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Summary

Being Human 2021

Under the theme ‘Renewal’, the eighth Being Human festival of the humanities took place between 11th and 20th November 2021.

Being Human’s purpose is “to demonstrate why humanities research is vital to society and directly relevant to the lives and interests of people across the UK”, and it is led and run by the University of London’s School of Advanced Study (SAS), which had these priorities for the 2021 edition:

1. Train the next generation of humanities researchers.
2. Devise innovative methods for new discoveries.
3. Connect humanities researchers and practitioners across disciplines and sectors.
4. Boost the national infrastructure for humanities through the development of our unique resources and capabilities to enable new methods and support the growth of ideas.
5. Achieve inclusivity and national reach.

An independent evaluation of Being Human gathered feedback from event organisers, stakeholders (partners, speakers etc.) and audiences, and drew on monitoring and programming information provided by SAS, to assess: the success or otherwise in meeting stated targets¹ for the year; the experiences of organisers, stakeholders and audiences; and the comparative success of the festival year-on-year in meeting its stated targets.

Programme Metrics & Reach

The 2021 programme comprised 240 events: 56.7% of these were in-person, 36.3% online 7.1% hybrid or other remote format. Events took place in every country and region of the UK. With the exception of London, where 26.1% of events were located compared to 13.4% of the UK population, the presence of a Hub, as in previous years, resulted in the regional proportion of events exceeding the relevant population percentage. Four Hubs (Coventry, Lincoln and Swansea, and a COP26 Hub in Glasgow) organised multiple events and together represented 23.3% of the whole programme.

An estimated total ‘live’ audience of 21,360² attended events or engaged with remote and online activities during the festival period. In addition, a ‘legacy’ audience of 36,301 watched event recordings or otherwise engaged with digital content up to March 2022, taking the total audience reach to 57,661. The live audience was 4.1% lower than in 2020, although the 2021 programme had 8.4% fewer events and took place when there was considerable uncertainty about attending in-person events due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Digital fatigue, following a period of online-only engagement, may have affected live online numbers and been a factor in the reduced legacy audience, which was 21.2% lower than 2020. The 2021 audience figures can be used by SAS to determine targets for a hybrid festival in future.

¹ The Being Human 2021 Operational Plan set out a number of targets for programme design, diversity and inclusion, audience reach and outcomes, and marketing communications.

² Based on audience numbers reported to SAS for 103 events and an average of 89 attendees per event across 240 events. Audiences for individual events ranged from 3 to 2000, with a median of 33 attendees.
Funding, Investment and Partnerships

The total core funding commitment for Being Human 2021 was £80,000, of which c. £78,450 was allocated to support 123 events (51.3% of the programme), meaning average investment of £637.78 per event. Across the total programme of 240 events this equates to investment of £326.86 per event. For the total live + legacy audience, the investment per head ranged from £1.77 (based on median attendance of 33) to £1.36 (based on mean attendance of 89).

Organisers secured total additional funding of £83,606 and total in-kind investment valued at £55,322, meaning there was total additional investment of £138,928, i.e. 177.1% of the allocated core funding.

Partnerships featured significantly, as 86.3% of organisers indicated that their events involved at least one partnership, consistent with the priority to promote collaborative public engagement. In total, there were 326 individual partnerships, maintaining 2019 and 2020 numbers, notably achieved against a backdrop of ongoing uncertainty caused by the pandemic. Individual artists or performers, community organisations and arts organisations were the most prominent partners.

Interdisciplinarity was another key feature, achieving the priority to connect humanities researchers across disciplines and sectors. 81.3% of organisers ran events that were multidisciplinary. Other than cross-disciplinary collaboration within the humanities, which were reported in nearly all cases, almost three-quarters involved arts disciplines, and just under one-quarter involved STEM subjects.

Organiser Profile and Aims

86.3% of organisers came from the university sector, a similar proportion to previous years, and 11.3% represented heritage organisations. 78.7% of UK organisers identified as ‘white’, achieving the target for lowering this proportion. At 28.2%, the proportion who were ECRs or Doctoral Students fell from 39% in 2020, indicating that a specific target or other action may be needed to optimise this group’s involvement in Being Human.

