

Evaluation of the 2001 Canadian Psychological Association Convention

Abraham Ross

*Memorial University of
Newfoundland*

Joanne Gallivan

*University College of
Cape Breton*

Hazlon Schepmyer

*University of Toronto,
Rotman School of
Business*

Jennifer Veitch

*National Research
Council of Canada*

The Convention Committee is charged by the Board of Directors of the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) with overseeing the annual meeting of the Association. The Committee makes convention-related policy recommendations to the Board. Working closely with the Convention Office at the CPA Head Office, the committee also contributes to the preparations and planning for each year's convention. Both convention policy and implementation are aimed at making the CPA convention an exciting, interesting, educational and social experience for members and non-members alike.

Although sporadic attempts have been made at evaluating the convention, little useful information has been available to guide decision-making about the convention. Paper surveys inserted in successive years' convention packages had abysmal return rates that prevented the formation of generalisable conclusions.

In 2001, the first systematic evaluation of the convention was undertaken by a small sub-committee of the Convention Committee. This is the report of that sub-committee. We hope that this will be but the first step in the development of ongoing program evaluation of successive CPA conventions.

Method

Questionnaire

Suggestions for topics of interest to be included in the questionnaire were solicited from CPA Board members, CPA staff, and Chairs of Sections. In order to minimize the time needed to fill out the convention evaluation form, two questionnaire formats were used. Both forms had a common core of nine items assessing overall ratings of the convention. One consisted of twenty two further questions most of which were closed ended (see Appendix A). The other consisted of five open ended questions (see Appendix B). There were French and English versions of each questionnaire.

Procedure

Students from Laval University were recruited collect data, in exchange for which they were given free convention registration. The students distributed questionnaires using a simple random sampling procedure: every n^{th} person was selected as they passed a fixed location. CPA Board members, Convention Committee members, and CPA staff were excluded from participation.

The senior author met with the students the day before the convention to explain the importance of random sampling and how the random sample would be selected. Each student was given a number of the four questionnaire formats and mixed up the two English formats and the two French formats so that the order of the questionnaires was haphazard.

At the opening ceremonies on the Thursday of the convention, an announcement was made about the evaluation. Attendees were urged to take the time to respond to the questionnaire if they were selected as part of the sample.

If a person asked the students distributing the questionnaires to fill out the questionnaire, i.e., a person who was not part of the random sample, their data was flagged. Responses from the 20 people who volunteered are not included in the results of the random sample nor are the responses from the fourteen questionnaires on which this was not indicated.

Results

Response Rate

Two hundred and thirty four randomly selected persons responded to the questionnaires. The breakdown by language and format is presented below in Table 1.

Of the people randomly selected, 116 people were not willing to respond. Only three people actually refused to fill out the questionnaire (e.g., said they “didn’t like to fill out questionnaires”). All of the rest of the refusals were from people on Thursday (first day of the convention) who said that it was too early for them to evaluate the convention, or from people who were rushing to hear a paper or present one of their own.

Table 1: Questionnaire forms and language

	<i>English</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>Total</i>
Closed ended	153	34	187
Open ended	40	7	47
Total	193	41	234

The number of respondents for each day and their registration can be seen in Table 2. As 23 June was a provincial holiday, fewer students agreed to do the interviewing. This is reflected in the fewer respondents on that day.

Table 2: Date questionnaire filled out and period of registration

<i>Date of Survey</i>	<i>Registration Period</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>The whole convention</i>	<i>One or more days (but not the whole convention)</i>	
Not indicated	42	8	50
21-Jun	73	2	75
22-Jun	58	6	64
23-Jun	36	4	40
Total	209	20	229

Sample Comparison to Population

To assess sample bias there are two questions for which we can compare the sample to the population; (a) whether they were students and (b) whether people registered for the whole convention or for a single day.

Registration statistics indicate that of the 937¹ registrants, 56% registered as students. Of the 205 respondents who responded to the question, only 46% indicated they considered themselves primarily students. A chi-square test of goodness-of-fit using the convention registrations for expected values indicates that the two sample distribution differs significantly from the convention distribution ($\chi^2 = 8.35$, $p < .05$) with students being under-represented in

¹ We did not include Companions or the Exhibitors in this total.

the sample. For this test, the category “student” includes respondents who indicated it as the only category to which they belonged. Students who also classed themselves in another category, e.g., student and educator, would not be included in this test. As noted below, the question asking people to classify themselves was problematic and will be revised in future forms.

Only 8% of the people who attended the convention registered for one day. The other 92% registered for the full three days. Of the 229 respondents who indicated their registration, only 9% indicated that they were registered for one day. A chi-square test of goodness-of-fit using the convention registrations for expected values indicates that the sample distribution does not differ significantly from the convention distribution ($\chi^2 = .36$, $p > .05$).

