarding consciousness or awareness (metacognition) about the functioning of the mind or
dennett, dehaene, bock, lau, tong, rees, laureys, owen, tononi, koch, naccache
Quantum consciousness.
Marcel Kinsbourne
no
(43) Do you recommend any changes in the format of the conference: for example, the length of the conference, the days of the week on which it is held, the length and timing of sessions, and so on?
1 I would make it a day longer - this way, perhaps there could be only two rather than three concurrent sessions. The organizers did an admirable job of avoiding similar topics competing at the same time, but for me part of the point of being at ASSC was to see stuff that is out of my narrow field.
2 n/a
3 As I said before, the poster session should be longer in my opinion.
4 Longer lunches, or lunches provided would be a good idea.
5 I would suggest single day registration for those like me who could attend only one day but had to pay full price.
6 no, it is fine as it is.
7 More tutorial-like sessions would be great.
8 Longer poster session.
9 I recommend that the rooms for poster sessions be larger. It was too crowded and we could not walk through.
10 Pretty good, overall. The only thing is maybe go back to the old concurrent time limits—but I can see it the other way, too, so I'm not cast in stone on this.
11 Pick venues where there are more researchers, i.e. less international travel for them. Those of us paying our own way cannot put it on grant money like others.
12 OK in the past.
13 not really.
14 I like the format very much as it is.
15 No, ok as it is. Just the venue of this year's conference was poor. Better place for poster sessions needed!
16 The duration is fine. The dates clash with other meetings I attend so I can't come every year. I wonder if it is worth randomising the dates within a month long window so there aren't clashes every year?
17 More concurrent sessions, less sessions with 4 invited speakers.
18 No. I think the current format is good.
19 There must be a longer lunch break. This was a bad mistake made in Berlin, and once again this year there was not long enough for lunch if you wanted to attend the morning and afternoon session.
20 Structure was good.
21 For me it would be better if conferences take place at the end of June, not at the beginning...
22 I would prefer a conference that starts a day sooner and ends a day sooner.
23 As the number of scientists working on consciousness is increasing, I propose either the increase of concurrent session numbers or the increase of the numbers of the conference days.
24 Length was ok, but the content of the main sessions didn't appear to appeal to the majority of attendees - we were left having to pick and choose between concurrent sessions.
25 I feel that having a lunch break longer than an hour would allow more time for networking. Often times the talks ran long, leaving only 45 mins to wander around and find somewhere nice.
26 see before: there's too much stuffed into one conference day. That's counterproductive. There's only so much information a mind can take up. Start later in the day, finish earlier. Fewer talks, more selection.
27 not some many overlapping sessions of similar topics.
28 no.

(45) Do you have any suggestions on how to improve this questionnaire for next year?
1 n/a.
2 Try to avoid double barrelled questions. Try survey monkey, this questionnaire refused to load in a recent version of Mozilla (a standards compliant browser derivative of Firefox). I was forced to use Internet Explorer to complete the survey.
3 Shorter.
4 No.
5 Shorter.
6 This one is fine.
7 Ask fewer questions.
8 Provide a chance to go back.
9 not really.
10 No, questionnaire was good.
11 No question about venue of the conference, which was the worst this year.
12 Seems pretty good to me!
13 On each page of the questionnaire, put the current page number out of the total # of pages. E.g., "page 1/10"
14 The above question is hard for me to follow. I am trying to communicate that breaks are good, and hope that I just didn't make it appear that I think they are bad!
15 it's good as it is.
16 no.
(46) Do you have any other final thoughts or suggestions? (...On the printed conference program, which was shortened this year to exclude the abstracts; on the overall atmosphere of the conference; or on anything else.)

