Survey Statistics	
Viewed	297
Started	54
Completed	54
Completion Rate	100%
Drop Outs (After Starting)	0
Av erage time taken to complete survey : 12 minute(s)	

Frequ	iency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Yes	11	20.37%					
2.	No	43	79.63%					
	Total	54	100%					
Key A	nalytics							
Mean			1.796					
Confi 95%	dence Interval @	[1.	688 - 1.905] n = 54					
Stand	ard Deviation		0.407					
Stand	ard Error		0.055					

Frequ	iency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Most recent one	3	27.27%					
2.	Most successful one	2	18.18%					
3.	Largest one in terms of labeled units	2	18.18%					
4.	Largest one in terms of spent annotation time	1	9.09%					
5.	Most interesting one	3	27.27%					
6.	Other	0	0.00%					
	Total	11	100%					
Key A	nalytics							
Mean			2.909	<b>Key Facts</b>				
Confi 95%	fidence Interval @ [1.940 -		940 - 3.879] n = 11	<b>■ 54.55</b> %	% chose the	•	options :	
Stand	ard Deviation		1.640		ost recent o ost interesti			
Stand	ard Error		0.495		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	19 0110		

Frequ	iency Analysis								
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	
1.	Document classification	3	17.65%						
2.	Part-of-speech	1	5.88%						
3.	Chunk	1	5.88%						
4.	Parse	0	0.00%						
5.	Word senses	2	11.76%						
6.	Sentiment	0	0.00%						
7.	Named entity	5	29.41%						
8.	Relations/Ev ents	4	23.53%						
9.	Other	1	5.88%						
	Total	17	100%						
Key A	nalytics								
Mean	-		5.529	Key Facts					
Confi 95%	dence Interval @ [4.		184 - 6.875] n = 17	52.94% chose the following options:					
Stand	ard Deviation		2.831		lations/Eve	nts			
Stand	ard Error		0.687						

Frequ	iency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Newswire	3	25.00%					
2.	Bio-medical	4	33.33%					
3.	Other	5	41.67%					
	Total	12	100%					
Key A	nalytics							
Mean	ean 2.167		Key Facts					
Confi 95%	-		694 - 2.639] n= 12	- Ullici				
Stand	ard Deviation		0.835	■ Least ch	osen optio	n <b>25%</b> :		
Stand	ard Error		0.241	⇒ Ne	wswire			

Frequ	iency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	English	11	100.00%					
2.	Hindi	0	0.00%					
3.	Mandarin	0	0.00%					
4.	Arabic	0	0.00%					
5.	Spanish	0	0.00%					
6.	French	0	0.00%					
7.	German	0	0.00%					
8.	Other	0	0.00%					
	Total	11	100%					
Key A	nalytics							
Mean			1.000					
Confi 95%	dence Interval @	[1.	000 - 1.000] n = 11					
Stand	ard Deviation		0.000					
Stand	ard Error		0.000					

How did you assemble the corpus of unlabeled annotation instances (i.e., the pool from which your AL mechanism selected)? (Select one alternative)

	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	We took all annotation instances available to us	3	27.27%					
2.	Random subsample of all annotation available instances	3	27.27%					
3.	Subsample of all annotation available instances based on introspection	0	0.00%					
4.	Subsample of all annotation available instances based on key words	3	27.27%					
5.	Other	2	18.18%					
	Total	11	100%					
Cey A	nalytics							
1ean			2.818	Key Facts				
Confid 5%	dence Interval @	[1.	872 - 3.764] n= 11	<b>34.55%</b> ⇒ We	took all an	following on the following of the follow	-	ailable
tand	ard Deviation		1.601	▶ Rar	ndom subs	ample of al	I annotatio	n
Stand	ard Error		0.483	av a	ailable insta	inces		

Frequ	iency Analysis								
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	
1.	Uncertainty sampling	2	18.18%						
2.	Query -by -Committee (including variants such as Query - by -Bagging, Query - by -Boosting, Co-testing etc)	2	18.18%						
3.	Variance Reduction	0	0.00%						
4.	Expected error reduction	2 18.18%							
5.	Other	5	45.45%						
	Total	11	100%						
Key A	nalytics								
Mean			3.545	Key Facts					
Confi 95%	•		544 - 4.547] n = 11	<b>€ 63.64</b> %		e following o	options :		
Stand	ard Deviation		1.695		certainty s	ampling			
Stand	ard Error		0.511		oortainty o	apg			

Frequ	uency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Evaluation of model learned on annotations with a held-out gold standard	4	36.36%					
2.	Money and/or time available for annotation used up	4	36.36%					
3.	All relev ant documents annotated	1	9.09%					
4.	Expected gains in model performance compared to additional annotation costs below critical threshold	1	9.09%					
5.	Other	1	9.09%					
	Total	11	100%					
Key A	Analytics							
Mean		2.182		Key Facts 72.73	% chose the	following o	options :	
Confi 95%	dence Interval @			⊁ Ev	ned on ann lard	d on annotations		
Stand	ard Deviation	ard Deviation 1.328		us	ed up hosen option			
Stand	ard Error		0.400		I relevant do		nnotated	

