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Summary

The Being Human festival 2014

Being Human is the UK’s first and only national festival dedicated to the humanities. The inaugural Being Human festival ran over nine days, from 15th to 23rd November 2014. Led by the School of Advanced Study, University of London, in partnership with the Arts and Humanities Research Council and the British Academy, the 2014 festival encouraged universities and other cultural organisations to hold humanities-focussed events for the public. 163 events were held, attended by 15,000 to 20,000 people, and organised by 161 participating organisations, 57 of whom were registered as 'lead participants' for their festival events.

Evaluating the 2014 festival

In terms of evaluation, the festival team at the School of Advanced Study collected qualitative and quantitative data about people’s experiences and perceptions of the first Being Human festival, via two questionnaire surveys and a series of ‘vox pop’ interviews. These data were then outsourced to an independent researcher (Dr Ruth Townsley) for analysis and reporting.

Using data collected from 1,254 festival attendees, 26 vox pop respondents and 45 lead participating organisations, the evaluation considered the success of the Being Human festival 2014 against its stated aims, which were:

- To inspire innovation in public engagement with leading research in the humanities.
- To foster collaboration between HEIs, independent research organisations and cultural and community partners.
- To make a significant and visible contribution to the national cultural life of the UK in November 2014.
- To demonstrate the need and desire for an annual national festival of the humanities.

Findings from the survey of attendees

- **Number of events attended:** Most people had attended just one event (89%). A few (5%) indicated they had attended two to four events, with just 1% attending five events or more. A total of 1,414 visits were made to festival events by the 1,254 people who responded to the survey. The majority of attendees visited events in just one region of the UK, with a small proportion attending events in two or three regions.

- **Profile of festival attendees:** More women (53.6%) than men (35.2%) attended events and 10% of all attendees described themselves as disabled. The age of attendees was
mixed, with fairly equal representation across all age groups, with the exception of the youngest group of attendees (age 14 or less) where attendance was less than 1%. The majority of festival attendees described themselves as White (76.4%). The profile of festival attendees by ethnic group broadly matches national statistics\(^1\) for White, Mixed/Multiple, and Other ethnic groups. Proportionately, however, the festival is less consistent in reaching Asian\(^2\) and Black\(^3\) groups of the national population. More than three-quarters (77%) of all attendees were graduates and of these, 70% reported that they had a humanities degree.

- **Attendees’ prior knowledge of festival events**: Most people heard about the festival by word of mouth, followed by web-based communication, email and social media. Paper-based communication (magazines, newspapers, newsletter, etc) were less successful in reaching people, with the national press playing a very minor role. Most attendees (86%) felt that events had matched their expectations exactly, very closely or closely. Very few people (6%) thought that events had not been as they had expected. When asked if they had visited the event venue before, 54% said they had, 39% had not and 7% did not provide an answer.

- **Attendees’ experiences of festival events**: Most people indicated that the events they attended had been ‘excellent’ (48%) or ‘very good’ (33%). Fewer described events simply as ‘good’ (18%) and very few as ‘not very good’ (1%). Just one person (less than 0.1%) thought the event he had attended was ‘terrible’. When asked if they would recommend the Being Human festival to others, the vast majority of attendees (85%) said they would; 5% did not know, and just 1% said they would not.

- **Attendees liked**:
  - Speakers’ knowledge, enthusiasm and expertise
  - The wide variety of presentations, talks, films, music, tours, exhibitions, readings, lectures, and other events on offer
  - Events that were different, engaging, free, friendly, informative, interactive, interesting and participative
  - Content and topics that prompted discussion, stimulated debate, were focussed on research, were academic but accessible, and involved the audience
  - Venues that were comfortable, had a good atmosphere and included refreshments.

- **Attendees disliked**:
  - Speakers who were hard to hear and spoke too fast; the fact there were no women speakers at some events
  - Events where the format was unclear in advance; that were too long or too short; had little discussion, debate or time for questions; did not involve the audience; had no activities; were difficult to book online; were fully booked in advance but not full on the day
  - Content and topics that lacked focus; where the central subject was unclear in advance; were not linked sufficiently to the festival theme

---

2. ONS 2011 census data show 7.5% of the population were Asian and Asian British: 4.2% of Being Human festival 2014 attendees were from these ethnic groups.
3. ONS 2011 census data show 3.3% of the population were Black, African, Caribbean and Black British: 1.7% of Being Human festival 2014 attendees were from these ethnic groups.
Venues that were too cold, too hot, difficult to find, lacked signage on site, had poor acoustics and did not include refreshments.

- **Attendees’ perceptions of humanities research**: There was a small amount of qualitative evidence to suggest that attendance at festival events may have had an impact on people’s perceptions of humanities research. Some attendees appeared mildly surprised that the academic events they attended were so accessible, relaxed and welcoming. Others described feeling inspired, informed and enthused by the content and delivery of events, possibly in ways that they had not expected. Some were now planning to do further research or reading on the topic and a few thought the festival had showcased the intrinsic value of humanities research for them personally, and for wider society.

**Findings from the survey of lead participating organisations**

- **Profile of lead participants**: All but one of the 45 respondents represented universities or other higher education institutions (HEIs). Most (58%) of these lead participants had organised one event as part of the Being Human festival 2014. Around a quarter (24.5%) had organised between two and four events, whilst fewer (17.5%) had put on five events or more, with 11 being the highest number of events organised (by two participants). A total of 121 separate events were organised by the lead participants who responded to the survey. Most of the lead participants (87%) had taken part in some form of public engagement activities before and 47% felt that centrally provided training in this area was not necessary. Just over a third (38%) expressed an interest in training, whilst a few (9%) thought it was something that was of ‘possible’ interest. Most participants had heard about the festival by word of mouth.

- **Visitor numbers**: The 45 lead participants who responded to the survey provided an estimated total audience of 18,881 people across the 121 events they organised, giving a mean average of 156 people per event (range: 4 to 10,000 people). Most events (84%) averaged an audience of one to 100 people. Less events (16%) catered for audiences of more than 100, and of these, only 4% reached audiences of over 250.

- **Event partners**: Very few events (4%) were run by one sole organisation. Most events were held by the lead participant plus one partner (33%). Twenty-two per cent involved the lead plus two other organisations. Less than a quarter of events (21%) were held by consortia of five or more organisations (including the lead). Most event partners were third sector organisations (40%). Public sector organisations, other HEIs and private sector organisations or freelance individuals were significantly less likely to be involved in events. Forty-nine per cent of lead participants said that work on their festival events had helped to create new partnerships with other organisations, whilst 47% felt their partnerships pre-dated the festival.

- **Funding for festival events**: Of the 57 lead organisations who took part in the 2014 festival, 36 received sponsorship of between £500 and £3,000, totalling £58,670 in direct funding for their events. In addition, nine lead participants were funded directly by the
AHRC with grants of £3,000⁴ and 17⁵ drew on their own funds to finance their festival events. Using actual and estimated figures of additional sponsorship and indirect funding, it is suggested that the total resources leveraged by the festival team, HEIs and other sponsors for the 2014 festival was approximately £360,479, five times the funding allocation for individual events administered by the festival team and the AHRC.

- **Staffing festival events**: In most cases (42%), four to ten staff (including students and volunteers) were involved in helping to plan and run festival events. Around a third (31%) of lead participating organisations involved one to three staff in their festival events, whilst a fifth (20%) mobilised a larger number of 11 to 20 staff. In two cases, very large numbers of staff were involved from the lead organisation: one respondent cited 30 and another cited 33.

- **Extent and nature of media coverage gained by participants**: Sixty-nine per cent of participants had gained some media coverage for their events. Of the 73 examples given, the majority (31) were mentions in the regional press and local publications. There was also significant coverage online and via social media (21 mentions). Further media coverage included two mentions on national radio, ten on local radio, three on regional TV, four articles in trade and consumer publications and one mention each in the national press and an international media outlet.

- **Information, advice and support from the Being Human festival team**: Almost all lead participants (42 out of 45) were positive about the information, advice and support they had received from the festival team. Almost all centrally-available festival resources were well-used by lead participants. Logos were used by almost all of the 45 respondents and two-thirds had used the evaluation guide or vox pop cameras.

- **Feedback on Being Human marketing and key messaging**: Most lead participants (78%) provided ‘excellent’, ‘very good’ or ‘good’ feedback about central marketing and key messaging. Positive feedback included: effective and professional marketing for the festival as a whole; excellent use of social media to market the festival, with visible results; clear and eye-catching marketing tools, including logo and branding materials; prompt, helpful and detailed responses from the festival team to individual marketing queries. Twenty-two percent were less positive about the overall input on marketing and key messaging and highlighted the following issues as problematic from their perspective: festival logo and branding materials were perceived as old fashioned and corporate; online festival events listing was difficult to navigate; lack of a print version of the events programme for the festival as a whole; lack of online advertising outside of social media; too much expected of lead participants for the level of funding awarded.

- **Outcomes of festival events**: Analysis of open-ended data from lead participants about what they had gained from the festival highlighted that Being Human events had:
  - Provided experience of doing public engagement work
  - Created opportunities for innovation, experimentation and creativity

---

⁴ These were a series of activities financed by the AHRC but out of a separate budget, administered directly by them and not by the festival.
⁵ This figure includes events held at the School of Advanced Study and funded directly from their own festival grant.
Led to the creation and development of new and existing partnerships
Promoted and validated humanities research.

- Outputs and legacy of festival events included:
  - Blog posts
  - Films of events
  - New websites and online content
  - Exhibition of photos and images from events
  - Technical developments and collection of new data
  - Sound-clips/podcasts
  - New research groups or working groups
  - Pinterest boards
  - Further joint work with event partners
  - Further showing or continued use of event outputs/materials
  - Learning resources for schools
  - Numerous other outputs including a conference paper, iTunes download, book, report, booklet, grant application, Twitter hashtag.

Website traffic, social media activity and media coverage

- Website demographics: Most users of the festival website were UK-domiciled (87%) and based in London (42%). Other main geographical areas represented were Nottingham, Oxford, Edinburgh and Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Men (54%) were more likely to use the website than women (45%) and two-thirds of users (60%) were aged between 18 and 34.

- Website traffic and referrals: Thirty-eight per cent of new users and 33% of all sessions originated directly by people typing in the url or via a bookmark, indicating these users were led to the website by word of mouth or offline advertising. It would be good to explore these statistics further: they appear to validate a potential link with data from the surveys of attendees and lead participants where ‘word of mouth’ responses were highest in relation to the question ‘where did you hear about the Being Human festival?’ In terms of both sources and referrals, there were very significant levels of traffic via Twitter and Facebook. Time Out also played a key role in directing users to the website. Between them, Twitter, Facebook and Time Out were responsible for 51% of referrals for all sessions, and 39% of referrals of new users. Bounce rates for users visiting the website via Google, Twitter and Facebook were much higher (61-71%) than those for users referred by Time Out and the School of Advanced Study (25-27%). However even the higher bounce rates were within average range for a site whose primary use appears to be for checking events listings.
• **Social media activity:** The festival team continued its active engagement with Twitter, Facebook and Pinterest and encouraged participating organisations and their partners to do the same. Data from website traffic and social media analytics show that Twitter and Facebook played a major role in advertising the 2014 festival and for directing new users towards the festival website. Pinterest was also useful both as a means for festival marketing and as a vehicle for displaying outputs and legacy projects. Despite this, the objectives for all social media channels are not clear at present and do not appear to have been adequately communicated to all festival participants. It would be helpful to clarify and re-state if necessary the core purposes of using social media and set clear objectives for the 2015 festival so that participating organisations understand the rationale for their involvement, where requested.

• **Media coverage:** Two documents from the festival team showed that the festival had good media coverage and was referenced in nine national media outlets (print, online and radio) and in 23 regional media outlets (print, online, radio and TV). There was a slight mismatch between the details of some of the media coverage in the reports provided by the festival team; and not all of the media coverage mentioned by survey respondents appeared to have been logged centrally. For future festivals it is important to find an accurate and systematic means for recording media mentions both centrally, and via participants, so that the full regional, national (and international) impact of Being Human can be monitored. It may also be worth considering recording additional details such as whether the festival and/or events are directly named.

**Conclusions**

The evaluation has demonstrated that Being Human 2014 has been particularly successful in meeting all four of it stated aims. Analysis of the findings showed that the festival has inspired innovation in public engagement, fostered collaboration between event partners, and made a significant and visible contribution to the national cultural life of the UK. Feedback from attendees and lead participants highlighted that there is a strong desire for an annual national festival of the humanities and that the current festival team at the School of Advanced Study has the skills, knowledge and experience to continue to manage such a festival on a UK-wide basis.

“Distinctive, exciting, diverse - as it says - a festival of the humanities - what a treat!”

*(Lead participant)*
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1. **Context for the evaluation**

1.1. **The Being Human festival 2014**

Being Human is the UK’s first and only national festival dedicated to the humanities. The inaugural Being Human festival ran over nine days, from 15th to 23rd November 2014. Led by the School of Advanced Study (SAS), University of London, in partnership with the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and the British Academy, the 2014 festival encouraged universities and other cultural organisations to hold humanities-focused events for the public. Its purpose was to make research in the humanities accessible and engaging to non-academic audiences and to demonstrate the role of the humanities in the cultural, intellectual, political and social life of the UK. The second Being Human festival will be held from 12th to 22nd November 2015.

A small team manage the festival from its base at the School of Advanced Study. For the 2014 festival, the team included Professor Barry Smith (director), Dr Michael Eades (curator), Dee Burn (communications and marketing), Rosemary Lambeth (partnership coordinator) and Abhay Adhikari (social media strategy). The festival is also overseen by a steering committee comprising representatives from the AHRC and the British Academy.

