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Overview

ASSC 15 took place 9-12 June 2011, hosted by the University of Kyoto, Japan. The main conference was held alongside social neuroscience, meta-cognition, and neurophysiology satellite meetings, all of which proved to be very popular; as well as a day of tutorials and tours of research facilities in Kyoto – the Primate Research Institute and the Robotics Lab – all again highly rated. Such tours of state-of-the-art facilities at future conferences would likely be equally popular.

The main conference included three days of keynotes, symposia, concurrent talks, and poster sessions, as well as the student mentor scheme lunch. Social events included the opening night reception, student social, conference dinner, “poor man’s” dinner, and after party. As in past years, a large number of graduate students and new attendees came, and the atmosphere of the conference was both friendly and integrative.

Overall, the conference was a great success, with an interesting mix of researchers from a variety of fields and of a variety of ages. The diversity of ASSC conferences is clearly one of their strengths and should continue to be encouraged through choice of speakers, selection of symposia topics, and planning of concurrent talks and poster sessions. One way to do this might be to expand the range and number of talks in neuroscience, psychology (particularly developmental), computational approaches to consciousness, and general methodology. As with previous meetings, a major concern of attendees was that talks – with particular concern for the keynotes and plenary sessions -- be directly focused on consciousness and report recent empirical work; judging by comments, the degree of success varies by year. Speakers should be strongly encouraged to present new, empirically based research and address core methodological problems wherever possible. This year the best-received symposia were the ones titled Metacognition and Consciousness, and Consciousness: Powerful or Useless’.

As in past years, many comments targeted the standard of philosophical work and complained about its lack of empirical grounding. Philosophical talks that do not make direct reference to up-to-date empirical research are viewed by many non-philosophers as unnecessary or unenlightening. Clearly, there is an ongoing need to address the role of philosophy in consciousness science and to identify speakers who can appeal to both the philosophical and non-philosophical members of the audience. Notably, the keynotes by Fiona MacPherson and Nicolas Humphreys received very mixed ratings.

The mentor scheme was again a big success and should be expanded if possible. As in past years, student participants asked for more time with their mentors, something that can be difficult to achieve within the time constraints of the conference.

The conference’s social events were generally disappointing compared to previous years. The quality of food at the opening reception was commented on by many, as was the reception’s very short duration. The conference banquet likewise ended early; the buffet-style arrangement and the use of the conference hall for the venue was generally seen as bad value for money. The parallel
“poor man’s dinner” once again provided a cheap and fun alternative but was not well attended. The student social ended early; those who went would have preferred just going to a traditional local bar. Finally, the after party was not well attended.

No complementary tea, coffee, or water was provided, which was surprising given the high registration fees and served to discourage interaction during the (short) breaks between talks. Longer breaks with refreshments are clearly requirements for future conferences.

The revised format of the conference, with four instead of three concurrent sessions and 20-minute instead of 30-minute talks, worked well for most respondents. Perhaps the talks could have been better organized to prevent overlap between sessions. The shortened length was too short for some but acceptable for most. Ensuring that chairs keep to the schedule and uploading all of the presentations before the sessions start would help.

The poster sessions were well attended, though more refreshments might have been provided, and the posters could easily have been left up longer. The poster abstracts should continue to be included in the program, and the full printed program should be retained (in contrast to Toronto).

Unlike previous years, there was no conference hotel. Many respondents complained that more information about accommodation should have been available on the conference website. That said, they were generally happy with the accommodation they found.

Respondents were generally in favour of the changes suggested by the ASSC16 organising committee, as presented in the questionnaire: i.e., extending the conference by a day while keeping the registration fee roughly the same and making talks available online. Most said they would be likely to attend even if they cannot present a talk.

**Demographics**

Both the response rate and the total number of responses decreased once more this year over last. Only half of attendees visited the survey website (59% last year), with three quarters of those completing it (71%), yielding a 37% completion rate overall (42%). For discussion, see the concluding section.

As in previous years, the greatest number of respondents were students (39%). A quarter were non-ASSC members. Similarly to last year, just over three quarters of respondents either presented a poster (42%) or gave a concurrent talk (34%). By subject area, neuroscientists were best represented (36%), followed by psychologists (27%) and philosophers (22%). Smaller numbers of clinicians, computer scientists, and physicists were also represented.

More than half of respondents came from Asia. A third came from Europe, with smaller numbers from North America, Australia, and New Zealand. A clear majority received some form of funding to attend (80%). Fifteen percent received an ASSC travel bursary, which was directed at overseas students in particular. Three out of five had never been to an ASSC conference before.
Mentoring Program

A fifth of respondents participated in the mentoring program, either as mentor or student, with almost 70% interested in participating next year. All those who took part were happy with their assignment. Four in five rated the mentoring program lunch as good or excellent. As usual, some students commented that having more time with their mentors would have been better (possibly over dinner), but the time constraints of any ASSC conference will tend to make this difficult.

As a student, I really enjoyed the lunch, it was really interesting and inspiring.
I served as a mentor and found the process well organized and enjoyable. I hope the students found it useful.
More time, less of a rush. Perhaps move it to an end-of-day social with the option of going to dinner together?
A longer session and a bigger room. It felt very rushed. Food was excellent. Overall well organised.

Tours and Satellite Conferences

Tours of research facilities – the robotics lab at the ATR Computational Neurosciences Laboratory, and the Primate Research Institute – were offered for the first time this year. Although a relatively small proportion of respondents went on them (10%, due to a cap on numbers), they seem to have been successful.

The primate tour was an amazing once in a life-time experience that I will always remember.
Would have liked to attend primate tour, but it was full.

Satellite conferences on social neuroscience and meta-cognition were held before the conference, with the neuropsychology satellite held after. Many of the respondents had been to at least one of these conferences; overall, their comments were very positive. Some found the meta-cognition venue difficult to find. A number of respondents commented on the significant overlap between the content of the satellite conferences and the main ASSC program. This should be avoided in the future; at the same time, there is clearly a demand for this kind of satellite conference.

Satellite conferences were excellent. I’d like to see more like these in the future. Very good way of dealing with the diversity of specializations within ASSC.
A lot of repetition in the main ASSC schedule.
All of the satellites were of excellent quality.
Place where Metacognition satellite was held was inconvenient.
Tutorials

The tutorials were rated mainly good to excellent. Expense, travel arrangements, and attending a tour were the main reasons offered for not participating. Comments are often quite specific to the tutorial. General comments focused on the need to ensure that tutorials are well-organised and planned, empirically up to date, and discussion oriented. Several respondents targeted tutorials on speculative theories for criticism. Future conferences should ensure that tutorials function as comprehensive, well-delivered introductions to an area of research.

*Mostly conceptual, linkage to experimental neuroscience were a bit out-dated.*

*The quality of the content was high but it was less like a tutorial but more like a very long talk because there was almost no time for interaction and discussion. I thought this was what the whole tutorial was about. The only thing that differentiated it from the other talks was that only a hand full of people were participating.*

*There was very little discussion in the tutorial I attended. The speaker seemed to want to get through some material, and was not interested at all in letting the discussion flow.*

*This should never have been allowed as a tutorial - it was instead an immensely speculative outline of an interesting, but completely novel and somewhat wild theory. A tutorial should surely be instead about teaching us about EXISTING methods, data or theory.*
Which (if any) of the morning tutorial sessions did you attend on Thursday?

- T1: Integrated information, causal density and conscious level / Adam Barrett and Anil Seth (10, 9%)
- T2: Disorders of Consciousness: Coma, Vegetative State and Minimally Conscious State / Tristan Bekinschtein, Melanie Boly and... (6, 5%)
- T3: Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation and Conscious Awareness / Tony Ro and Hakwan Lau (7, 6%)
- T4: Self-Knowledge: Philosophy meets Cognitive Science / Peter Carruthers (12, 10%)
- I did not attend any of the morning tutorials. (33, 28%)
- I did not attend any of the morning or afternoon tutorials. (49, 42%)

How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?
- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

19 (54%)
4 (11%)
12 (34%)
Keynotes

The keynote talks were mostly rated “good” or “excellent”. Half of respondents did not attend either Takamitsu Yamamoto or Fiona MacPherson’s talk. The best attended talks were Ralph Adolphins and Nicolas Humphreys. Attendance did not necessarily correlate with ratings. The top-rated talk (and the only one with more “excellent” than “good” ratings) was David Eagleman’s. Ralph Adolphins and Ian Phillips (the William James Prize Winner) rated well (although some respondents were unsure about the relevance to consciousness research of Adolphins’ talk or the scientific merit of Phillips’ work); other talks received mixed ratings. In particular, Nicolas Humphreys’ talk received very mixed ratings and sharply divided opinion; some really enjoyed the talk, but nearly one in five rated it “very poor” to “poor”. Some respondents, while acknowledging that the talk was well presented, were highly critical of this kind of talk being given at an ASSC conference, expressing strong concerns about both the empirical basis and the implications of the material.

Eagleman

*Best keynote of the session by some distance. Very clearly presented, lots of exciting data, clever studies, made solid effort to tie his work in with consciousness, and dealt with the questions extremely well too.*

Great talk, great personality, broad research interest of relevance for society. Best presentation at the conference.

Adolphins (presidential address)

*Made little attempt to make talk relevant to consciousness, which it barely was. In future, give stronger explicit instructions to keynotes to make sure they tie in their talk to consciousness - even if that is somewhat speculative. Otherwise it seems like a bit of desperation to get these speakers to talk, when the relevance to consciousness is tenuous.*

Phillips (William James Prize winner)

*Excellent!*

Interesting to have a philosopher as the James Prize - his talk was well put together.

Very clear and well presented, but emphasis should have been more on empirical issues at end, given largely scientific audience. Also, was this argument really new, to warrant a William James Prize, (e.g. see Ruff, Kristjansson and Driver 2007 Psych Science)

Nice talk, not sure about the interpretation of the results.

Humphreys

*Quite quite awful. Embarrassing that a former serious scientist should present a talk with no empirical support whatsoever to his theory, relying instead on poetic and theological quotes as evidence. Talk was wonderfully eloquent, and well polished, but without anything substantive to back up his claims for a scientific audience, it was frustratingly vacuous (also, it was just a public-oriented book talk, essentially). Given the title of this organisation, shouldn't we be championing the SCIENTIFIC study of consciousness, and moving away from these woolly approaches?*
A beautiful and well-crafted presentation - we need more like this! While not necessarily bogged down in quantitative detail, talks like Humphrey's remind us of the joy and wonder of the topic, and why we got into this field in the first place.