1. Had a great time!
2. This ASSC14 is very poorly organized in many aspects. Hope it will not repeat again.
3. The abstracts should definitely be included in the printed conference program, even though it might approach telephone-book size. I still use the program from Berlin from time to time as a reference to look things up... Overall atmosphere of the conference was great.
4. I loved the conference, however, more discussion about consciousness would be appreciated.
5. The mailing with the conference programs said that a printed copy of the abstracts would be provided at registration, so I did not bother to print and bring it with me. I was very disappointed, and greatly inconvenienced, that the mailing had lied: I had to plan my days without the use of abstracts, relying on titles only, which are often not informative enough to decide which session to attend. The advice of the staff at the registration table was to "look the abstract up online" which was not possible without WI-FI... Overall a disastrous decision.
6. Include the abstracts in the printed program. The cost of the conference was, I was told, more than last year but failed to provide lunch?
7. It was a wonderful conference. I'm looking forward to Kyoto.
8. The conference could not have been planned for a worse time (G20) and location (near Dundas and Queen).
   This was a terrible oversight on the behalf of the local planning committee. One of my friends (a fellow conference goer) was assaulted and arrested by police for asking if we were inside the security perimeter on Sunday. I missed the remainder of the conference on Sunday trying to find out where the police had taken him.
9. I'd rather have the full printed program.
10. If you are planning not to provide the abstracts, it might be better announcing in advance, so that some of participants can bring their own copies with them. Very few people can memorize most abstracts, and It was very inconvenient to access the abstracts under the condition that the internet service was not provided in the hotel room. It is important to have a wireless internet service to the hotel room. If this service requires some extra expense, it must be included within the accommodation at the beginning of announcement.
11. The lack of abstracts made it hard to plan session attendance. This is inexcusable for something that costs so much.
12. Give contact info per presenter.
13. Pay attention to fresh ideas on the problem of consciousness. Do not repeate same old.
14. A few panel discussions would have improved the atmosphere
15. conference program this year was really nice.
16. there were no coffee at the tutorials! This is a problem, a lot were jet-laged, and many just need coffee to function. So i found that to be a major problem.
17. It is a great meeting - I just wish I could come more often (see above about clashes with other meetings). I've been a bit critical in some of my comments - I'd just like to emphasise the I really enjoyed ASSC this year and that the criticisms are intended as suggestions for the future. I'd like to really thank the organisers for the great job they did this year!
18. The abstracts shouldn't have been excluded, they serve as a good reference and provide a more detailed information about the talks and poster presentations. It is very hard to decide which concurrent session to attend based only on the titles of the talks.
19. I'd like a return to having a full book of abstracts - especially given the lack of (free) wireless in the hotel so we couldn't check them online throughout the day.
20. I lost a lot by not having an abstract book. I view this as absolutely essential. At the very least we should have been told about this so we could print the abstracts from home. But still, a book is much better. I really didn't like the venue. It was a depressing and soulless place, and really needs a facelift.
21. This year was well-organised in overall terms of registration etc. But on the ground it seemed uninspired and routine. Both Taipei and Berlin were much, much better in terms of the overall conference experience.
22. The idea that conference program did not have abstracts was not good.
23. I liked more the full version of the printed conference program, e.g. Taipei book
24. I am very disappointed that there is no access to the abstracts.
25. It seemed fewer philosophy faculty attended than in past years. Perhaps the recession has limited travel budgets.
26. thanks
27. Most enjoyable! It was an information feast and had great socials. Many, many thanks to all the organizers.
28. For crying out loud make coffee available at the tutorials! They aren't cheap and it is a tough task to concentrate at 9am in the morning with jetlag, and to keep it up for 3 hours with just one 5 minute break without any fecking coffee! Put the abstracts back in the program - they were sorely missed this year. The lack of abstracts, lack of coffee, poor banquet, and shoddy accommodation made this event feel like poor value for money.
29. I would have preferred to have a program containing abstracts because there was no (easy) internet access so it was difficult to choose with concurrent sessions to go to without this extra information.
some small stuff: check out the conference site before you book it; print participants' affiliation on the name tag; put the abstracts back into the program. But most importantly, you're doing a GREAT job and I want to thank all of you who put so much work into this important conference!

I enjoyed the conference, thanks!

The printed conference program was perfect. Perhaps there could be some more variety in the way of food at breaks (rather than so much chocolate). Fruit would be great.

no