Over the 2014 festival’s nine days of duration, 163 events were held across the UK covering a wide variety of topics. The events were diverse and creative, showcasing how the arts and humanities can inspire and enrich people’s everyday lives. The full programme of 2014 events is still available on the Being Human festival website. Length and reach of events ranged from short talks of one hour, exhibitions over several days, to online resources downloadable for much longer. Events took place online, in pubs, on beaches, on streets and in more traditional venues such as universities, libraries and museums.

A total of 54 universities, three independent research organisations and 104 other organisations or cultural partners participated in the 2014 festival by running one or more events. Some organisations held a range of events on the same theme, whilst others put on several events on different topics. Many organisations worked together with several participating partners to hold events. A full list of all 161 festival participants is given in Annex D.

A total of 57 organisations were registered as ‘lead participants’ for the 2014 festival. Participating organisations could apply for sponsorship for their event from the festival team at the School of Advanced Study. A total of 36 lead participants received sponsorship of between £500 and £3,000 for their events (see Annex E). In addition, nine lead participants were funded directly by the AHRC with grants of £3,000 to hold events and

---

6 http://beinghumanfestival.org/us/
7 http://beinghumanfestival.org/events/
8 These were a series of activities financed by the AHRC but out of a separate budget, administered directly by them and not by the festival.
17⁹ drew on their own funds but the events were included as part of the festival programme.

The Being Human festival team estimated that around 15,000 to 20,000 people attended festival events or engaged with them online. This figure is an estimated total based on attendee numbers supplied by event organisers plus booking figures received via the central Eventbrite¹⁰ booking system.

1.2. Evaluating the festival

The purpose of the evaluation was to consider the festival’s success against its stated aims, listed as follows:

- To inspire innovation in public engagement with leading research in the humanities
- To foster collaboration between HEIs, independent research organisations and cultural and community partners
- To make a significant and visible contribution to the national cultural life of the UK in November 2014
- To demonstrate the need and desire for an annual national festival of the humanities.

Up until December 2014, the festival team designed and managed the evaluation process for the Being Human festival. This included the following tasks:

- Designing an evaluation strategy and producing an evaluation guide for participating organisations
- Designing, setting up and managing two web-based survey tools – one for lead participants (see Annex A), the other for event attendees (see Annex B). The questionnaire for attendees was also available as a paper version
- Providing guidance and a list of questions for participants wishing to undertake filmed interviews (‘vox pops’) with attendees at events themselves (see Annex C).

By January 2015, the following data sources were available:

- Quantitative and qualitative data from 1,254 responses to the paper and online survey of attendees (as SurveyMonkey files)
- Quantitative and qualitative data from 49 responses to the online survey of festival participants (as SurveyMonkey files)
- Qualitative data from 26 vox pop interviews with attendees, conducted by staff from four HEIs (as video files)

---

⁹ This figure includes events held at the School of Advanced Study and funded directly from their own festival grant.
¹⁰ https://www.eventbrite.co.uk/
- Qualitative data captured as email correspondence between participants and the Being Human festival team
- Statistics on web traffic, social media activity and media coverage.

In February 2015, the decision was made to outsource the analysis and reporting of the evaluation data to an external researcher, Dr Ruth Townsley. These stages of the evaluation were undertaken from March to May 2015 and involved desk-based work, via documentary and data analysis of the existing data sources listed above. Data from the two SurveyMonkey files were downloaded to Excel for quantitative and qualitative analysis. The vox pop video files were transcribed in note form. A list of data queries was drawn up and agreed with the festival curator: this was used as the basis for analysis of frequencies and descriptive statistics from the quantitative survey data. Qualitative material from the survey responses and interviews were analysed thematically.

1.3. About this report

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback on the success of the festival from the perspectives of event attendees and lead participating organisations. With reference to this material, conclusions will be drawn about the progress of the festival towards its stated aims as listed above. The report will also offer recommendations for the organisation and on-going evaluation of the festival as whole, from 2015 onwards.

All quotations used in the report have been edited where necessary to ensure the anonymity of respondents.
2. Feedback from festival attendees

This chapter presents the findings from the survey of Being Human festival 2014 attendees. A total of 1,254 fully completed responses were submitted online or on paper, indicating a response rate of around 7.2%\(^{11}\). The sections that follow reflect the question areas of the survey tool (see Annex A).

2.1. Number of events attended and number of regions visited by attendees

We asked festival attendees to tell us how many events they had attended and in which region of the UK. Although most people had attended just one event (89.3%), a few indicated they had attended two to four events, with 19 people (1.5%) attending five events or more. Five people said they had been to nine events and one person reported attending a total of 12 events. A total of 1,414 visits were made to festival events by the 1,254 people who responded to the survey.

Table 1: Number of events attended per person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of events visited per person</th>
<th>Number of attendees</th>
<th>% of attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 event visited</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 events visited</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 events visited</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 events visited</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 events+ visited</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total attendees</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,254</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of attendees visited events in just one region of the UK, with a small proportion attending events in two or three regions (see Table 2).

Table 2: Number of regions visited per event attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of regions visited</th>
<th>Number of attendees</th>
<th>% of attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 region visited</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 regions visited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 regions visited</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total attendees</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,254</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{11}\) This response rate has been calculated using an estimated total attendance figure of 17,500: the mean average of the estimated range of 15,000 to 20,000 provided by the festival team.
2.2. Profile of festival attendees responding to the survey

We asked attendees responding to the survey to provide some demographic information about themselves. Their answers showed that more women (53.6%) than men (35.2%) attended events\textsuperscript{12} and that 10% of all attendees described themselves as disabled.

Office for National Statistics (ONS) census results for England and Wales\textsuperscript{13} showed that in 2011, 51% of the population were women, 49% were men and 17% had a limiting long term illness, impairment or disability. Using these figures as a baseline, we can see that Being Human 2014 reached slightly more women, but significantly less men and disabled people than might have been expected.

Figure 1 below indicates that the age of attendees was mixed, with fairly equal representation across all age groups, with the exception of the youngest group of attendees (age 14 or less) who had very low attendance at festival events (0.6%).

![Figure 1: Percentage of festival attendees by age group (base size = 1,254)](image)

In terms of ethnicity, the majority of festival attendees described themselves as White (76.4%). Figure 2 below shows that attendance by people from other ethnic groups was lower, with the highest representation from Asian/Asian British attendees (4.2%). ONS 2011 census results for England and Wales\textsuperscript{14} highlight that whilst the majority was White (86%), 7.5% of the population were Asian or Asian British, 3.3% were Black, African, Caribbean or Black British, 2.2% were from mixed or multiple ethnic groups and 1% were from other ethnic groups. These data indicate that profile of festival attendees by ethnic group broadly matches national statistics for White, Mixed/Multiple, and Other ethnic groups.

---

\textsuperscript{12}In terms of gender, 1.8% preferred not to say, and 9.4% did not provide an answer.

\textsuperscript{13}http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776_290558.pdf

\textsuperscript{14}see footnote 15
Proportionately, however, the festival is less consistent in reaching Asian\textsuperscript{15} and Black\textsuperscript{16} groups of the national population.

**Figure 2: Percentage of festival attendees by ethnic group (base size = 1,254)**

We were interested to know about the level of education of festival attendees. We asked them to tell us whether they had a degree and if so, whether it was in the humanities. More than three-quarters (77\%) of all attendees were graduates and of these, 70\% reported that they had a humanities degree\textsuperscript{17}. These findings indicate that a high level of prior interest and knowledge of the humanities was likely amongst the majority of people who attended festival events in 2014. There may well be significant scope for the festival to reach a broader audience base of non-graduates, and graduates from outside the humanities, in future years.

### 2.3. Prior information for attendees about festival events

We asked attendees to say how they had heard about festival events. They were given a list of eight categories (Being Human flyer; Being Human festival website; Twitter; Facebook; other website; local press; national press; other) and could tick as many as they wished. Over half of all responses to this question ticked ‘other’ and in these cases people were asked to provide more detail. Analysis of the ‘other’ data led to the creation of some additional categories to help code responses. These were: word of mouth; direct mailing or email; posters and advertisements in public places; other publications (local newsletters; community magazines, etc); Eventbrite; can’t remember. We also checked the ‘other’ responses and transferred them where necessary to one of the existing seven categories. For example several respondents included names of websites in ‘other’ which were

\textsuperscript{15} ONS 2011 census data show 7.5\% of the population were Asian and Asian British: 4.2\% of Being Human festival 2014 attendees were from these ethnic groups.

\textsuperscript{16} ONS 2011 census data show 3.3\% of the population were Black, African, Caribbean and Black British: 1.7\% of Being Human festival 2014 attendees were from these ethnic groups.

\textsuperscript{17} 969 attendees (out of 1,254) had a degree and of these 683 said they were humanities graduates.
transferred to the existing category of ‘other websites’. Similarly there were examples of local and national magazines which were transferred to the categories of ‘local press’ or ‘national press’. Figure 3 below presents the data by category type.

**Figure 3: How did attendees hear about the Being Human festival? (base size = 1,218\(^{18}\))**

Word of mouth was the most frequently cited way in which people heard about the festival events they attended. Given that attendees could choose Facebook or Twitter as alternative options, we must assume that when they said word of mouth, they meant exactly that – direct communication from one person to another. There were many examples given to describe how this communication had occurred – from relatives involved in an event telling their extended family to come along; to lecturers reminding a roomful of students that events were happening on their doorstep.

Web-based communication, email and social media all played an important role in publicising the existence of the festival. It is interesting to note that paper-based communication (magazines, newspapers, newsletter, etc) were less successful, with the national press playing a very minor role. It is worth highlighting that a few people appeared to have come across the festival whilst searching for other events on the Eventbrite website – a helpful by-product of using this particular marketing tool.

\(^{18}\) 100 people did not reply to this question. Of those that did, they could tick as many options as they wished.
Both the Being Human festival website and Eventbrite provided a synopsis of each event advertised. Some participating organisations also provided information about events via their own websites, email lists or other marketing outputs. We were interested to know the extent to which events had met attendees’ prior expectations and asked them to rank events to this effect. Figure 4 below shows that the majority (83%) of attendees felt that event had matched their expectations exactly, very closely or closely. Very few people (6%) thought that events had not been as they had expected.

**Figure 4: The extent to which events met attendees’ expectations (base size 1,254)**

Clarity about what to expect was probably helped by the fact that over half of all respondents had prior experience of visiting the venues where events were held. When asked if they had visited the event venue before, 54% said they had, 39% had not and 7% did not provide an answer.

### 2.4. Attendees’ experiences of festival events

Attendees provided feedback on 93 of the 178\(^{19}\) events listed as options on the survey. For 85 events, no feedback at all was received. It is important to highlight therefore that findings concerning attendees’ experiences relate only to around one half of the events held across the Being Human festival as a whole. As we saw in Section 2.1, the vast majority of respondents (89%) only attended one event, with very few (6%) attending two or more events. Thus it is fair to assume that the majority of feedback received from attendees about their experience of the festival related to just one event. Table 3 below shows that it was most common (27.5%) for events to receive feedback from one to ten attendees each. There were fewer events with feedback from 11 to 20 (8%), 21 to 30 (9%), or 31 to 50 (7%)

\(^{19}\) Please note that this list was not fully comprehensive of all the events actually held. There were also some issues noted during analysis, concerning the wording of events listed on the survey. For example, the titles of some events were not consistent with the titles given on the Being Human festival website, or on other festival documents.
attendees. The highest amount of feedback was from 66 attendees of one London-based event.

Table 3: Amount of feedback received per event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee feedback per event</th>
<th>Number of events</th>
<th>% of events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 responses</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 responses</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 responses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 responses</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50 responses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We asked several questions relating to attendees’ experiences of the Being Human festival 2014. Attendees were asked to provide an overall rating of the events they had visited by choosing a response from the following list: excellent; very good, good, not very good, or terrible. The results are presented in Figure 5 below. Most people indicated that the events they attended had been ‘excellent’ (48%) or ‘very good’ (33%). Fewer described events simply as ‘good’ (18%) and very few as ‘not very good’ (1%). Just one person (less than 0.1%) thought the event he had attended was ‘terrible’.

When asked if they would recommend the Being Human festival to others, the vast majority of attendees (85%) said they would; 5% did not know, and just 1% said they would not.

Figure 5: Attendees’ overall rating of festival events (base size 1,145)

---

20 9% of attendees did not provide an answer to this question.
21 109 or 11% of respondents did not provide an answer to this question.
Attendees were also asked to provide comments in response to the following two open-ended questions:

- What did you like? - 974 comments received
- What did you dislike? - 389 comments received.

The sheer quantity of open-ended data in relation to these questions meant it was not possible to complete a full thematic analysis in the time available for analysis. However, a review of the content, combined with word cloud analysis for frequencies of key words, helped to highlight some of the main points.

Figure 6 summarises the 60 most common words used by attendees to describe the things they liked about the Being Human festival 2014 (with frequency count in brackets).

Figure 6: What did attendees like about the Being Human festival 2014?

The word cloud presented in Figure 6 shows that attendees enjoyed:

- Speakers’ knowledge, enthusiasm and expertise
- The wide variety of presentations, talks, films, music, tours, exhibitions, readings, lectures, and other events on offer

Note: The word cloud analysis tool Tag Crowd was used since it has the flexibility to show frequencies, to group similar words together, to filter using wild-card characters and to exclude unwanted words. [22]

• Events that were different, engaging, free, friendly, informative, interactive, interesting and participative

• Content and topics that prompted discussion, stimulated debate, were focussed on research, were academic but accessible and involved the audience

• Venues that were comfortable, had a good atmosphere and included refreshments.