Frequ	uency Analysis								
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	
1.	Minimize labeling cost	8	72.73%						
2.	Gather experience with/test AL	0	0.00%						
3.	Test your annotation guidelines against hard cases	2	18.18%						
4.	Other	1	9.09%						
	Total	11	100%						
Key A	Analytics								
Mean			1.636	<b>Key Facts</b>					
Confi 95%			974 - 2.298] n = 11	=					
Stand	ard Deviation		1.120		st y our ann	otation guid	lelines agai	nst	
Stand	ard Error		0.338	ha	rd cases				

Frequ	iency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Yes	4	36.36%					
2.	No	1	9.09%					
3.	Partially	6	54.55%					
	Total	11	100%					
Key A	nalytics							
Mean			2.182	<b>Key Facts</b>				
Confid 95%	dence Interval @	[1.602 - 2.762] n = 11		● 90.91% Part	options :			
Stand	ard Deviation		0.982	Least che	osen optio	n <b>9.09%</b> :		
O4I	ard Error		0.296	. No				

Would you use AL	again in an	annotation	project o	f this t	y pe and	scope? (Sele	ct
one alternative)							

Frequ	ency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Yes	11	100.00%					
2.	No, because	0	0.00%					
	Total	11	100%					
Key A	nalytics							
Mean			1.000					
Confid 95%	dence Interval @	[1.	000 - 1.000] n = 11					
Standa	ard Deviation		0.000					
Standa	ard Error		0.000					

Which of the following is the annotation project you are reporting on? (Select one alternative) Frequency Analysis Percent 80% Count 20% 40% 60% 100% Answer 65.12% 1. Most recent one 28 5 2. Most successful one 11.63% Largest one in terms 7 16.28% 3. of labeled units Largest one in terms of spent annotation 2.33% time 5. Most interesting one 1 2.33% 1 2.33% 6. Other **Total** 43 100% **Key Analytics Key Facts** Mean 1.721 **81.4%** chose the following options: [1.362 - 2.080] Most recent one Confidence Interval @ 95% n = 43Largest one in terms of labeled units Least chosen option 2.33%: Standard Deviation 1.202 Largest one in terms of spent annotation Standard Error 0.183

Frequ	iency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Document classification	4	5.26%					
2.	Part-of-speech	10	13.16%					
3.	Chunk	4	5.26%					
4.	Parse	7	9.21%					
5.	Word senses	4	5.26%					
6.	Sentiment	2	2.63%					
7.	Named entity	12	15.79%					
8.	Relations/Events	13	17.11%					
9.	Other	20	26.32%					
	Total	76	100%					
Key A	nalytics							
Mean			6.105	Key Facts				
Confid 95%	idence Interval @ [5.485 - 6.72 n =		485 - 6.726] n = 76	<b>3.42</b> % ∴ Otl			options :	
Stand	ard Deviation		2.760	▶ Least cl	hosen optio	n <b>2.63%</b> :		
Stand	ard Error		0.317	> Se	ntiment			

Frequ	iency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Newswire	9	18.37%					
2.	Bio-medical	13	26.53%					
3.	Other	27	55.10%					
	Total	49	100%					
Key A	nalytics							
Mean			2.367	Key Facts		f all and a second	Cons	
Confid 95%	dence Interval @	[2.	148 - 2.586] n = 49	*** 81.63% ** Oth ** Bio		tollowing c	options :	
Stand	ard Deviation		0.782	Least ch	osen optio	n <b>18.37</b> %	:	
Stand	ard Error		0.112	⇒ Ne	wswire			

Frequ	iency Analysis								
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	
1.	English	27	62.79%						
2.	Hindi	1	2.33%						
3.	Mandarin	0	0.00%						
4.	Arabic	0	0.00%						
5.	Spanish	4	9.30%						
6.	French	3	6.98%						
7.	German	1	2.33%						
8.	Other	7	16.28%						
	Total	43	100%						
Key A	nalytics								
Mean			3.023	Key Facts					
Confi 95%	dence Interval @	[2.169 - 3.877] n = 43		<b>▶ 79.07%</b> chose the following options :					
Stand	ard Deviation		2.858	> En					
Stand	ard Error		0.436						