Demographics of respondents. As can be seen in Table 3, most respondents were from Ontario (43%) followed by Quebec (17.5%). The distribution closely, but not exactly, follows the distribution of convention attendees. Some of the discrepancy might related to the different sources of information.

Table 3: Geographic Distribution

	<i>Respondents' Province of Work</i>		<i>Attendees' Mailing Addresses</i>	
	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
BC	14	6.0	60	6.4
Alberta	16	6.8	44	4.7
Saskatchewan	12	5.1	43	4.6
Manitoba	12	5.1	40	4.3
Ontario	100	42.7	414	44.2
Quebec	41	17.5	242	25.8
New Brunswick	14	6.0	34	3.6
Nova Scotia	11	4.7	36	3.8
PEI	3	1.3	1	0.1
Newfoundland	1	.4	6	0.6
USA	2	.9	9	1.0
Other	4	1.7	8	0.9
Total	230	98.3	937	100.0
Not indicated	4	1.7		
Grand Total	234	100.0	937	100.0

As can be seen in Table 4 most respondents belong to more than one organization. Of those who belong to only one organization, most belong to CPA.

Table 4: Membership in Psychological Organizations

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Alberta (PAA)	2	.9
Quebec (OPQ)	3	1.3
New Brunswick (NBPA)	1	.4
Other	1	.4
CPA	70	29.9
APA	1	.4
Other	21	9.0
More than one	117	50.0
Total	216	92.3
Not indicated	18	7.7
Grand Total	234	100.0

The CPA section(s) to which respondents' belong can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5: Number of respondents from each section

<i>Section</i>	<i>Respondents</i>
Adult Development and Aging	3
Brain and Behaviour	0
Clinical	29
Clinical Neuropsychology	0
Community	2
Counselling	4
Criminal Justice	7
Developmental	11
Psychologists in Education	2
Environmental	1
Family	1
Health	6
History and Philosophy	1
Industrial/Organizational	16
International and Cross-Cultural	2
Military	4
Perception, Learning and Cognition	0
Psychopharmacology	1
Religion	5
Social and Personality	19
Students	16
Teaching	3
Women and Psychology (SWAP)	5
Interest Group - Disaster and Trauma	0
Interest Group - Psychophysiology	0

Note. Respondents may belong to more than one section.

Respondents were asked whether they classified themselves primarily as a practitioner in the publicly funded sector, a practitioner in the private sector, a student, a scientist or an educator. Most respondents had trouble putting themselves into any one category, many felt they fit two or three different categories. Data from this question were not usable.

Overall Reactions to Convention

As can be seen in Table 6, the majority (58%) of the respondents rated the convention as “good” or “excellent.” Without data from previous years we cannot tell if this is better or worse than other conventions.

Table 6: Overall rating of convention

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Bad	13	5.7
*	1	.4
Okay	81	35.4
Good	111	48.5
*	2	.9
Excellent	21	9.2
Total	229	100
Missing	5	
Grand Total	234	

Note. A row with no label but * indicates a response between the two categories.

There being no data from previous years, respondents were asked if they had attended previous conventions and, if they had, how the present convention compared. (See Table 7). One hundred and thirty-six respondents (61%) had attended previous conventions. Of these sixty people (44%) said that it was the same. However, 54 respondents (40%) said that it was either worse or much worse than previous conventions. Only 22 respondents (16%) thought that it was better than previous conventions.

Table 7: If you have been to previous conventions how would you rate the present one?

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>
Much worse	11	8.1
Worse	40	29.4
*	3	2.2
Same	60	44.1
*	3	2.2
Better	17	12.5
Much better	2	1.5
Total	136	100.0
Missing	98	
Grand Total	234	

Note. A row with no label but * indicates a response between the two categories.

When asked to compare value to overall cost of the convention, 35% thought the price about right and 41% thought that it was good or very good value for the cost.

Table 8: Value for overall cost

	Frequency	Percent
Very poor value for the cost	8	3.5
Poor value for the cost	42	18.4
*	1	.4
Just about right	83	36.4
Good value for cost	65	28.5
Very good value for cost	29	12.7
Total	228	100
Missing	6	
Grand Total	234	

Note. A row with no label but * indicates a response between the two categories.

As might be expected, these three measures were all correlated with each other (see Table 9). However, and perhaps more important, they all correlate significantly with plans to attend future conventions. Those who are more satisfied with the present convention are more likely to plan to attend future conventions.

Table 9: Spearman correlations between measures of satisfaction and plans to attend future conventions.

		Overall rating	Value for cost	Been to previous how rate present?	Likely attend future conventions?
Overall rating	Correlation		.53	.63	.41
	N			136	221
Value for cost	Correlation	.53		.434	.35
	N	226	228		220
Been to previous how rate present?	Correlation	.63	.43		.27
	N	136	134	136	224
Likely to attend future conventions?	Correlation	.41	.35	.27	
	N	221	220	134	

Note. All correlations $p < .001$

Convention Activities

These data are from the closed-ended questionnaires, so the sample size is smaller than for the overall questions above.