I think many of us come to ASSC instead of TUCSON precisely just to avoid talks like this. Nothing wrong about it, but this kind of totally speculative talks, citing poets more than academics, are more suited for a TV program than a scientifically rigorous conference like ASSC. ASSC will hurt its own credibility to be taken seriously if more speakers of this kind are invited.

Fantastic presentation - apparent that a lot of thought and effort had been put in (even if not just for this audience). Compelling message, well directed.

Beautiful talk but not of high interest for science.

Edmund Rolls' talk rated reasonably well; the main criticism was that he presented no new empirical work.

The talk was far too solipsistic; the core ideas were plausible, but not enough effort was made to explain what was novel about them, or how they differed from similar ideas/theories that would be well-known to this audience.

Dull and disconnected from the cutting-edge work on consciousness.

The main criticisms of Takamitsu Yamamoto's talk were a general lack of clarity and his inability to understand the questions from the audience.

Speaker didn't make clear (perhaps because this wasn't very well done) the vital details of how his results were controlled for (e.g. the selectivity issues of the non-intervention group in relation to their recovery rates).

He did not understand the questions. His English was awful. And the topic was not very suited for this conference.

Fiona MacPherson's talk mainly rated fair to good. Comments varied between it being a good philosophy paper and being insufficiently informed by empirical work.

Narrow-minded and uninformed by science.

A good paper, very clearly presented.

General comments

General comments focused on the need to base talks on up-to-date empirical work and to present new material rather than well-known theories. Respondents suggested having fewer keynote talks and at different times: notably, not as the first event in the morning! Suggestions for future keynotes included Frederique de Vignemont, Susanna Siegel, Martin Davies, and Daniel Stoljar.

Please try to keep keynotes relevant to consciousness as much as possible, emphasising empirical work as much as possible too. I personally would prefer to see less philosophy or speculative keynotes and more scientific keynotes. Many philosophy talks have a poor understanding of current scientific work or methods, and base long, complex talks on these misunderstandings. If
there aren’t enough consciousness speakers, please instead look to closely related cog science fields, such as attention and working memory.

Schedule them at different times, maybe after lunch.

General comment on the keynote talks: There are too many of them. One or two (say, one philosopher and one scientist) would suffice, and the time the other ones take up would be better spent on an additional concurrent talk session.
Plenary Symposia

The plenary symposia mostly rated “good” to “excellent”. General comments focused on the need to ensure that speakers address consciousness directly based on solid empirical work, and that session have speakers who are more clearly related.

Symposium 1: Metacognition and consciousness - Stephen Fleming, Robert Hampton, Peter Carruthers. This was the best attended symposium and was very well rated. Respondents appreciated the range of speakers; the only criticism was that the material replicated content from the meta-cognition satellite conference.

*Relevant topic for theoreticians and empirical researchers, balanced representation of various views.*

*Somewhat redundant with the satellite.*

*The symposium itself was fine, but it largely replicated the satellite event on the same topic (despite the organizers saying that it wouldn’t).*

Symposium 2: Consciousness: Powerful or useless? – Roy Baumeister, Hakwan Lau, Al Mele, Simon van Gaal. This symposium was also well attended and generally well rated. Comments focused on the excellent choice of subject; however, many respondents were highly critical of several of the speakers. In particular, Al Mele’s talk was seen by many to be poor both in its disorganized presentation and lack of empirical content.

*Good question to discuss, but quite mixed session. Baumeister and van Gaal gave good talks, though I personally would have liked for them to have more time - especially Baumeister. Lau’s talk was interesting, but not so relevant and very speculative, with very provisional data, which probably wasn’t ready for a talk. Mele’s talk was very poor both in presentation and content.*

*Excellent subject, variable speakers. Unfortunately Al Mele did not do the philosophical contingent any favours, a very poor talk.*

*I found Al’s talk very poor but the others were quite good.*

*Baumeister’s talk was among the worst I ever attended by a prominent psychologist; Mele’s talk was devoid of content.*

Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger. Only half of respondents attended this symposium. It received mixed comments. Again, the main criticism was the lack of a direct connection to consciousness, even though many found the content interesting.

*The message of the speakers toward using robots for the study of consciousness was weak. It is difficult to understand if they are creating robots or trying to understand consciousness using robots. There are many questions around artificial consciousness that could have been explored. The panel was also too short to be of any use.*

*The idea had potential, but the robotics speakers didn’t seem to have thought much about how to make their work relevant to this audience.*
Interesting Data, Nice discussion, controversial viewpoints, constructive discussion, thought-provoking.
Concurrent talks

Three quarters of the concurrent talks were rated “good” or “excellent”. Despite problems with the shortened length of the talks (from thirty to twenty minutes), 78% rated the talk length “okay” to “just perfect”. Some respondents clearly preferred to have thirty-minute talks. Much time was lost due to technical problems with projectors or speakers running over time. Better technical support and better chairing would have helped.

The number of concurrent sessions was increased this year from three to four; most respondents (71%) thought that this worked. That said, many commented that they missed interesting talks due to overlap in the contents between simultaneous concurrent sessions. There was little consensus on whether to decrease or increase the overall number of talks. Some respondents suggested extending the conference to allow the same number of talks but with fewer concurrent sessions, or reducing the number of keynote speakers or plenary symposia.

Give the speakers 30 mins for presentation and q&a. It feels like a speed race otherwise, the discussion is a farce, and many people struggle to bring even the most basic point across.

Have all presentations set up on a single computer before the start of the session. Fewer talks, more demanding selection criteria.

For a relatively small crowd four concurrent sessions is not a good idea. An additional day would be better.

I liked the choice and often sprinted from one session to another.

There were too many good options to choose from. This is NOT to say there should be fewer talks, but that there should be more time slots for concurrent sessions, with fewer talk streams in each. This could easily be accomplished by cutting down the number of keynotes, symposia, sessions devoted to the hosting country, etc.

Despite the inevitable conflicts, for the most part the 4-choice schedule was very satisfying. I also liked that the sessions were less segregated by discipline (compared to recent years), sorting more by topic than by methodology. Less monotonous that way.

Poster sessions

A high majority of respondents (86%) attended at least one of the poster sessions, which they mostly rated “fair” to “good”. The somewhat lower ratings here may be the consequence of the large number of posters accepted.
Opening Reception

The high point was the Japanese traditional dance, which everyone seemed to enjoy. The opening reception generally rated “fair” to “good”, though a worrying minority – one in five – rated it “poor” to “very poor”. Comments focused on the poor quality of the food and the early end to the evening.

Wider variety of drinks and food, and to go on for longer.

Lovely, exciting theatrical event followed by awful food and drink, and draconian measures to get us out of the building.

Giving food from Seven/Eleven was a joke. In Japan, where food is an important part of the culture, I’m sure the organizers could have done much better than that.

Student Social

Ratings were generally good, but respondents would have preferred to go to a traditional Japanese bar and stay out later: the evening ended at nine.

They took us to an Irish Pub, but all people would have prefer to go to a traditional bar.

The idea of having a student social is great but the place and the way the food and drinks were presented was poor. Next time the place should be something like a nice bar where you can have real drinks and can stay longer if you like.

Conference Banquet

Half of respondents attended. The wine and food ratings were mixed but mainly “good” (40%). Many people were clearly disappointed with the value for money. Almost half of respondents who attended the banquet rated the value “poor” to “very poor”, the main criticisms being that the meal was too expensive, ended too early (9.30), and had an inappropriate choice of venue (the conference hall) and format (buffet).

It ended very early. I didn't feel there was time to talk to everybody I wanted to talk to.

For $60 you really expect more than a slightly poshed up buffet lunch. Nothing wrong with a buffet in principle, as it makes it possible to talk to a variety of people, but either make it cheaper (preferable) or serve better quality food, and more of it. Also, have it go on for longer - people were in the middle of discussions when suddenly the lights went out.

Finished too early, poor selection of food, didn't really feel much like a 'banquet'. Had to go for a second dinner after!

Good quality food but not enough. Would have preferred a sit down meal, particularly for the cost. Not held in the same room as the talks - felt a bit unsophisticated and ad hoc.

This year's was not a banquet - it was a spread of finger food consumed while standing around. For Brighton: perhaps a dinner cruise or an oceanside restaurant? A fantastic and memorable banquet would be worth it, even if it comes at a slightly higher cost.
Poor Man’s Dinner

Only 4% of respondents attended the alternative poor man’s dinner. Either the banquet needs to be cheaper in future, or the “poor man’s dinner” (started two years ago in Berlin) needs to be better advertised.

After Party

Only a quarter of respondents attended the after party, which they mainly rated “fair” to “good”. Previous ASSC conferences have seen similar attendance figures. Many people travel soon after the end of the conference. It may also be that the after party is not as well organized as the other social events.

Accommodation

Most respondents (86%) were happy with the price and quality of their accommodation. Some clearly preferred having a conference hotel, with negotiated special rates. Otherwise, a more comprehensive accommodation guide (including prices, distance from conference venue, etc.), would have been much appreciated.

*It would be much better to have a hotel associated with the conference. This would make it easier to negotiate a better deal for each guest, rather than having to search for reasonably-priced accommodation in a touristy city, with those on a tight budget (like me) settling for a third-rate option.*

*I got lucky and found a good, cheap hotel -- but it wasn't on the official list. I found it very frustrating that the official list didn't explain anything about where the listed hotels were or how long it would take to get from each one to the venue.*

*I ended up finding a place not listed on the conference website. The information provided wasn't very useful. It was categorised by type of accommodation (modern/traditional) but there was no indication of price range or location which made the whole process of considering the options not very efficient.*

Conference Format

Nine out of ten respondents were happy with the relative proportions of philosophy, psychology, and neuroscience at the conference. A few respondents complained of there being either too much or too little philosophy. Regardless, respondents would clearly have appreciated philosophy that was more empirically informed.

