

## Small Talk working lunch Thursday 26 January 2006



This working lunch was hosted by the BA in the d.studio of the Dana Centre.

20 attendees booked and 19 people attended on the day. The event was advertised on psci-com and via the BA's science communicators events list. Bookings were open for 2 weeks prior to the working lunch and places filled up quickly. Despite previous reluctance to run working lunches in London, since it was perceived that people would not be willing to take time out of a busy working day, the high attendance indicates that people are willing to come to an event at lunchtime. The low drop-out rate, despite this event being free, was also encouraging.

17 evaluation forms were completed by attendees (89% response rate).

**Overall responses to the working lunch were extremely positive.** 88% were either satisfied or very satisfied with the working lunch with the remaining 12% being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

100% thought the workshop was well structured, felt welcome to comment and enjoyed taking part in the workshop. Some attendees felt there was not enough time for discussion (12%) or networking (35%). This is often a problem with the lunches as they can only take place over a limited period of time. This particular working lunch was also slightly shorter than normal (1.5 hours compared to 2.5-3). However, in this instance, an extra half an hour prior to the start of the event was included for informal networking, though few people took the opportunity.

The main reasons that people attended the working lunch were to:

- hear about dialogue methods - including dialogue on nanotechnology (6)
- find out about Small Talk (5)
- network (4)
- learn more about science communication (3)
- learn about input to policy (2)

The main expectations were:

- no expectations (4)
- discussion (3)
- hear more information about what dialogue events had been done (2)
- hear more detail about Small Talk (2)
- share experiences (2)
- good lunch (2)

Dialogue techniques or processes which attendees were interested to learn more about were:

- deliberative mapping (4)
- citizens' juries (3)
- DEMOCS (1)
- reverse dialogue – asking people what they want from science (1)
- passive & active audiences (1)
- all forms of dialogue techniques (1)

## Appendix: Feedback data

### 1. What was the main reason you decided to attend this event?

Hear about dialogue methods (incl nano dialogue)	6
Find out about Small Talk	5
Network	4
Learn more about science communication	3
Learn about input to policy	2
Relevant to current projects	1
Learn from others	1
Hear what people are up to	1
Had run a Small Talk event	1
See how project received by science communicators	1

### 2. What were your expectations?

No expectations	4
Discussion	3
Hear more information about what had been done	2
Hear more detail about Small Talk	2
Share experiences	2
Good lunch	2
Share best practice	1
See/hear more presentations	1
Find out about nano initiatives	1
Meet people involved in nano initiatives	1
Good conversations	1
Good audience	1

### 3. What dialogue techniques or processes would you be interested to learn more about (eg. Citizens' juries, deliberative mapping, DEMOCS)?

Deliberative mapping	4
Citizens' juries	3
DEMOCS	1
Reverse dialogue – asking people what they want from science	1
Passive & active audiences	1
All forms of dialogue techniques	1

4. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements		strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree		agree + strongly agree
there was enough time for discussion	0	2	8	7			15
there was enough time for networking	0	6	10	1			11
the workshop was well structured	0	0	12	5			17
I felt welcome to comment and ask questions	0	0	10	7			17
I enjoyed taking part	0	0	13	4			17
<b>5. How satisfied were you with the working lunch overall?</b>	<b>don't know</b>	<b>not at all satisfied</b>	<b>not very satisfied</b>	<b>neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>satisfied</b>	<b>very satisfied</b>	<b>satisfied + very satisfied</b>
overall satisfaction	0	0	0	2	11	4	15