Most (82.5%) organisers were aiming to reach a new audience and other significant aims were to try out new public engagement, and to further develop or initiate relationships with community/cultural partners. Events targeted a wide range of audiences, including groups associated with improving diversity and inclusion, e.g. disability groups, LGBTQIA+ groups, Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic people, people of faith, those with lived experience of poverty, which supports the priority to improve diversity and inclusion for Being Human. This was also apparent in most organisers taking specific steps to make their events as accessible and inclusive as possible.

Target audiences included people with existing interest or prior experience of a topic, theme, or venue/place, who may be considered ‘already engaged’, but also people with little or no knowledge or experience of the content, or who were unfamiliar with an event setting. Both of these groups included local audiences, which is consistent with place-based or community-relevant engagement.
Organiser Experiences and Impacts

Organisers’ satisfaction levels were high and similar to previous years. 95.0% rated their overall experience positively, attributing this to the support they received and the personal or organisational impacts they gained, particularly reaching new audiences and innovating in public engagement. 98.7% rated central SAS team support above average, and specific elements of this support (central website and marketing, training masterclasses and guidance etc.) also received positive ratings. However, organisers would like supporting information to be more streamlined and different tiers of masterclasses tailored according to background or experience. Other suggestions focused on more opportunities for knowledge sharing between organisers, more straightforward evaluation materials, and earlier, clearer explanation of evaluation expectations.

Aligning to SAS priorities and Being Human objectives, organisers from a range of public engagement backgrounds and all levels of seniority increased their skills and confidence across different areas of public engagement. Their cultural and community partnership aims were also widely met.

- 93.8% engaged with a new audience, 88.8% raised their profile, 83.8% were inspired to innovate in public engagement
- 60.0% developed new public engagement formats
- 63.5% increased and 62.2% initiated relationships with cultural/ community partners
- 86.1% developed skills and 80.5% improved confidence in event planning/ management
- 58.2% developed skills and 61.0% improved confidence in presenting to public
- 59.7% improved confidence in obtaining audience feedback on research
- 57.0% developed skills and 57.1% improved confidence in co-production

Stakeholder Profile and Impacts

Half of stakeholders (partners, speakers etc.) came from the university sector, and, similar to organisers, one-quarter of these were ECRs or Doctoral Students. Representation for both the heritage and arts sectors was 16.9% and was 8.5% for the community/ third sectors, suggesting stakeholders complemented university or research input to events. 71.2% were aiming to engage with a new audience for their work or organisation and most (86.4%) helped to promote events.

Like organisers, stakeholders rated their Being Human experience highly, with 98.3% rating it above average. Their primary aim to engage new audiences, along with other public engagement outcomes.

- 88.1% engaged with an audience that was new to them
- 74.6% were inspired to develop new ways of working and the same proportion raised their profile
- 61.0% further developed existing community or cultural relationships
Audience Profile

As in 2020, Being Human 2021 attracted an educated audience, but one that was younger and more ethnically diverse than last year. 26.5% were age under 35, up from 21% in 2020, and key targets for protected characteristics were met.

- 3.5% identified as ‘Black, African, Caribbean, Black British, up from 3% in 2020.
- 79.5% identified as ‘White’, down from 89% in 2020.
- 14.9% identified as D/deaf, disabled or having a long-term health condition, up from 14% in 2020.

Audiences were more likely to be London-based, which is proportionate to the distribution of events, and more engaged with arts/culture than UK general population. Most were also likely to have attended public events featuring university research before and be educated to university level. 55.7% were educated to postgraduate level and 75.5% had an arts/humanities/social science degree. They were more likely than in 2020 to have attended Being Human before, as 21.3% were first time attendees compared to 34% in 2020.

The most common reason for attending events was educational/professional interest, reported by 31.4%, similar to 2020 when 29% were attending ‘to aid my own studies or research’. Subjects or topics were another motivating factor, as 28.3% attended events to learn more about a subject/topic, or because a subject/topic was directly relevant to them in some way.