The following comments from attendees illustrate these points:

“The speakers were amazing - passionate, good use of visuals, right length of talk and pitched well.” (Festival 2014 attendee)

“Fantastic range of information/studies and activities. Enough variation so the information wasn't reproduced and each station complimented each other.” (Festival 2014 attendee)

“This was an immensely enjoyable event. A high level of discussion and introductory information. Aesthetically rich. Thank you ever so much!” (Festival 2014 attendee)

“The atmosphere was relaxed and attendees were encouraged to join in the discussion; the subject was very interesting; the panel were knowledgeable.” (Festival 2014 attendee)

“Exceeded expectations! The whole event was great! Well organised and very interesting talks. The films were fascinating and it felt like a real privilege to experience the live music!” (Festival 2014 attendee)

“The variety of the format - the energy and passion of the performers, the Q&A at the end.” (Festival 2014 attendee)

“How enthusiastic all the presenters were and how accessibly they described their work and research. It was great to have the variety of speakers, to illustrate the research ideas.” (Festival 2014 attendee)

“The setting was very quiet and a nice surprise. I liked the refreshments and enthusiasm of the participants.” (Festival 2014 attendee)

“Fantastic venue, great food and atmosphere. Very entertaining!” (Festival 2014 attendee)
The 60 most frequent words used by attendees to describe the things they did not like about the Being Human festival 2014 are summarised below in Figure 7 (frequency count in brackets).

**Figure 7: What did attendees not like about the Being Human festival 2014?**

- Speakers who were hard to hear and spoke too fast; the fact there were no women speakers at some events
- Events where the format was unclear in advance; that were too long or too short; had little discussion, debate or time for questions; did not involve the audience; had no activities; were difficult to book online; were fully booked in advance but not full on the day
- Content and topics that lacked focus; where the central subject was unclear in advance; were not linked sufficiently to the festival theme
- Venues that were too cold, too hot, difficult to find, lacked signage on site, had poor acoustics and did not include refreshments.

The analysis presented above illustrates that the main things attendees disliked were:

- Speakers who were hard to hear and spoke too fast; the fact there were no women speakers at some events
- Events where the format was unclear in advance; that were too long or too short; had little discussion, debate or time for questions; did not involve the audience; had no activities; were difficult to book online; were fully booked in advance but not full on the day
- Content and topics that lacked focus; where the central subject was unclear in advance; were not linked sufficiently to the festival theme
- Venues that were too cold, too hot, difficult to find, lacked signage on site, had poor acoustics and did not include refreshments.

The following comments from attendees illustrate these points.

“*Some talks were a little too academic.*”  (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“*Would have liked a bit more detail on the topic itself. Also the interviewer was knowledgeable but talked a little too much.*”  (Event attendee – survey respondent)
“Poor quality of acoustics. The 'ushers' seemed unaware of the event and, although helpful, were not clear on directions.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“No women present on the panel!” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“The talk was too brief and there was not enough time for questions and discussion. It was not directly linked to the core concept of exploring 'Being Human'. In this sense, despite the imagination of the national project, local execution was, in reality, just a history talk in a museum.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“There was a total lack of information about what to expect from the talks. As we had to make choices about what to attend, and it feels impolite to exit a talk, this meant sitting through talks that were of little interest. A simple short summary could have avoided this.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“I'd have liked to have known more about the structure of the day - very vague when I looked at the descriptions beforehand and could not find starting times of individual activities.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“About half of the seats in the seminar were not taken, which meant that a number of people who wanted to attend were unnecessarily denied attendance. Some way of avoiding this should be found for future events.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“The booking for events was a bit confusing - I have not had anyone check my booking so it feels as if it was a waste of time to book.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

2.5. Did the festival change attendees’ perceptions of humanities research?

The festival team were keen to find out if there was any evidence that attendees’ perceptions of humanities research had been affected by their participation in the Being Human festival. We searched the open-ended survey responses for any insights and also looked through the transcribed data from the vox pop interviews. Overall, we found very little data specifically relating to this issue. This was not surprising as the question in the sub-heading above was (a) not covered in the survey of attendees; and (b) not asked specifically by any of the vox pop interviewers, despite being on the suggested list of questions (see Annex C). The data that are available, however, provide a small, but valid, evidence-base to begin to think about the themes relating to this question.

The first theme to highlight is that some attendees’ comments conveyed a mild sense of surprise that the academic events they attended were so accessible, relaxed and welcoming.

“[I liked] academics being laid back about their research.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)
“Wasn’t sure it was going to be too academic. It wasn’t and I loved the film and the discussion.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“Approachability of experts. I felt able to be involved and ask questions and interact. Everyone was very kind and supportive. I felt included even though I am not an academic.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“This is the first one I’ve been to and very impressed. The whole point of having a University nearby is to hear from people themselves talking about academic subjects. They make academic ideas more accessible without having to pay for the books or go to university.” (Event attendee – vox pop respondent)

Secondly, a few people talked about feeling inspired, informed and enthused by the content and delivery of events, possibly in ways that they had not expected.

“It was something we didn’t know much about. It’s given me things to think about.” (Event attendee – vox pop respondent)

“It was much better than I thought it would be - delightfully ironic chair, articulate young debates and a very interesting issue.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“Young people debating in public and being challenged by their issues - it reinvigorated my faith in youth.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“So much better than expected! The musical accompaniment was incredible! The playing really made the experience. And the explanations and discussions were very interesting to hear.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“It was thought-provoking and I didn’t know what to expect. I was intrigued.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

Thirdly, as a result of attending festival events, a few people explained that they were now planning to do further research or reading on the topic.

“It has inspired me to go and research aspects which arose.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

“The topics were interesting and informative and have inspired me to find out more about them. The project inspires non-professionals to get involved.” (Event attendee – survey respondent)

Finally, several people talked about how the festival events they attended had showcased the intrinsic value of humanities research for them personally, and for wider society.

“I’m very interested in literature and I don’t get the chance to study as much now and I’m keen to come to anything that has a literature bent to it. This kind of event is really good. It gives people an opportunity to hear and see things they have an
“interest in but don’t usually get a chance to talk about in more detail.” (Event attendee – vox pop respondent)

“From a student point of view it shows that we are doing something that is of benefit and for public it shows how the university is doing work that can benefit people’s lives. Everyone’s interpretation is different. It’s great to get people talking and it helps society in general.” (Event attendee – vox pop respondent)

Whilst these themes, and the comments which illustrate them, are more indicative than conclusive of changes to attendees’ perceptions of humanities research, they do begin to highlight some potential areas for further investigation of this topic, perhaps in the evaluation of the 2015 festival.

2.6. Summary of feedback from attendees

- **Number of events attended:** Most people had attended just one event (89%). A few (5%) indicated they had attended two to four events, with just 1% attending five events or more. A total of 1,414 visits were made to festival events by the 1,254 people who responded to the survey. The majority of attendees visited events in just one region of the UK, with a small proportion attending events in two or three regions.

- **Profile of festival attendees:** More women (53.6%) than men (35.2%) attended events and 10% of all attendees described themselves as disabled. The age of attendees was mixed, with fairly equal representation across all age groups, with the exception of the youngest group of attendees (age 14 or less) where attendance was less than 1%. The majority of festival attendees described themselves as White (76.4%). The profile of festival attendees by ethnic group broadly matches national statistics\(^\text{23}\) for White, Mixed/Multiple, and Other ethnic groups. Proportionately, however, the festival is less consistent in reaching Asian\(^\text{24}\) and Black\(^\text{25}\) groups of the national population. More than three-quarters (77%) of all attendees were graduates and of these, 70% reported that they had a humanities degree.

- **Attendees’ prior knowledge of festival events:** Most people heard about the festival by word of mouth, followed by Web-based communication, email and social media. Paper-based communication (magazines, newspapers, newsletter, etc) were less successful in reaching people, with the national press playing a very minor role. Most attendees (86%) felt that events had matched their expectations exactly, very closely or closely. Very few people (6%) thought that events had not been as they had expected. When asked if they had visited the event venue before, 54% said they had, 39% had not and 7% did not provide an answer.

---

\(^\text{23}\) http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776_290558.pdf

\(^\text{24}\) ONS 2011 census data show 7.5% of the population were Asian and Asian British: 4.2% of Being Human festival 2014 attendees were from these ethnic groups.

\(^\text{25}\) ONS 2011 census data show 3.3% of the population were Black, African, Caribbean and Black British: 1.7% of Being Human festival 2014 attendees were from these ethnic groups.
Attendees’ experiences of festival events: Most people indicated that the events they attended had been ‘excellent’ (48%) or ‘very good’ (33%). Fewer described events simply as ‘good’ (18%) and very few as ‘not very good’ (1%). Just one person (less than 0.1%) thought the event he had attended was ‘terrible’. When asked if they would recommend the Being Human festival to others, the vast majority of attendees (85%) said they would; 5% did not know, and just 1% said they would not.

Attendees liked:
- Speakers’ knowledge, enthusiasm and expertise
- The wide variety of presentations, talks, films, music, tours, exhibitions, readings, lectures, and other events on offer
- Events that were different, engaging, free, friendly, informative, interactive, interesting and participative
- Content and topics that prompted discussion, stimulated debate, were focussed on research, were academic but accessible and involved the audience
- Venues that were comfortable, had a good atmosphere and included refreshments.

Attendees disliked:
- Speakers who were hard to hear and spoke too fast; the fact there were no women speakers at some events
- Events where the format was unclear in advance; that were too long or too short; had little discussion, debate or time for questions; did not involve the audience; had no activities; were difficult to book online; were fully booked in advance but not full on the day
- Content and topics that lacked focus; where the central subject was unclear in advance; were not linked sufficiently to the festival theme
- Venues that were too cold, too hot, difficult to find, lacked signage on site, had poor acoustics and did not include refreshments.

Attendees’ perceptions of humanities research: There was a small amount of qualitative evidence to suggest that attendance at festival events may have had an impact on people’s perceptions of humanities research. Some attendees appeared mildly surprised that the academic events they attended were so accessible, relaxed and welcoming. Others described feeling inspired, informed and enthused by the content and delivery of events, possibly in ways that they had not expected. Some were now planning to do further research or reading on the topic and a few thought the festival had showcased the intrinsic value of humanities research for them personally, and for wider society.
3. Feedback from lead participants

This chapter examines the findings from the survey of organisations who took part in the Being Human festival 2014 as lead participants. The festival team sent emails to 130 individuals representing lead participating organisations. A total of 49 fully completed responses were received, indicating an overall response rate of 38%. Four of these were combined or removed as they contained duplicate data from more than one respondent from the same organisation relating to the same focal event. Thus a total of 45 survey responses were included in the analysis of the data from the survey of lead participants.

3.1. Profile of lead participants responding to the survey

All but one of the 45 respondents represented universities or other higher education institutions (HEIs). Most (58%) of these lead participants had organised one event as part of the Being Human festival 2014. Around a quarter (24.5%) had organised between two and four events, whilst fewer (17.5%) had put on five events or more, with 11 being the highest number of events organised (by two participants). A total of 121 separate events were organised by the lead participants who responded to the survey.

Table 4: Number of events organised per lead participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of events organised per lead participant</th>
<th>Number of lead participants</th>
<th>% of lead participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 event organised</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 events organised</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 events organised</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 events organised</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 events+ organised</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total attendees</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We asked if respondents had prior experience of engaging the public in humanities research\(^{26}\). Most of the lead participants (87%) had taken part in some form of public engagement activities before. For just 6% (n=3) the Being Human festival had provided their first opportunity for public engagement work. One university answered ‘yes and no’ to this question, explaining that whilst most staff had some experience of public engagement, it for the first experience of it for some PhD students.

Given the high level of prior experience in public engagement, it is no surprise that around a half of respondents (47%) felt that centrally provided training in this area was not necessary. Just over a third (38%) expressed an interest in the suggestion of training, whilst a few (9%; 2 respondents declined to answer this question.

---

\(^{26}\) Two respondents declined to answer this question.
n=4) agreed it was something that was of ‘possible’ interest\(^{27}\) for the following types of reasons:

“It depends on the nature of the training.” (Lead participant)

“I think it is best learnt through practice but I am sure guidelines would be welcome.” (Lead participant)

“Possibly but one has to be mindful of time as well. The events should not consume too much time or few will be willing to participate.” (Lead participant)

3.2. How did lead participants hear about the Being Human festival?

Lead participants were asked to indicate how they heard about the Being Human festival from a list of the following categories: word of mouth; AHRC website/mail out; British Academy website; School of Advanced Study website/mail out; Twitter; JISC mail; other.

Figure 8 below shows the distribution of answers to this question and highlights the important role played by word of mouth in publicising the festival amongst potential lead participants. On this occasion, we do not know if respondents’ interpretations of the category ‘word of mouth’ included Facebook or other forms of social media, since apart from Twitter, these were not offered as separate options for this question.

**Figure 8: How did participants hear about the Being Human festival? (base size = 58\(^{28}\))**

---

\(^{27}\) Three respondents provided no answer to this question.

\(^{28}\) Respondents could choose more than one answer.
3.3. **Lead participants’ estimates of visitor numbers for their festival events**

Lead participants were asked to estimate visitor numbers during the week that the 2014 festival ran for. If they hosted multiple events they were asked to either estimate the overall total, or to list the events separately with estimated numbers for each event. The 45 lead participants who responded to the survey provided an estimated total audience of 18,881 people across the 121 events they organised, giving a mean average of 156 people per event. However it is important to be mindful that a very wide range of figures were given in response to this question, from four people to an audience of 10,000. This reflects the variety of types of event and their potential reach in terms of audience numbers. For example, a workshop or field trip might be available to just a few people, whilst a week-long exhibition at a popular museum could reach thousands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated visitor numbers</th>
<th>Number of events</th>
<th>% of events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-250</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the range of estimated visitor numbers by number of events organised. It is clear that the majority of events (84%) averaged an audience of one to 100 people. There was a fairly even distribution of events by the three lowest audience bands: 28% of events reached one to 20 people, 25% reached 21 to 50 people and 31% were attended by 50 to 100 people. Less events (16%) catered for audiences of more than 100, and of these, only 4% reached audiences of over 250. The two events with the largest audiences were run over the full week of the festival, and included a downloadable walking tour and an art history exhibition at a major city art gallery.

