

## Evaluations for the LitSciMed training programme

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	5
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> , closely followed by 1 <sup>st</sup> .
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes and no. Yes – we are a community who to an extent speak the same 'language', and which has merged HPS with English. No because there is still a tendency for work to be organised (rightly) by historical period which means that theories and methods are often weighted towards certain historical moments (although this is changing).
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Definitely. I've thought about and been introduced to material which I may not otherwise have come across and in some cases has had a direct impact on my thesis.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Workshop style – allowing participants to talk and thereby shape the agenda to an extent.</li> <li>2) Social space – point of focus to keep up to date and to an extent engaged between events.</li> <li>3) Quality of speakers, resources, locations – the whole programme was successful because it was very well organised and thought through. Time for social interaction.</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Event 5 – didn't get much out of it, particularly on day 1.</li> </ol> <p>Can't think of any more.</p>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	Meeting/Networking with other people in the field – some kind of news site for what's going on/adverts because BSLs does not really have a mailing list and LitSciMed is more active.
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Self-criticism/self-reflection.</li> <li>2) Close reading/historical.</li> </ol>
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	Uncovering hidden histories.

2

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	All.
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	Salford – Poetry and Science, also the beauty of St Deiniol's. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It directly aligned with my research interests.</li> <li>• The energy, intelligence, passion and openness of the speakers e.g. John Holmes.</li> <li>• Analysing poetry in groups.</li> </ul>
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	It is rather an area of research and way of thinking which unites many disciplines into new and more dynamic forms.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Definitely. I have had to read, think about and debate issues from many disciplines with different types of scholars – I feel I have challenged ways of thinking and have a firmer grasp on the variety of ways to analyse a text, objects and ideology.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Connections between PhD students.</li> <li>2) Students feeling comfortable to challenge speakers.</li> <li>3) The interdisciplinary of the speakers, events, venues and students.</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Science Museum, Blythe House – disorganization and no engagement with the students</li> <li>2) More students going through all events.</li> <li>3) National Maritime Museum talk and tour of paintings – it was more of a tour and less of an interactive session.</li> </ol>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes definitely.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	PhD focused lectures, workshops, and events based on LitSciMed.
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Openess to new ideas</li> <li>2) Challenging your own and other methodologies.</li> <li>3) Texts are seen to be both in context and require close reading.</li> </ol>

<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	Methods and theories, they are symbolic.
--	--

3

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	5
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	The Welcome/Hunterian Event was my fave. Not only was it closest to my research interests, but it had great material/objects to work with and terrific projects i.e. the presentation about an item bit. The event at the Maritime Museum was tops too!
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes. Since we are academic types and regularly discussing and meeting with a shared purpose/ideas, I'd say we've carved out a niche.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Not in a rigid or formal sense, but through the discussions, readings, and lectures, a general understanding of the theories and methods of their academic field has materialized.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Presentations made by the group participants (Hunterian/Maritime)</li> <li>2) Smaller group discussion times.</li> <li>3) Social aspects</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Pre-event, online discussions-lack of participation.</li> <li>2) Some open discussions needed more directed chairing.</li> <li>3) Using the pre-event readings in events i.e. some material was not really thoroughly enjoyed as a lit.type should.</li> </ol>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes, most certainly.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	Meetings for lecturer discussions.
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	There are several available: 'This Theory', various theories such as historicism, structuralism, post-modernism etc. – historical contextualism, two-culture, gender crit ect, cultural history. Generally a blend of these theoretical forms.

