



5-2013

DataOne Member Surveys

Alison Specht

Centre for the Synthesis and Analysis of Biodiversity

Carol Hoover

Kevin Crowston

Syracuse University, crowston@syracuse.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_dataone



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Specht, Alison; Hoover, Carol; and Crowston, Kevin, "DataOne Member Surveys" (2013). *DataONE Sociocultural and Usability & Assessment Working Groups*.

https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_dataone/113

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Communication and Information at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in DataONE Sociocultural and Usability & Assessment Working Groups by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

DATAONE MEMBER SURVEYS


ALISON SPECHT, CAROL HOOVER, KEVIN CROWSTON

BACKGROUND

- ❖ Two surveys administered at the last All-Hands Meeting (18–20 September 2012 in Albuquerque)
- ❖ Personal motivations for contributing to DataONE (n=69)
- ❖ Perceptions of working groups as the structure for project (n=52)

SURVEY 1: MOTIVATIONS FOR CONTRIBUTION

❖ Respondents (n=69)



REASONS FOR AND BENEFITS FROM PARTICIPATION

- ❖ Reasons for joining DataONE group into four factors:
 - ❖ Publications
 - ❖ Access to data and other resources
 - ❖ Experience and networking
 - ❖ Employment / grant funding

- ❖ What respondent reports gaining from working with DataONE is similar, except grant funding clusters with publications

SATISFACTION WITH PARTICIPATION

- ❖ Significant differences in reported satisfaction across parts of DataONE

| Group | Mean | Std. Dev. | N |
|----------------|-------------|------------------|----------|
| Leadership | 4.54 | 0.52 | 13 |
| Engagement | 4.19 | 0.71 | 36 |
| Infrastructure | 3.88 | 0.72 | 16 |

1=Not at all
5=To a great extent


- ❖ Predictors of satisfaction:
 - ❖ Reasons for and gains from joining DI aren't significant
 - ❖ Having freedom to choose the work, getting constructive feedback, feeling an important part of the project and feeling that the work is meaningful are significant

WHAT MEASURES OR INDICATORS WOULD YOU USE TO TELL IF YOUR PRODUCT OR INPUT HAD IMPACT OR SUCCESS?



SURVEY 2: PERCEPTIONS OF WORKING GROUPS

❖ Respondents (n=52)



ARE GROUPS PERCEIVED TO WORK WELL?

| Group | My work on the working group satisfies my personal needs | The outputs of my working group are satisfactory to those in the DI project who use them | My working group is well positioned to continue its contributions to the DI project | My working group has been innovative in its methods and/or outputs |
|----------------|---|---|--|---|
| Leadership | 5.33 | 5 | 4 | 2.67 |
| Engagement | 4.84 | 4 | 5.13 | 4.66 |
| Infrastructure | 4.69 | 4.44 | 5.31 | 4.63 |

1=Strongly disagree

6=Strongly agree

ARE WORKING GROUPS CONFIGURED CORRECTLY?

| Group | Responsibility | Authority | Expertise within the group | Right number of members |
|----------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Leadership | 6 | 6 | 5.33 | 4 |
| Engagement | 4.81 | 4.53 | 5.41 | 4.63 |
| Infrastructure | 5.2 | 4.93 | 5.38 | 4.31 |

1=Strongly disagree
6=Strongly agree

DO WORKING GROUPS HAVE WHAT THEY NEED?

| Group | Resources | Time | Productivity | Common purpose | Morale |
|----------------|-----------|------|--------------|----------------|--------|
| Leadership | 5.33 | 3.67 | 4 | 5 | 4.67 |
| Engagement | 3.81 | 3.19 | 4.88 | 4.78 | 5.25 |
| Infrastructure | 3.56 | 3.63 | 4.75 | 5.13 | 5.31 |

1=Strongly disagree

6=Strongly agree

ARE WORKING GROUPS COMMUNICATING?

| Group | Communication within the group | Communication among groups | Division of tasks within group | Division of tasks among groups |
|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Leadership | 5.33 | 4 | 4 | 4.67 |
| Engagement | 4.63 | 3.5 | 4.59 | 3.71 |
| Infrastructure | 5 | 2.94 | 4.53 | 3.93 |

1=Strongly disagree
6=Strongly agree

ADVANTAGES OF WORKING GROUPS

ability accommodated **achievable** address affordable **allows** assignments attention beneficial **better** brainstorming
bright **brings** **building** bursts capturing commissioned **community** complementary contribution convenient
created developers different difficult disciplinary discussion dissolved **diversity** divides division effort emerging
engagement environment **expertise** explored fabulous flexible **focus** forces
freedom funded goals harvest **ideas** input interdisciplinary interests involvement issue **knowledge**
labor leverage mandate **many members** mobilize model mutually **networking** obligations
people opportunity optimizing overlap **passionate** perspectives postdocs practice problems
productive relevant representation responsibilities **results** scientific short single sized **skills** space **students** subgroups
synergy tackling talented team **technical** them **think** tightly **time** triangulations twice undergrad varied viewpoints visions **wide**

DISADVANTAGES OF WORKING GROUPS

abstract accomplish **advance** align **apply** artificial attendees **benefit** borders budget challenges committees
communication cultural cyberinfrastructure **data** derived different **difficult** direction
disadvantage discuss diverse division driven **duplication** effectively **effort** elsewhere endpoint energy ensure everyone expense
expertise extent **face focus** formalized funding gaps goals guilt happens **helps ideas** inappropriate increased
individual interact interested interestws intermittent internal **isolation** issues knowledge **lacking** layout link
makes **many meetings** **members** memberships miscommunication momentum money
needs never opaque opportunity oriented outweigh overall overhead **overlap** paid participate particularly
people periods perspectives possible predicted presence priorities **products** projects
research resources role **selection** **silos** staff think **time** unclear vision whole