The value of using multiple and widespread promotional methods and tools was revealed. 26.6% of attendees heard about events through central channels, i.e. the Being Human website, social media and email. Being told or recommended by someone involved in an event was the most common single channel, reported by 20.9%. This, along with marketing or email from a venue or organiser and local listings, totalled 36.5%, which highlights the importance of local promotional channels. Social media channels were also significant, and reported by a total of 24.3%.

Audience Profiles for Online and In-person Events

Whilst the evaluation brief did not specify examining the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, a comparison of the profiles for online and in-person attendees gives some insight to any effect the pandemic may have had on audience profile. It demonstrates the value of a hybrid programme in optimising accessibility for all audience groups and types, and the value of in-person events in reaching beyond ‘already engaged’ or educated audience groups.

- The in-person audience was younger than the online cohort.
- The in-person audience was less likely to identify as white than the online cohort.
- The online audience was more likely than the in-person cohort to identify as D/deaf or disabled, or have a long-term health condition that impacts on their daily life.
- The in-person audience was less likely than the online cohort to have a university postgraduate education
- The in-person audience was less likely than the online cohort to have previously attended a public event featuring university research or to be frequent attenders of such events.
### Audience Impacts

91.1% of the 2021 audience rated events above average, with 68.3% giving the highest rating of ‘excellent’. There was no variation in ratings given by online and in-person audience cohorts. The main success factor was ‘thought-provoking content’ as reported by 77.4% (73% in 2020). 51.3% said ‘no improvement was needed’, another indicator of high satisfaction. The most common improvement was better signposting to information to follow-up events, followed by more background information, which are characteristics of an audience that seeks further knowledge. The main audience impacts aligned to SAS priorities.

- 64.0% increased their understanding of a topic’s relevance to everyday life, higher than in 2020 and 2019. This is significant with regards to the objective to demonstrate the significance of the humanities and to Being Human’s stated purpose “to demonstrate why humanities research is vital to society and directly relevant to the lives and interests of people across the UK.”
- Other significant audience outcomes were 61.6% being inspired to find out more about a topic or subject, and 45.9% learning more about research into a subject or topic. The latter was lower than the 57.3% who, in 2020, increased their awareness of research in a subject. A change in question wording may have been a factor in this variation and it is recommended that consistent wording is used in future for this outcome.

### Performance against Priorities

**SAS Priority 1: Train the next generation of humanities researchers**

The evaluation findings demonstrate that Being Human 2021 provided a significant development opportunity for the organisers that took part.

Organisers from a range of public engagement backgrounds and all levels of seniority increased their skills and confidence across different areas of public engagement. This was most significant for event planning/management, where most improved their skills and increased their confidence. Over half also reported improved skills and increased confidence in presenting to the public; obtaining feedback to inform research; co-production; and community collaboration.

Skills and confidence gains were highest for Early Career Researchers and Doctoral Students, who were less represented as organisers than previously, meaning there is scope for them to be more involved, particularly as they reported professional development outcomes at higher levels than other organisers.

Central support and guidance was deemed to have contributed to organisers’ development and was highly regarded in general, with some suggestions to optimise specific aspects.

**SAS Priority 2: Devise innovative methods for new discoveries**

Through their participation in Being Human 2021, organisers and stakeholders were able to implement innovative approaches to public engagement and develop formats that were relevant and appealing to their target audiences.

83.8% of organisers and 74.6% of stakeholders were inspired to develop new ways of working in public engagement. 60.0% of organisers were able to develop or test new public engagement formats and resources, including many with the potential to provide a legacy benefit.
Organisers’ feedback and evaluators’ observations of events found evidence of how addressing COVID-19 restrictions and seeking to broaden audiences encouraged the implementation of hybrid formats and the use of innovative approaches for both in-person and online events.

**SAS Priority 3: Connect humanities researchers and practitioners across disciplines and sectors**

All feedback indicates that a key success factor in every facet of Being Human 2021 was the prominence, excellence and impact of partnership working.

Cross-discipline and cross-sector collaboration underpinned events at a local level. Partnerships with individual artists and arts organisations helped organisers to create appealing events and entertaining experiences for their audiences. Partnerships with community organisations and the heritage sector aided audience targeting and reach. Partners of all types provided promotional channels, venues, facilitators, and, in some cases, financial support.

