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## Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hackathon Participants</th>
<th>Survey Sample</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks

- The data was collected by means of an online survey between 1st and 19 October 2021, i.e. approx. 6 months after the event; one invitation email and two reminders were sent out.
- The response rate of 37% is similar to the one of the previous year (38%) and a bit lower than in earlier years (42-50%).
Composition of the Participants
Gender Distribution (based on registration data)

N = 95

Gender:
- Male: 55%
- Female: 45%
Participants’ Professional Background or Field of Study

N = 35
Several answers possible

Professional Background or Field of Study

- Information technology, engineering: 51%
- Cultural heritage profession: 43%
- Teaching, education: 20%
- Media, journalism: 6%
- Marketing, communication: 6%
- Design, artistic profession: 6%
- Social sciences, humanities: 29%
- Other: 3%
Participants’ Previous Hackathon Experience

How many other hackathons had you attended before?

N = 35

- 0: 46%
- 1: 17%
- 2: 14%
- 3: 9%
- 4-5: 9%
- 6-10: 3%
- more than 10: 3%
Participants’ Role(s) During the Hackathon

In which role did you participate in the hackathon?

N = 35

Several answers possible

- Data provider: 37%
- Software programmer: 43%
- Ideator: 29%
- Designer: 11%
- Researcher: 26%
- Multimedia producer: 14%
- Artist: 6%
- Wikipedia editor: 3%
- Wikidata editor: 6%
- Hackathon organizer: 11%
Remarks / Insights

- Like in the previous year, the hackathon has reached almost equal representation of men and women after women had been underrepresented in earlier years (2015: 19%; 2016: 33%; 2017: 37%; 2018: 39%; 2019*: 12%; 2020: 45%; 2021: 45%).

- The hackathon attracted a substantial share of new hackathon-goers (46%); this number is a bit higher than in the last few years (2015: 61%; 2016: 53%; 2017: 37%; 2018: 41%; 2020: 38%; 2021: 46%).

- Software programmers (43%) and data providers (37%) made up the largest participants groups, followed by ideators (29%) and researchers (26%).

- Half of the participants had an IT or engineering background (51%). The other three professional groups that were most strongly represented were cultural heritage professionals (43%), people with a background in the social sciences or in the humanities (29%), and people with a background in teaching and education (20%).

* Note that in 2019, the hackathon had a completely different format (3 days; mix’n’hack); due to the smaller number of participants (33) no survey data is available for 2019.
Communication Channels
How Participants Learned About the Hackathon

How did you learn about the hackathon?

- Through social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.): 14%
- Through a mailing list or a newsletter: 37%
- Through a poster, flyer, etc.: 3%
- At a real life event (meetup, conference, etc.): 17%
- A friend or colleague told me about the hackathon: 6%
- A teacher or professor of mine told me about the hackathon: 9%
- I'm a member of the organizing team / organization: 26%
- I just remembered from last year: 20%
- Other: 3%

N = 35
Several answers possible
Remarks / Insights

- The communication channels that worked best to attract participants were mailing lists and newsletters (37%) as well as word of mouth through friends or colleagues (26%) or the organizers (17%).
- One fifth of the participants said that they had just remembered the hackathon from the previous year.
Participants’ Activity During and After the Hackathon
Involvement in Hackathon Projects

N = 35

How many projects did you work on during the hackathon?

- 86% worked on one project.
- 9% worked on more than one project.
- 6% did not work on any project.

none
one
more than one
Activity around Hackathon Projects after the Event

Have you further pursued the project(s) you worked on during the hackathon?

N = 32

- Yes: 34%
- No: 66%
• **91% of hackathon participants took an active part** in at least one of the 17 hackathon projects. The remaining 9% acted as organizers or participated as “observers” or data providers.

• **34% of the participants** who had taken an active part in one of the hackathon projects **further pursued their project** after the event. This number is at the lower end compared to what has been observed in earlier years. (2015: 50%; 2016: 40%; 2017: 50%; 2018: 35%; 2020: 43%; 2021: 34%). Note the varying time lag between the event and the survey (2015: 9 months; 2016: 5 months; 2017: 6 months; 2018: 6 months; 2020: 4 months; 2021: 6 months).