The majority of the respondents² attended invited talks (62%) and took part in presentations (87%). Of those who took part in a presentation, most were posters (38%)

² This and subsequent questions were only on the closed ended questionnaire so the number of respondents is lower than to the previous questions.

followed by those who took part in a symposium (25%). The next largest group took part in both posters and a symposium (11%).

Of the 34 respondents who had attended workshops, most (6) had attended the CCPPP followed by the SWAP session (5) and Suicide prevention (5). Others were attended by only one or two of the respondents.

Fifty six people offered reasons for not attending the social events. The commonest reason given was lack of time and/or other commitments (36%). Other reasons were given by one or two people and do not indicate any overall trend.

Of the 43 respondents who gave reasons for not attending business meetings, the commonest reason was lack of interest (28%). Again, other reasons were given by one or two people and do not indicate any overall trend.

Programme Quality

These data are from the closed-ended questionnaires, so the sample size is smaller than for the overall questions above.

Most respondents who took part in a presentation felt that the submission deadline, the length and the standards of the review process were about right (see Table 10).

Table 10: Reactions to submission process

	N	Rating	%	Rating	%	Rating	%
Submission deadline	138	too early	20%	about right	80%		
Length of review process:	127	too long	8%	about right	92%		
Standards of review	129	too easy	12%	about right	81%	too hard	7%

Respondents' rating of the quality of the various presentations can be seen in Table 11. Pre-convention workshops and the invited talks tend to get the highest ratings.

Table 11: Ratings of the quality of presentations

	N	Very poor (%)	Poor (%)	Okay (%)	Good (%)	Very Good (%)
Pre-convention workshops	30			1	26	63
Invited talks	102	1	2	13	27	57
Panels	69		1	23	45	30
Symposium	122		1	16	35	48
Posters	150	.6	1	12	45	41

Posters tend to have the greatest variability. This may be because the majority of the posters are presented by students. Although only marginally significant ($\chi^2 = 3.69$, $p = .055$), students were more likely to present a poster than were other respondents. Of the 51 respondents who indicated that they only took part in a poster session 58% were students (this might be higher, given that students were under-represented in the sample.) Not surprisingly, only 25% of the students have been to previous conventions (compared to 75% of other respondents). This too may have contributed to the unevenness of the poster presentations.

The programming committee managed to minimize scheduling two presentations at the same time that would appeal to the same person. Most respondents only had occasional problems with wanting to attend two sessions at the same time. (See Table 12).

Table 12: Frequency of schedule overlaps.

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>
Frequently	41	23.3
*	1	.6
Occasionally	79	44.9
Rarely	33	18.8
Never	22	12.5
Total	176	100.0
Missing	58	
Grand Total	234	

Note. A row with no label but * indicates a response between the two categories.

Abstract book. As can be seen in Table 13, reactions to the quality of the abstract index were generally positive but there is room for improvement. I am not sure how the indexing was developed but it might not be a bad idea to convene a focus group to discuss optimal indexing. (On-the-other-hand, it is likely that there is no system that will satisfy everyone.)

Table 13: Index quality of the abstract book

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>
Awful	1	.6
Bad	14	7.7
Okay	48	26.5
Good	78	43.1
Excellent	40	22.1
Total	181	100.0
Missing	53	
Grand Total	234	

Accommodation

Of the 166 respondents to the closed-ended questionnaire who indicated where they stayed, the majority stayed in Laval residence (26%) followed by the Plaza hotel (19%). Other respondents were spread out among friends (6%), family (6%), and at other hotels. As might be expected, the largest percentage of students stayed at Laval (40%) and the largest percentage of other respondents stayed at the Plaza hotel (26%) followed by the Laval residence (17%).

Most people reported paying between \$101 and \$150 for their accommodation (see Table 14), and were satisfied with their accommodation (see Table 15). (Note: The Plaza Hotel cost \$136 per night with GST; Laval University cost \$40.25.) It is interesting to note that cost is not related to ratings of quality ($\rho = .07, p > .10$). Indeed, in response to a specific question, 79% of the respondents said that the cost was about right for the quality of the accommodation. A large majority of respondents (75%) said that they would stay at comparable accommodations if they came to a future convention.

Table 14: Cost of accommodations

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>
Nothing	20	11.6
\$50 or less	29	16.9
\$51-\$100	33	19.2
\$101-\$150	68	39.5
\$151-\$200	22	12.8
Total	172	100.0
Missing	62	
	234	

Table 15: Quality of your accommodations?

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>
Awful	4	2.5
Bad	13	8.2
*	1	.6
Okay	56	35.4
*	1	.6
Good	51	32.3
Excellent	32	20.3
Total	158	100.0
Missing	76	
Grand Total	234	

Note. A row with no label but * indicates a response between the two categories.