Making new connections and strengthening existing collaborations were key impacts of Being Human for both organisers and stakeholders. Mostly, these featured community or cultural partnerships.

**SAS Priority 4: Boost the national infrastructure for Humanities through the development of our unique resources and capabilities to enable new methods and support the growth of ideas**

Organisers welcomed the capacity-building and skills development support they received from being part of a national undertaking, but stakeholders’ perceptions varied about the value of Being Human to events, which suggests there is scope to strengthen messaging about the benefits of the festival to events and stakeholders.

There was evidence that the festival supported new methods and new ideas for over half of organisers and stakeholders.

**SAS Priority 5: Achieve inclusivity and national reach**

There was considerable evidence that organisers were seriously committed to planning and delivering inclusive, accessible events, and Being Human met targets for increasing audience and organiser diversity and inclusivity.

The audience was more diverse in terms of protected characteristics than in 2020, but, as in previous years, the audience was mostly well-educated and experienced in event-going, and there is scope to diversify these socio-economic characteristics in future, e.g. through specific targets or funding. Organisers were also more ethnically diverse than previously.

Being Human’s emphasis on local, placed-based engagement manifested itself in the UK-wide location of events, which, along with community or other local partnerships, meant organisers were able to target particular audience groups in order to meet their own strategic objectives and local priorities, and respond to local interests as well as contribute to the festival’s national aims.
Performance against Targets

The 2021 festival successfully met most of the targets that were assessed through the evaluation.

Programme Design

- Increase UK event numbers to 285 [2020: 262] with the increase to come largely via the unfunded section of the programme. Not Met – 238 (maybe due to COVID)
- Maintain number of towns and cities featuring at least one Being Human event around our average of 53 for 2017-2020. Not met – 38 (maybe due to COVID)
- Maintain number of activities in Wales [2020: 16 in 2 towns/cities]. Met towns/cities, Not met events 15 events in 3 towns/cities.
- Increase number of places in Northern Ireland from 1 university in 1 city to at least one new participant, either region or university [2018-2020: 1] Met - 2 universities in 2 towns/cities
- Maintain number of activities in Scotland across multiple towns and cities, including Glasgow [2020: 36 in 7 towns and cities]. Met r events, Not met towns/cities 41 events in 5 towns/cities

Ethnic Diversity

- Number of attendees describing as ‘white’ to return to pre-pandemic improvement on national average of 86%. [2019: 82%; 2020: 89%]. Met - 79.5%
- Increase number of attendees identifying as ‘Black, African, Caribbean, Black British’ to 3.5% [2020: 3%]. Met - 3.5%
- Increase diversity of organisers, speakers and panellists – lowering the number who describe themselves as ‘white’. [2020: 83.7% identifying as ‘white’] Met – 82.4%

Accessibility and Inclusion

- Maintain 2020 target for number of attendees who describe themselves as having a disability at 15% [2020: 14%]. Met - 14.9%

Audience Outcome

- Improve ratio of attendees saying that they learn ‘a lot’ about the subject/research under discussion at Being Human event to 80% [2020: 73%]. The 2020 Evaluation Report (p.8) used the % of attendees who agreed that an event was thought-provoking, as a proxy for learning ‘a lot’ about the subject/research under discussion. Therefore, the 2021 figure for finding events thought-provoking is used here. Met - 77.4% of attendees found content thought-provoking.
**Marketing and Communications**

Increase organiser satisfaction with website [2020: 56% rating it as excellent].

Not met - 53.8%

Increase percentage of audience that are aware of the festival before attending an event [2020: 35%].

Met - 59.0%

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

Progress towards the Being Human objectives below was evidenced through audiences’ positive experiences and outcomes (Objectives 1 and 3); organisers’ efforts to establish local partnerships and feature topics of local interest (Objective 2); festival-wide efforts made to improve inclusion and broaden audience reach (Objective 3); plus positive outcomes for organisers in developing skills and building capacity for public engagement (Objective 4). The fact that Being Human is in its eighth year is indicative of progress towards embedding the festival (Objective 5), which can only be properly assessed by including feedback from funders; senior management in universities, and representatives of the wider public engagement landscape, e.g. NCCPE.