Thirty-two of the 45 respondents were able to provide an accurate single figure for their one event, or if they had run two or more events, a full breakdown of audience numbers by event. For the 13 organisers of multiple events who did not provide a breakdown, we averaged audience numbers over the total number of events per respondent, in order to complete the analysis for Table 5.
3.4. Number and type of event partners working with lead participants

Although the 45 survey respondents providing data about their events were all lead participants, many other organisations took part in the organisation and delivery of festival events. The lead participants were asked to list the partners they had worked with and Table 6 shows the overall findings in response to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of event partners</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>% of lead participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show that most events were held by the lead participant plus one partner (33%), but a sizable proportion (22%) were three-way partnerships where the lead plus two other organisations ran events together. The majority of events (73%) were run by between two to four organisations (including the lead) working in partnership. Less than a quarter of events (21%) were held by consortia of five or more organisations (including the lead). Very few events (4%) were run by one sole organisation.

Lead participants provided names of 113 partner organisations and these were then categorised by organisation type. Figure 9 shows the distribution of different types of organisational partners and highlights that most event partners (40%) were third sector organisations. Public sector organisations, other HEIs and private sector organisations or freelance individuals were significantly less likely to be involved in events.

This finding is perhaps not surprising, given the remit of the festival: many of the third sector partners were small-scale arts organisations with particular expertise in engaging with the public. However, the data show there may be scope for further future collaboration with larger voluntary sector and public sector organisations such as libraries, museums, orchestras, theatres and other public bodies with an interest in the arts and humanities, whose size may also help to boost future audience numbers. It may also be interesting to examine the impact of involving high profile individuals from the arts and humanities, whose input, if a fee were charged, would be categorised as private/freelance.
Respondents were asked to indicate if partnerships with external organisations had been initiated by the Being Human festival 2014. Forty-nine per cent of lead participants said that work on their festival events had helped to create new partnerships with other organisations, whilst 47% felt their partnerships pre-dated the festival. It would be interesting to know if these existing partnerships were strengthened or developed as a result of organisations working together to plan and deliver festival events. It would also be worth exploring how and why new partnerships were created, the skills and value that external partners brought to festival events, and the longer term impact of these new partnerships for lead participants.

3.5. **Amount and type of funding for festival events**

As explained in Section 1.1, participating organisations could apply for sponsorship for their event from the festival team at the School of Advanced Study. Of the 57 lead organisations who took part in the 2014 festival, 36 received sponsorship of between £500 and £3,000, totalling £58,670 in direct funding for their events (a mean average of £1,630 per funded event). In addition, nine lead participants were funded directly by the AHRC with grants of £3,000 each and 17 drew on their own funds to finance their festival events.

Of those 45 lead participants who responded to the survey, 29 had received direct funding from the festival team, with a combined total of £46,020 (representing 78% of total festival funding).

---

29 These were a series of activities financed by the AHRC but out of a separate budget, administered directly by them and not by the festival.

30 This figure includes events held at the School of Advanced Study and funded directly from their own festival grant.
funding allocation). Three additional respondents had received £3,000 each in direct sponsorship from the AHRC.

Respondents were asked to estimate (a) any sponsorship or additional direct funding gained for their festival activities; and (b) the costs of any indirect resource contributed by their own institution in terms of staff time, space, use of equipment, etc. Respondents could choose from a list of banded amounts, which differed slightly for each of the two financial estimates requested. For the extra direct funding (a), the bands were: £1-2K; £2-4K; £4-6K; £6-8K; other. For the indirect costs (b), the bands given were: £1-5K; £5-10K; £10-15K; £15-20K; other. Firstly, responses to each question were analysed by banding group (see Tables 7 and 8). Table 7 shows that whilst a third (36%) of lead participants received no extra funding for their event, just over a half (54%) were able to pull in additional sponsorship of up to £4,000 (54%), and 10% had found extra funds up between £4,000 to £8,000 or more.

Table 7: Estimated additional sponsorship or direct funding (in addition to festival grants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated funding by band</th>
<th>Number of lead participants</th>
<th>% of lead participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1-£1k</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1k-2k</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2k-4k</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£4k-6k</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£6k-8k</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£8K+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Estimated indirect resource contributed to events by lead organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated funding by band</th>
<th>Number of lead participants</th>
<th>% of lead participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1k-5k</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5k-10k</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10k-15k</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15k-20k</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 highlights that a large proportion (69%) of lead participants estimated the indirect costs of their events to be in the region of £1,000 to £5,000, with a few reaching £5,000 to £20,000. Seven lead participants (16%) reported that their organisations had provided nothing in the way of indirect contributions and that all work on their festival events had either been funded externally or not funded at all.
However, in addition to the banded analysis, we also wanted to gauge an overall estimate of the total cost of the events organised by respondents (and ultimately for the festival as a whole). In order to do this, it was necessary to provide actual figures for analysis purposes, which were estimated as the mean average of each band. For example, if a respondent ticked £1-2K for additional direct funding and £5-10K for indirect costs, the figures used for analysis were £1,500 and £7,500 respectively.

Table 9 shows the total estimated additional resource contributed to the events organised by the 45 lead organisations who responded to the survey. We can see that the majority of lead participants (80%) had estimated additional resources ranging from £1,000 to £10,000.

Table 9: Estimated additional resource contributed to events organised by the 45 survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated additional direct funding plus indirect costs</th>
<th>Number of lead participants</th>
<th>% of lead participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1-£999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1K-£4,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5K-£9,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10K-£19,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20K+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Estimated total resources allocated to Being Human festival 2014 events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Festival event direct funding (including AHRC direct funding)</th>
<th>Estimated additional direct funding from other sources</th>
<th>Estimated indirect funding from resource allocation</th>
<th>Estimated total funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 survey respondents</td>
<td>£46,020</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td>£155,000</td>
<td>£277,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mean average per respondent)</td>
<td>(£1,693)</td>
<td>(£3,444)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 57 lead participants of festival 2014 events</td>
<td>£67,670</td>
<td>£96,501</td>
<td>£196,308</td>
<td>£360,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total resources leveraged for the Being Human festival as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£360,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 gives a rough estimation of the total overall resources allocated to festival events organised by the 45 survey respondents, alongside an estimated figure for the overall resources leveraged for the Being Human festival 2014 as a whole. Using estimated costs already calculated for additional direct funding and indirect funding from resource allocation, a mean average per participant has been calculated. When this mean average is multiplied by the total number of lead participants of festival 2014 events, it gives a very rough indication of the estimated total resources leveraged by the festival team, HEIs and other sponsors for the Being Human festival as a whole: currently approximately £360,479, five times the funding allocation for individual events administered by the festival team and the AHRC.

3.6. Staffing support for festival events

In addition to financial support, respondents were asked to estimate the number of staff from each lead organisation who had taken part in organising or delivering festival events. An analysis of the responses to this question showed that respondents included volunteers and students in their overall numbers, so the definition of ‘staff’ on this occasion includes anyone who helped with the festival events.

Table 11 shows that in the majority of cases (42%), four to ten staff members were involved in helping to plan and run festival events. Around a third (31%) of lead participating organisations involved one to three staff in their festival events, whilst a fifth (20%) mobilised a larger number of 11 to 20 staff. In two cases, very large numbers of staff were involved from the lead organisation – one respondent cited 30 and another cited 33.

Table 11: Number of staff involved in organising and delivering festival events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of staff per event</th>
<th>Number of lead participants</th>
<th>% of lead participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents simply provided an overall figure, with no additional information on the staff involved and whether this included students or volunteers. In some cases, however, numbers were broken down and from these responses it was clear that many organisations were successfully involving many postgraduate students in their public engagement work.
3.7. Extent and nature of media coverage gained by participants

Lead participants were asked if they had been able to gain any media coverage for their Being Human activities and if so, to provide details. This was an open-ended question and any answers were permitted. All but eight respondents provided answers and from these we were able to ascertain that 31 (69%) had gained some form of media coverage. Six respondents (13%) said they had not gained any media coverage themselves, although some referred to indirect media references via output from the festival team. In one case, the organiser said she had chosen not to pursue any media interest as her event ‘had sold out quickly’. Similarly another lead participant explained that as the event was a launch screening, he wished ‘to gauge the public response first’. These responses highlight that lead participants may need further guidance on engaging with the media, since coverage is not simply about trying to increase audience numbers for individual events, but is essential to the social and public profile of events and for the festival as a whole.

For the 69% of lead participants who had gained some media coverage of their events, examples were given of a minimum of 73 media references. Overall mentions are likely to be much higher as several respondents did not provide sufficient detail in their answers for their media coverage to be included in the analysis for this section (e.g. ‘press releases did appear’ or ‘the event was strongly promoted across online outlets’).

The majority of media coverage gained by participants was represented in the regional press and local publications. Thirty-one mentions were highlighted, which included coverage in key regional publications such as: The Herald, The Daily Record, Manchester Evening News, The Journal, Time Out, Evening Standard and the South Wales Evening Post. There was also significant coverage online and via social media (21 mentions), including mentions on several events listings websites.

As Figure 10 below shows, further media coverage included two mentions on national radio\textsuperscript{31}, ten on local radio, three on regional TV, four articles in trade and consumer publications and one mention each in the national press\textsuperscript{32} and an international media outlet\textsuperscript{33}.

\begin{itemize}
  \item [\textsuperscript{31}] BBC Radio 5 Live, Drive Time programme, 5.20pm, 21st November 2014; BBC Radio 4, Today programme, 8.40am, 22nd November 2014.
  \item [\textsuperscript{32}] The Independent, Nick Clark, ‘Does the Digital Age Spell the End of Braille?’, 20th May 2014.
  \item [\textsuperscript{33}] www.monocle.com
\end{itemize}
3.8. Information, advice and support from the Being Human festival team

The Being Human festival team at the School of Advanced Study provided a range of information, advice and support for organisers of festival events. Some of this was made available as online resources through the festival website and newsletter, whilst other advice and resources were provided directly to participants by phone or email. We asked respondents if they had found the festival team helpful in providing them with support and information. Almost all (42 participants) responded positively, giving some of the following comments:

“Didn’t need much, but what I did was provided.” (Lead participant)

“Thanks especially for your help getting last minutes details on the website.” (Lead participant)

“The team were extremely helpful - many thanks to all!” (Lead participant)

“They provided many instructions and good information about other events.” (Lead participant)

Three lead participants were not positive about the support provided by the central team and the following explanations were given:

“Would have been nice to know that big pull-up banner was arriving; only by chance found it in the departmental office day before the event!” (Lead participant)

“I had to provide the same information repeatedly on several occasions which was slightly irritating.” (Lead participant)
We also asked lead participants responding to the survey to say which of the following resources they had used:

- Evaluation guide/vox pop cameras
- Template media releases
- Logos
- Other branding materials e.g. web banner, pull-up banners, Facebook page branding
- Guidelines (for instance, how to use Eventbrite).

The results are presented in Figure 11 which shows that, with the exception of ‘other branding materials’, all centrally-available festival resources were well-used by lead participants. Logos were used by almost all of the 45 respondents and two-thirds had used the evaluation guide or vox pop cameras.

**Figure 11: Centrally-available festival resources used by lead participants (base size 132)**

Respondents were also asked if there were any other resources that would have been helpful to them and were invited to list these. Twelve separate suggestions were received which have been summarised as follows:

---

34 Respondents could choose more than one option.
• Web-based festival events listing that is easier to navigate
• Print version of the events programme for the festival as a whole
• More publicity and branding materials (e.g. more banners)
• More advice on how to approach the media
• Further information up-front about how the funding would operate
• Guidance on whether specific information should be given to visitors when opening/closing events (e.g. about the aims of the festival)
• In addition to email communication, using the resource page on the website to highlight, in a one-page format, the key actions and deadlines for event organisers.

3.9. Feedback on Being Human marketing and key messaging

Feedback was sought from lead participants about their perceptions of the central Being Human marketing and key messaging and how this could be improved in coming years. Since these questions were presented as open-ended, it was necessary to establish a coding system for responses in order to present the feedback in a meaningful way. The results of this analysis are presented in Figure 12 below.

Figure 12: Feedback from lead participants on Being Human central marketing and key messaging (base size 41)\(^{35}\)

\(^{35}\) Four respondents did not give answers to this question.
Figure 12 shows that of the 41 respondents who provided comments, the majority (78%) were categorised as giving ‘excellent’, ‘very good’ or ‘good’ feedback about central marketing and key messaging. Key positive feedback is summarised as follows:

- Effective and professional marketing for the festival as a whole
- Excellent use of social media to market the festival, with visible results
- Clear and eye-catching marketing tools, including logo and branding materials
- Prompt, helpful and detailed responses from the festival team to individual marketing queries.

Some illustrative quotations are given below:

“Excellent showcasing of the humanities and their socio-cultural relevance.” (Lead participant)

“I thought its social media presence excellent. Its Twitter links were engaging and exciting.” (Lead participant)

“I rather like the way it is loose and not too prescriptive, and each institute can interpret the being human theme in its own way.” (Lead participant)

“I think the number of downloads for the event suggest that the marketing was very good.” (Lead participant)

“Very good, responsive and helpful team...quick to reply on marketing issues.” (Lead participant)

Nine respondents (22%) were less positive about the overall input on marketing and key messaging and highlighted the following issues as problematic from their perspective:

- Festival logo and branding materials were perceived as “a little old fashioned” and “rather corporate in appearance and tone”
- Being Human festival website’s festival events listing was difficult to navigate
  “Several of our participants commented that it was hard to find out more about individual events via the website.” (Lead participant)
- Not enough print-based marketing and lack of a print version of the events programme for the festival as a whole
- Not enough online advertising outside of social media (e.g. on other arts and humanities websites, etc)
- Too much expected of lead participants for the level of funding awarded.
“As no funding was available for staff costs, it became difficult to manage the different needs of the Being Human central team with our own local needs and target audience.” (Lead participant)

In terms of future improvements to marketing and key messaging, the following suggestions reflect the main points made by respondents:

- Consider launch events outside London
- Timing of media releases to coincide more closely with the start of the festival
  “It wasn’t helpful to do an early press release in May, so based on advice from our own media team, we didn’t do a press release until the week before the event.” (Lead participant)
- More advice on engaging with regional/local media and other more traditional, mainstream, media outlets, including those which run regular events listings pages (online and in print)
  “I wonder if the core demographic of many of the events were social media literate. As such, more might have been done with traditional (and traditional local) media.” (Lead participant)
- Find more ways to advertise the key messages of Being Human as one national festival as a whole, alongside the marketing of individual event
  “It was always going to be difficult to market a festival for so many venues so it was difficult for our audience to match what was happening in [out city] with the overall aims of the festival. Perhaps providing venues with a banner to highlight the key messages of the overall event might have helped to overcome this?” (Lead participant)
- Consider possibilities for more linkage between separate events through common themes and topics, which might also help to generate additional media coverage
- Aim for an overall increase in regional, national and online media coverage of the Being Human festival for future years
- Provide a clear, concise checklist of key actions and deadlines for lead participants
- Create a template document containing key information about the festival, its aims and funders, which can be customised by participants and event partners.