Food

Most people thought that the quality of the food facilities was “okay” or better (see Table 16) and 81% rated the cost of the food as “about right.”

Table 16: Quality of food facilities while at the convention?

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>
Awful	8	5.2
Bad	21	13.6
Okay	70	45.5
Good	49	31.8
Excellent	6	3.9
Total	154	100.0
Missing	80	
Grand Total	234	

Overall Venue

There were several anecdotal complaints about the on-campus convention venue and a few written submissions noting the drawbacks of the venue. Given lack of data for previous venues, it is hard to make absolute statements but as can be seen in Table 17 while most respondents thought the venue was “okay” or better, close to 25% were not pleased with the venue.

Table 17: How would you rate the overall quality of the convention venue?

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>
Awful	8	4.7
Bad	32	18.6
*	3	1.7
Okay	63	36.6
*	1	.6
Good	55	32.0
Excellent	10	5.8
Total	172	100.0
Missing	62	
Grand Total	234	

Note. A row with no label but * indicates a response between the two categories.

Sub-group Opinions

Students. Most of the students who came to the convention (62%) received financial support and felt comfortable while there (see Table 18).

Table 18: [Students only] Overall, how did you feel while at the convention?

	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>
Very uncomfortable		
Uncomfortable	2	2.5
Okay	23	29.1
Comfortable	40	50.6
Very comfortable	14	17.7

Clinicians. Of the 49 respondents who indicated that they were clinicians, 46 (94%) said that they would appreciate regular clinical updates in their area. Seventy four percent said that they would benefit if they could receive Continuing Education credits for attending workshops and/or the convention.

Sections. Of the people who indicated that they belonged to a section, most felt that the variety of topics presented was about right (see Table 19). However, close to a third thought that there could have been more topics covered and no one thought that there were too many topics covered.

Table 19: Variety of topics covered in the sessions was . . .

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>
Too few	9	9%
	24	25%
Just right	57	59%
	7	7%
Too many		
Total	97	100

Similarly, most respondents indicated that the variety of formats (e.g., workshops, symposia) presented by their section was just right (Table 20) but several respondents would have liked to have seen more formats used. Because suggestions were not requested, we cannot tell what they were thinking of.

Table 20: Variety of formats presented by the section was . . .

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>
Too few	6	6%
	14	15%
Just right	65	69%
	9	10%
Too many		
Total	94	100%

Finally, respondents were asked about the number of gatherings of section members. As can be seen in Table 21 most people thought the number of gatherings was just right but several would have liked more and on 3 people thought that there were more than enough.

Table 21: The number of times there was a gathering of members was . . .

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>
Too few	7	8%
	15	17%
Just right	61	71%
	3	3%
Too many		
Total	86	100%

Responses to Open-Ended Questionnaires³

Determinants of convention attendance. As can be seen in Table 22, the most important determinant of why a person comes to CPA is location, i.e., where the convention is held. This is followed by whether or not the person is presenting at the convention, and then by the other presentations. There were many other reasons given by only by an individual.

³ In the following we will only include responses when they were given by more than one respondent.

Table 22: What is the single most important determinant of whether you attend a CPA convention?

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Number of respondents who gave it</i>
Location	17
Whether or not presenting	12
Presentation topics; what & who	5
Funding/finances	4
Includes my area of interest	4
Invited Speakers	3
Content	2
Quality of conference	2
Meet with colleagues	2

Highlights of convention. When asked about the highlights of the convention, the commonest response was that it was too early for the respondent to judge because the question was asked on the first day. The second most common reason was the invited speakers followed by the presentations, followed by networking (Table 23).

Table 23: What were highlights of the present convention for you?

<i>Highlight</i>	<i>Number of respondents who gave it.</i>
N/A, Day 1-too early, convention just started	7
Invited speakers	7
Presentations & Posters	6
Networking	6
Prochaska's talk	3
Preconvention workshops	2
Wide scope of work/research	2

Hope to get from convention. When asked what they hoped to get from the convention, the commonest reason given was networking with presentations and finding out about current research well behind (Table 24). Clearly, for some portion of the respondents, professional training and development was important.

Table 24: What do you hope to get from the convention (e.g., networking; presentation; professional training...)

<i>Hope to get</i>	<i>Number of respondents who gave it.</i>
Networking	34
Opportunity to present/presentations	18
Info on current research of interest to me	18
Professional Training/development	14

Changes for future conventions. When people were asked what changes they would like to make for next year if they were on the committee, the commonest change was to have the convention at the same place people stay. It is interesting to note that the second commonest response was that the convention was quite good as it is (Table 25).

Table 25: If you were on the convention organizing committee, what changes would you want to make for next year?