- Demonstrate, and celebrate, the national value and significance of humanities research.
- Build capacity for place-based public engagement with humanities research, demonstrating its interest and significance to local communities.
- Strengthen the public’s understanding of the range and relevance of humanities research by extending its reach across diverse communities.
- Develop skills for humanities researchers seeking to engage with publics and increasing opportunities for all researchers to do so.
- Embed the festival as a sustainable, high-impact national fixture.
- All feedback indicates that Being Human 2021 was generally very successful. A few considerations for the future emerged in the findings, which are presented here as strategic and operational recommendations.

**Strategic Recommendations**

**R1:** Set, and agree with funders, a consistent set of short- medium- and long- term SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time bound) goals for each Being Human objective.

**R2:** Develop a funding strategy aligned to the SMART goals, and continue to explore additional sources of funding, such as used to support the COP26 Hub in 2021.

**R3:** Realise the strategic development opportunity that Hubs provide, e.g. creating a network around them to share best practice and form the basis of a Community of Practice to support humanities public engagement more widely. This network could also help shape the future direction of the festival, and raise its profile nationally and at a strategic level within universities.

**R4:** Develop a dedicated strategy and guidance for reaching beyond ‘already engaged’ audiences, and consider ring-fencing an amount of funding for events or organisers to work specifically with such audiences.
Operational Recommendations

R5: Align operational targets to SMART goals and share them with organisers to optimise the likelihood that they will be monitored and achieved.

R6: Streamline some of the organiser guidance and tools, and offer different tiers of training and support opportunities to organisers who have different levels of experience.

R7: Consider ways to optimise how local branding and Being Human branding can co-exist and be proportionately recognised, including in the application process and organiser guidance, to ensure the festival benefits fully from the significant opportunity that local stakeholders provide to help raise the its profile and extend its reach.

R8: Build on learning from operating within a global pandemic to continue with a hybrid programme to optimise inclusivity and provide equality of opportunity for the broadest range of audiences to engage with humanities research.

R9: Once SMART goals have been set and aligned to operational targets, use them to review and streamline the evaluation, ensuring that it focuses on the most important and most relevant information.

R10: Wherever possible, retain the same wording for key evaluation indicators and questions to optimise the validity of year-on-year comparisons.

R11: The evaluation would benefit from simplification, e.g. prioritisation about what questions are essential, and giving organisers the earliest-possible notice, i.e. on acceptance into the programme, about evaluation expectations for their input.
1. Introduction

This report presents the findings of an evaluation of the eighth Being Human Festival of the Humanities, which took place between 11th and 20th November 2021 under the theme ‘Renewal’.

1.1. About Being Human

Now in its eighth year, as stated on the festival website: https://beinghumanfestival.org/, Being Human’s purpose is “to demonstrate why humanities research is vital to society and directly relevant to the lives and interests of people across the UK.” The festival is led and run by the University of London’s School of Advanced Study (SAS). Being Human 2021 was delivered through a programme of 2403 free online and in-person events. It was core funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and the British Academy (BA), with additional funding from AHRC and UKRI (UK Research and Innovation) to support both a ‘COP26 Hub’ in Glasgow and activities run by ‘AHRC and BBC New Generation Thinkers’ https://www.ukri.org/blog/could-you-be-a-new-generation-thinker/.

Being Human has the following strategic objectives leading up to 2025:

1. Demonstrate, and celebrate, the national value and significance of humanities research.
2. Build capacity for place-based public engagement with humanities research, demonstrating its interest and significance to local communities.
3. Strengthen the public’s understanding of the range and relevance of humanities research by extending its reach across diverse communities.
4. Develop skills for humanities researchers seeking to engage with publics and increasing opportunities for all researchers to do so.
5. Embed the festival as a sustainable, high-impact national fixture.

1.2. 2021 Priorities and Aims for Being Human

1.2.1. SAS Priorities for Being Human

The following ‘SAS Priorities’ were specified during planning for the evaluation:

1. Train the next generation of humanities researchers.
2. Devise innovative methods for new discoveries.
3. Connect humanities researchers and practitioners across disciplines and sectors.
4. Boost the national infrastructure for humanities through the development of our unique resources and capabilities to enable new methods and support the growth of ideas.
5. Achieve inclusivity and national reach.