How did you assemble the corpus of annotation instances to be labeled? (Select one alternative) Frequency Analysis Answer Count Percent 20% 40% 60% 80% 100% We took all annotation 17 39.53% instances available to us Random subsample 2. of all available 13 30.23% annotation instances Subsample of all av ailable annotation 3 6.98% instances based on introspection Subsample of all av ailable annotation 4 9.30% instances based on key words 5. Other 6 13.95% 43 **Total** 100% **Key Analytics Key Facts** 2.279 Mean ■ 69.77% chose the following options: ▶ We took all annotation instances available Confidence Interval @ [1.850 - 2.708] to us 95% n = 43Random subsample of all available annotation instances Standard Deviation 1.436 Least chosen option 6.98%: Subsample of all available annotation instances based on introspection Standard Error 0.219

requ	iency Analysis								
	Answer	Count	Percent	200	%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Evaluation of model learned on annotations with a held-out gold standard	1	2.33%						
2.	Cross-v alidation of model on annotations	1	2.33%						
3.	Money and/or time available for annotation used up	19	44.19%				]		
4.	All relevant documents annotated	15	34.88%						
5.	Expected gains in model performance compared to additional annotation costs below critical threshold	2	4.65%						
6.	Other	5	11.63%						
	Total	43	100%						
(ey A	nalytics								
/lean			3.721	Key Fa		chose the	e following o	options :	
Confid 95%	dence Interval @	[3.	393 - 4.049] n = 43	>	Mon use	ey and/or d up	time availa	ble for an	notation
Stand	ard Deviation		1.098	▶ Lea			n <b>2.33</b> % :		
Stand	ard Error		0.167	>			model learr t gold stand		otations

Frequ	uency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Never heard of Active Learning	8	11.11%					
2.	Insufficient expertise/knowledge	18	25.00%					
3.	Did not want to spend overhead in implementing Active Learning-based annotation environment	12	16.67%					
4.	Did not meet my projects specific requirements	10	13.89%					
5.	Wanted a corpus with a different instance distribution	2	2.78%					
6.	Was not convinced that Active Learning would reduce labeling cost	7	9.72%					
7.	Doubts that Active Learning would work well in my scenario	8	11.11%					
8.	Other	7	9.72%					
	Total	72	100%					
(ey A	Analytics							
Mean			3.944	Key Facts  41.67%	6 chose the	following o	options :	
Confi 95%	dence Interval @	[3.4	117 - 4.472] n = 72	» Dic	ufficient ex I not want to Diementing A notation env	o spend ov Active Lear	erhead in	d
Stand	ard Deviation		2.282	■ Least ch	nosen optioi	n <b>2.78</b> % :		
Stand	ard Error		0.269	▶ Wa	nted a corp tribution		ifferent in	stance

Frequ	uency Analysis								
	Answer	Count	Percent		20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Yes	17	39.53%						
2.	No	0	0.00%						
3.	Maybe	24	55.81%						
4.	Only under specific circumstances:	2	4.65%						
	Total	43	100%						
Key A	Analytics								
Mean			2.256	Kev	Facts				
Confid 95%	dence Interval @	[1.942 - 2.569] n = 43		95.35% chose the following options :					
Stand	ard Deviation	1.049			→ Mag	=			
Stand	ard Error		0.160		F 10.	5			

Frequ	ency Analysis								
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	
1.	Academia	46	85.19%						
2.	Industry	3	5.56%						
3.	Gov ernmental organization	3	5.56%						
4.	Other	2	3.70%						
	Total	54	100%						
Key A	nalytics								
Mean			1.278	Key Fac	ts				
Confid 95%	Confidence Interval @ [1.081 - 1.475]								
Standa	ard Deviation	ion 0.738							
Standa	ard Error		0.100	>	Other				

Frequ	iency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Linguistics	12	22.22%					
2.	Computational linguistics	25	46.30%					
3.	Computer Science/Informatics	12	22.22%					
4.	Mathematics	0	0.00%					
5.	Other	5	9.26%					
	Total	54	100%					
Key A	nalytics							
Mean			2.278	<b>Key Facts</b>				
Confid 95%	fidence Interval @ [1.983 -		983 - 2.573] n = 54	68.52% chose the following option			-	
Stand	ard Deviation		1.106		quistics	i iiiigaistics		
Stand	ard Error		0.151	`	<b>J</b>			

Frequ	iency Analysis								
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	
1.	General Text Mining	15	27.78%						
2.	Bio Text Mining	11	20.37%						
3.	Machine Learning	10	18.52%						
4.	Other	18	33.33%						
	Total	54	100%						
Key A	nalytics								
Mean			2.574	Key Facts					
Confid 95%	dence Interval @	dence Interval @ [2.248 - 2.900] n = 54							
Stand	ard Deviation			Least ch	osen optio	n <b>18.52</b> %	:		
Stand	ndard Error 0.1		0.166	<b>∍</b> Mad	chine Learr	ning			

Frequ	iency Analysis							
	Answer	Count	Percent	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
1.	Yes	30	55.56%					
2.	No	24	44.44%					
	Total	54	100%					
Key A	nalytics							
Mean			1.444					
Confi 95%	dence Interval @	[1.3	311 - 1.578] n = 54					
Stand	Standard Deviation 0.502		0.502					
Stand	ard Error		0.068					

Analytics Powered by QuestionPro