• About **half** of those who have not further pursued their project(s) have not done so due to a **lack of time**. Others pointed to a lack of interest in the topic. Three respondents indicated that the project’s aim had already been reached during the hackathon. In one case, one of the participating organizations will take care of the implementation of the project.
Effectiveness of the Hackathon
### Effectiveness of the Hackathon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1 - Not effective at all</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 - Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting interesting people / networking (34)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring new skills and know-how (35)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting new inspiration or ideas (39)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting a concrete project done (39)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting/promoting access to cultural data (39)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing decision-makers to make data openly available for re-use (25)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding funding opportunities for your project(s) (24)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N varies for the different items (indicated in brackets)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meeting interesting people / networking</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting new inspiration or ideas</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting / promoting access to cultural data</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finding out how the data/content of your institution can be used in new contexts</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing skills and know-how</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convincing decision-makers in your institution to make cultural data/content openly available for re-use</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquiring skills and know-how</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting a concrete project done</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finding funding opportunities for your project</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks / Insights

- The hackathon has been **most effective** in terms of “getting new inspiration or ideas” (rated positively at 91%), of “finding out how data of one's institution can be used in new contexts” (72%), and of “meeting interesting people / networking” (67%), followed by “sharing skills and know-how” (60%), and “getting/promoting access to cultural data” (57%).

- The hackathon has been **somewhat effective** in acquiring new skills and know-how (49%), in convincing decision-makers to make cultural data/content openly available for re-use (48%), and in getting a concrete project done (48%).

- The hackathon has been **rather ineffective** in terms of finding funding opportunities for hackathon projects (17%).

- The reported **effectiveness of the two online hackathons is the same as for the earlier in-person hackathons**, maybe at the exception of «meeting interesting people / networking» where they score equally low as the 2018 edition which featured a competition between hackathon projects.

- Interestingly, the **2021 hackathon scored an all-time high on «getting new inspiration and ideas»**.
Suggested Topics for the Side Programme
Topics for the Side Programme

Participants were asked to indicate what topics should be covered as part of the (online) side programme of future hackathons. The results are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Average score (1-5)</th>
<th>Percentage of “(very) interesting”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machine learning applications in the heritage field</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linked data use cases from the heritage field</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to linked data</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowdsourcing projects in the heritage field</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on Wikidata introductory workshop</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on OpenRefine workshop</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of data cleansing tools and techniques</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From prototype to product – how hackathon projects made their way into productive systems</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the IIIF standard</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further mentions (“other topics”):
- Publishing linked data on websites and blogs in an incremental manner
- Bringing the hackathon into your organization
Participants’ Satisfaction
General Satisfaction

How did you like the hackathon in general?

N = 35

1 - I did not like it at all 2 3 4 5 - I liked it very much

60% 37% 3% 0% 0%
Readiness to Participate in Another Cultural Hackathon

Would you participate in a cultural data hackathon again?

N = 35

- 0% for 1: No. not at all
- 0% for 2
- 11% for 3
- 23% for 4
- 66% for 5: Yes. absolutely

The graph indicates that 66% of respondents would participate in another cultural data hackathon, with 23% choosing a moderate level of participation.
Readiness to Recommend the Hackathon

Would you recommend a friend/peer to participate in the upcoming hackathon?

N = 35

- 0% for option 1 - No. not at all
- 0% for option 2
- 9% for option 3
- 14% for option 4
- 77% for option 5 - Yes. absolutely

1 - No. not at all
2
3
4
5 - Yes. absolutely
## Satisfaction scores over the years

### Percentages with scores 4 or 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General satisfaction</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to participate again</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to recommend</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentages with score 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General satisfaction</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to participate again</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to recommend</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions
Conclusions

- From a participants’ perspective, the hackathon has been a large success. Satisfaction rates are among the highest in the history of the Swiss Open Cultural Data Hackathon.
- The hackathon continues to attract a significant share of participants who hadn’t been involved in hackathons before.
- The hackathon has been most effective in terms of spurring and exchanging ideas, finding out how data can be used in new contexts, networking, sharing skills and know how, and promoting access to cultural data.
- From a sustainability point of view, the survey results paint a mixed picture: Only a third of the participants actively involved in one of the projects had further pursued their project(s) 6 months after the event. As expected, the hackathon hardly improved the participants’ chances to get funding for their projects.
- The online format has proven as effective in achieving the objectives of the hackathon as the traditional in-person format. What participants missed most was the richness of social interactions typical for an in-person hackathon. In the online format, social interactions are mostly limited to one’s own team. Several respondents indicated that they would prefer an in-person hackathon if it were not for the pandemic.