<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	Loosely, the methods are a use of literary, cultural and historical materials representing aspects of medicine and science.
--	---

4

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	The last 4.
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	The Manchester and Salford one, it was interesting to learn about the literature side of things and possible methodologies especially the John Holmes talk.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	I'm not sure I would call it a discipline or sub-discipline, but it is something of necessary value. I say that calling it a discipline could bend it in the way that I feel we are all doing here tries to 'cross-over' disciplinary.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, because of the various options that were put forward at the different venues. I think the next stage picking up the bits that would work for our own research projects and come out with a particular method for each project using these tools.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Formation of a community of researchers structured as the same kind of thing (even of from different perspectives).</li> <li>2) Thoughts about methodology, I am not sure I have an answer yet but to go back to question 3, I think that thinking of methodologies and alternatives to what LitSciMed is about.</li> <li>3) Introduction to important institutes and people of interest to the kind of research we are doing.</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I felt that we could've gotten more out of the workshops and participatory activities, but I have no idea how.</li> <li>2) A failure on our part – the social space. I do believe that it can live on though I'm not sure in what form exactly.</li> </ol>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Definitely. I know that many of us already go to ?? for advice in particular subjects, but also general moral support.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maybe a ?? project where everyone of the participants addresses the question of methodology head on.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More about people's projects, where they are at, how it is going, possible obstacles, possible solutions – a workshop/conference?</li> </ul>
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think that it's a mix and match of methods to come up with whats working best.</li> <li>• It involves a lot of trying out and experimentation and that seems to make the research projects longer and more complicated – but that's not a bad thing.</li> <li>• My method (at the moment anyway) is a combination of material culture studies (mostly to get out of historicity), history of science and aspects of visual culture. I tried the literature close reading of texts thing and although I did enjoy it, it was clear to me that I can't really do it.</li> </ul>
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That it might be useful for the sciences to study their cultural history.</li> <li>• That combining various aspects of different disciplines can be very useful.</li> <li>• That there is a value to what we do (in different ways) and the main proof is that so many of us do it.</li> </ul>

5

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	3 (4, 5 & 6)
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	The one at Manchester and Salford. I particularly enjoyed the Hasok Chan session and then all of the sessions at Salford on poetry with John Holmes and Michael Whitworth.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	I think that it is a sub-discipline, although perhaps more detailed thought is needed about exactly what and who it involves. Immediately, it would seem that it's a sub-discipline within literature, but there are also a lot of historians attending, and who we've heard from. How does 'LitSciMed' relate to history, and must it necessarily be historical lit? Another reason I think that as a literary scholar, you may have much more in common in

	terms of 'theories and methods' with another LitSciMed person than with another scholar from your period. I also think that we might need to think more about how LitSciMed relates to the medical humanities, another new and related discipline.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, I certainly feel that through experiencing the theories and methods of a number of other practitioners of LitSciMed – either fellow students or academics – I have been able to begin to think about what are the theories and methods that unite us, despite our seemingly disparate projects.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The way in which coherence was maintained whilst also having a really wide range of material and disciplines covered.</li> <li>2) The people on it! Having the opportunity to chat to all the other participants casually and socially as well as academically.</li> <li>3) Fantastic organization.</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There was often an extremely large amount of reading. Whilst this is mostly fine and great for an indepth understanding, it may have been useful to be directed to a shorter essential piece to ensure unity of understanding or at least one point.</li> <li>2) Clearer definitions of Lit Sci and Med. Difference between Sci and Lit &amp; Med and Lit could have been looked into more.</li> </ol>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes, absolutely. And a community I feel so happy to belong to, and which I feel will help and stay with me in the future.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	Getting together with all the participants. Some sort of seminar series where we can continue discussing these ideas? Some sort of online space through which we can easily contact one another and share events any of us are attending/organising. Facebook page or similar on the social space.
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	Reading literature, science and medicine as inherently inter-related cultural practices. Historicism.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	That our readings of Lit, Sci and Med are illuminated by being read in conjunction with the others. That all knowledge is culturally produced,

	and that understanding ways in which certain types of knowledge become epistemologically dominant is really important.
--	--

