

## CSCW 2002 Doctoral Colloquium

Paul Dourish  
Information & Computer Science  
UC Irvine  
[jpd@ics.uci.edu](mailto:jpd@ics.uci.edu)



## goals for the colloquium

- to gain new perspectives
  - present your work to new audiences
  - solicit a wider range of feedback
- to initiate reflection
  - most of you are in the later stages of your work
  - reflecting on how to organize and present
- to initiate conversations
  - with us
  - with each other
  - today and in the future

## plan for the day

- the schedule is *very* tight
  - conference constraints & our desire to accommodate as many people as we could
  - please try to keep to time
    - we have a little slop, but not much
  - regard today as the *start* of conversations
    - use breaks, lunch, the conference, email to follow-up

## plan for the day

- day broken into half-hour slots
  - we'll go alphabetically rather than by theme
    - sorry, Irene!
  - brief presentation followed by discussion
    - focus on the main points; we'll follow up about detail
  - listen to the conversation about others' work
    - the issues tend to be common ones across everyone
  - participate in those conversations
    - your own experiences are valuable
    - learn from each other as much as from us

## plan for the day

8:30	Breakfast
9:00	Intro
9:30	Mattias Esbjornsson
10:00	Chris Hinds
10:30	Break
11:00	Charlotte Lee
11:30	Jon Matthews
12:00	Jack Muramatsu
12:30-1:30	Lunch

## plan for the day

1:30	Kris Nagel
2:00	David Pinelle
2:30	Ekaterina Prasolova-Forland
3:00	Ahmad Reeves
3:30	Break
4:00	Stephanie Roeder
4:30	Wendy Schafer
5:00	Irene Sigismondi
5:30	Wrap-up
6:00	Repair to the bar!

## some generic issues

- constructing an argument
  - identifying a thesis
  - identifying a contribution
  - motivating the work
  - situating the work
  - “That’s Interesting” -- Davis
- listen to the talks (today & at CSCW) for this...
  - the *form* as well as the *content* of the argument
- read other people’s dissertations!
  - best way to write one is to know what they look like

## some generic issues

- PhD is your first piece of research
  - two views of the PhD
    - a contribution to the sum of human knowledge
    - a licence to do further research
  - demonstrate that you understand and can execute the *process* of conducting research
- focus, focus, focus
  - precision is absolutely critical
  - a narrow but well-defined problem is much easier to defend than a broad but diffuse one
  - don’t leave anything to the examiners’ imagination!

## final caveat

- emphasize constructive criticism
  - students are often the harshest critics of their own (and others’ work)
  - different research styles
    - different national approaches
    - different disciplinary approaches
    - different personal approaches
  - constructive comments are better listened to
  - constructive comments are more relevant to *group*