*The philosophy was on average not as good as I hoped and relatively little of it.*

*I enjoyed many of the neuroscience talks and I also understand that NS is bound to be the core of these meetings, for various reasons. However, I sometimes missed more theorizing, whether*
philosophical or psychological (or even "big theories" in neuroscience). Psychology, in particular, was very thin.

A huge number of people commented on the lack of beverages or snacks between sessions. Respondents asked for longer breaks between sessions, more time for the posters (perhaps splitting them up according to discipline), and more information on where to buy lunch. Having easier wifi access is a must. Food and drink during poster sessions has been very successful in the past and should perhaps be re-introduced.

This was the first conference in my 25-year experience at which no coffee was served during breaks... outrageous.

Coffee breaks would be good - not only in order to socialize, but to get coffee, water etc at all without having to leave the area where the conference really happens.

No coffee is as shame. It greatly facilitates discussion.

Posters up all day, or even all conference preferably, so that people can browse in dead time. Poster sessions seemed very rushed this time...Coffee and water all the time!!!!...Internal food for lunch/ or at least tea would make things less rushed. Or at least recommendations in program for quick local restaurants/cafes near conference for lunch/dinner. Wifi is extremely useful. Please arrange this at future conferences too (though the wifi setup here was also poorly organised and complex). Longer lunch hours...if you are in a big group and want to chat about research too, 60 minutes is usually quite tight a period. Same with morning/afternoon coffee tea breaks. 30 minutes at least? Or integrate them more with the poster sessions, to make time more efficient.

Coffee is essential; I'd certainly rather pay extra to have it available between sessions. Also, historically, the poster sessions have been *much* more successful in the years where snacks + drinks have been made available in the same room.

Poster session should be divided into more days. It is almost impossible to watch 120 posters during one session.

**Suggestions for topics for keynote talks:** subjective time perception, imagination, social neuroscience (social cognition, joint attention, joint action), signal detection theory, anaesthesia, non-human animal research, developmental psychology, (cognitive) modeling, computational neuroscience, large-scale neural dynamics, anatomy of consciousness, the role of philosophy in consciousness science.

**Suggestions for speakers:** Andreas Engel, Anil Seth, Steven Laureys, Christof Koch, David Chalmers, Stanislas Dehaene, Rafael Malach, Uri Hasson, Roozbeh Kiani (Stanford), Dan Dennett, Giulio Tononi, Kovisto, Naccache, Gerald Edelman, Antonio Damasio, Eric Schwitzgebel, Michael Gazzaniga, Rodolfo Llinas, Christian Keysers (Groningen), Hendrik Ehrsson (Karolinska Institute).
ASSC 16 Brighton

Nearly three quarters of respondents agreed with the idea of extending the conference to four days to accommodate more talks, longer breaks, and more time for posters. Only 3% of respondents were strongly opposed.

Fewer than one in ten respondents would only attend the conference if they gave a talk, although one in two said that an invitation to give a talk would be an important consideration. One in two supported making as many talks as possible available online; roughly one in three preferred limiting the online access to keynote talks and plenary symposia. Overall, the ASSC 16 organising group’s suggestions, as presented in the survey, were well supported.

Questionnaire

Feedback was, as in past years, mixed. Some respondents requested a shorter survey. Some requested more space for comments. The survey length has varied from year to year without significant impact on the number of respondents completing it. The greatest problem was the low number of people even visiting the survey website. Perhaps, in future years, the survey can be promoted at the close of the conference.
In deciding whether to attend ASSC having submitted an abstract, how important is the decision about mode of presentation (poster or talk)?

- Critical: I can only attend if given a talk - 36 (31%)
- Important: I am more likely to attend if given a talk - 57 (49%)
- Unimportant: I am equally likely to attend if given a talk - 16 (14%)
- I actually prefer to give a poster - 8 (7%)

ASSC16 may consider making available selected (e.g., keynotes and symposia) available online. Do you:

- Support this idea for as many talks as possible - 68 (58%)
- Support this idea but only for keynotes and/or symposia - 34 (29%)
- Do not support this idea, e.g., because it might discourage attendance - 12 (10%)
- Any comments: - 8 (7%)
# ASSC15 Kyoto Conference Survey

**Results Overview**

**Date:** 10/12/2011 10:47 AM PST  
**Responses:** Completes  
**Filter:** No filter applied

## 1. What is your membership status with the ASSC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full voting member.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular member (non-voting).</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student member.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Involvement</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial presenter.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote speaker.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary speaker in a symposium.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker in concurrent session.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter of a poster.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested observer.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Please choose the best response that describes you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a computer scientist.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a neuroscientist.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a clinician.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a philosopher.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a psychologist.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an interested member of the public.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Please Specify</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. In which region do you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia or New Zealand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 117 100%

### 5. How was your conference participation funded?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant or scholarship.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty travel budget.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC travel bursary.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-funded.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 117 100%

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSC14: Toronto (2010)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC12: Taipei (2008)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC11: Las Vegas (2007)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC10: Oxford (2006)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC9: Caltech (2005)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC8: Antwerp (2004)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC7: Memphis (2003)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC6: Barcelona (2002)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC5: Durham, North Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 8. Would you be interested in participating next year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Were you satisfied with your assignment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 10. How would you rate the mentor lunch on Friday?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 20 100%
12. Which (if any) of the tours did you go on?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tour of robotics laboratory in ATR Computational Neuroscience Laboratories.</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tour of Primate Research Institute.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not attend any of the tours.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on tours:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Which satellite conference(s) did you attend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satellite conference</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social neuroscience.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurophysiology.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not attend any of the satellite events.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on satellite events:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutorial session</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1: Integrated information, causal density and conscious level / Adam Barrett and Anil Seth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2: Disorders of Consciousness: Coma, Vegetative State and Minimally Conscious State / Tristan Bekinschtein, Melanie Boly and Olivia Gosseries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3: Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation and Conscious Awareness / Tony Ro and Hakwan Lau</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4: Self-Knowledge: Philosophy meets Cognitive Science / Peter Carruthers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not attend any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I did not attend any of the morning tutorials. | 33 | 28%
---|---|---
I did not attend any of the morning or afternoon tutorials. | 49 | 42%
---|---|---
**Total** | 117 | 100%

### Question 15. How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 17. Which of the afternoon tutorials on Thursday did you attend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutorial</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5: Towards the neuroscientific definition and empirical investigation of qualia / Naotsugu Tsuchiya and Ryota Kania</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6: Comparison of the Major Scientifically Oriented Theories of Consciousness / Ned Block</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not attend any of the afternoon tutorials.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 18. How would you rate the quality of the tutorial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 20. Why not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel schedule</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested in any of the tutorial topics.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 21. How would you rate the overall quality and relevance of the keynote talks you attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keynote</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Welcome: Tetsuro Matsuzawa</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William James Prize Winner: Ian Phillips</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Address: Ralph Adolphs – Consciousness and emotion</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote 1: Edmund T Rolls – Pleasure, emotion, decision-making, oscillations, higher order syntactic thoughts, and consciousness</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote 2: Takamitsu Yamamoto – Cerebrospinal stimulation therapy for the treatment of vegetative state and minimally conscious state</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote 3: Fiona Macherson – Cognitive penetration of colour experience</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Keynote 5: David Eagleman – Kaleidoscopic varieties of conscious experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 23. How would you rate the plenary symposia you attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symposium 1: Metacognition and consciousness – Stephen Fleming, Robert Hampton, Peter Carruthers.</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symposium 2: Consciousness: Powerful or useless? – Roy Baumeister, Hakwan Lau, Al Mele, Simon van Gaal.</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 25. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the concurrent talks you attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. Is the length of the concurrent talks (20 minutes)...

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Much too short</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Slightly too short</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Okay</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Just perfect</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Too long</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. This year, there were four concurrent sessions going on at the same time instead of three. Do you think this worked?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Did you attend either of the poster sessions?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the posters you saw?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Very poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Fair</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Good</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Excellent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Very poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 33. How would you rate the student social?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excellent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did not attend</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 35. Did you attend the conference banquet on Saturday night?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Poor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fair</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excellent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 37. The cost of this year's banquet was JPY5000 ($60/€45/£40). How would you rate the value of the banquet, all things considered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very poor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Poor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fair</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excellent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did not attend</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. Did you attend the "poor man's banquet" instead?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Responses

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Did not attend |  |    |    |    |    | 76%
| Total       | 0  | 2  | 9  | 14 | 2  | 87|
| Total       | 0  | 2  | 9  | 14 | 2  | 87|

114 Responses

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Responses

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Responses
45. The organizers of ASSC16 (Brighton, UK) are considering extending the main conference so that it runs for 4 days instead of 3, allowing a greater number of talks with sufficient time also for tea/coffee and lunch breaks, and more dedicated time for posters. Registration fees would not be substantially affected. Tutorial and any pre/post symposium days would be in addition. Do you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly support this idea</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>72%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree with this idea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any comments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. In deciding whether to attend ASSC having submitted an abstract, how important is the decision about mode of presentation (poster or talk)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical; I can only attend if given a talk</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important; I am more likely to attend if given a talk</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant; I am equally likely to attend if given a talk or poster</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actually prefer to give a poster</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. ASSC16 may consider making available selected (e.g., keynotes and symposia) available online. Do you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support this idea for as many talks as possible</th>
<th>68</th>
<th>58%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support this idea but only for keynotes and/or symposia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support this idea, e.g. because it might discourage attendance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any comments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSC15 Kyoto Conference Survey (1)

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

In which region do you live?

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

How was your conference participation funded?

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

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

- ASSC14: Toronto (2010)
- 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
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:

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Which (if any) of the tours did you go on?

- Tour of robotics laboratory in ATR Computational Neuroscience Laboratories.
- Tour of Primate Research Institute.
- I did not attend any of the tours.
- Comments on tours:

Which satellite conference(s) did you attend?