6

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	6
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	Event 1, for the sort of residential aspect. I liked how simultaneously hardcore and relaxing it was, and it was also fabulous to be exposed to so many different ideas and approaches so close to the start of my PhD (I was 3 months in), which really sped things up for me.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	I don't feel that enough of the attendees have enough in common for it to be a 'sub-discipline', (what is a sub-discipline? How can a sub-discipline be inter(multi)disciplinary? To me this labeling impetus opens up a number of really unnecessary complications), but I continue to insist that this is a strength; that its nebulousness and had loads of eg. manifesto keep it inclusive, dynamic and interesting. We should all be working more closely, more often with people studying other things in other ways – LitSciMed is a banner under which this can happen, and in my view gloriously so.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Certainly my awareness of resources has increased. I sometimes felt that a connection was being implied between object theory and LitSciMed which is perhaps not as intrinsic as it was made out to be – perhaps the organizers should have been more explicit about this. But I don't think it was to the detriment of other approaches which we were exposed to, and I thought Gowan Dawson's methodological discussion in event 6 was a particularly good example of this being done right.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Contact with some of the 'big names' in the field (range of excellent teachers and thinkers).</li> <li>2) Opening new resources/lines of enquiry (first chapter of my thesis came out of event 2).</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Financial logistics – Salford's strange decision to return my expenses on an employee paycheck means I have paid tax on</li> </ol>

	<p>them which I won't get back until April. Small point but frustrating for impoverished student.</p> <p>2) Reading quantities per event were usually prohibitive. Don't mind doing lots of reading but did feel a lot of it was never actually discussed (or only skimmed over) at the actual events. Appreciate 'being exposed to things' arguments but sometimes was to the detriment of pieces which were the true focus of each session. Perhaps a greater sense beforehand of <u>why</u> each reading?</p> <p>3) There is no 3.</p>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	I guess I prefer 'network' or 'cohort' or something, but see my answer to Q3. There's definitely people I'll stay in touch with, which is great.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	It would be nice to think that other new doctoral students will have the same chances we did! Why shouldn't that residential thing from event 1, or something like it, be an annual thing for people each time?
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	Archive and museum stuff; biography seems prevalent. Strongly in favour but, as an example of arguments in Qs 3 & 10, these things will only be of peripheral relevance to my project.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	Could have done with a greater sense of when the course separated from orthodoxy (see Q4). Seems very historicism-y, and with an interest in material culture and images. However, I remain convinced that individual's here continue to work very differently, and that this is good (see Q3).

7

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	3
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	Event 6-it was most appropriate for my area of study, but I did appreciate the locations/visits to the RI and the National Maritime Museum (event 3).
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	In some respects I feel that it is a sub-discipline in so far as it brings together a research area that is being 'widely' (for want of a better word) studied, but has not yet become a collective where further



	progress can be made, rather than the individual ways it is currently being conducted.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	I definitely feel that I have been trained in how to approach my research through certain theories and methods. Instead of the haphazard approach I began my research with, I am both conscious of theories and methods of approach to my research; and also my thesis has been greatly influenced by this training in the focus I have taken. It has had a transformative effect!
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The speakers – being able to hear authorities in a variety of fields.</li> <li>2) Archive Work – I am not familiar with using archives (only electronic) and I really appreciated the work we did on event 3.</li> <li>3) Format – two day courses sporadically spaced throughout the year, rather than an intensive course.</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Earlier in the programme there were extensive and expensive reading lists.</li> </ol> <p>Can't think of anymore.</p>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	Social space and perhaps an annual meeting?
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	I feel that there are numerous methods and theories of LitSciMed that it would be difficult/impossible to summarise. With the 3 disciplines there are a multitude of positions to take.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	Please see above.

8

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	6
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	First, an opportunity to present own work and get to listen to others. Environment conducive to networking.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is</b>	No, there seems to be many conflicting methodologies and research