<i>Changes they would like to make</i>	<i>Number of respondents who gave it.</i>
Conference same place where people stay –hotel	11
Quite good as is	5
More places to eat available	5
Getting information in advance; location, schedule facilities for presentation	3
Shuttle service-better transport	3
More opportunities to meet socially	3
I don't know	3
Break during presentation: 2 hrs to long for one sitting	2
20 min designated lunch break	2
Coffee; refreshments free/complementary	2
Lower the cost, i.e., hotel expenses	2

Suggestions for future speakers. Most people had no suggestions when asked to suggest future keynote speakers. In this section, we have included all suggestions, since we are looking for ideas rather than a popularity contest.

Table 25: Do you have any suggestions for keynote speakers for future conventions?

<i>Suggestion</i>	<i>Number of respondents who made it.</i>
No suggestion	12
Cutting edge research/speakers	2
Canadian Speakers; to highlight Canadian excellence in areas of research/clinical work.	1
Sandra Butler	1
More sessions for practitioners	1
More educational psychology	1
More interactive session (workshop style)	1
Philip Shaver, U.California at Davis	1
Rene Caissie	1
Gary Poole	1
Neuroscience cognitive; Antorir Damasia, Mario Beauregard	1
Janice Richtock	1
Dr. Cannie Stark-Adamac on policing	1
Dr.S.Toukmanian-the process of psychotherapy	1
Gary Wells- Iowa State University(formerly Univ. of Alberta)	1

Discussion

As the first systematic evaluation of the CPA convention, these results are suggestive rather than conclusive. The methodology produced a larger and more representative sample than the paper questionnaires inserted in convention packages, which had resulted in under 20 responses in recent years. However, the process of undertaking the survey revealed some problems of both measurement and method to be addressed in future years.

Opinions of the 2001 CPA Convention

Overall, respondents expressed themselves satisfied with the convention, with over half rating it as 'good or excellent' and another 35% rating it 'okay'. For those respondents who had previously attended, the majority (44%) rated it as the same in quality as previous years and a small percentage (14%) rated it as better. Of some concern are the 37% who indicated that the 2001 convention was worse than in other years. In addition, most respondents rated the convention as providing good value for the cost (41%), or as 'just about right' (36%). Presentation quality was also rated as 'good' or 'very good' by most respondents for most types of presentations.

One of the most pressing questions for the Convention Committee concerns whether to hold the event on a university campus or in a hotel/convention centre. We received clear feedback from a few members that the campus location was not particularly favoured, and 25% of the respondents rated the overall venue as less than 'okay' in quality (Table 17). Thirty-six percent rated it as 'okay', and 38.4% were more positive. In a related vein, there were several open-ended remarks about the desirability of having accommodation and meetings in one location, and unsolicited feedback from a few members was particularly critical on this point. In addition, attendees who are not students did not tend to stay on-campus. It is not clear from

these data that a university campus is a good choice of venue. Perhaps in 2002, when hotel-like accommodation will be close by the meeting location at the University of British Columbia, a clearer picture will emerge.

Recommendations for Future Evaluations

- A line item in the Convention budget for Evaluation should be established, to fund this activity annually.
- A data base of convention evaluations should be maintained so that data can be compared from year to year. Revisions of questions should be sensitive to the need to maintain comparability.
- On-site surveys miss obtaining data from those who do not attend. The committee should conduct a survey of CPA members, annually if possible, to include both attenders and non-attenders.
- On-site convention evaluation need not start until the second day of the convention, and should include more day 3 data.
- Start recruiting students earlier to serve as surveyors. Have more surveyors on the last day.
- Several questions need to be revised. For example, in asking what people attend at the convention a better format might be to ask respondents to indicate the percentage of their time they spend in each, e.g., "Please indicate the percentage of your time you spend in each of the following activities..."
- In subsequent questionnaires, ask respondents what other session formats they would like to see.
- Consider asking explicitly about preferred venue types and cost limits.

Appendix A English Closed-Ended Questionnaire

Evaluation of the Canadian Psychological Association Convention
Ste. Foy, Quebec
June 2001

Interviewer: R V

Date:

In which province/state do you work?

To which psychological organizations do you belong?

Do you belong to a section of CPA? Yes No

If "Yes" please list the sections and respond to the questions at the end of this questionnaire.

Would you categorize yourself primarily as a:

Practitioner	Practitioner	Scientist	Educator	Student
publicly funded sector	private			

Are you registered for:

The whole convention One or more days (but not the whole convention)

Overall ratings

Overall, how would you rate the present convention?

1	2	3	4	5
Awful	Bad	Okay	Good	Excellent

In terms of value for overall cost, how would you rate the present convention (when you take into account the cost of registering for the convention, accommodations, and meals.)

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor value for the cost	Poor value for the cost	Just about right	Good value for cost	Very good value for cost

Have you been to previous CPA conventions? Yes No

If "Yes" how would you compare this one to previous ones?