- Social neuroscience.
- Metacognition.
- Neurophysiology.
- I did not attend any of the satellite events.
- Comments on satellite events:

**Page 4 - Question 14 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)**

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

- T1: Integrated information, causal density and conscious level / Adam Barrett and Anil Seth [Skip to 5]
- T2: Disorders of Consciousness: Coma, Vegetative State and Minimally Conscious State / Tristan Bekinschtein, Melanie Boly and Olivia Gossers [Skip to 5]
- T3: Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation and Conscious Awareness / Tony Ro and Hakwan Lau [Skip to 5]
- T4: Self-Knowledge: Philosophy meets Cognitive Science / Peter Carruthers [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]

**Page 5 - Question 15 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)**

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>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 5 - Question 16 - Open Ended - Comments Box**

Do you have any specific comments on the session?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

**Page 6 - Question 17 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)**

Which of the afternoon tutorials on Thursday did you attend?

- T5: Towards the neuroscientific definition and empirical investigation of qualia / Naotsugu Tsuchiya and Ryota Kania [Skip to 7]
- T6: Comparison of the Major Scientifically Oriented Theories of Consciousness / Ned Block [Skip to 7]
- I did not attend any of the afternoon tutorials. [Skip to 8]

**Page 7 - Question 18 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)**

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>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 7 - Question 19 - Open Ended - Comments Box**

Do you have any specific comments on the session?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

[Skip Unconditionally to 9]
### Why not?

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

### Page 9 - Question 21 - Rating Scale - Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Welcome: Tetsuro Matsuzawa</td>
<td>❑ 1</td>
<td>❑ 2</td>
<td>❑ 3</td>
<td>❑ 4</td>
<td>❑ 5</td>
<td>❑ Did not attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William James Prize Winner: Ian Phillips</td>
<td>❑ 1</td>
<td>❑ 2</td>
<td>❑ 3</td>
<td>❑ 4</td>
<td>❑ 5</td>
<td>❑ Did not attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Address: Ralph Adolphs – Consciousness and emotion</td>
<td>❑ 1</td>
<td>❑ 2</td>
<td>❑ 3</td>
<td>❑ 4</td>
<td>❑ 5</td>
<td>❑ Did not attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote 1: Edmund T Rolls – Pleasure, emotion, decision-making, oscillations, higher order syntactic thoughts, and consciousness</td>
<td>❑ 1</td>
<td>❑ 2</td>
<td>❑ 3</td>
<td>❑ 4</td>
<td>❑ 5</td>
<td>❑ Did not attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote 2: Takamitsu Yamamoto – Cerebrospinal stimulation therapy for the treatment of vegetative state and minimally conscious state</td>
<td>❑ 1</td>
<td>❑ 2</td>
<td>❑ 3</td>
<td>❑ 4</td>
<td>❑ 5</td>
<td>❑ Did not attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote 3: Fiona Macherson – Cognitive penetration of colour experience</td>
<td>❑ 1</td>
<td>❑ 2</td>
<td>❑ 3</td>
<td>❑ 4</td>
<td>❑ 5</td>
<td>❑ Did not attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Souldust: the magic of consciousness</td>
<td>❑ 1</td>
<td>❑ 2</td>
<td>❑ 3</td>
<td>❑ 4</td>
<td>❑ 5</td>
<td>❑ Did not attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote 5: David Eagleman – Kaleidoscopic varieties of conscious experience</td>
<td>❑ 1</td>
<td>❑ 2</td>
<td>❑ 3</td>
<td>❑ 4</td>
<td>❑ 5</td>
<td>❑ Did not attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Page 9 - Question 22 - Open Ended - Comments Box

Do you have any general comments about the keynote talks you attended, or any suggestions for future keynote speakers?
How would you rate the plenary symposia you attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symposia 1: Metacognition and consciousness – Stephen Fleming, Robert Hampton, Peter Carruthers.</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ Did not attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symposia 2: Consciousness: Powerful or useless? – Roy Baumeister, Hakwan Lau, Al Mele, Simon van Gaal.</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ Did not attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symposia 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysu Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ Did not attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

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

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Page 11 - Question 26 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

[Optional]

Is the length of the concurrent talks (20 minutes)...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much too short</th>
<th>Slightly too short</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Just perfect</th>
<th>Too long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 11 - Question 27 - Yes or No

This year, there were four concurrent sessions going on at the same time instead of three. Do you think this worked?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Additional Comment

Page 11 - Question 28 - Open Ended - Comments Box

Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the quality and presentation of the concurrent talks?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Page 11 - Question 25 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

[Optional]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 10 - Question 24 - Open Ended - Comments Box

[Optional]

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

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Page 10 - Question 23 - Rating Scale - Matrix

[Optional]

How would you rate the plenary symposia you attended?
Page 12 - Question 29 - Yes or No
Did you attend either of the poster sessions?

- Yes [Skip to 13]
- No [Skip to 14]

Page 13 - Question 30 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)
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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 14 - Question 31 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)
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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 14 - Question 32 - Open Ended - Comments Box
Do you have any comments about this year's reception or suggestions for next year?

Page 14 - Question 33 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)
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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 14 - Question 34 - Open Ended - Comments Box
Do you have any comments or suggestions about the social?

Page 15 - Question 35 - Yes or No
Did you attend the conference banquet on Saturday night?

- Yes [Skip to 16]
- No [Skip to 17]

Page 16 - Question 36 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)
How did you find the quality of the food and wine at this year's banquet?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The cost of this year's banquet was JPY5000 ($60/€45/£40). How would you rate the value of the banquet, all things considered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

[Skip Unconditionally to 18]

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

- Yes
- No
- Comments:

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

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?
Page 19 - Question 44 - Open Ended - Comments Box

Do you have any other thoughts or suggestions about the conference? (For example the lack of tea/coffee/water between sessions.)

Page 19 - Question 45 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets) [Mandatory]

The organizers of ASSC16 (Brighton, UK) are considering extending the main conference so that it runs for 4 days instead of 3, allowing a greater number of talks with sufficient time also for tea/coffee and lunch breaks, and more dedicated time for posters. Registration fees would not be substantially affected. Tutorial and any pre/post symposium days would be in addition. Do you:

- Strongly support this idea
- Strongly disagree with this idea
- No opinion
- Any comments

Page 19 - Question 46 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets) [Mandatory]

In deciding whether to attend ASSC having submitted an abstract, how important is the decision about mode of presentation (poster or talk)?

- Critical; I can only attend if given a talk
- Important; I am more likely to attend if given a talk
- Unimportant; I am equally likely attend if given a talk or poster
- I actually prefer to give a poster

Page 19 - Question 47 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets) [Mandatory]

ASSC16 may consider making available selected (e.g., keynotes and symposia) available online. Do you:

- Support this idea for as many talks as possible
- Support this idea but only for keynotes and/or symposia
- Do not support this idea, e.g. because it might discourage attendance
- Any comments:

Page 19 - Question 48 - Open Ended - Comments Box

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

Thank you for participating in the ASSC15 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).

Screen Out Page

For more information about ASSC, please click the link below. <http://assc.caltech.edu/>

Over Quota Page

Standard

Survey Closed Page

The survey for ASSC15 is no longer open. Please contact conference committee chair Joel Parthemore (Joel.E.Parthemore@sussex.ac.uk) with any questions or comments. Thank you.

<http://www.theassc.org/conferences/assc_15>
3. Please choose the best response that describes you.

#  Response
1  Philosopher and physicist
2  Cognitive neuroscientist (equal measures psychologist/neuroscientist)
3  Cognitive Neuroscientist
4  Physicist

5. How was your conference participation funded?

#  Response
1  1/3 by my institution, 2/3 by me
2  Combination of conference and grant
3  ASSC travel grant PLUS faculty PLUS private
4  Project budget

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?

#  Response
1  I participated as a student. It was a good idea, but it got a mentor that didn't have anything to do with my research interests. So, it was not so interesting.
2  I had lunch with Thomas Metzinger who was very friendly and helpful. We had a very interesting conversation over a few hours.
3  The time is too limited.
4  Great program. Many thanks to the organizers
5  As a student, i really enjoyed the lunch, it was really interesting and inspiring.
6  More time spent with mentors would've been better.
7  I served as a mentor and found the process well organized and enjoyable. I hope the students found it useful.
8  Very useful and informative. I would have been nice to have more time to spend with mentors, perhaps also as a group.

9. Were you satisfied with your assignment?

#  Response
1  Even though I wasn't assigned my first or second choices, I was very happy with my assignment of Thomas Metzinger. I understood that each mentor can only be assigned a couple of students so wasn't (too) disappointed that I'd missed out on my first preferences.
2  I was assigned to one of my top5
3  I made my selection based on relevance to my own work - no-one was in the same field, but I felt our backgrounds were similar. It would have been good to have more experimental psychologists & neuroscientists; there were a lot of philosophers, which I felt didn't really represent the conference topics proportionally.
11. Do you have any comments on the lunch (for example, anything that could be done better or differently)?

# Response
1 My table was fine, but I noticed that some of the students at Ned Block's table were too far away from him to be able to have any sort of discussion. I would encourage the mentors to look out for this and perhaps rotate positions at the table once or twice so that each assigned student can benefit from the mentor's company.
2 Maybe more mentor lunches since it is really helpful!
3 More time, less of a rush. Perhaps move it to an end-of-day social with the option of going to dinner together?
4 I thought it was good. I would not change anything
5 A longer session and a bigger room. It felt very rushed. Food was excellent. Overall well organised.
6 i didn't participate in a mentor lunch

12. Which (if any) of the tours did you go on?

# Response
1 Missed my tour.
2 Fantastic
3 The primate tour was an amazing once in a life-time experience that I will always remember
4 Would have liked to attend primate tour, but it was full.
5 announced as one day tour and finally only 2.5h and rushed through all the seances
6 I was too late to go on the tours, but I would have loved to

13. Which satellite conference(s) did you attend?

# Response
1 Place where Metacognition satellite was held was inconvenient.
2 Very good, sometimes even better than the main conference, but somewhat redundant
3 Excellent
4 The metacognition symposium was excellent. Many congratulations to the organisers.
5 Badly organised - venue too hot, no water or coffee available for much of the time, talks overlapped too much with seminar session in main conference
6 All satellites were nice, but it was a bit difficult for me to find out the place for Metacognition Satellite...
7 Excellent programs
8 good line up
9 Both were very good.
10 all of the satellites were of excellent quality
11 Satellite conferences were excellent. I'd like to see more like these in the future. Very good way of dealing with the diversity of specializations w/in ASSC.
12 Excellent
13 A lot of repetition in the main ASSC schedule.
16. Do you have any specific comments on the session?