We also asked respondents to indicate their overall impressions of the Being Human festival website by choosing one answer from a list of 5 options, ranging from ‘excellent’ to ‘terrible’. Every single person answered this question: 49% described the website as ‘good’, 27% thought it was ‘very good’ and 24% described it as ‘excellent’. No-one thought the website was ‘not very good’ or ‘terrible’, although just two comments were given in response to this question both of which highlight potential improvements that could be made.
“Sometimes accuracy was sacrificed in the interest of uniformity, so e.g. some events of ours appeared to need booking, although this was not the case, because the link for booking had to be in a particular position. Some flexibility would be helpful.” (Lead participant)

“The design could be more vibrant, off-beat, catchy and engaging. I found it a pity that this was only an advertisement tool - I couldn’t list the workshop part of my event because it wasn’t open to the public, although I did feel that this would have lent a better perspective of the interesting things we do with the theme.” (Lead participant)

3.10. Outcomes of festival events

Survey respondents were asked to list three things that they had gained from participating in the Being Human festival 2014. In response, 42 lead participants provided information about a range of outcomes of their festival events, which were categorised thematically as follows:

- Provided experience of doing public engagement work
- Created opportunities for innovation, experimentation and creativity
- Led to the creation and development of new and existing partnerships
- Promoted and validated humanities research.

We also asked respondents if they would recommend participating in Being Human to others and to give reasons for their answers. A virtually unanimous 98% said ‘yes’, with just one person saying no.

Further analysis of these responses showed that the categories listed above relating to outcomes, were also valid for understanding the reasons given for recommending participation. It seems that respondents were drawing on their own positive experiences of what they had learned or gained from taking part in the festival in order to suggest reasons for recommending participation to others. In addition, we checked responses to the ‘general comments’ section at the end of the survey for any further examples of outcomes.

The balance of outcomes mentioned by lead participants in their survey responses is illustrated in Figure 13 below.

36 42 people answered this question: 41 said yes, 1 said no and 3 declined to answer.
For most respondents, the main outcome of their involvement in the Being Human festival was that their events provided new, or continued, experience of public engagement. As we saw earlier, most of the lead participants had done some form of engagement work before; but for three people, the festival was their first opportunity for public engagement. Several respondents also mentioned that festival was a chance for less experienced staff and postgraduate students to try out engagement work for the first time. There was a lot of positivity and enjoyment expressed in survey responses, encapsulated by some of the following quotes:

“It was a really good experience and precisely what we ought to be doing: breaking out of the institution and spreading some humanities joy!” (Lead participant)

“It is a great opportunity for a team to unite, work together and present complex/varied research in a coherent fashion with a strong narrative that demonstrates the significance and relevance of our work. When members of the public engage with, and contribute to your research it reminds you why you got into arts and humanities research in the first place. It’s joyful!” (Lead participant)

Setting up a funded festival to share humanities research with the public was perceived by many as a new and welcome opportunity.

“A previously missing avenue to connect the public with humanities research.” (Lead participant)

“A wonderful experience - it really made us think about the importance of sharing research with the community in innovative ways.” (Lead participant)
Participants described how they had used the festival experience to practise engagement skills, to get feedback on what worked (and what didn’t) and for more general experience of events management. Several people highlighted how the process of engagement had benefited the development of their research and there was even a suggestion that sharing humanities research with the public is essential to the maintenance and evolution of the discipline.

“All team members enjoyed and benefitted from the opportunity to share and develop their research through discussion with members of the public.” (Lead participant)

“The humanities are important and it is healthy for researchers to think outside the academy and for the discipline to evolve in relation to society.” (Lead participant)

Survey findings in relation to this theme showed a strong motivation for further public engagement work, and as one person summed up:

“The more academics who take creative public engagement seriously, the better!” (Lead participant)

**Opportunities for innovation, experimentation and creativity**

Many respondents said that their involvement in the Being Human festival had provided an impetus to find new and innovative ways to communicate their research.

“It made us think outside the box as an institution, and pushed us to do something different with our research.” (Lead participant)

In some cases, the creative projects showcased during Being Human 2014 would not have happened without festival funding.

“It provided the chance to fund an original documentary project for the first time.” (Lead participant)

“Our project was a completely new collaborative commission - two performances that would never have taken place if they had not been supported by the festival. More encouragement for really innovative one-off activities would be good to see next year.” (Lead participant)

For a few people, the festival events were a chance to experiment with new ways of working, to gain feedback on new practices and methodologies, and potentially, to collect primary data from attendees as part of new and on-going research.

“It was an unexpected bonus opportunity to carry out a research activity within the main project scope yet not foreseen during proposal writing. A body of publishable experimental data was collected that, when analysed properly, will potentially
produce important [theoretical] insights and remain available for future scholars.” (Lead participant)

Participants appreciated the loose brief of the festival, its interdisciplinarity and the way it encouraged innovative and exciting ways of engaging with the public.

“Since the brief is so loose, I think most humanities researchers would enjoy devising ways of introducing aspects of their work to the public.” (Lead participant)

“It provides space to explore your field with new eyes.” (Lead participant)

“Even the limited funding allowed us to experiment and innovate in presenting our research to the public.” (Lead participant)

**Creation and development of new and existing partnerships**

Respondents offered many examples of involvement in the Being Human festival had led to the creation of new partnerships, or helped to develop and maintain existing relationships with working partners. As discussed in Section 3.4, around half of lead participants said that work on their festival events had helped to create new relationships, whilst the other half felt their partnerships pre-dated the festival. Survey findings presented earlier explained that very few events (4%) were run by one organisation working alone; rather, lead participants worked together with one or more external partners, most of whom were from the voluntary/third sector, the public sector or other HEIs.

Participants highlighted some of the strengths of working in partnership, particularly in terms of innovation, creativity and experience of engaging with the public.

“Working with established partners in different ways from normal allowed us space to be more creative.” (Lead participant)

“Direct engagement with city partners on this scale gave [the] University a positive profile. The programme convinced some partners to collaborate more openly with us and contribute time/venues free of charge. Hopefully we can build on this for other collaborative events.” (Lead participant)

Festival events provided an opportunity to establish new contacts with members of the public, particularly as potential audiences of the future.

“We made new contacts with members of public interested in the theme of our event and new contacts with external contributors.” (Lead participant)

“The public have a vast appetite for our research, but we need to be more inventive as to how they can access it (many of our evaluations asked when we’d be doing something like this again!).” (Lead participant)
Being part of a national festival offered a focus and funding for close collaboration with external partners in ways that would not have been possible otherwise.

“The new relationships with [three voluntary sector organisations] were entirely the result of the Being Human festival - the festival was the first time that all the projects met formally to work together. This one event created a set of trust-based and mutually beneficial relationships that will outlive Being Human 2014.” (Lead participant)

“We were pleased to have the opportunity to work with key partners on a series of events, rather than isolated events.” (Lead participant)

“It was great to work more closely with local partners in the cultural sector (in this case, the library).” (Lead participant)

In several cases, the festival had helped to create and strengthen relationships within lead participants’ own institutions. As one person summed up:

“It was great to be a part of something which really ignited interest and as importantly enthusiasm for and from the humanities in promoting what we do, how we do it, and why it is important. Also, the interaction between disciplines (in our case, across five university departments, from Dance to Life Sciences) was incredibly fulfilling.” (Lead participant)

Promotion and validation of humanities research

There was a strong body of comments which reflected the beneficial role played by the festival in promoting and validating humanities research. There was great appreciation of being part of a wider community of arts and humanities researchers, facilitated by the festival.

 “[We gained] (1) access to an amazing network; (2) being part of a wider cultural contribution; and (3) learning and experience of engaging in public facing events.” (Lead participant)

As a structured opportunity to contribute to public debate, the festival both celebrated knowledge and raised awareness of the value of research in the humanities.

“It was a chance to conduct/test a semi-formal humanities experiment and gain a direct, heightened sense of how academia sits within the public realm.” (Lead participant)

“It enabled us to gauge interest in the subject which proved to our venue that there is an interest in this kind of event.” (Lead participant)
Several people mentioned that the festival had confirmed public interest in their disciplines and demonstrated a high demand for humanities research-based events.

“It showed us that there is a public appetite for intelligent discussion of the humanities. Not overview, not simplification, but genuine discussion. If we were to be involved next year we would strip back the ‘talk’ element almost completely and provide exclusively interactive workshops. There was an interactive element to all of our events, but after the first year I feel confident this could be effectively extended. All future events should be organized in direct consultation with those intending to attend. We received requests for future events on specific topics, which could be organized.” (Lead participant)

3.11. Outputs and legacy of festival events

We asked lead participants to provide details of any outputs or legacy resulting from their Being Human festival activities. Thirty-seven people (82%) listed a wide range of different items and in many cases also provided links for reference purposes. In eight cases, no answers were provided, or respondents stated that no outputs or legacy projects were available.

The following outputs and legacy projects were cited by respondents:

- Blog posts (10 mentions)
- Films of events (10 mentions)
- New websites and online content (7 mentions)
- Exhibition of photos and images from events (2 mentions)
- Technical developments and collection of new data (2 mentions)
- Sound-clips/podcasts (2 mentions)
- New research groups or working groups (2 mentions)
- Pinterest boards (2 mentions)
- Further joint work with event partners (6 mentions)
- Further showing or continued use of event outputs/materials (8 mentions)
- Learning resources for schools (2 mentions)
- Conference paper, iTunes download, book, report, booklet, grant application, Twitter hashtag (all 1 mention each).

The quotes below give a flavour of the outputs and legacy work achieved as a result of festival events.
“Our film-maker is cutting together footage from the day to make a short film. We used some of the budget to create eight interactive display boards that will be used for pop-up and longer-term exhibitions during the next few years. A team-written blog about the day is available.” (Lead participant)

“Blogs on the university website. The events increased circulation and visibility for our facebook account. Exhibits from the exhibition will be used for Applicant Days, Fresher events, and related activities. The film screenings followed by Q&A sessions were a great success and we have been asked by audience members to schedule more. There is interest from [museum] to do this as well, so we will be planning more such events.” (Lead participant)

“We collected a considerable quantity of experimental data and metadata concerning audience responses during performances. The data will be published online as Linked Data as an output of our umbrella project. We developed a suite of software to capture real-time metadata and performance information, and allow this to be played back in alignment with audio recordings. The entire event was videoed professionally, and we shall soon release online an edited version of this (with slide presentations/animations inserted appropriately).” (Lead participant)

“We are working on a podcast based on recordings made during the event. We created a twitter hashtag, which allowed us to keep a record of the main discussion points on the day.” (Lead participant)

“[Two academics] are in the process of setting up a [subject] research group at [out university]. A short film of the event is in the process of being edited and finalised. There is a plan to perform [performance launched at festival event] in other settings, and build on the archive of memories built up through this interaction. A blog of the premiere performance is available online. A Pinterest board generated at the event will soon be available. [Two event partners] will be coming together to work [with us] on campus as a result of the day's activities.” (Lead participant)

### 3.12. Lead participants’ suggestions for future improvements

At the very end of the survey, respondents were asked to suggest three key things that could be improved in future years. Forty of the 45 lead participants provided numerous and varied suggestions which have been summarised thematically as follows:

**Funding and support from the festival team**

- Provide clear information about how the funding process will operate, including advice on invoicing
- Provide a clear, concise checklist of key actions and deadlines for lead participants

---

37 Some of these suggestions emphasise or repeat those listed in other sections.
- Create a template document containing key information about the festival, its aims and funders, which can be customised by participants and event partners
- Create a central database of information from lead participants so all information is in one place and requests for repeat information are limited
- Help to organise and support networking amongst festival participants – areas for potential collaboration included: use of space; ideas for presenting material; topic connections
- Consider how to incorporate increased lead time into the funding and awards process – this was thought to be especially important for larger, high profile events which may need up to one year to book and plan
- Provide more advice on events management – many people felt more funding was needed for this too
- Provide guidance on whether specific information should be given to attendees when opening/closing events (e.g. about the aims of the festival).

**Evaluation**

- Ensure that sufficient funding is earmarked by lead participants in order to respond to requests for taking part in evaluation activities
- Ensure that the survey for attendees is available on the Being Human festival website to enable them to complete it as soon as possible after events
- Consider the effectiveness of vox pops – a few people said they were very time-consuming and for the purposes of evaluation the results lack consistency and comparability (different data was collected by different HEIs).