1.2.2. Operational Priorities

The evaluation brief also set out seven operational priorities for Being Human in 2021:

1. Connecting humanities researchers with communities and cultural partners.
2. Promoting collaborative, co-produced PE (public engagement) that increases the impact of humanities research.
3. Enabling small-to-medium scale PE projects not supported in other ways.

3 Source: SAS Programme Monitoring Spreadsheet
4. Leading innovation and best practice in PE delivery and methods.
5. Providing a focus for media interest in humanities research locally, regionally and nationally.
6. Improving inclusion and diversity in the festival programming and provision.
7. Emphasising place-based activities, representing a range of communities and interests across the four nations of the United Kingdom, creating a national festival that is rooted in local place.

1.2.3. Being Human 2021 Broad Aims & Targets

An Operational Plan outlined the following broad aims for the 2021 festival:

- Deliver a broad ranging, high quality and truly national festival connecting people outside higher education with new research in the humanities.
- Synthesise learning from Being Human 2020 to offer a programme that delivers both high quality digital engagement and meaningful, safe in-person interaction (or hybrid formats).
- Renew and refresh the festival’s focus on reaching beyond ‘already engaged’ audiences and participants.

This Operational Plan also specified a number of quantifiable targets for Being Human 2021, some of which (e.g. Diversity and Inclusion, Audience Outcomes) were assessed in the evaluation (see aims above). Where a finding relates to a Being Human 2021 operational target, it is highlighted in bold text in this report. The reports does not include targets that were outside the scope of the evaluation, e.g. marketing and communication or fundraising targets, which it is assumed will have been tracked through the SAS team’s own monitoring.

1.3. Evaluation of Being Human 2021

1.3.1. Evaluation Aims

The brief specified that the evaluation should assess:

- Success or otherwise of the festival in meeting its stated targets for the year.
- Experiences of audiences at Being Human festival events.
- Experiences of organisers of Being Human activities and events.
- Experiences of other stakeholders in the festival (e.g. cultural/community partners involved in the planning and delivery of events).
- Comparative success of the festival year-on-year in meeting its stated targets (e.g. diversity, size, and regional scope of audience).

1.3.2. Evaluation Methodology

A mixed-methods approach was adopted to collect feedback for UK events. It comprised:

- Evaluation guide for organisers of the 2021 festival events distributed pre-festival.
- Observation of a sample of events for first-hand insight and context for evaluation analysis and reporting (34 events observed).
- Post-festival online survey for event organisers (inc. Hub coordinators) to capture event and audience metrics, and organiser profile, experiences and outcomes (80 responses).
- Post-festival interview with Hub\(^4\) coordinators for more in-depth reflections (4 interviews).
- Post-festival online survey for event stakeholders\(^5\) (partners, speakers, performers etc.) to capture their profile, experiences and outcomes (59 responses).
- Online and hard copy event survey to capture audience (attendee) profile, experiences and outcomes (990 responses across 160 events).

The SAS team was consulted throughout the evaluation design and development process, providing feedback on materials and, where relevant, specifying particular questions.

### 1.3.3. About this Report

**Contents**

Chapter 2: 2021 Festival metrics. Event and audience numbers, UK regional spread, overall and regional investment per attendee and per event.
Chapter 3: Organiser Event Reporting. Leveraged funding and in-kind support, interdisciplinarity, partnerships, promotion and media coverage.
Chapter 4: Event Organiser Profile. All: sectors, demographics, familiarity with Being Human, aims. Plus for university organisers only: career stage, public engagement experience, AHRC or British Academy funding.
Chapter 5: Event Organiser Experience. Ratings of experience and support, suggestions.
Chapter 7: Stakeholder Profile. Demographics, career stage, role, motivations.
Chapter 8: Stakeholder Experience & Outcomes. Ratings, suggestions and outcomes.
Chapter 9: Audience Profile. Demographics; education, occupation, engagement with culture, arts and universities; familiarity with Being Human; motivations; comparison of in-person and online audiences.
Chapter 11: Discussion. Key themes and learning from the evaluation cross-referenced to SAS priorities, festival aims and objectives.
Chapter 12: Conclusions and Recommendations. Conclusions structured according to evaluation aims followed by strategic and operational recommendations.