# Response
1 A bit above my head, in the end, but the presenters did did a very good job of presenting the basic concepts, which was very useful.
2 They ran out of time so we could not discuss.
3 Helpful to hear a senior academic at more length than is usually possible.
4 Tony Ro’s section was good, but much of Hakwan Lau’s was a rehash of his talk the previous day (in satellite symposium) and only had minimal relevance to TMS. Could have made the whole tutorial far more comprehensive and relevant. In future, have more quality control? Detailed tutorial plan peer reviewed for approval?
5 I really enjoyed the tutorial!
6 More practical technical details would’ve been helpful for a paid tutorial.
7 Useful information, well presented, with good responsiveness to audience questions & requests. My only quibble is that the session seemed primarily aimed at would-be users of TMS (i.e. lots of technical/practical detail), while the description had made it seem that there would be more theoretical discussion.
8 Mostly conceptual, linkage to experimental neuroscience were a bit out-dated.
9 not in particular
10 The quality of the content was high but it was less like a tutorial but more like a very long talk because there was almost no time for interaction and discussion. I thought this was what the whole tutorial was about. The only thing that differentiated it from the other talks was that only a hand full of people were participating.
11 It was perhaps too biased towards the presenter’s own theory/work rather than providing an instructive overview of the field
12 Presented in a nice style. The philosophy seemed promising but it fell short slightly in the psychology.
13 There was very little discussion in the tutorial I attended. The speaker seemed to want to get through some material, and was not interested at all in letting the discussion flow. I also attended an afternoon tutorial (with Ned Block on consciousness) which was excellent and completely different in this regard.

19. Do you have any specific comments on the session?

# Response
1 Not a "tutorial" in the normal sense of the word - more an extended argument - but interesting nevertheless.
2 Very interesting ideas, quite interactive with the audience.
3 Very exciting.
4 I had very high hopes for this tutorial. The subject matter was very relevant and, I thought, well-chosen: an overview of theories of consciousness by a leading philosopher. However, the tutorial derailed almost immediately, mostly due to constant (and often not relevant) questions and remarks from the audience. Very frustrating.
5 This should never have been allowed as a tutorial - it was instead an immensely speculative outline of an interesting, but completely novel and somewhat wild theory. A tutorial should surely be instead about teaching us about EXISTING methods, data or theory. Quality of presentation was rather disorganised as well.
It was an excellent tutorial. Good atmosphere, and the contents of the tutorial was exciting. Specifically, the relationship between Integrated Information Theory and Qualia was a bit difficult to understand... But I enjoyed the whole contents.

A number of presenters had problems with the projectors. There should be some experts around to help. I am being forced to rate the quality of the tutorial. Very embarrassing.

It should be a tutorial but it was disturbed by too many professional questions.

While it was a privilege to hear a luminary's survey of the field, it came across as a bit haphazard.

Discussion was very good.

Overall structure could have been stronger; the individual parts of the session were content-rich and interesting, but they weren't strongly integrated.

The presenter spoke very widely about consciousness, so it was very difficult to understand everything.

Rushed through definitions and justifications for their theories. Practical work was unnecessary for understanding.

This tutorial was excellent. Block managed to convey very interesting ideas but in a manner that encouraged discussion.

20. Why not?

# Response
1 Got lost in other matters, own tutorial was cancelled.
2 PRI Tour
3 Was on the ATR tour
4 was sick and jet-lagged!
5 I presented
6 work to finish
7 no need
8 was attending the full-day primate tour
9 tutorial 8 was cancelled, no appropriate alternative was offered
10 participation tour
11 to see kyoto
12 date of arrival
13 Went for tour
14 Primate Research Institute tour conflicted with the tutorial schedule.
15 Deadline for work.

21. How would you rate the overall quality and relevance of the keynote talks you attended?

# Response
1 Opening Welcome: Tetsuro Matsuzawa
Not necessary - it was the same text I had read.
William James Prize Winner: Ian Phillips
Very clear.

2 William James Prize Winner: Ian Phillips
Excellent!
Keynote 2: Takamitsu Yamamoto – Cerebrospinal stimulation therapy for the treatment of vegetative state and minimally conscious state
Too focused on his own research; no references to other groups.

Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness
Excellent!

3

Presidental Address: Ralph Adolphs – Consciousness and emotion
Would have been even more interesting if I hadn't heard a very (very, very) similar talk two days prior at the Social Neuroscience satellite.

Keynote 1: Edmund T Rolls – Pleasure, emotion, decision-making, oscillations, higher order syntactic thoughts, and consciousness
I think the title says it all - all over the shop, undisciplined, not helpful.

4

William James Prize Winner: Ian Phillips
Interesting to have a philosopher as the James Prize - his talk was well put together.

Presidental Address: Ralph Adolphs – Consciousness and emotion
A bit prosaic

5

William James Prize Winner: Ian Phillips
Very clear and well presented, but emphasis should have been more on empirical issues at end, given largely scientific audience. Also, was this argument really new, to warrant a William James Prize, e.g. see Ruff, Kristjansson and Driver 2007 Psych Science for highly relevant data to this debate.

Presidental Address: Ralph Adolphs – Consciousness and emotion
Made little attempt to make talk relevant to consciousness, which it barely was. In future, give stronger explicit instructions to keynotes to make sure they tie in their talk to consciousness - even if that is somewhat speculative. Otherwise it seems like a bit of desperation to get these speakers to talk, when the relevance to consciousness is tenuous.

Keynote 2: Takamitsu Yamamoto – Cerebrospinal stimulation therapy for the treatment of vegetative state and minimally conscious state
Speaker didn't make clear (perhaps because this wasn't very well done) the vital details of how his results were controlled for (e.g. the selectivity issues of the non-intervention group in relation to their recovery rates).

Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness
Quite quite awful. Embarrassing that a former serious scientist should present a talk with no empirical support whatsoever to his theory, relying instead on poetic and theological quotes as evidence. Talk was wonderfully eloquent, and well polished, but without anything substantive to back up his claims for a scientific audience, it was frustratingly vacuous (also, it was just a public-oriented book talk, essentially). Given the title of this organisation, shouldn't we be championing the SCIENTIFIC study of consciousness, and moving away from these woolly approaches?

Keynote 5: David Eagleman – Kaleidoscopic varieties of conscious experience
Best keynote of the session by some distance. Very clearly presented, lots of exciting data, clever studies, made solid effort to tie his work in with consciousness, and dealt with the questions extremely well too.
6 **Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness**
I think many of us come to ASSC instead of TUCSON precisely just to avoid talks like this. Nothing wrong about it, but this kind of totally speculative talks, citing poets more than academics, are more suited for a TV program than a scientifically rigorous conference like ASSC. ASSC will hurt its own credibility to be taken seriously if more speakers of this kind are invited.

7 **William James Prize Winner: Ian Phillips**
pedestrian

**Keynote 1: Edmund T Rolls – Pleasure, emotion, decision-making, oscillations, higher order syntactic thoughts, and consciousness**
dull and disconnected from the cutting-edge work on consciousness

**Keynote 3: Fiona Macherson – Cognitive penetration of colour experience**
narrow-minded and uninformed by science

**Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness**
just so stories; no scientific, philosophical, or mathematical content

8 **Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness**
great!

9 **Opening Welcome: Tetsuro Matsuzawa**
The talk was interesting, but it's relevance was questionable.

**Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness**
Although the talk didn't offer much by way of science (and I'm not qualified to comment on the philosophy), I found it entertaining an inspiring, which is a worthy achievement in itself.

10 **Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness**
A beautiful and well-crafted presentation - we need more like this! While not necessarily bogged down in quantitative detail, talks like Humphrey's remind us of the joy and wonder of the topic, and why we got into this field in the first place.

11 **Keynote 1: Edmund T Rolls – Pleasure, emotion, decision-making, oscillations, higher order syntactic thoughts, and consciousness**
The talk was far too solipsistic; the core ideas were plausible, but not enough effort was made to explain what was novel about them, or how they differed from similar ideas/theories that would be well-known to this audience.

**Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness**
Interesting ideas, very well presented. My only gripe is that the talk seemed pitched below the level of this specialist audience; basic concepts (e.g. Cartesian Theater) could have been covered much more quickly, to leave more room for advanced considerations (e.g. empirical implications of the theory).

12 **Keynote 5: David Eagleman – Kaleidoscopic varieties of conscious experience**
Great Talk, great personality, broad reasearch interest of relevance for socitey. Best presentation at the conference.

13 **Keynote 2: Takamitsu Yamamoto – Cerebrospinal stimulation therapy for the treatment of vegetative state and minimally conscious state**
He did not understand the questions. His English was awful. And the topic was not very suited for this conference.
Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness
Beautiful talk but not of high interest for science

14 William James Prize Winner: Ian Phillips
Nice talk, not sure about the interpretation of the results.

Keynote 1: Edmund T Rolls – Pleasure, emotion, decision-making, oscillations, higher order syntactic thoughts, and consciousness
Very poor presentation style. Rushed through data with very little interpretation or discussion or relevance. Very difficult to connect with.

Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness
Fantastic presentation - apparent that a lot of thought and effort had been put in (even if not just for this audience). Compelling message, well directed.

Keynote 5: David Eagleman – Kaleidoscopic varieties of conscious experience
Strong presentation style, but little new work was presented.

15 Opening Welcome: Tetsuro Matsuzawa
This session simply repeated the document in the program.

William James Prize Winner: Ian Phillips
I enjoyed this one immensely. A very good paper from an excellent young philosopher.

Presidential Address: Ralph Adolphs – Consciousness and emotion
This was an excellent presentation which combined neuroscientific expertise with philosophical insight.

Keynote 3: Fiona Macherson – Cognitive penetration of colour experience
A good paper, very clearly presented.

Keynote 4: Nicolas Humphrey – Soul dust: the magic of consciousness
A nice performance, though I had quite a lot of criticisms of the basic picture.

22. Do you have any general comments about the keynote talks you attended, or any suggestions for future keynote speakers?

