



# National Defense University

## Center for Technology and National Security Policy



June 28th and 29th, 2008

# **Human Social and Cultural Behavior Modeling Workshop**

## Post-workshop Survey Results



# Survey Purpose, Goal, and Methodology



- Purpose: Measure the perceived value and utility of the Human Social and Cultural Behavior Modeling workshop to attendees
- Goal: Use survey responses to gauge the success of the workshop and identify areas for improvement for future events in the HSCB Modeling workshop series
- Methodology: Surveys presenting 5 short answer prompts and a recommendation section were handed out to each attendee at the close of the workshop



## Questions 1- 3

- Prompt: *“We welcome your comments, for both process and content, for any or all of the following.”*
- Respondents were asked to evaluate both plenary sessions and the two working groups they participated in



# Results: Plenary Session - Day 1

- Areas of Satisfaction:
  - Respondents were satisfied with the caliber and diversity of the speakers
  - Several respondents were very happy with Dr. Partnow's presentation, noting that she applied HSCB modeling in an entirely novel way
- Areas of Dissatisfaction:
  - Some respondents felt that the presentations did not delve into enough technical detail



# Results: Plenary Session - Day 2



- Areas of Satisfaction:
  - As with Day 1 respondents were very satisfied with the quality of the presenters
  - The more technical nature of Day 2's presentations satisfied respondents who were unhappy with the talks on Day 1
- Areas of Dissatisfaction:
  - Several respondents felt the session ran too long and would have benefited from more breaks



# Results: Social Science - Micro Working Group



- Areas of Satisfaction:
  - Respondents were generally happy with the quality of their fellow participants
  - Respondents appreciated the mix of civilian, military, and academic personnel
- Areas of Dissatisfaction:
  - Several respondents noted that the format was too “free-form” to effectively capture data
  - Many respondents felt the working group was over-crowded



# Results: Social Science - Macro Working Group



- Areas of Satisfaction:
  - Respondents were generally pleased with the quality of moderation and variety of fields represented
  - Respondents indicated that the thought papers were a good jumping off point for discussion
- Areas of Dissatisfaction:
  - Many respondents felt too much time was spent hashing out definitions and ontology
  - As with the Micro group, several respondents felt that the session had too many participants to be fruitful



# Results: Operations Research Working Group



- Areas of Satisfaction:
  - Respondents were very pleased with the discussion
  - Respondents were happy with the quality of moderation
- Areas of Dissatisfaction:
  - Several respondents felt that OR specialists were overrepresented
  - Most respondents indicated that the working group needed stronger focus



# Results: Models, Methods, and VV&A Working Group



- Areas of Satisfaction:
  - Respondents enjoyed both Dr. Arbetman-Rabinowitz's presentation and the discussion it yielded
- Areas of Dissatisfaction:
  - Respondents felt that the working group focused on verification at the expense of exploring validation
  - Many respondents thought that the session lacked sufficient focus to draw out important ideas



# Results: Deterrence Working Group



- Areas of Satisfaction:
  - Respondents were very pleased with both the focus and quality of discussion
  - Most respondents noted that the working group was very well structured in comparison to the Day 1 groups
- Areas of Dissatisfaction:
  - Some respondents felt the group could have benefited from more time



# Results: Counterterrorism Working Group



- Areas of Satisfaction:
  - Most respondents were very pleased with Lt Col Lailari's and Dr. Gupta's moderation
  - Most respondents noted that they were satisfied with the final out-brief produced
- Areas of Dissatisfaction:
  - Some respondents felt the discussion did not reach deeply enough into the technical aspects of HSCB modeling



# Results: Counterinsurgency Working Group



- Areas of Satisfaction:
  - Respondents indicated that Dr. Goldstone was a *very* effective group chair
  - Respondents felt that having CDR Pierson and Dr. Crane outlining their model added significant value to the discussion
- Areas of Dissatisfaction:
  - Several respondents felt that more discussion of needs would have created a more effective final product



# Results: SSTRO Working Group



- Areas of Satisfaction:
  - Respondents were pleased with the level of focus compared to Day 1 sessions
  - Most respondents noted that the cross-disciplinary collaboration was productive
- Areas of Dissatisfaction:
  - Many respondents felt that group discourse would have been improved if frameworks and definitions were established prior to the working group



## Question 4

- Prompt: *“What did you like most about this workshop?”*
  - Respondents were generally very happy with the caliber of the speakers, chairs and their fellow invitees
  - Most respondents were very pleased with the quality of discussions in the working groups, even if they had complaints about other areas of the sessions
  - Respondents enjoyed the social aspects of the workshop, particularly the catering and social event following Day 1’s working groups



## Question 5

- Prompt: *“What aspects of this workshop need improvement?”*
  - Respondents in Day 1 working groups felt their experience would have been more productive with clearer, more concrete goals
  - Respondents almost universally agreed that the establishment of a formal ontology would greatly aid progress in HSCB modeling research
  - Many respondents noted that the workshop could’ve been more productive if working groups were smaller



# Respondent Recommendations



- **Civilian respondents felt that distributing a glossary of military acronyms prior to future workshops would greatly enhance their experience; many felt lost in “acronym-ese”**
- **Many respondents would have liked more time for questions during the plenary sessions**
- **Development of a “Wiki” to help the community refine definitions and establish what HSCB models are currently available or in development**
- **Several respondents would like to see more applied research in the next workshop**



# Conclusions

- Respondents were generally satisfied with the overall quality of the workshop
- However, most also indicated that establishing a common ontology and lexicon prior to the workshop would have added significant value to working group outputs
- Nearly all respondents noted that the cross-disciplinary working groups on Day 2 produced better discussion. Future workshops in the HSCB Modeling series could benefit from more formal facilitation and moderation