**Data Presentation**

Survey respondents were not forced to answer all questions and some questions were only asked on the basis of responses to earlier questions meaning sample sizes could differ. Therefore, the number of respondents (n=) is shown for every graph. Percentages have been rounded and when totalled may be greater or less than 100. Illustrative quotes have been anonymised, attributed to ‘Organiser’, ‘Stakeholder’ or ‘Audience member’, and are shown in *blue italic*.

---

\(^4\) Being Human Hubs present programmes of multiple events responding to the histories, cultures and communities of their local areas aimed at a variety of ages and interests. In 2021, there were Hubs in Coventry, Lincoln, Swansea and a COP26 Hub in Glasgow.

\(^5\) SAS uses the term ‘cultural partner’ for individuals in this group. The term ‘stakeholder’ is used throughout the report, as it was throughout the evaluation, as it includes other researchers, community groups, venues and heritage organisations, in addition to individuals and organisations from the culture sector.
2. 2021 Being Human Metrics

Drawing on monitoring and programming data provided by SAS, this Chapter summarises key audience and event metrics; profiles the geographic distribution of UK events, audiences and funding; and analyses the per event and per attendee funding investment.

2.1. Audience and Event Totals

The 2021 numbers from SAS monitoring information are presented in Table 1 alongside the equivalent figures for Being Human in 2018, 2019 and 2020, taken from the published evaluation reports for each of those years. When making any year-on-year comparisons of numbers, general uncertainty and other effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 and 2021 must be noted, as programming changes made in response to the pandemic mean that different years are not directly comparable. In 2020, organisers chose to take events almost entirely online. In 2021, the programme comprised 136 (56.7% of total programme) in-person events, 87 (36.3%) online events, plus 17 (7.1%) hybrid (in-person and digital combined) formats or delivered via remote means, e.g. postal pack, self-guided tour.

The Being Human 2021 Operational Plan aimed for an approximate audience of around 30,000 ‘in real time’ and stated: given ongoing uncertainty, we feel we can only monitor audience numbers in 2021 and discuss plans for going forward. The data show that the total live or real time audience number for Being Human events has remained broadly stable from 2018 to 2021, with the exception of a peak in 2019. There was a slight reduction of 4.1% from 2020 to 2021 in the ‘live’ audience (i.e. attended or engaged directly with events during the festival period), which can be explained in part by the 2021 programme having 8.4% fewer events, and uncertainty around COVID-19 causing reluctance to attend in-person events. As frequently reported by engagement professionals, ‘digital fatigue’ following a period of online-only engagement was likely to have reduced both the live online audience and the ‘legacy’ (i.e. additional digital content views or access March 2022) audience, which was 21.2% lower for 2021 than for 2020. The figures below can be used by SAS to determine an appropriate target for a hybrid festival in future.

Table 1. Being Human 2018 to 2021 - Audience & Event Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total reach (live + legacy audiences)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68,358</td>
<td>57,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ‘live’ audience during festival period</td>
<td>20,183</td>
<td>29,640</td>
<td>22,270</td>
<td>21,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ‘legacy’ audience digital views/ digital access to the following March</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46,088</td>
<td>36,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of events</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (mean) ‘live’ audience per event</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculating Live Audience

To enable comparison with previous years, the total live audience for 2021 of 21,360 was calculated for 240 events from the mean (average) per event figure reported to SAS, which was 89. The audiences for individual events ranged in number from 3 to 2000, with the median being 33.
**Hub Audiences**

**Being Human 2021 met its operational target to maintain 4-5 UK Hubs.** SAS monitoring data show that the four Being Human 2021 Hubs presented a total of 56 events, representing 23.3% of the whole programme. Hub events attracted a combined live audience of 1,941, i.e. 9.1% of the total estimated live audience. For three Hubs that each received between £3,800 and £5,000 funding (Coventry, Lincoln and Swansea) the average Hub total audience was 220. The COP26 Hub, which received £20,000 funding, reported a total audience of 1,281.