# Response
1 Don’t put keynotes as first events in the morning.
2 Fewer philosophers please! More on animal consciousness perhaps?
3 Please try to keep keynotes relevant to consciousness as much as possible, emphasising empirical work as much as possible too. I personally would prefer to see less philosophy or speculative keynotes and more scientific keynotes. Many philosophy talks have a poor understanding of current scientific work or methods, and base long, complex talks on these misunderstandings. If there aren’t enough consciousness speakers, please instead look to closely related cog science fields, such as attention and working memory.
4 I think that if we had a more question time, it would be much better.
5 Frederique de Vignemont, Susanna Siegel, Martin Davies, Daniel Stoljar
6 Schedule them at different times, maybe after lunch
7 General comment on the keynote talks: There are too many of them. One or two (say, one philosopher and one scientist) would suffice, and the time the other ones take up would be better spent on an additional concurrent talk session.
8 Very good slate of talks.
9 I thought the quality of keynote speakers was very high.
10 I think speakers offering general theories of consciousness should be strongly encouraged to relate their proposals to existing theories/problems in the field. For a specialist audience that's well aware of competing alternatives, it's unsatisfying to hear a new theory presented as if it were the first to address these issues.

11 I liked the mix of topics and speakers

12 nothing in particular

13 I thought the Humphrey keynote had the right balance of ambition and insight. Some of the keynotes seemed to me too much like presenting some work without drawing out the larger lessons.

23. How would you rate the plenary symposia you attended?

# Response

1 Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.
Chaotic

Bizarre comment by Ishiguro during discussion: "We should not care about ethics at all!" Memorable, but also scandalous.

3 Symposium 1: Metacognition and consciousness – Stephen Fleming, Robert Hampton, Peter Carruthers.
Relevant topic for theoreticians and empirical researchers, balanced representation of various views.

4 Symposium 1: Metacognition and consciousness – Stephen Fleming, Robert Hampton, Peter Carruthers.
Somewhat redundant with the satellite

Talk by Ishiguro was awefull. what's the link to consciousness?

6 Symposium 1: Metacognition and consciousness – Stephen Fleming, Robert Hampton, Peter Carruthers.
Excellent subject, excellent speakers
Excellent subject, variable speakers. Unfortunately Al Mele did not do the philosophical contingent any favours, a very poor talk.

7 Symposium 1: Metacognition and consciousness – Stephen Fleming, Robert Hampton, Peter Carruthers.
Good, but far too similar to the satellite
Good question to discuss, but quite mixed session. Baumister and van Gaal gave good talks, though I personally would have liked for them to have more time - especially Baumister. Lau's talk was interesting, but not so relevant and very
speculative, with very provisional data, which probably wasn't ready for a talk. Mele's talk was very poor, both in presentation and content.

**Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.**
Interesting session, but again little attempts to relate talks to consciousness. I realise that the robotics field isn't mature enough to talk about consciousness, but if it's in this conference, they should at least make an effort. Metzinger's talk was weak - making an arguably important point about need to start thinking about the ethics of artificial consciousness, but making it far too strongly, with the argument effectively that all robotics research should stop in case we create robot suffering! There could have been a place for this philosophy talk if it was more measured.

8 **Symposium 2: Consciousness: Powerful or useless? – Roy Baumeister, Hakwan Lau, Al Mele, Simon van Gaal.**
Baumeister's talk was among the worst I ever attended by a prominent psychologist; Mele's talk was devoid of content.

9 **Symposium 1: Metacognition and consciousness – Stephen Fleming, Robert Hampton, Peter Carruthers.**
The symposium itself was fine, but it largely replicated the satellite event on the same topic (despite the organizers saying that it wouldn't). I realize the satellites are independently organized, but in a conference that has such time limitations, where a lot of what one wants to see is missed because of concurrent scheduling, this has to be taken into account.

**Symposium 2: Consciousness: Powerful or useless? – Roy Baumeister, Hakwan Lau, Al Mele, Simon van Gaal.**
The symposium was mostly excellent. I'm afraid Al Mele's approach, of not preparing an actual presentation, didn't work for me. This isn't to say that all talks have to be accompanied by a Powerpoint presentation; but if a talk isn't, nowadays there has to be some very good reason, and the talk has to carry itself well without it. In this particular case, I'm sorry to say I didn't get the impression either of these caveats was met. This would be less of a problem in a concurrent session, but in the future, for a symposium attended by the whole conference, it might be better to ensure all presenters intend to meet this basic requirement.

10 **Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.**
The message of the speakers toward using robots for the study of consciousness was weak. It is difficult to understand if they are creating robots or trying to understand consciousness using robots. There are many questions around artificial consciousness that could have been explored. The panel was also too short to be of any use.

11 **Symposium 1: Metacognition and consciousness – Stephen Fleming, Robert Hampton, Peter Carruthers.**
I enjoyed the Stephen and Robert's talk but got less from Peter's

**Symposium 2: Consciousness: Powerful or useless? – Roy Baumeister, Hakwan Lau, Al Mele, Simon van Gaal.**
I found Al's talk very poor but the others were quite good.

**Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.**

this symposium was outstanding probably my favorite part of the conference

**Symposium 2: Consciousness: Powerful or useless? – Roy Baumeister, Hakwan Lau, Al Mele, Simon van Gaal.**

Good overall, except the Mele talk, which seemed oddly short on content.

**Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.**

The idea had potential, but the robotics speakers didn't seem to have thought much about how to make their work relevant to this audience.

**Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.**

The speakers' timing was poor - the last talk had to be shortened due to the fact that the other talks were too long! Not very professional...

**Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.**

Interesting Data, Nice discussion, controversial viewpoints, constructive discussion, thought-provoking

**Symposium 2: Consciousness: Powerful or useless? – Roy Baumeister, Hakwan Lau, Al Mele, Simon van Gaal.**

Al Mele presented comments on the Libet study published by others in the 1980s. That's not up to date and useless.

**Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.**

Interesting but barely related to consciousness

**Symposium 2: Consciousness: Powerful or useless? – Roy Baumeister, Hakwan Lau, Al Mele, Simon van Gaal.**

Most speakers didn’t seem to be distinguishing between the causal efficacy of consciousness itself and that of the physical states which are accompanied by conscious experience. Without that distinction, you cannot say anything about whether consciousness is an epiphenomenon or not.

**Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.**

The session was, at times, theoretically naive yet nevertheless informing and charming.

**Symposium 3: Robotics and consciousness – Shinsuke Shimojo, Ysuo Kuniyoshi, Hiroshi Ishiguro, Thomas Metzinger.**

Very interesting and a welcome break from the 'data heavy' schedule.
24. Do you have any general comments about the symposia you attended, or suggestions for future symposia topics?

# Response
1 Again and again: Must be ABSOLUTELY FOCUSED on consciousness.
2 Again, please try to keep things relevant to consciousness! And please try to prioritise talks that centre on solid empirical work, rather than make wild unsupported claims or theories!!
3 Organizers should try new formats with fewer speakers and more commentators
4 This year many of the symposia talks seemed more like what I would expect from a concurrent session -- i.e. making a small move in a debate in some sub-discipline of specialized interest, with not much synergy between the individual talks within a session. The symposium topics sounded good, but somehow the talks didn't live up to them. Maybe symposium chairs need to be encouraged to give clearer/firmer guidance to their speakers?
5 Panel discussion was a very nice format for the final questions. Would like to see this at all symposia.

27. This year, there were four concurrent sessions going on at the same time instead of three. Do you think this worked?

# Response
1 The interesting sessions were often overlapped. I think three concurrent sessions are better.
2 I had to skip a lot of potentially interesting talks. Even though I indicated that the 20 mins for a talk is good, I would rather have 15 min talks and only 3 concurrent sessions. Another option is cutting some talks which is probably also better than 4 concurrent sessions.
3 But think 4 concurrent sessions works well too.
4 Just gives you more choice.
5 3X4 would have been better than 4x3. Four sessions in parallel increases the probability of missing a good talk.
6 Too much to chose from...
7 Its OK but ideally I’d prefer only 3.
8 Concurrent talks work okay in other conferences, where the field is much broader (e.g. Society for Neuroscience, where it is essential!), but with a conference on essentially a single research topic, many people want to visit multiple sessions simultaneously. I’d far prefer the conference to be longer (either longer days or 1 more day for the conference) and less sessions in parallel, so that I don’t miss good talks.
9 4 is too much, 3 is good.
10 The pros and cons are obvious
11 it works, but I prefer having 3 concurrent sessions rather than 4.
12 although i wished i could have gone to more on the same time ;-)
13 There were too many good options to choose from. This is NOT to say there should be fewer talks, but that there should be more time slots for concurrent sessions, with fewer talk streams in each. This could easily be accomplished by cutting down the number of keynotes, symposia, sessions devoted to the hosting country, etc. Personally, I came to the conference mainly to hear what new work other researchers are up to;
this is mainly covered in the concurrent sessions, which are the most important aspect of the conference.

14 Too many options to choose from. Is it out of the question to extend the conference rather than to pack more content into a shorter time?
15 It did mean that I spent a lot of time moving between sessions but it also meant that there was always a talk that I wanted to see... In the past there were often talks in a session that I had no interest in. Overall I thought it was a good compromise to allow more speakers
16 Despite the inevitable conflicts, for the most part the 4-choice schedule was very satisfying. I also liked that the sessions were less segregated by discipline (compared to recent years), sorting more by topic than by methodology. Less monotonous that way.
17 I missed several interesting ones. People were running in and out. Coordination of time even more difficult when four
18 Seems like a reasonable compromise given the numbers and the alternatives.
19 Three will be better.
20 I think the whole thing begins to look like a monster industry. Too many people, too little time. 15 minutes for oral presentation is a VERY brief period. It almost gives the impression that it doesn't really matter. The minimal period for a presentation should be 20 minutes, excluding question period.
21 3 would be better but then they should be longer. If 3 means they will be shorten than 4 or better than not being able to attend them at all.
22 Too many - I think 3 is about right
23 Frustrated by having to run between talks, missing the end of one and the beginning of the next. Would have preferred fewer talks of higher quality.
24 I liked the choice and often sprinted from one session to another.
25 Too much overlap. Had to miss many talks i was interested in.
26 rather spread it out over more days, so i can visit more talks
27 For a relatively small crowd four concurrent sessions is not a good idea. An additional day would be better.

28. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the quality and presentation of the concurrent talks?