<b>'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	values. Interesting and valuable collaborations have been brokered and we have had many thought provoking moments but too many traditions remain separate (if open to collaboration). There seems to have been no real bleeding of boundaries.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	I feel as though various academics from established fields have run through their own theories, methods and values. Only one or two seem to have attempted to re-designate boundaries and establish a method drawing upon more than one discipline. Theory has been somewhat skimmed.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The relationships forged will persist throughout our careers.</li> <li>2) The realization that, although multi-disciplinary/trans-disciplinary/inter-disciplinary (etc) work is valued, one must be acutely aware of where they are positioned in terms of traditional discipline if one wants an academic post. One must be able to identify oneself as a 'sociologist', for instance, or a 'historian'.</li> <li>3) A space has been created to discuss 'LitSciMed' subjects (that is subjects that address more than one discipline).</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In a sense, the programme has not made enough noise. There has been no tangible change in the way 'LitSciMed' work is perceived (though this may require time).</li> <li>2) Following the most spectacular event (1<sup>st</sup> event) with standard conferences drove some people away by rousing expectations.</li> </ol>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Most certainly, a very valuable one too.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	The community.
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	I don't think there are any distinct methods....
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	...or theories! I suppose, in a way, the clashing of different incompatible theories and methods could constitute an approach. This is not to say it

	is not valuable. It has been a great way to think about how one might need to defend against attacks from other disciplines.
--	--

9

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	1
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	A sub-discipline separate from science studies/history of science? It fits into the existing field of critical studies of scientific practice.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Ive appreciated some of the methodological discussions, I found these quite eye-opening. I don't feel I can adequately comment on formal 'training' in anything.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	I found some of the workshops retreated into a conventional 'conference' format because of a lack of chairing – the students became an audience, listening to academics discuss in front of them.
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	As a late-comer, I would be keen to see another years programme
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	Seems largely historicist from my perspective.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	

10

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	1 (event 6)
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	N/A

<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, there are particular ways literary studies 'history of sci' people need to learn to talk to each other and use each other's work.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, the idea of reading scientific texts in literature and the same in LitSciMed were closer together, were useful.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	1) Preparing the reading for the Dawson led event – good materials that talk to each other. 2) Focus on discussion. 3) Group led discussion like Holly and Claire's.
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	1) Discussion on Day 1 of Event 6 wandered away from the readings and toward more general sci stuff so I couldn't participate as much. We should have been brought back to gender more.
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	Trips to relevant exhibits (like DIRT) at the Wellcome. Online forum – interesting articles.
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	Reading medical/sci texts like literature – interrogating their cultural biases, their intended audience. Reading novels and lit works to see how they are influenced by, and shape debates about medical/cultural issues like motherhood, eugenics, and abortion etc.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	Cultural assumptions shape scientific thought, medical research as well as literature, and these 3 things shape each other, so they should be looked at together.

11

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	4.
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	Event 2 – it introduced me to some fantastic resources at the Wellcome, visiting the different venues. I enjoyed the discussions. Event 6 – the first day was definitely the most useful with regard to my

	research – the reading for the first lecture and the second lectures as a whole.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	I'm unsure, my work falls predominantly in the lit and med categories, and I believe this has a stronger more historical claim to being a sub-discipline as the fields were so clearly related, as literary cases were discussed in medical journals.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, I have learnt many things on this programme, including manuscript handling and ?? with objects etc. And the lectures have really helped feed into my work and given me a solid grounding which has helped me take my PhD forward.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Developing a community – this has provided me with excellent networking opportunities.</li> <li>2) Introducing me to resources and theories I had not encountered before.</li> <li>3) A space to discuss how the various disciplines feed into each other and it provided a forum to explore these ?? with fellow enthusiasts.</li> <li>4) Some great speakers.</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) First day of Event 5 – (the second day was much more successful), we didn't get to see the archives and it finished early.</li> <li>2) The social space was useful but it has also struggled to provide the permanent online community it intended to.</li> <li>3) More workshop time would've been useful and productive.</li> </ol>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Absolutely.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	<p>I think there should be a conference, it would've been good to hear more about each others work and how it feeds into LitSciMed in a more formal way.</p> <p>A series of seminars perhaps?</p>
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of</b>	I don't feel there are particular methods, or theories, I feel that theres a

<b>LitSciMed?</b>	multiplicity of methods and theories which we have discussed and encountered and that these bear greater or lesser relevance depending on the focus of the individuals research.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	As above.