1	2	3	4	5
Much worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better

How likely is it that you will attend future CPA conventions?

1	2	3	4	5
Very unlikely		Don't know		Very likely

Conference Activities

Did you take part in any pre-convention workshops? Yes No
 If "Yes", which ones?
 Did you attend any of the invited talks? Yes No
 Did you take part in any presentations? Yes No
 If "Yes", was it a (Circle all that are appropriate)
 Poster Panel Symposium Invited address
 How would you rate the submission review process?

Submission deadline:	too early	about right		Don't know
Length of review process:	too long	about right		Don't know
Standards of review	too easy	about right	too hard	Don't know

Overall How would you rate the quality of the presentations you attended?

	Very poor	Poor	Okay	Good	Very good	Didn't attend
Pre-convention workshops						
Invited talks						
Panels						
Symposium						
Posters						

Programme

How would you rate the index quality of the abstract book/programme, (e.g., did you have problems finding when or where events were occurring)?

1	2	3	4	5
Awful	Bad	Okay	Good	Excellent

Were there times when two sessions you wanted to attend were given at the same time?

1	2	3	4
Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never

Other events

Did you attend any CPA or section social events? Yes No
 If you did not, was there any particular reason why not?
 Did you attend any CPA or section business meetings? Yes No
 If you did not, was there any particular reason why not?

Location

Accommodations

Where did you stay while at the convention? _____

How much did your accommodations cost? (*Please indicate an amount, even if you did not pay it yourself.*)

Nothing	\$50 or less	\$51-\$100	\$101-\$150	\$151-\$200
---------	--------------	------------	-------------	-------------

How would you rate the quality of your accommodations while at the convention?

1	2	3	4	5
Awful	Bad	Okay	Good	Excellent

How would you rate the cost of your accommodations compared to the quality?

About right too high

If you come to a future convention, would you try to stay at accommodations which were

Less expensive	Same as current one	More expensive
----------------	---------------------	----------------

Food

How would you rate the quality of food facilities while at the convention?

1	2	3	4	5
Awful	Bad	Okay	Good	Excellent

How would you rate the cost of food?

About right too high

Overall venue

How would you rate the overall quality of the convention venue, e.g., layout, places to meet colleagues, seating, temperature?

1	2	3	4	5
Awful	Bad	Okay	Good	Excellent

Students (skip if you are not a student)

Did you receive any financial support to come to the convention? Yes No

Overall, how did you feel while at the convention?

1	2	3	4	5
Very uncomfortable	Uncomfortable	Okay	Comfortable	Very comfortable

Clinicians (Skip if you are not a clinical psychologist)

Would you appreciate regular clinical updates in the main areas of practice?

Yes No

Would you benefit if you could receive Continuing Education credits for attending workshops and/or the convention?

If you belong to a section please respond to the following questions

Do you feel that your section provided too much or too little in the way of
The variety of topics covered in the sessions

1	2	3	4	5
Too few		Just right		Too many

The variety of formats (e.g., workshops, symposia) presented by the section was,

1	2	3	4	5
Too few		Just right		Too many

The number of times there was a gathering of members,

1	2	3	4	5
Too few		Just right		Too many

Appendix B
English Open-Ended Questionnaire

Evaluation of the Canadian Psychological Association Convention
St. Foy, Quebec
June 2001

Interviewer: R V
In which province/state do you work?
To which psychological organizations do you belong

Do you belong to a section of CPA? Yes No

If "Yes" please list the sections:

Would you categorize yourself primarily as a:

Practitioner	Practitioner	Scientist	Educator	Student
publicly funded sector	private			

Are you registered for:
The whole convention One or more days (but not the whole convention)

Overall ratings

Overall, how would you rate the present convention?

1	2	3	4	5
Awful	Bad	Okay	Good	Excellent

Have you been to previous CPA conventions? Yes No

If "Yes" how would you compare this one to previous ones?

1	2	3	4	5
Much worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better

General questions

What is the single most important determinant of whether you attend a CPA convention?

What were highlights of the present convention for you?

If you were on the convention organizing committee, what changes would you want to make for next year?

Do you have any suggestions for keynote speakers for future conventions?

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

Appendix C French Closed-Ended Questionnaire

Évaluation du Congrès de la Société canadienne de psychologie
Sainte-Foy (Québec)
juin 2001

Interviewer : R V
Date :

Dans quelle province ou quel état travaillez-vous?

À quelle(s) organisation(s) de psychologie appartenez-vous?

Faites-vous partie d'une section de la SCP? Oui Non

Dans l'affirmative, veuillez indiquer à quelle(s) section(s) vous appartenez :

Est-ce que vous vous définiriez principalement comme un(e) :

Praticien(ne) du secteur public	Praticien(ne) du secteur privé	Scientifique	Enseignant(e)	Étudiant(e)
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------	---------------	-------------

Êtes-vous inscrit(e) pour :
Tout le Congrès Une journée ou plus (mais pas tout le Congrès)

Évaluation globale

Globalement, comment évalueriez-vous le Congrès de cette année?

