

## Event 5

Questions Responses	Three best things	Things to change or improve
Student 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of topics/subject discussed.</li> <li>• An opportunity to be exposed to something unfamiliar.</li> <li>• The format of the event itself.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The choice of Blythe House as a location was not the best one, so perhaps a more accessible venue could have been better.</li> <li>• The schedule was a little bit erratic.</li> </ul>
Student 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inter-disciplinary nature - As an historian of science, it is refreshing to hear from and talk to such a wide variety of disciplines.</li> <li>• The opportunity to meet and discuss with other PhDs.</li> <li>• The opportunity to see Scott Anthony's Post Office propaganda films.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Day 1 was very brief – a tour of Blythe House would've been much appreciated.</li> <li>• More history, less literature (but that's my own disciplinary bias!).</li> </ul>
Student 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Films of first day – the diversity yet common subject matter.</li> <li>• The unity and impressiveness of the 3 lectures from day 2.</li> <li>• Particularly the handout from Isobel – her readings were incredibly interesting and subtle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Day 1 needed 1 more speaker.</li> <li>• Background of Blythe House – I arrived and wished I was told more about the building.</li> </ul>
Student 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The second day was by far the most productive as the presenters seemed well at ease with their materials and presented a strong breadth of topics to discuss.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I was quite disappointed by the lack of structure in day 1. There was little input from the presenters as to the theoretical relevance of these selected topics.</li> <li>• Also in day 1, we were situated in a building with significant historical relevance but were not allowed to leave and explore. With a theme of objects, next time the event should be held where we as adults are allowed to respectfully explore the grounds in the quest for</li> </ul>

		knowledge.
<b>Student 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Isobel Armstrong.</li> <li>• Our reception at Birkbeck – excellent hosts.</li> <li>• The material behind ‘the Man in the White Suit’ – a shame it wasn’t capitalised upon.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Day 1 – unfortunately more or less entirely useless, largely, I think, because ill thought through.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lectures were excellent.</li> <li>• Films were good.</li> <li>• Group is diverse (of topic anyway).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Let us into Blythe House to see the objects.</li> <li>• Is there a way to use the websites social space?</li> </ul>
<b>Student 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lectures on Friday morning.</li> <li>• Movies on Thursday.</li> <li>• End discussion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MIWS talk – was very thorough not leaving much for discussion.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I particularly enjoyed the films and analysis of the ‘Man in the White Suit’.</li> <li>• The discussion about objects was varied and useful, and nice change to lectures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Student 9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being introduced to new ideas, methodologies and theories, some of which may impact on my work, but all of which were interesting and thought provoking.</li> <li>• Isobel Armstrong’s talk on ‘Glass Reflections’ was stimulating and shed new light on the way one might approach objects in research.</li> <li>• Esther Leslie’s talk was really interesting – I enjoyed the slides very much too.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The accommodation – it was slightly grotty, but conveniently situated.</li> <li>• The first day could’ve been more full – if indeed earlier than expected.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Friday morning – 3 interesting and engaging speakers – thought provoking.</li> <li>• Discussion in the afternoon – Friday – was useful and democratic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thursday – was not well planned, there was not enough structured discussion and watching the films gave the event a passive feel.</li> <li>• Thursday – pointless location, did not get to view any of</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The topic, Things, was broad enough to draw everyone in.</li> </ul>	<p>the collections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Friday – distributing the application information from event 1, including confidential funding information, was inappropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The quality of the talks, their creativity and breadth, in particular.</li> <li>• The variety of research topics represented by the other students, and opportunities to discuss with them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would have been nice to have a period for discussion, questions after each talk.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scott Anthony’s lecture was a pleasure to partake in.</li> <li>• Day 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Day 1 at the Science Museum was a shambles, poorly organised and with no visible structure.</li> <li>• Day 1 is a wasted opportunity. We could have looked at wonderful objects. There seems to have been no reason to visit Blythe House.</li> <li>• Hotel not clean, quite or efficient.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 13</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The speakers.</li> <li>• The discussion.</li> <li>• The reading material distributed beforehand.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More ventilation in the 2 rooms.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having great talks by great people and reflections on their texts and methods.</li> <li>• Thinking about things in film.</li> <li>• Exchanging thoughts on methods.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A visit of some of the objects at Blythe House would’ve been nice.</li> <li>• Perhaps a workshop based on a particular thing.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Esther Leslie’s presentation was fantastic.</li> <li>• The GPO films, specifically the discussion.</li> <li>• Isobel’s lecture and reading.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More engagement with the venues, particularly Blythe House.</li> <li>• Prep reading for films.</li> <li>• Discussion prints, handouts, would have been useful.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 16</b>	<p>Only attended 2<sup>nd</sup> day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 3 speakers worked excellently together, they</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was strange to circulate a list of delegates for event 1 rather than the event we were actually attending.</li> </ul>

	<p>were diverse yet interconnected in a really useful way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The long open forum discussion at the end worked well. It was great having the opportunity to reflect at length on the rich material we had heard before.</li> <li>• Great to catch up with and reconnect from people met at the past events.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lunch was not very nice!</li> <li>• Struggling to think of other criticisms!</li> </ul>
<b>Student 17</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Day 2 introduced me to some interesting concepts pertaining to my research that I hadn't previously considered.</li> <li>• Quality of speakers on day 2 very impressive.</li> <li>• Great networking and catching up with delegates from past events.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wish we could have perhaps scheduled a look at some of the collection while we were at Blythe House.</li> <li>• Day 1 rather short. Seemed to come to an abrupt end.</li> <li>• Lunch on day 2 was rather uninspiring.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variety of content and people and media (films, pictures, talking).</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> day – Thing Theory in particular.</li> <li>• Afternoon discussion – fluid, vibrant and expensive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tour of Blythe House!</li> <li>• Some introductions at the beginning to know backgrounds of participants and convenors and more about the project.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 19</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The discussion at the end of the last day.</li> <li>• The opportunity to discuss and consider the relevance of things – which I can now see as making an impact on my research in a smaller but really important way.</li> <li>• The talks on the last day.</li> <li>• The opportunity to meet and speak with fellow postgrads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first day finished early and we didn't get to look at the collections/archives which was disappointing. I felt that the first day was a wasted opportunity which was a real shame.</li> <li>• The accommodation was dirty and noisy.</li> </ul>
<b>Student 20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Really interesting mix of speakers, topics and ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would have liked more group discussion of GPO films on day 1.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stimulating discussions with other delegates.</li><li>• Lots of interesting theoretical directions to follow up.</li></ul>	
--	--	--