12

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	The last 3.
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	The event in Manchester, as it was more relevant to my own work <u>but</u> I enjoyed all 3.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, we can bring a different perspective to the traditionally 'rigid' sciences and show <u>how</u> science is influenced and informed by, for example, culture and literature. This is important work.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, LitSciMed has taught me about so many new theories and methods I feel confident in incorporating in my own research. Much more aware of resources available and networking opportunities have been amazing.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	1) John Holmes talk in Salford. 2) Hasok Changs into to philosophy of science was <u>so</u> useful to non-scientists.
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	Perhaps more 'hands on' work with archives and objects would have been valuable.
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	Social space – perhaps a move to facebook!!! See answer 6.
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	We can use our training in literary studies to, for example, look at scientific texts as literary texts – looking for things like cultural context, reader reception, even the language and rhetoric used. We can compare scientific and literary texts by looking at the time which they were produced, authorship etc. Just as the scientist can never be isolated from his culture nor can the scientific text.

<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	See answer 3.
--	---------------

13

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	3.
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	This one because so many of the talks and discussions were directly relevant to my research. I may well use Keele's archive in the future! Event 4 was very relevant and inspiring too.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Maybe more of a 'contact zone' between disciplines because its open to different approaches without selecting one or privileging it. As individual scholars, I think we pick and choose approaches which suit the objects of our research.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, I feel like I understand SSK and material culture a lot better now through examining objects with experts and talking about how to approach them critically/historically. It was great to hear historians of science bridging the gaps between us showing how linguistic analysis is part of their work as history of science can be part of ours.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Establishing dialogue between disciplines through speaker choices.</li> <li>2) John Holme's talk – he showed how science and literary studies can be used together.</li> <li>3) Hasok's talk on SSK – again showed how textual close reading and history, philosophy of science can work together.</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Not entirely clear how Mike Brown's discussion of guns related to medicine.</li> <li>2) Could be longer.</li> </ol> <p>Sorry, cant think of any other criticism.</p>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Definitely.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	More events, more inter-disciplinary lectures.

<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	Counter factual history, material culture analysis, combination of literary analysis, history of science and medicine.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	That science is embedded in culture and ideology, which needs to be traced, discussed, historicized. That scientific, medical and literary texts can all be studied in literary ways. That literature, science and medicine are comparable practices, involving imagination and institutional norms, standards.

14

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	All.
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	Manchester and Salford – HPS and poetry and science, John Holmes lecture – explained the literature and science/medicine interaction very clearly, in pieces of literature that it was possible to read all of it.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is ‘LitSciMed’ a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, or it could be – future projects will be able to be more balanced between lit and med/sci – at the moment most people come from one or the other field of study – difficult to integrate when the project is already formed.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the ‘theories and methods’ of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, although, not having done English literature since GCSE, I found there was somewhat of an assumption that students would know/remember literary theory etc.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) John Holmes lecture on poetry and science – for reasons in question 2.</li> <li>2) The <b>Huntenan</b> museum and discussion/presentation afterwards – very interesting and doing the occasional presentation was useful.</li> <li>3) The first event as a whole was very useful due to its intensity and meeting/getting to know people.</li> </ol>
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The final day of event 1 – trip to MOSI was difficult – could’ve been part of Manchester event.</li> <li>2) Science museum – lack of discussion.</li> </ol>



<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes, has been excellent for learning and networking.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	Conferences – to showcase the results of our training. More courses with basics perhaps for future PhD's.
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	Contextualising literature/SciMed texts within their own spheres and <u>others</u> . Close reading of SciMed texts as literary pieces. Archival research – material culture.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	Literature feeds into SciMed, SciMed feeds into literature. LitSciMed are products on each other and of their culture.

15

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	3/6.
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	Event 2 was focused towards my own research so I found it the most useful and more able to contribute than on other events.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, I feel LitSciMed people often come across the same obstacles in their research and for this reason issues of methods and theories unites them as a sub-discipline even when different topics, combinations and approaches are used.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	I believe the discussions of theories and methods over the events have helped me define and support my own methodology. By being aware of alternative methodologies it is easier to see the benefits and limitations of my own approach.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	1) The speakers were very good and the range of approaches to LitSciMed presented by them was impressive. 2) The museum visits gave me the opportunity to explore the relationship between LitSciMed and objects/spaces. 3) The online social space was a great opportunity to read about the research and thoughts of other members.
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	1) The discussion boards on the LitSciMed social space was underused.