1	2	3	4	5
Pauvre	Médiocre	Correct	Bon	Excellent

En ce qui a trait au rapport qualité/prix, comment évalueriez-vous le présent Congrès (lorsque vous prenez en considération le coût d'inscription au Congrès, les chambres et les repas)?

1	2	3	4	5
Très mauvais rapport qualité/prix	Mauvais rapport qualité/prix	Rapport qualité/prix à peu près correct	Bon rapport qualité/prix	Très bon rapport qualité/prix

Avez-vous déjà assisté à d'autres Congrès de la SCP? Oui Non

Dans l'affirmative, comment compareriez-vous celui-ci aux autres?

1	2	3	4	5
Bien pire	Pire	Même chose	Mieux	Beaucoup mieux

Quelles sont les probabilités que vous assisterez à d'autres Congrès de la SCP?

1	2	3	4	5
Très peu probable		Je ne sais pas		Fort probable

Activités du Congrès

Avez-vous participé à l'un des ateliers précongrès? Oui Non
 Dans l'affirmative, lesquels?

Avez-vous assisté à l'une ou l'autre des présentations de conférenciers invités? Oui Non

Avez-vous assisté à l'une ou l'autre présentation? Oui Non
 Dans l'affirmative, de quel type de présentation s'agissait-il? (Encerclez la ou les réponses)

Affiche Panel Symposium Conférencier invité

Comment évalueriez-vous la procédure d'évaluation des présentations?

Date d'échéance de présentation	Trop rapprochée	Convenable		Ne sait pas
Longueur de la procédure d'évaluation	Exagérée	Convenable		Ne sait pas
Critères d'évaluation	Pas assez sévères	Convenable	Trop sévères	Ne sait pas

Dans l'ensemble, comment évalueriez-vous la qualité des présentations auxquelles vous avez assisté?

	Très pauvre	Pauvre	Correcte	Bonne	Très bonne	N'ai pas assisté
Ateliers précongrès						
Présentations de conférenciers invités						
Panels						
Symposiums						
Affiches						

Programme

Comment évalueriez-vous la qualité de l'index à la fin du numéro des résumés/programme (p. ex., avez-vous éprouvé des difficultés à trouver où et quand avaient lieu les différentes activités)?

1	2	3	4	5
Horrible	Mauvaise	Correcte	Bonne	Excellente

Vous est-il arrivé de voir que deux séances étaient prévues pour la même heure?

1	2	3	4
Souvent	À l'occasion	Rarement	Jamais

Autres événements

Avez-vous assisté à des activités spéciales organisées par la SCP ou par les sections?

Oui Non

Si vous n'avez assisté à aucune de ces activités, pour quelle raison?

Avez-vous assisté à l'une des réunions d'affaires des sections? Oui Non

Si vous n'avez assisté à aucune de ces activités, pour quelle raison?

Emplacement

Hébergement

Où habitiez-vous durant le Congrès? _____

Combien vous coûtait l'hébergement? (*Veillez préciser le montant, même si vous ne l'avez pas payé*)

0 \$	50 \$ et moins	51 \$ à 100 \$	101 \$ à 150 \$	151 \$ à 200 \$
------	----------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Comment évalueriez-vous la qualité de l'hébergement offert durant le Congrès?

1	2	3	4	5
Horrible	Mauvaise	Correcte	Bonne	Excellente

Comment évalueriez-vous le coût de votre hébergement par rapport à la qualité?

À peu près correct TROP ÉLEVÉ

Si vous participez à un prochain congrès, choisiriez-vous un type d'hébergement

Moins coûteux	Au même prix	Plus coûteux
---------------	--------------	--------------

Repas

Comment évalueriez-vous la qualité de la nourriture des restaurants au Congrès?

1	2	3	4	5
Horrible	Mauvaise	Correcte	Bonne	Excellente

Comment évalueriez-vous le prix de la nourriture?

À peu près correct TROP ÉLEVÉ

Ensemble du site

Comment évalueriez-vous la qualité globale du site du congrès, i.e., agencement, endroits où rencontrer des collègues, sièges, température?

1	2	3	4	5
Horrible	Mauvaise	Correcte	Bonne	Excellente

Étudiants (ne pas remplir si vous n'êtes pas étudiant)

Avez-vous reçu de l'aide financière pour assister au congrès? Oui Non

Dans l'ensemble, comment vous êtes-vous senti durant le congrès?

1	2	3	4	5
Très mal à l'aise	Mal à l'aise	Correct	À l'aise	Très à l'aise

Cliniciens (ne pas remplir si vous n'êtes pas psychologue clinicien)

Aimeriez-vous recevoir des mises à jour régulières de données cliniques dans les principaux champs de la pratique?