# Response
1   More time for parallel talks, less symposia.
2   Perhaps reducing the number of talks slightly.
3   I think it would be good to assign speakers to sessions with consideration of their field more than their topic. I had no other philosophers in my audience and therefore no substantial questions. It seems everyone in the audience was interested in brain imaging so despite the idea behind the session, the extent to which we all found each other's talks to be helpful was a little disappointing. While interdisciplinarity is great and should be encouraged, to go from psychology to philosophy to neuroimaging is asking too much of a student audience.
4   Give the speakers 30 mins for presentation and q&a. It feels like a speed race otherwise, the discussion is a farce, and many people struggle to bring even the most basic point across.
5   See above - more concurrent talk sessions, with fewer concurrent talk streams in each.
6   Post-conference peer discussion (make greater use of online forum...
7    Far too much time is lost to speakers struggling to set up their computers with the
projector. Given the tight schedule for the concurrent talks, I think we should do what
many other conferences do: have the chairs collect all the presentations for a session on
one computer.
8    Japanese organizing personal is very polite.. but speakers did sometimes exceed timing
extremely (up to 23min! not including discussion). this should be handled more
rigorously in the future..
9    more coherent speakers/topics within sessions (in some it worked very well though!)
10   nothing
11   Regarding the ordering of poster boards: Morning and afternoon posters should
alternate (not be grouped in groups of 10). This gives people a bit more space to stand
on each side of the poster.
12   As I mentioned, more time for presentation is essential. Also, better technical support.
Speakers should be able to have the time to fix their PP presentations ready before a
given session begins.
13   Have all presentations set up on a single computer before the start of the session. Fewer
talks, more demanding selection criteria.
14   It's hard. I know the ASSC picked the best talks they could (because I was on the steering
committee).
15   Limit to 2 or 3 sessions at the same time. Invite attendees to vote before the conference
on the talks they are interested in, and schedule the talks to minimize overlaps.
16   20 minutes a bit too short. Say 30 minutes minimum.

32. Do you have any comments about this year's reception or suggestions for next year?

#    Response
1    The organizers did a perfect job, but were overwhelmed in the first two hours of the
meeting.
2    Food seemed like fast-food snacks.
3    I was expecting sushi (but don't take that too litteraly -- no need for fish & chips next
year!)
4    Wider variety of drinks and food, and to go on for longer
5    I mean the food...what happened there?
6    Finished too early!
7    Lovely, exciting theatrical event followed by awful food and drink, and draconian
measures to get us out of the building early.
8    Actually, I was uncomfortable with the contents of the food supply. Most participants
did not expect the very nice Japanese cousin in opening reception, because it was free
to register. However, in this year of ASSC, all foods were supplied from 7-Eleven... I was
really disappointed. Why the quality of foods was worse than that of student social??
9    An outside venue would be a nice change of pace.
10   Giving food from Seven/Eleven was a joke. In Japan, where food is an important part of
the culture, I'm sure the organizers could have done much better than that.
11   I enjoyed the dancing
12   make it a bit longer please..
13   The atmosphere was very good.
This year, ASSC15 was held in Kyoto. Maiko and Geisha, who are Japanese traditional women, danced. It was a very astonishing and moving event. So next year, it will be good to hold the traditional event of the meeting ground.

Wine is excellent, but the food...

Food shouldn't be from supermarket.

34. Do you have any comments or suggestions about the social?
# Response
1 They took us to an Irish Pub, but all people would have prefer to go to a traditional bar.
2 Ending it at 9pm was a shame. I guess that was out of the hands of the organisers. Remember that students, being students, like to stay out quite late, so a closing time of 10:30 at the earliest would have been more appropriate.
3 It was good!
4 Fantastic. Kaneko did a great job.
5 it is important to have local options for everyone to go after the student social has finished
6 The idea of having a student social is great but the place and the way the food and drinks were presented was poor. Next time the place should be something like a nice bar where you can have real drinks and can stay longer if you like.
7 It was a bit unclear where it was.

38. Do you have any comments on this year's banquet or any suggestions for next year?
# Response
1 I think that the diner was too expensive. The quality of the food was really good, but since we were standing up in the hall of the University I thought that the cost should be less. I expected to have diner in a restaurant
2 Far too short. I had hardly had time to talk to anyone.
3 It ended very early. I didn't feel there was time to talk to everybody I wanted to talk to.
4 The setting could have been nicer.
5 I thought the amount of food on offer for the price was a little disappointing. I also found it quite difficult to eat a full meal without being able to sit down. Holding a plate in one hand and a drink in the other meant that eating went very slowly and therefore it took a long time to have a sufficient amount of food. The food that was there, however, was excellent.
6 For $60 you really expect more than a slightly pushed up buffet lunch. Nothing wrong with a buffet in principle, as it makes it possible to talk to a variety of people, but either make it cheaper (preferable) or serve better quality food, and more of it. Also, have it go on for longer - people were in the middle of discussions when suddenly the lights went out.
7 The banquet was the most dissapoint thing in this conference. No seats, the food was just ok, and clearly not worth the price! We even got kicked out very quickly.
8 Finished too early, poor selection of food, didn't really feel much like a 'banquet'. Had to go for a second dinner after!
9 The worst value for money of any meal I've paid for in my life (I also paid for my wife to attend). I wouldn't have grumbled as much if I'd paid about £10 for the meal instead of £40, but the price seemed amazingly high for what we got, and for the first time in my
life I was very tempted to complain about a paid for dinner. As a vegan, the food was particularly poor in fact, with little choice (it mainly seemed like cheap soggy sandwiches as well as a bit of sushi). But for everyone the fact that it was a buffet rather than sit down meal felt cheap, and meant that people on their own had no social hook of their sit-down neighbour. For many people the food ran out way before they'd had their fill, as did the drinks - it became quite a joke for the group we were in at least. Banquets are normally long affairs, with lots of opportunity to talk, but we were quite forcefully made to leave the hall around 8:30pm, which was a great shame. Conferences are meant also to be networking places, and it was almost as though we were being discouraged from this at many turns!

I think that the banquet fee for student should become much cheaper (e.g. $40). Please make a real dinner with seats. We are adults and Humans... Moreover, the price was equivalent to a nice dinner a quite good restaurant in Paris. And I had only some beer and pickles. Really disappointing.

The banquet should be a full evening event. It didn't last long enough.

I think it is good with more seating possibilities and more hot food. Otherwise good.

seats are important

This year's was not a banquet - it was a spread of finger food consumed while standing around. For Brighton: perhaps a dinner cruise or an oceanside restaurant? A fantastic and memorable banquet would be worth it, even if it comes at a slightly higher cost.

the banquet should not finish at 8:30pm. it is great to speak to colleagues and it was a shame it ended so early

I thought the "standing" format was very very good -- much nicer than being at one table for the whole evening.

I was expecting more at this price.

It is always much nicer to be seated in a restaurant/hall but perhaps the ASSI conferences are just too big for that?

It should be a real dinner where you can sit down and relax while eating. Buffet is great but if you have no chance to sit down with other people it is very exhausting. The whole atmosphere could have been a little more elegant.

Good quality food but not enough. Would have preferred a sit down meal, particularly for the cost. Not held in the same room as the talks - felt a bit unsophisticated and ad hoc.

It closed *very* quickly -- I think 9:30 on the dot or something. That seemed pretty odd to me.

A standing banquet at the conference hall at this price point was a little steep. Would have preferred to explore a different venue in Kyoto.

A bit expensive maybe...

It is better if there is more time for talking during conference dinner.

It wasn't a banquet this year, it was an expensive reception. The value of what I ate was about $5US and the same for my wife. I would not have attended if I had known what it was going to be like.

39. Did you attend the "poor man's banquet" instead?

# Response
1 still expensive
41. Were you happy with the price and quality of your accommodation?

#   Response
1   But it seemed high cost and high return, then high conflict between them.
2   stay in ryokan was nice Japanese experience.
3   I think the accommodation which I stayed is perfect
4   It was very good value for money.
5   I stayed in a very nice & small typical Japanese hostel.
6   I sought accommodation on my own; I stayed in a hotel in central Kyoto and was happy with it.
7   Got good deal at Kyoto Royal - but information and assistance on conference website was poorest of any conference I've been to (I've been to about 20). No conference hotel with special deals, and virtually no help for us to find an alternative. One or two options on the list of recommended hotels was 2 hours train ride away!!!
8   no because I had to share my room. The rest was quite nice.
10  Too expensive.
11  It would be much better to have a hotel associated with the conference. This would make it easier to negotiate a better deal for each guest, rather than having to search for reasonably-priced accommodation in a touristic city, with those on a tight budget (like me) settling for a third-rate option.
12  Kyoto public transportation is very good, making my daily commute to Kyoto U (from near the Kyoto station) convenient.
13  I got lucky and found a good, cheap hotel -- but it wasn't on the official list. I found it very frustrating that the official list didn't explain anything about where the listed hotels were or how long it would take to get from each one to the venue.
14  budget hotel in city centre. good location and friendly staff
15  It was too expensive to join in the conference as a non-member.
16  I ended up finding a place not listed on the conference website. The information provided wasn't very useful. It was categorised by type of accommodation (modern/traditional) but there was no indication of price range or location which made the whole process of considering the options not very efficient.
17  There were few options
18  Too expensive.
19  Very comfortable and the price was quite reasonable.
20  We found an apartment near the university and near the river in Kyoto. We liked it very much.

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

#   Response
1   I thought it was a very good balance this year
2   Less philosophy would have been better!
3   Very few philosophers
4   Though, not much mixing between the fields.
5 Philosophers need more time for presenting their ideas. Poster presentation may be
good for philosophers, but they usually don't know that. That might be the reason of the small
proportion of philosophers in the participants.
6 Overall balance was good, but *within* psych the distribution seemed skewed (way too
much psychophysics, to the exclusion of other approaches)
7 the philosophy was on average not as good as I hoped and relatively little of it
8 Philosophers should be more active.
9 I enjoyed many of the neuroscience talks and I also understand that NS is bound to be
the core of these meetings, for various reasons. However, I sometimes missed more theorizing,
whether philosophical or psychological (or even "big theories" in neuroscience). Psychology, in
particular, was very thin.
10 Too much philosophy.
11 It would be more psychological sessions.