	<p>2) I felt more textual analysis of set readings was needed.</p> <p>3) Far too many sandwich lunches.</p>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Definitely, I am now in contact with members on writing papers, organizing seminars, and sharing good research methods.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	I would like to see parts of the programme continued in an annual conference/seminar series to show the evolution of members work. The social space should continue with an application where members could post publications/conferences etc (this may exist already).
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	Methods and theories cannot be easily separated but one strong theme is historiography as a methodological approach. The events I have chosen have been primarily 19 <sup>th</sup> Century for this reason.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	One method that has followed through the events is the importance of 'object theory' in LitSciMed. Its objects are important in my own research, I am thankful of this running theme.

16

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	3.
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	Event 4 on poetry and science (day 2). It offered new and innovative ways to think about the ?? between poetry and science. John Holmes session was especially good – I was inspired by his insistence on the importance of poetry in conceptualizing our experience of the world.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, albeit a (re)emerging one, and one that is still finding ways and means of expression. In my work, it involves the recovery of intersections that have been forgotten, or are no longer relevant for contemporary science but which can help understand the geneology of both cultures.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, in event 4 we were provided with a useful framework with which to analyse science in poetry. Much of the programme has been devoted to ensuring a rigorous and critical analysis of our methodologies.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your</b>	1) Event 4 – see above – the expertise and enthusiasm of those involved.

<b>choices.</b>	2) The structure of each event – giving plenty of time for discussion and analysis. 3) The opportunity to meet others working in this emerging sub-discipline.
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	1) The event at the V&A archives, which could have been better organized.
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes – I wish there were more events. I don't doubt that we will stay in touch, however.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	An outline resource would be useful – particularly with news and events – a place to keep in touch with each other.
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	Being open to ideas from other disciplines and fields of study. Allowing for conversation between those disciplines.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	LitSciMed is open to a number of theories – I'm not sure if there are any that particularly adhere to the discipline itself, but for myself, in my own work, feminist, historical and literary theory are particularly useful.

17

<b>How many of the six events have you attended?</b>	2.
<b>Which was your favourite event and why?</b>	Event 6 – most relevant to my own interests and about subjects on which I was more knowledgeable, and well co-ordinated.
<b>In your opinion, after attending this programme, is 'LitSciMed' a sub-discipline? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	No, there were students of literature and history who share topics and even research materials, and this programme has brought them together and made them more aware of each others' work, but I think they remain separate.
<b>Do you feel as though you have been trained in the 'theories and methods' of LitSciMed? Please give reasons for your answer.</b>	Yes, there has been serious attempt to discuss both practical and theoretical approaches to studying LitSciMed – many of which seemed novel to more students.
<b>Name three things that you thought were the most successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	1) Student selection – good variety of topics and approaches amongst attendees. 2) Locations – events have been well located and have ran very smoothly.

	3) Organiser – Sharon has been fantastic – very friendly and sociable.
<b>Name three things that you thought least successful in this programme and explain your choices.</b>	<p>1) Practical sessions – some sessions focused on skills or techniques that weren't particularly useful or new.</p> <p>2) Website – social space was perhaps not a useful way to communicate.</p> <p>3) Readings – weren't used at events and thus a bit ??.</p>
<b>Do you feel as though you belong to a community after having attended this programme?</b>	Yes, one of research – it's a loose community but one that becomes relevant more outside events – when you meet LitSciMeders at other, non LitSciMed events.
<b>Which aspects of the programme would you like to see continue?</b>	A communal blog, rather than each having our own, that could be easily subscribed to, and added to. Social side?
<b>In your opinion, what are the methods of LitSciMed?</b>	Too numerous to list – theory of the methods of history, literature, sociology etc – combined and multiplied.
<b>In your opinion, what are the main theories of LitSciMed?</b>	(unfortunately) exegesis of text.