Oui Non

Souhaiteriez-vous voir des crédits alloués pour la participation à des ateliers et/ou au congrès?

Oui Non

Si vous êtes membre d'une section, veuillez s'il-vous-plaît répondre aux questions suivantes.

Si vous êtes membre de plus d'une section, à laquelle de ces sections vous sentez-vous principalement appartenir?

_____ Veuillez s'il-vous-plaît répondre aux questions ci-dessous, en fonction de cette section.

Croyez-vous que votre section en fait trop ou trop peu en ce qui concerne

La variété des sujets traités pendant les séances

1	2	3	4	5
Trop peu		Correct		Trop

La variété des formes de présentation (p. ex, ateliers, symposiums) dont la section a eu recours était

1	2	3	4	5
Trop peu		Correct		Trop

Le nombre de réunions des membres

1	2	3	4	5
Trop peu		Correct		Trop

Nous vous remercions du temps que vous avez consacré à répondre à ce questionnaire.

Appendix D French Open-Ended Questionnaire

Évaluation du Congrès de la Société canadienne de psychologie
Ste Foy (Québec)
juin 2001

Interviewer :

R
V

Date :

Dans quelle province ou quelle état travaillez-vous?

À quelle(s) organisation(s) de psychologie appartenez-vous?

Appartenez-vous à une section de la SCP? Oui Non

Dans l'affirmative, veuillez indiquer à quelle(s) section(s) vous appartenez :
Est-ce que vous vous définiriez principalement comme un(e) :

Praticien(ne) du secteur public	Praticien(ne) du secteur privé	Scientifique	Enseignant(e)	Étudiant(e)
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------	---------------	-------------

Êtes-vous inscrit(e) pour :

Tout le Congrès

Une journée ou plus (mais pas tout le Congrès)

Évaluation globale

Globalement, comment évalueriez-vous le Congrès de cette année?

1	2	3	4	5
Pauvre	Médiocre	Correct	Bon	Excellent

En terme de rapport qualité/prix, comment évalueriez-vous le présent Congrès (lorsque vous prenez en considération le coût d'inscription au Congrès, les chambres et les repas)?

1	2	3	4	5
Très mauvais rapport qualité/prix	Mauvais rapport qualité/prix	Rapport qualité prix à peu près correct	Bon rapport qualité/prix	Très bon rapport qualité/prix

Avez-vous déjà assisté à des Congrès de la SCP? Oui Non

Dans l'affirmative comment compareriez-vous celui-ci aux autres?

1	2	3	4	5
Bien pire	Pire	Même chose	Mieux	Beaucoup mieux

Quelles sont les probabilités que vous assisterez aux Congrès de la SCP à l'avenir?

1	2	3	4	5
Très peu probable		Je ne sais pas		Fort probable

Questions d'ordre général

Quel est le plus important facteur qui fait que vous assistez ou non à un Congrès de la SCP?

Selon vous, quels ont été les faits saillants du présent Congrès?

Qu'espérez-vous retirer du Congrès (par ex., réseautage, présentations, formation professionnelle...)

Si vous faisiez partie du comité d'organisation du Congrès, quels changements voudriez-vous apporter pour l'an prochain?

Auriez-vous des suggestions de noms de conférencier d'honneur pour les prochains Congrès?

Nous vous remercions du temps que vous avez consacré à répondre à ce questionnaire.

Appendix E 2001 Procedural Details

There were two questionnaire formats at the convention.

- Longer, more detailed questionnaire with specific questions. This will have general questions about the convention and some section specific questions.
- Open ended questionnaire

Data collection

We recruited eight bilingual undergraduates from Laval to collect the data. Interviewers received free registration, as did the other student volunteers. The Chair of the Evaluation Committee met with the interviewers to discuss sampling prior to the convention.

Interviewers wore a special coloured ribbon or badge to identify themselves. Each interviewer was assigned to a specific location. They randomly selected every 5th person that passed them, and ask that person to participate. CPA Board members, Convention Committee members, and CPA staff were not eligible to participate and were omitted from the sample.

Target sample size was around 300 for detailed questionnaire and 100 for the open ended one.

The following is the schedule and target number of cases for each day, used in 2001.

	AM	# interviews	PM	# interviews	Total
Thur			E,F,G,H	64	
Friday	A,B,C,D	64	E,F,G,H	64	
Sat	A,B,C,D	64			
TOTAL		128		128	256
Detailed		102		102	205
Open		26		26	51

Note: Letters stand for each of 8 interviewers

At the opening session of the convention we announced the evaluation, explained about the coloured ribbon or badge, and asked people to please take the time if approached. We also told people that they could approach the interviewers and ask for a questionnaire. (A space on the questionnaire noted if respondent was random or volunteer.)