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

#     Response
1     no
2     Andreas Engel, Anil Seth & Steven Laureys
3     Christof Koch, David Chalmers, Stanislas Dehaene, Rafael Malach, Uri Hasson
4     Subjective time perception
5     Imagination would be a nice topic, especially because it is such a broad label. It would
also follow on nicely from the conference on emotions.
6     I thought that with the exception of the social neuroscience satellite, all things social
were rather under-represented. Next to nothing (particularly by philosophers) on social
cognition, joint attention, action, and the like.
7     Roozbeh Kiani (Stanford)...great paper on metacognition and perceptual decision-
making
8     yes, more technical topics in empirical sectors (testing or questioning the validity or
relevance of some commonly used indices-measures of consciousness, eg Anil Seth’s
presentation) restricting the philosophical debates on epistemological issues (why this concept
is problematic being given our technical means, our paradigms, ? what has been really
demonstrated and what has been only assumed in the sciences of consciousness etc...) well,
real efficient philosophy and no kind of ‘life is beautiful, I am happy to be conscious and
conscious to be happy’....
9     Maybe: What is reality like given that what we experience is created by our brain? Some
physics could be relevant here.
10    signal detection theory
11    Tononi, Kovisto, Dehaene, Naccache
12    Gerald Edelman Antonio Damasio Eric Schwitzgebel Michael Gazzaniga Rodolfo Llinas
13    I would be happy to see more computational neurosciences as it is an immense field
that could help solving the problem of consciousness.
14    I would love to hear more about anesthesia
15    Talks on nonhuman animals have a very good track record at ASSC (i.e. are usually good,
relevant, and well-received) and so I hope they’re encouraged next year and given at least a
symposium. Also, given the strong historical interest w/in ASSC, I’d hope to see more talks on
large-scale neural dynamics + anatomy of consciousness (e.g. thalamocortical circuits, binding,
synchrony, states + disorders of consciousness).
16    Synaesthesia.
17    christian keysers, groningen, the netherlands hendrik ehrsson, karolinska institute,
18    sweden antonio damasio, southern california, usa
19    consciousness of time
20    self psychoanalysis
21    Tetsuro Matsuzawa is.
22    I'd like to see more perspectives from developmental psychology.
23    I think it might be good to be clearer on what the role of philosophy is at a conference
    like this. (I say this as a philosopher.)
24    modelling work
25    more formal approaches / cognitive modeling

44. Do you have any other thoughts or suggestions about the conference? (For example the lack of
tea/coffee/water between sessions.)

# Response
1    It is extremely dissapointing that the conference did not have any daycare service. I had
    to find the place to take care my child by myself. The place was far from the Kyoto Univ. and I
    had to go back and forth between the conference room and daycare place.
2    No elevator on Sunday was not convenient. If there was a vendor on the 1st or 2nd floor
    in the building, that would not be problematic.
3    We missed the coffee, tea and water!
4    The lack of tea/coffee between sessions.
5    no
6    A bit of tea between sessions would have been nice. It's a good opportunity to speak to
    the conference participants.
7    I wish there had been coffee breaks with coffee.
8    I did not mind the absence of coffee between sessions; as long as there is a cheap coffee
    shop nearby
9    Tea and coffee should definitely be present every morning. Also there should have been
    more information about where to buy food on Sunday given that all the on-campus stores were
    shut.
10    Yes, for example. I don't think I've ever been to a three-day conference, and particularly
    not one that cost $400 or so (I registered late) that did not even provide you with water! Never
    mind tea, coffee and perhaps the odd biscuit. Utterly unacceptable.
11    the lack of tea/coffee/water!!!!!!!
12    Thanks for remind me. Yes coffee was definitely missing, especially since it helps
    socializing.
13    More refreshments are essential! Especially when its so hot. Water is a must.
14    Yes, coffee would have been nice!
15    Indeed, absence of coffee/tea breaks was a major problem
16    Posters up all day, or even all conference preferably, so that people can browse in dead
time. Poster sessions seemed very rushed this time (organisers forced us to take them down at
3:30, I think). Coffee and water all the time!!!! Many people are jetlagged, and need some
    compensation. Internal food for lunch/ or at least tea would make things less rushed. Or at least
    recommendations in program for quick local restaurants/cafes near conference for
    lunch/dinner. Wifi is extremely useful. Please arrange this at future conferences too (though the
wifi setup here was also poorly organised and complex). Longer lunch hours – at least 90 mins?
If you are in a big group and want to chat about research too, 60 minutes is usually quite tight a
period. Same with morning/afternoon coffee tea breaks. 30 minutes at least? Or integrate them
more with the poster sessions, to make time more efficient. Better tutorial quality control and
timekeeping (both tutorials that I attended overran a lot). Better communication between
tutorial/satellite and main conference, to avoid duplications. Give good info about how to get to
conference from town or whatever. In this conference, we received directions just a couple of
days before!! Make explicit, sensible recommendations for hotels (and have official conference
hotel with reduction?). What's the point of calling it student social, when everyone attends?
Why not conference social, with student free stuff - perhaps combined with some evening
entertainment? And make sure there is ample space to fit lots of people - Kyoto post conference
party space was totally tiny and squashed, and there was no concession on the door for the
conference people - it was quite expensive just to get in!

I was disappointed with three points. First, there were no coffee or tea supply during
the break. I think that coffee or tea is nice tools for communication between researchers.
Conversation during the coffee break is, in most cases, very informative. Second point was, the
last "special" session. I do not think that the quality of this session was not so good. Actually,
question and discussion at this session was not exciting. ASC was international conference. It is
not a good idea to organize one session which is totally occupied by well-established Japanese
researchers. Presentation and discussion among several countries should be required. I think
that if organizers have two hours in the last day, accepting one another symposium would be
the better idea. Third was the quality of foods in opening reception. I already wrote this in the
previous question, so I do not repeat this issue again.

better organization of the poster rooms, by field for example. The few time one has to
see them demands a good organization, if not everyone is penalized. maybe one can give an
award to each field as well, and not only to a psychophysical or neuroscience one.

There need to be longer coffee and lunch breaks. Coffee, tea and water really should be
provided during these breaks.

No coffee is as shame. It greatly facilitates discussion

Would appreciate coffee breaks that were longer and had coffee

this was the first conference in my 25-year experience at which no coffee was served
during breaks... outrageous.

Availability of water, at least, is a must. Water from vending machines only is not
enough!

It's true that having some coffee breaks would have been nice.

it is nice to have tea and coffee to allow people to talk more between sessions

Tea/Coffee/Water must be provided.

Coffee is essential; I'd certainly rather pay extra to have it available between sessions.

Also, historically, the poster sessions have been *much* more successful in the years where
snacks + drinks have been made available in the same room.

No.

Coffee breaks would be good - not only in order to socialize, but to get coffee, water etc
at all without having to leave the area where the conference really happens.

some snacks, coffee and water would INDEED be nice! Also, the additional fees for the
tutorials are VERY unfortunate...

At least in Japan, we have many PET bottle vending machines.

nothing
1) tea and coffee should have been provided indeed. 2) At times, it seems that the schedule is too crammed
3 I think the lack of tea/coffee between sessions is highly regretable. First, it just doesn't look good. I paid around 300$ for registration fee (I know that many people did not pay) and would never have imagined that in the end this will not even include coffee breaks. Second, it makes the experience a lot better. These breaks provide opportunities for people to meet and to chat with each others and with plenary speakers right from day one. It also creates a better atmosphere. Instead, we had to run to a cafeteria and back to the session. Sigh.
4 The lack of tea/coffee/water was very unusual and was a real disadvantage. The big party should be on the day before the last day - then, more people would attend. And all the events should be organized in a way that one is not forced to leave at 9 or 10 pm.
5 It was better in Toronto when refreshments were laid on during breaks between sessions
6 the lack of tea/coffee/water between sessions!! Lack of a break between sessions. Speed with which we were removed from the premises.
7 The conference was very well run.
8 Some coffee would have been good.
9 provide coffee in breaks
10 I missed coffee between sessions
11 Poster session should be divided into more days. It is almost impossible to watch 120 posters during one session.
12 Coffee would have been good.

45. The organizers of ASSC16 (Brighton, UK) are considering extending the main conference so that it runs for 4 days instead of 3, allowing a greater number of talks with sufficient time also for tea/coffee and lunch breaks, and more dedicated time for posters. Registration fees would not be substantially affected. Tutorial and any pre/post symposium days would be in addition. Do you:

# Response
1 Maybe "strongly support" is a bit too much, but I think it is worth trying.
2 Longer always means more expensive (eg accommodation)
3 Attendance per session will be DECREASED by this change
4 it will be too long; the last day of the conference is usually already poorly attended
5 I don’t think the posters need *more* time, they just need *better* times (i.e. not clustered together so people just skip that whole day) and better physical environs (spacing, snacks/drinks nearby).
6 A calmer pace is always a good idea, it will have a good effect both on the atmosphere and on the ability to digest the materials.

47. ASSC16 may consider making available selected (e.g., keynotes and symposia) available online. Do you:

# Response
1 I don't know.
2 Personally, I would not like my own video online
3 It is good idea. Actually, ASSC is exciting because most people can easily join the discussion. If the talk was available online, people would have an interest much more.
4 I do not understand the question
Some journals have embargo criteria, so posting pre-publication might damage chances of publication in leading journals. Presenters should be made aware of this before posting.

Do not support this idea because it would make internet slow.

My only concern is that, depending on the venue, recording can be quite expensive -- and it seems questionable to make paying attendees bear this cost when they won't be the primary beneficiaries.

I do not understand this question

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

# Response
1 Avoid question 39
2 Did I miss the poster feedback box? I would have liked to say something about this, but didn't see the option.
3
4 no
5 This was well designed and covered the bases, thanks! I would just like to add that the final symposium featuring various high-level (but not necessarily consciousness-focused) Japanese scientists was excellent. It may be worthwhile to arrange a similar symposium featuring talks by highly-accomplished local researchers in fields that may be peripheral to C and yet enlightening to ASSC attendees.
6 Making it shorter :)
7 I think the questions about suggestions/guidance for future years (of which there were a good number in this questionnaire) are useful and could be expanded; e.g. why not ask people about topics that they'd like to see in the tutorials and satellites?
8 Identify how many questions there will be, how far you have progressed, how long it will take!