**Marketing, media coverage and key messaging**

- Offer increased information and advice on marketing and how to approach the media
- Update the Being Human festival website so the festival events section is easier to use and navigate (this might include downloadable/printable content by event and/or by region, or the ability to create your own personalised program of chosen events)
- Provide a print or PDF version of the events programme for the festival as a whole
- Consider wider online advertising and marketing
- Consider more posters and flyers in relevant public spaces
- Aim for an overall increase in regional, national and online media coverage of the Being Human festival for future years
- Consider Being Human festival collaboration with a national media partner such as a national weekend broadsheet or the BBC
- Consider regional launch events
Assess the value of offering more events with high-profile speakers to raise awareness of the festival and increase media attention

Try to ensure that the timing of media releases coincides more closely with the start of the festival

Consider more engagement with regional/local media and other more traditional, mainstream, media outlets, including those which run regular events listings pages (online and in print)

Find more ways to advertise the key messages of Being Human as one national festival as a whole, alongside the marketing of individual event

Highlight links between events - consider possibilities for more linkage between separate events through common themes and topics, which might also help to generate additional media coverage

Consider the value of promoting a section of the festival aimed at children and schools.

3.13. Summary of feedback from lead participants

Profile of lead participants: All but one of the 45 respondents represented universities or other higher education institutions (HEIs). Most (58%) of these lead participants had organised one event as part of the Being Human festival 2014. Around a quarter (24.5%) had organised between two and four events, whilst fewer (17.5%) had put on five events or more, with 11 being the highest number of events organised (by two participants). A total of 121 separate events were organised by the lead participants who responded to the survey. Most of the lead participants (87%) had taken part in some form of public engagement activities before and 47% felt that centrally provided training in this area was not necessary. Just over a third (38%) expressed an interest in training, whilst a few (9%) thought it was something that was of ‘possible’ interest. Most people heard about the festival by word of mouth.

Visitor numbers: The 45 lead participants who responded to the survey provided an estimated total audience of 18,881 people across the 121 events they organised, giving a mean average of 156 people per event (range: 4 to 10,000 people). Most events (84%) averaged an audience of one to 100 people. Less events (16%) catered for audiences of more than 100, and of these, only 4% reached audiences of over 250.

Event partners: Most events were held by the lead participant plus one partner (33%). Twenty-two per cent involved the lead plus two other organisations. Less than a quarter of events (21%) were held by consortia of five or more organisations (including the lead). Very few events (4%) were run by one sole organisation. Most event partners were third sector organisations (40%). Public sector organisations, other HEIs and private sector organisations or freelance individuals were significantly less likely to be involved in events. Forty-nine per cent of lead participants said that work on their festival events had helped to create new
partnerships with other organisations, whilst 47% felt their partnerships pre-dated the festival.

- **Funding for festival events:** Of the 57 lead organisations who took part in the 2014 festival, 36 received sponsorship of between £500 and £3,000, totalling £58,670 in direct funding for their events. In addition, four lead participants were funded directly by the AHRC with grants of £3,000 each[^38] and 17[^39] drew on their own funds to finance their festival events. Using actual and estimated figures of additional sponsorship and indirect funding, it is suggested that the total resources leveraged by the festival team, HEIs and other sponsors for the 2014 festival was approximately £360,479, five times the funding allocation for individual events administered by the festival team and the AHRC.

- **Staffing festival events:** In most cases (42%), four to ten staff (including students and volunteers) were involved in helping to plan and run festival events. Around a third (31%) of lead participating organisations involved one to three staff in their festival events, whilst a fifth (20%) mobilised a larger number of 11 to 20 staff. In two cases, very large numbers of staff were involved from the lead organisation: one respondent cited 30 and another cited 33.

- **Extent and nature of media coverage gained by participants:** Sixty-nine per cent of participants had gained some media coverage for their events. Of the 73 examples given, the majority (31) were mentions in the regional press and local publications. There was also significant coverage online and via social media (21 mentions). Further media coverage included two mentions on national radio, ten on local radio, three on regional TV, four articles in trade and consumer publications and one mention each in the national press and an international media outlet.

- **Information, advice and support from the Being Human festival team:** Almost all lead participants (42 out of 45) were positive about the support they had received. Almost all centrally-available festival resources were well-used by lead participants. Logos were used by almost all of the 45 respondents and two-thirds had used the evaluation guide or vox pop cameras.

- **Feedback on Being Human marketing and key messaging:** Most lead participants (78%) provided ‘excellent’, ‘very good’ or ‘good’ feedback about central marketing and key messaging. Positive feedback included: effective and professional marketing for the festival as a whole; excellent use of social media to market the festival, with visible results; clear and eye-catching marketing tools, including logo and branding materials; prompt, helpful and detailed responses from the festival team to individual marketing queries. Twenty-two percent were less positive about the overall input on marketing and key messaging and highlighted the following issues as problematic: festival logo and branding materials perceived as old fashioned and corporate; online festival events listing was difficult to navigate; lack of a print version of the events programme for the festival as a whole; lack of

[^38]: These were a series of activities financed by the AHRC but out of a separate budget, administered directly by them and not by the festival.

[^39]: This figure includes events held at the School of Advanced Study and funded directly from their own festival grant.
online advertising outside of social media; too much expected of lead participants for the level of funding awarded.

- **Outcomes of festival events included:**
  - Provided experience of doing public engagement work
  - Created opportunities for innovation, experimentation and creativity
  - Led to the creation and development of new and existing partnerships
  - Promoted and validated humanities research.

- **Outputs and legacy of festival events included:**
  - Blog posts
  - Films of events
  - New websites and online content
  - Exhibition of photos and images from events
  - Technical developments and collection of new data
  - Sound-clips/podcasts
  - New research groups or working groups
  - Pinterest boards
  - Further joint work with event partners
  - Further showing or continued use of event outputs/materials
  - Learning resources for schools, conference paper, iTunes download, book, report, booklet, grant application, Twitter hashtag.
4. **Website traffic, social media activity and media coverage**

Other sources of feedback for evaluating Being Human 2014 came from data provided by the festival team about website traffic, social media activity and media coverage. This chapter provides some analysis of these data.

4.1. **Website traffic**

The source for the statistics presented in this section is a report provided by the festival team for the period 30th September to 23rd November 2014. Summary data about traffic to the Being Human festival website during this period are outlined below:

- 32,368 sessions
- 22,306 users
- 108,349 page views
- 67% new visitors
- 33% returning visitors
- Average session duration 2 minutes 35 seconds
- 3.35 pages viewed per session
- Overall bounce rate 56%.

**Using the website for events listings**

More detailed data relating to pages viewed highlighted that website visitors were mainly using the Being Human festival website for the events listings pages. The most popular page was the homepage (13% of page views), but all of the other most popular pages related to events listings.

People could search the events listing pages by title of event, date or region. The most frequently viewed title pages were ‘Too much information’ (4%), ‘Is religion a consolation worth having?’ (1%), ‘Ancient passions’ (1%), ‘Memory banquet’ (1%), ‘Feeling funny’ (1%) and ‘Openness, secrets and lies’ (1%). The most frequently viewed date pages were for 15th and 22nd November 2014, both Saturdays. London was the most popular region searched for in the events listings pages.

Given that the use of the website was primarily to check events listings, the bounce rate of 56% is very respectable. A higher than average bounce rate for all web content is around 56% to 70%, but for news, blogs and events a bounce rate of 70% or higher is more usual.

---

40 ‘Being Human festival website statistics (30 September – 23 November 2014)’, provided by Michael Eades.
41 All percentages presented in this chapter have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole percentage.
42 With one exception (/us) which accounted for 2% of page views.
Where do website users live?

The data provided listed the top 25 countries and cities where website sessions originate. Most people visiting the website had UK registered IP addresses (87%) with 3% having IP addresses registered in the United States.

In terms of more precise geographical location, website users were mostly based in London (42%), with far fewer visits from other regions of the UK: Nottingham (4%), Oxford (3%), Edinburgh (2%), and Newcastle-upon-Tyne (2%). Other areas listed in the top 25 included (in rank order): Birmingham, Southampton, Brighton, Norwich, Glasgow, Aberdeen, Manchester, Canterbury, York, Bristol, St Andrews, Liverpool, Cambridge, Sheffield, Portsmouth, Iver, Leeds, Croydon, Coventry.

Age and gender of website users

Most people using the website were male (54%), with women accounting for 45% of users overall. Figure 14 shows the distribution of age of website users, with most almost two-thirds (60%) aged between 18 and 34.

Traffic and referrals

Table 12 summarises the top ten sources of Being Human festival website traffic by all sessions, new users and bounce rate. Sources are the places where users were before coming to the website. It shows that 38% of new users and 33% of all sessions originated directly by people typing in the URL or via a bookmark. Often this website traffic comes from existing users, or people driven by word of mouth or offline advertising. These are interesting statistics and it would be good to explore them further for future festivals. They appear to validate a potential link with data from the surveys of attendees and lead
participants where ‘word of mouth’ responses were highest in relation to the question ‘where did you hear about the Being Human festival?’

Table 12 also highlights the impact of the festival’s marketing and key messaging via Twitter and Facebook: 16% of all sessions and 17% of new user traffic originated from these sources. Time Out also played a key role in directing users to the website.

**Table 12: Top ten sources of Being Human festival website traffic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of website traffic</th>
<th>All sessions</th>
<th>New users</th>
<th>Bounce rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct (none)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google (search)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter (referral)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook - 3 sources (referral)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Out (referral)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Advanced Study (referral)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham University (referral)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Institute of Philosophy (referral)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 lists the top ten referrals for traffic to the Being Human festival website. Again, the key role of Twitter, Facebook and Time Out are highlighted, who between were them responsible for 51% of referrals for all sessions and 39% of referrals of new users.

**Table 13: Top ten referrals to the Being Human festival website**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of website traffic</th>
<th>All sessions</th>
<th>New users</th>
<th>Bounce rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook - 4 sources</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Out</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Advanced Study</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham University</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Institute of Philosophy</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHRC</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics for bounce rates listed in the two tables are worth examining. They show visitors who arrived at the website via Google, Twitter and Facebook were less likely to view more than one page, as opposed to visitors referred by Time Out and the School of Advanced Study who explored the content in more detail and for longer.
4.2. Social media activity

The festival team provided a document entitled ‘Marketing communications strategy and plan 2014’ which listed some objectives for use of social media to promote the festival. These included:

- Achieve a combined reach of 50,000 to 100,000 across Twitter for each co-ordinated campaign
- Grow the festival Twitter account followers by 250 per quarter from 14 May onwards
- Achieve a 50% engagement rate for tweets by the end of June
- Drive at least 25% of the traffic to the website using Twitter by November
- Identify and engage a minimum of four influencers with a Twitter following greater than 10,000
- Two new Facebook and website stories each week from June to November 2014
- Fortnightly blog content from March to May, and weekly content from June onwards.

In order to assess success against these objectives, we were provided with another report containing social media statistics and data for the period 1st September to 23rd November 2014. The report covered social media activity on Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, Storify (no activity listed) and YouTube (no activity listed).

**Twitter**

The Being Human Twitter account has been active since July 2014. The following summary data cover the account from its inception up until the 23rd November 2014:

- Tweets sent 748\(^{44}\)
- Clicks 2,035 (1,250 1st September to 23rd November 2014)
- Mentions 2,262 (1,221 in November 2014)
- New followers 1,313 (452 in November 2014)
- Retweets 1,111
- Followers 1,586\(^{45}\)
- Total reach 2,200,000

Significant retweeters included:

- British Museum (403K)
- UK Supreme Court (101K)
- Samar Nadir (93K)
- Royal College of Arts (25K)

\(^{43}\)‘Being Human social media summary: 1 Sep-23 Nov 2014’, prepared by Annett Seifert, Digital Marketing Officer.

\(^{44}\)2,973 on 12th May 2015.

\(^{45}\)2,081 on 12th May 2015.
The social media summary provided by the festival team also made the following key points:

- Followers are mainly women (61%) – 39% are men
- Women aged 25-34 are the leading force among followers
- The age of most followers is 21 to 34 with a decrease in the proportion of followers aged 45 to 54, indicating that Being Human Twitter is gaining more young followers
- The most successful days on Twitter were:
  - 8th and 9th September – the launch of the 2014 festival programme: 260 clicks, 40 mentions and 30 new followers
  - 23rd September – event promotion and a blog post by Dr Sue Brunning: 100 clicks, 14 new followers
  - 15th to 23rd November - the festival week and weekends: 281 clicks, 888 mentions, 201 retweets, 308 new followers
- The engagement rate (the % of followers engaging with tweets through mentions and retweets) is 28% on average, peaking at 91% at the launch event in May and again at 97% in November 2014 when the festival was running.

The festival team has continued its active engagement with Twitter and has encouraged participating organisations and their partners to do the same. On average, the team sent 5.6 tweets per day from September to November 2014.

**Facebook**

The festival team provides very regular updates to the page and engagement appears high, with likes for most updates.

**Pinterest**

On 12th May 2015, the festival account had 78 boards (no change since 23rd November 2014), 364 pins (no change) and 37 followers.

Statistics on 23rd November 2014 included:

- 31 average daily viewers
- 8 average monthly engaged users
- 282 users from the UK, 280 from the United States, 31 from Canada, 23 from France, 19 from the Netherlands
- 615 female users, 184 male and 63 unspecified.
Social media objectives

In terms of the objectives set out earlier, it is clear that:

- The desired reach of 50,000 to 100,000 across Twitter has been met
- There have been at least 250 new followers per quarter from May 2014 (objective met)
- The engagement rate has been 28% on average, so the goal for 50% engagement has not been met
- 22% of all website referrals and 10% of all website traffic originated from Twitter, so the goal to drive at least 25% of the traffic to the website using Twitter has not been met in full; despite this, referrals from Twitter and Facebook have played a major role in advertising the festival and for directing new users towards the website
- Four influencers with a Twitter following greater than 10,000 were engaged (objective met)
- Two new Facebook and website stories were added each week from June to November 2014 (objective met)
- The festival team posted fortnightly blog content from March to May, and weekly content from June onwards (objective met).

There were no objectives for use of Pinterest, or other social media channels. However, it is clear that Pinterest is useful both as a means for festival marketing and as a vehicle for displaying outputs and legacy projects.

Overall, the objectives for all social media channels are not fully clear at present and do not appear to have been adequately communicated to all festival participants. It would be helpful to clarify and re-state if necessary the core purposes of using social media and set clear objectives for the 2015 festival so that participating organisations understand the rationale for their involvement, where requested.

4.3. Media coverage

Two documents were provided by the festival team which list details of the media coverage for Being Human 2014. They list the PR activity undertaken and any resulting media coverage.

In summary, the following coverage was achieved between May and November 2014:

Regional media mentions (print, online, radio and TV)

- Bristol Evening Post
- York Press
- Birmingham Post

National media mentions (print, online and radio)

- Times Higher Education (May)
- Research Fortnight
- Waitrose Weekend
- Times Higher Education ‘Campus Close Up’ section (November)
- Time Out
- Times Higher Education (November)
- The Conversation
- BBC Radio 4, Today Programme
- BBC News – Arts and Entertainment for Radio 4.

In reviewing the two documents provided by the festival team, it became clear that there was a slight mismatch between the details of some of the media coverage in each report. It also appeared that the festival team’s reports did not include all of the media coverage mentioned by some of the lead participants who responded to the survey. For future festivals it is important to find an accurate and systematic means for logging media mentions both centrally, and via participants, so that the full regional, national (and international) impact of Being Human can be monitored. It may also be worth considering recording additional details such as whether the festival and/or events are directly named.

Although the festival team provided a document entitled ‘Marketing communications strategy and plan 2014’ which listed some objectives (see list below) relating to national and

---

47 See footnote 49.
regional media coverage, it was not possible to assess success in relation to these objectives as we did not have access to the necessary data (e.g. exact number of media pieces and mentions and actual examples of the coverage). We suggest that the festival team revisit these objectives (listed below for reference) and consider whether they were met by activities for Being Human 2014:

- Inclusion of Being Human in all participating institution communications including newsletters, what’s-on guides, web calendars etc
- Significant national media pieces (half page and larger articles, programme features) detailing Being Human and School of Advanced Study (SAS), AHRC and British Academy (BA)
- Significant London media pieces on the SAS events (half page and larger articles, programme features) detailing Being Human and SAS
- Ten to 20 local media pieces detailing Being Human and SAS, AHRC and BA (led by participating institutions)
- Four pieces of coverage in higher education press detailing Being Human, AHRC and BA
- Call for applications to generate minimum of 4 pieces of coverage in higher education press.

4.1. Summary of website traffic, social media activity and media coverage

- Website demographics: Most users of the festival website were UK-domiciled (87%) and based in London (42%). Other main geographical areas represented were Nottingham, Oxford, Edinburgh and Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Men (54%) were more likely to use the website than women (45%) and two-thirds of users (60%) were aged between 18 and 34.

- Website traffic and referrals: Thirty-eight per cent of new users and 33% of all sessions originated directly by people typing in the URL or via a bookmark, indicating these users were led to the website by word of mouth or offline advertising. It would be good to explore these statistics further: they appear to validate a potential link with data from the surveys of attendees and lead participants where ‘word of mouth’ responses were highest in relation to the question ‘where did you hear about the Being Human festival?’ In terms of both sources and referrals, there were very significant levels of traffic via Twitter and Facebook. Time Out also played a key role in directing users to the website. Between them, Twitter, Facebook and Time Out were responsible for 51% of referrals for all sessions, and 39% of referrals of new users. Bounce rates for users visiting the website via Google, Twitter and Facebook were much higher (61-71%) than those for users referred by Time Out and the School of Advanced Study (25-27%). However even the higher bounce rates were within average range for a site whose primary use appears to be for checking events listings.

- Social media activity: The festival team has continued its active engagement with Twitter, Facebook and Pinterest and has encouraged participating organisations and
their partners to do the same. Data from website traffic and social media analytics show that Twitter and Facebook played a major role in advertising the 2014 festival and for directing new users towards the festival website. Pinterest was also useful both as a means for festival marketing and as a vehicle for displaying outputs and legacy projects. Despite this, the objectives for all social media channels are not clear at present and do not appear to have been adequately communicated to all festival participants. It would be helpful to clarify and re-state if necessary the core purposes of using social media and set clear objectives for the 2015 festival so that participating organisations understand the rationale for their involvement, where requested.

- **Media coverage:** Two documents from the festival team showed that the festival had good media coverage and was referenced in nine national media outlets (print, online and radio) and in 23 regional media outlets (print, online, radio and TV). There was a slight mismatch between the details of some of the media coverage in the reports provided by the festival team, and not all of the media coverage mentioned by survey respondents appeared to have been logged centrally. For future festivals it is important to find an accurate and systematic means for recording media mentions both centrally, and via participants, so that the full regional, national (and international) impact of Being Human can be monitored. It may also be worth considering recording additional details such as whether the festival and/or events are directly named. Due to lack of appropriate data, we were unable to assess the success of the festival’s media coverage against the objectives set out in the ‘Marketing communications strategy and plan 2014’. We suggest therefore that the festival team revisit these objectives and consider whether they were met by activities for Being Human 2014.
5. Conclusions and recommendations

The purpose of this evaluation was to consider the success of the Being Human festival 2014 against its stated aims, which were as follows:

- To inspire innovation in public engagement with leading research in the humanities
- To foster collaboration between HEIs, independent research organisations and cultural and community partners
- To make a significant and visible contribution to the national cultural life of the UK in November 2014
- To demonstrate the need and desire for an annual national festival of the humanities.

Using existing data collected by the Being Human festival team, this report has presented feedback from 1,254 festival attendees, 26 vox pop respondents and 45 lead participating organisations. It has also provided an analysis of website traffic, social media activity and media coverage of the 2014 festival. With reference to this evidence, this final chapter will draw conclusions about the progress of the festival towards its stated aims and offer recommendations for the organisation and on-going evaluation of the festival as whole, from 2015 onwards.

5.1. Progress of the Being Human festival towards its stated aims

Did the 2014 festival inspire innovation in public engagement with leading research in the humanities?

Yes: evidence from the survey of attendees showed that people enjoyed the wide variety of formats of the events on offer. Attendees were inspired, informed and enthused by the innovative content and delivery of events, possibly in ways that they had not expected.

For lead participants of festival events, involvement in the festival had provided an impetus for developing new and innovative ways to communicate their research. Events were a chance to experiment with new ways of working, to gain feedback on new practices and methodologies, and potentially, to collect primary data from attendees as part of new and on-going research. Participants appreciated the loose brief of the festival, its interdisciplinarity and the way it encouraged innovative and exciting ways of engaging with the public.

Has the festival fostered collaboration between HEIs, independent research organisations and cultural and community partners?

Yes: lead participants offered many examples of how involvement in the Being Human festival had led to the creation of new partnerships, or helped to develop and maintain existing relationships with working partners. Around half of lead participants said that work on their festival events had helped to create new relationships. The other half felt their
partnerships pre-dated the festival but had been maintained and developed through joint work for the festival. Very few events (4%) were run by one organisation working alone; rather, lead participants worked together with one or more external partners, most of whom were from the voluntary/third sector, the public sector or other HEIs.

Lead participants highlighted some of the strengths of working in partnership, particularly in terms of innovation, creativity and experience of engaging with the public. Festival events provided an opportunity to establish new contacts with members of the public, particularly as potential audiences of the future. Being part of a national festival offered a focus and funding for close collaboration with external partners in ways that would not have been possible otherwise. In several cases, the festival had helped to create and strengthen relationships within lead participants’ own institutions.

Did the festival make a significant and visible contribution to the national cultural life of the UK in November 2014?

Yes: Around 15,000 - 20,000 people visited at least one Being Human event in 2014 and many more engaged with events online, via local or national media, or through social media. The vast majority of attendees were hugely positive about their experience of the festival: most people (81%) described the events they had attended as excellent or very good.

There was good local media coverage of festival events, and some coverage at national level. Lead participants also provided details of a wider range of different outputs and legacy project results from their Being Human festival activities. In some cases, the creative projects showcased during Being Human 2014 would not have happened without festival funding. The range of outputs and links offers strong, quantifiable evidence of the impact of the festival on the national cultural life of the UK not just in November 2014, but ever since.

Has Being Human 2014 demonstrated the need and desire for an annual national festival of the humanities?

Yes: Almost all attendees surveyed said they would recommend the Being Human festival to others (85%), with just 1% saying they would not. Some attendees seemed mildly, but pleasantly, surprised that the academic events they attended were so accessible, relaxed and welcoming. Others felt that the festival events they attended had showcased the intrinsic value of humanities research for them personally, and for wider society.

Lead participants welcomed the opportunity of a funded festival to share humanities research with the public. Participants used the festival experience to practise engagement skills, to get feedback on what worked (and what didn’t) and for more general experience of events management. Several people highlighted how the process of engagement had benefited the development of their research and suggested that sharing humanities research with the public is essential to the maintenance and evolution of the discipline. Lead participants showed a strong motivation for further public engagement work.
There was also evidence of the beneficial role played by the festival in promoting and validating humanities research. There was great appreciation of being part of a wider community of arts and humanities researchers, facilitated by the festival. As a structured opportunity to contribute to public debate, the festival both celebrated knowledge and raised awareness of the value of research in the humanities. Findings from both attendees and lead participants showed that Being Human 2014 has confirmed public interest in the humanities and demonstrated there is a high demand for research-based events in the future.

5.2. Recommendations for the organisation and on-going evaluation of the Being Human festival

Findings from this evaluation have highlighted a number of recommendations relating to the audience, funding, organisation, marketing/key messaging, media coverage, and on-going evaluation of the Being Human festival. Because many of these are derived from survey respondents’ feedback, it is likely that some issues may have already been resolved or developed since the feedback was collected. Thus these recommendations are presented more as ‘suggestions for discussion’ by the festival team and steering committee:

**Audience**

- R1: Consider setting targets for increasing the numbers of attendees who were not well-represented in the audience profile for the 2014 festival. These groups include: men; disabled people; Asian/Asian British people, Black/African/Caribbean/Black British people; children and young people aged 14 or less; non-graduates and graduates from outside the humanities.
- R2: Decide how best to capture accurate data about audience numbers.
- R3: Consider setting targets for improvements in total audience numbers year-on-year (for example, an increase of 10% overall for 2015).

**Funding and organisation**

- R4: Provide clear information about how the funding process operates, including advice on invoicing.
- R5: Provide a clear, concise checklist of key actions and deadlines for lead participants.
- R6: Create a template document containing key information about the festival, its aims and funders, which can be customised by participants and event partners.
- R7: Create a central database of information from lead participants so all information is in one place and requests for repeat information are limited.
- R8: Organise and support networking amongst festival participants - areas for potential collaboration might include: use of space; ideas for presenting material; topic connections.
• R9: Consider how to incorporate increased lead time into the funding and awards process – this was thought to be especially important for larger, high profile events which may need up to one year to book and plan.

• R10: Provide more advice on events management – many people felt more funding was needed for this too.

• R11: Provide guidance on whether specific information should be given to attendees when opening/closing events (e.g. about the aims of the festival).

Marketing, media coverage and key messaging

• R12: Offer information and advice on marketing and how to approach the media to all Being Human participants (in 2014 only funded lead participants were eligible to receive information and advice and the PR Toolkit).

• R13: Update the Being Human festival website so the festival events section is easier to use and navigate - this might include downloadable/printable content by event and/or by region, or the ability to create your own personalised program of chosen events.

• R14: Provide a print or PDF version of the events programme for the festival as a whole.

• R15: Ensure the names of events are worded consistently between different listings and that all the necessary information is available (time, synopsis, venue, format, content, etc).

• R16: Consider wider online advertising and marketing.

• R17: Consider more posters and flyers in relevant public spaces.

• R18: Aim for an overall increase in regional, national and online media coverage of the Being Human festival year-on-year (% increase to be decided).

• R19: Consider Being Human festival collaboration with a national media partner such as a national weekend broadsheet or the BBC.

• R20: Consider regional launch events.

• R21: Assess the value of offering more events with high-profile speakers to raise awareness of the festival and increase media attention.

• R22: Where relevant, try to ensure that the timing of media releases coincides more closely with the start of the festival.

• R23: Consider more engagement with regional/local media and other more traditional, mainstream, media outlets, including those which run regular events listings pages (online and in print).

• R24: Find more ways to advertise the key messages of Being Human as one national festival as a whole, alongside the marketing of individual events.
R25: Highlight links between events - consider possibilities for more linkage between separate events through common themes and topics, which might also help to generate additional media coverage.

R26: Consider the value of promoting a section of the festival aimed at children, young people and schools.

R27: Continue to log all media mentions accurately and collect press clippings if possible.

R28: Continue to ask all funded lead participants, and if possible all non-funded lead participants, to log all media mentions relating to their events and to pass this information back to the festival team.

R29: Clarify the objectives for all social media channels so that participating organisations understand the rationale for their involvement, where requested.

Evaluation of future Being Human festivals

R30: Decide how the concepts of an ‘event’ and a ‘lead participant’ are best defined and ensure that these are used consistently in documents relating to the festival and its evaluation.

R31: For both the survey of attendees and the survey of lead participants, try to reduce the number of open-ended questions by introducing tick-box categories (we are happy to provide more input on this recommendation if needed).

R32: Both surveys would benefit from further codes being available or improved clarity of questions in the following topic areas (we are happy to provide more input on this recommendation if needed):

- Attendees’ survey:
  - add coding options for disability status
  - add coding options for likes and dislikes questions, e.g. rating scales for speakers, format of event, content of event, refreshments, venue, signage, etc
  - add a question about perceptions of humanities research before and after attending the event.

- Lead participants’ survey:
  - clarify definition of ‘word of mouth’ and split ‘website/mail out’ in ‘here did you first hear about the festival’ question
  - ask for information about number and type of event partners
  - ensure consistency in banding for funding information requests or preferably ask for actual figures
  - clarify definition of ‘staff’ who helped to organise or deliver festival events
  - add yes/no answer for media coverage
- request actual numbers of media mentions, links or press cuttings with coded options (national press, regional press, etc)
- split ‘evaluation guide/vox pop cameras’ in question on ‘use of festival resources’
- add coding options for feedback on marketing and key messaging
- add coding options for outcomes/what was gained
- add coding options and numbers and types of outputs and legacy projects
- add coding options for suggested improvements and limit response input if only three ideas are being sought by the question.

- R33: Both surveys would benefit from ‘don’t know’ options in addition to yes/no coding for many questions.
- R34: Ensure that sufficient resource is earmarked by lead participants in their funding bids in order to respond to requests for taking part in evaluation activities.
- R35: Ensure that the survey for attendees is also available on the Being Human festival website to enable them to complete it as soon as possible after events.
- R36: Consider limiting the use of paper copies of survey tools to avoid duplication of entries, errors and extra demands on event organisers.
- R37: Consider the effectiveness of vox pops as a research tool – a few people said they were very time-consuming, potentially resource-heavy and for the purposes of evaluation the results lack consistency and comparability (different data was collected by different HEIs).
- R38: Consider the addition of some structured, face-to-face, or telephone interviews with a sample of attendees and lead participants to collect more in-depth qualitative data.

5.3. Concluding comments

This report has examined the success of the inaugural Being Human festival 2014 against its stated aims, using a range of qualitative and quantitative data from the two surveys of attendees and lead participants and from a small number of vox pop interviews. The evidence presented has demonstrated that the Being Human festival 2014 has been particularly successful in meeting all four of it stated aims. Through the organisation and management of over 163 events, which reached 15,000 to 20,000 people and involved 161 participating organisations, Being Human 2014 has successfully and effectively inspired innovation in public engagement, fostered collaboration between event partners, and made a significant and visible contribution to the national cultural life of the UK. The findings presented in this report show that there is a strong desire for an annual national festival of the humanities and that the current festival team at the School of Advanced Study has the skills, knowledge and experience to continue to manage such a festival on a UK-wide basis.

“Distinctive, exciting, diverse - as it says - a festival of the humanities - what a treat!”
(Lead participant)
Annex A    Text of questionnaire for event attendees

Where did you hear about the event?
☐ Being Human flyer
☐ Being Human festival website
☐ Twitter
☐ Facebook
☐ Other website
☐ Local press
☐ National press
☐ Other ____________________________

Have you been to the venue before? (Circle one)
Yes  No

How closely did the event match your expectations? (Circle one)
Exactly  Very closely  Closely  Not very closely  Not at all

What did you like?

What did you dislike?

How would you rate today’s event? (Circle one)
Excellent  Very good  Good  Not very good  Terrible

Would you recommend the Being Human Festival to others? (Circle one)
Yes  No  Don’t know

Your age:
☐ 14 or younger
☐ 15-24
☐ 25-34
☐ 35-44
☐ 45-54
☐ 55-64
☐ 64 or above
☐ Prefer not to say
Gender: (Circle one)
   Male    Female    Prefer not to say

Your ethnicity:
   □ White
   □ Asian
   □ Asian British
   □ Black
   □ African
   □ Caribbean
   □ Black British
   □ Mixed
   □ Other ethnic group
   □ Prefer not to say

Do you have a disability? (Circle one)
   Yes    No    Prefer not to say

Have you been to/are you planning to go to other events at the festival? (Circle one)
   Yes    No    Don’t know

Do you have a degree or other qualification? (Circle one)
   Yes    No

If so, is it in the humanities? (Circle one)
   Yes    No
Annex B  Text of questionnaire for festival participants

Introduction

We would be grateful for your views about participating in Being Human 2014. Comments will be anonymised and the results of the survey will be used to help inform and improve the festival in the future.

Please find below a list of [24] questions, which should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, please contact us at beinghuman@sas.ac.uk.

About You

1. Lead Institution

2. Name of event or programme of events (if relevant)

3. Number of events organised for Being Human 2014

4. Please list any partner institutions/organisations involved in your Being Human activities

5. Were these partnerships initiated by the festival?
   Yes                     No

6. Estimated visitor numbers during Festival (if you hosted multiple events, please either list or estimate the overall total, list them separately here or send by email to beinghuman@sas.ac.uk)

7. How many staff from your institution(s) participated in Being Human?

8. Did you gain sponsorship or additional funding for your activities? If yes please provide an estimated total amount.
   - £1K-2K
   - £2K-4K
   - £4K-6K
   - £6K-8K
   - Other (please specify)

9. Briefly, how much indirect resource has your institution contributed (staff time, space, use of equipment, etc)?
10. Were you able to gain any media coverage for your Being Human activities? If yes, please provide details.

11. Are there any outputs or legacy project resulting from your Being Human activities (e.g. films, blogs, exhibitions)? If yes, please list these and provide links where appropriate.

**Our Comms/Resources/support**

12. Did you find the Festival team helpful in providing you with support and information?
   - Yes
   - No

13. How did you hear about the Being Human Festival?

14. What did you think of the central Being Human marketing and key messaging? How could this be improved in coming years?

15. Which of the following Being Human resources did you use?
   - Evaluation guide/vox-pop cameras
   - Template media releases
   - Logos
   - Other branding materials e.g. web banner, pull-up banners, Facebook page branding
   - Guidelines (for instance, how to use Eventbrite)

16. Are there any other resources which you would have found useful?

17. Overall, what did you think of the Being Human festival website?
   - Excellent
   - Very good
   - Good
   - Not very good
   - Terrible

**General Questions**
19. Have you/your staff engaged in public engagement activities before? Yes/No

20. Would centrally provided training in this area have been helpful? Yes/No

21. Please list the three key things that you have gained from participating in Being Human 2014 (please include comments from staff/events partners/visitors where appropriate)

22. Please list the three key things that we could improve in future years (please include comments from staff/events partners where appropriate).

23. Would you recommend participating in Being Human to others? If so, why? If not, why not? Yes/No

24. Please leave any general comments about the festival here.
Annex C  Suggested topics for vox pop interviews

1. What event are you here to see today?

2. Can you tell us a little bit about it?

3. Where did you hear about the event?

4. Have you been to the venue before?

5. Why did you decide to attend?

6. What has stood out for you?

7. How closely did the event match your expectations?

8. What could have been done differently to make the event better?

9. Have you learnt anything new today?

10. How has the event changed your perceptions of humanities research?

11. Any final thoughts?
Annex D    List of the 161 organisations participating in the Being Human festival 2014

Lead participating organisations (universities):

1. University of Aberdeen
2. Aberystwyth University
3. Bangor University
4. University of Bradford
5. University of Birmingham
6. Brunel University
7. University of Buckingham
8. University of Central Lancashire
9. City University London
10. University College London
11. Durham University
12. University of East Anglia
13. University of Edinburgh
14. University of Exeter, Cornwall
15. University of Glasgow
16. Goldsmiths College, University of London
17. Gresham College, University of London
18. Heythrop College, University of London
19. University of Hull
20. Keele University
21. University of Kent
22. King’s College London
23. University of Leicester
24. Liverpool John Moores University
25. London South Bank University
26. Manchester Metropolitan University
27. University of Manchester
28. University of Nottingham
29. Newcastle University
30. Northumbria University
31. Norwich University of the Arts
32. Open University
33. University of Oxford
34. Oxford Brookes University
35. University of Portsmouth
36. Queen’s University Belfast
37. Queen Mary University of London
38. University of Reading
39. University of Roehampton
40. Royal College of Art
41. Royal Central School of Speech and Drama, University of London
42. Royal Holloway, University of London
43. School of Advanced Study, University of London
44. University of Sheffield
45. Sheffield Hallam University
46. University of Southampton
47. University of St Andrews
48. University of Sussex
49. Swansea University
50. University of the Arts London
51. University of the Highlands and Islands
52. University of Warwick
53. University of West of England
54. University of York

Lead participating organisations (other)

1. British Academy
2. British Museum
3. Wellcome Trust

Partners and other participating organisations:

1. 1623 Theatre Company
2. Aberdeen College
3. ACE Dance and Music
4. Adam Matthew Digital
5. Archivio Memorie Migranti
6. Ashmolean Museum
7. B-Arts, Staffordshire
8. Birmingham Hippodrome
9. Blind Veterans UK
10. Bradford City Council
11. BFI National Archive
12. Britten Sinfonia
13. Broadway Media Centre, Nottingham
14. Buckingham Old Goal Museum
15. Catherine Wheels Theatre Company
16. Centre for Contemporary Arts Glasgow
17. Citizen Science Alliance
18. London Confucius Institute
19. CREST Consortium Research Excellence
20. D.H. Lawrence Heritage Centre
21. Dickens Fellowship
22. Dickens Journal Online
23. Dylan Thomas Birthplace
24. Dylan Thomas Centre
25. ecoartscotland
26. EMI Archive Group Trust
27. EYE Film Institute Netherlands
28. Excavate
29. Forum for the Future
30. Freeman College, Sheffield
31. Funny Women
32. Galleries of Justice Museum
33. Growhampton
34. GrowTheatre, Sheffield
35. History of Advertising Trust
36. IF Project
37. Institute of Mining and Mechanical Engineers
38. iTunes
39. The Laurence Sterne Trust
40. Leverhulme Trust
41. Library of Birmingham
42. Literature Wales
43. Live Art Development Agency
44. London Arts and Humanities Partnership
45. The Cinema Museum, London
46. Moving Memory Company
47. Museum of Oxford
49. National Museum of Scotland
50. National Theatre
51. National Waterfront Museum, Swansea
52. Natural History Museum
53. New Vic Theatre
54. Norfolk Castle Museum & Art Gallery
55. Norfolk Records Office
56. Norwich Cathedral
57. Norwich Heritage, Economic and Arts Regeneration Trust
58. Nottingham Castle Museum and Art Gallery
59. Nottingham Contemporary
60. Nuffield Theatre, Southampton
61. NVA, Glasgow
62. Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford
63. Palgrave MacMillan
64. Pan African Arts Scotland
65. Passenger Films
66. Portsmouth Film Society
67. Rich Mix Cultural Foundation
68. Royal National Institute for the Blind
69. Pier Arts Centre
70. Scottish Documentary Institute
71. Scottish Refugee Council
72. SeaCity Museum
| 73. | Senate House Library, University of London |
| 74. | Shakespeare Birthplace Trust |
| 75. | Sidney De Haan Research Centre for Arts and Health |
| 76. | Single Parent Action Network |
| 77. | Somerset Heritage Centre |
| 78. | Stratosphere Science Centre |
| 79. | St Margaret’s Institute, Oxford |
| 80. | St Mary Abbots Parish Church |
| 81. | The Supreme Court |
| 82. | Taliesin Arts Centre, Swansea |
| 83. | The Bartlett Centre for Advanced Spatial Analysis, University College London |
| 84. | The Beaney House of Art and Knowledge, Canterbury |
| 85. | The Blake Museum, Bridgewater |
| 86. | The Drum Intercultural Arts Centre, Birmingham |
| 87. | The Guild of St George |
| 88. | The Gulbenkian, University of Kent |
| 89. | The Lit & Phil, Newcastle |
| 90. | The Mass Observation Archive |
| 91. | The Museum of Somerset |
| 92. | The Suffragette Fellowship Collection at the Museum of London |
| 93. | Theatre Royal & Royal Concert Hall, Nottingham |
| 94. | Theatre Royal Newcastle |
| 95. | ThinkAmigo digital agency UK |
| 96. | Turkana Basin Institute, Stony Brook University |
| 97. | Tyneside Cinema |
| 98. | Urban Orchard Project |
| 99. | Victoria and Albert Museum |
| 100. | Warminster Museum |
| 101. | Wellcome Collection |
| 102. | Welsh Fargo Theatre Company |
| 103. | Wiltshire Heritage Centre |
| 104. | Zooniverse |
Annex E    List of the 36 lead participants funded by the Being Human festival 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name of lead participating university or HEI</th>
<th>Title of event or programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Aberdeen</td>
<td>Being Human Aberdeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bangor University</td>
<td>Heritage Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brunel University</td>
<td>Feeling Funny / What can humour tell us about being human?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Royal Central School of Speech Drama, University of London</td>
<td>Voicing Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Durham University</td>
<td>Facing Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>Visualising Voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Exeter, Cornwall</td>
<td>From a Cornish Window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
<td>Only Human?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of the Highlands and Islands</td>
<td>Wilder Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Hull</td>
<td>A Roving Soul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Liverpool John Moores University</td>
<td>My Life in Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
<td>The Tensions of Modernity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University</td>
<td>Forever Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Newcastle University</td>
<td>(Re)inventing Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Northumbria University</td>
<td>18th-century Legacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>University of Nottingham</td>
<td>Heroes and Villains, Subversion and Rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Open University</td>
<td>Ancient Fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
<td>The Shock of the Old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Oxford Brookes University</td>
<td>Understanding Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Queen Mary College, University of London</td>
<td>How We Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Roehampton University</td>
<td>Memory Banquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Royal College of Art</td>
<td>Punch and Judy's Chocolate Cornucopia of Human Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Royal Holloway, University of London</td>
<td>Memory Reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Sheffield</td>
<td>Wealthy Weekend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sheffield Hallam University</td>
<td>Fortitude and Frailty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>University of Southampton</td>
<td>The Sea and Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>University of Sussex</td>
<td>Being Mass Observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Swansea University</td>
<td>Rediscovering Dylan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>University of the Arts London</td>
<td>Wear Your Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>University College, London</td>
<td>Ancient Passions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>21st-century Human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>University of East Anglia</td>
<td>From Humanism to the Human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>University of the West of England</td>
<td>Romancing the Gibbet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>University of Warwick</td>
<td>Acting Against the Grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>University of York</td>
<td>Within the Walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Queen's University, Belfast</td>
<td>Finding Commonality: Hamlet in World Cinema</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>