**2.2. Overall Funding and Investment**

The 2021 Being Human festival was awarded core funding of £55,000 from AHRC (£35,000) and the British Academy (£20,000). This was distributed through a competitive process as: 24 ‘Small Awards’, each of up to £2,000 and totalling £41,908; and three Hub Awards for Coventry (£4,439), Lincoln (£5,000) and Swansea (£3,800), totalling £13,239.

Further funding of £20,000 from AHRC (£10,000) and UKRI (£10,000) supported a COP26 Hub in Glasgow. AHRC also committed up to £5,000 to support New Generation Thinker project grants, of which £3,300 was allocated.

The total ‘central’ funding commitment for Being Human 2021 was £80,000, of which £78,447.49 was allocated to support 123 events, i.e. 51.3% of the programme, at an average investment of £637.78 per event. Across the total programme of 240 events, the average investment was £326.86 per event.

Events in the programme that were unfunded by Being Human were referred to as ‘Open Call’. These events received support from the central SAS team and were able to benefit from central promotional tools and materials, such as the festival programme website, social media links etc.

Table 2 shows the central funding investment per attendee (per head), calculated using mean (average) and median live audience figures, as requested by SAS. For total audience reach, the investment per head ranged from £1.77 (based on median audience) to £1.36 (based on mean (average) audience), which would seem cost effective. The figures can be compared by Being Human funders and SAS to their per head investment cost for other public engagement activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Allocated Funding of £78, 447.49</th>
<th>Investment per head based on audience median of 33</th>
<th>Investment per head based on audience mean of 89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For total reach (live + legacy audiences) based on median n= 44,221, based on mean n= 57,661</td>
<td>£1.77</td>
<td>£1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For ‘live’ audience during festival period n for median= 7,920, n for mean= 21,360 mean</td>
<td>£9.90</td>
<td>£3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For ‘legacy’ audience digital views/ digital access to the following March n=36,301</td>
<td>£2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. Geographic Distribution of UK Events, Audiences and Funding

2.3.1. Event Distribution

The Operational Plan stated a target of 285 UK events, whereas the actual figure was 238, most likely as a result of COVID-19 pandemic restrictions, which were in place at varying levels throughout the UK during 2021. A total of 11 events were cancelled, which was almost entirely attributed to the pandemic.

Events took place across the UK with a wide regional spread, which can be seen in this map, highlighting in-person events (red) and online (green).

There were also a small number of online events in USA and Australia, which did not submit data to the evaluation.

Three UK events were described as ‘national’ and 235 were allocated to a specific UK country or region. Table 3 presents the latter’s geographic distribution, alongside equivalent figures for 2018 and 2019 (the 2020 evaluation report did not include this information, probably because all events were online). It shows that every UK country and region was represented in the 2021 programme. As in previous years, and even though it did not host a 2021 Hub, London was the location of the highest proportion of events at 26.1%, which compares to it being the location of 13.4% of the population. Outside London, every country or region where the percentage of 2021 events exceeded the relevant population percentage hosted a Hub – East Midlands, Scotland, West Midlands and Wales.

Generally, the table suggests that across the years, other than for London, the presence of a Hub results in the proportion of events being greater than the relevant population percentage. The only exception to this was Yorkshire & The Humber region in 2019, where there was a Hub, but the proportion of events, at 5.1%, was below the regional population figure of 8.3%.
Table 3. Being Human 2018 to 2021 - UK Country/Region Distribution of Events vs. Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK country/region</th>
<th>Mid-2020 % of UK Population</th>
<th>% of 2018 events</th>
<th>% of 2019 events</th>
<th>% of 2021 events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England - All</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.3**+</td>
<td>13.4**+</td>
<td>13.0**+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>27.3***+</td>
<td>26.9***+</td>
<td>26.1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13.9***+</td>
<td>5.1 +</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.8**+</td>
<td>13.9**+</td>
<td>17.2**+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.8**+</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.2**+</td>
<td>6.9**+</td>
<td>5.5**+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.1**+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; The Humber</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.1**-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Higher than UK population percentage  ** Being Human Hub in the country/region

Regional Programming Targets

Achievements versus the Operational Plan’s regional programming targets are shown in Table 4. They are more than satisfactory given the COVID-19 restrictions especially as Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland had particularly tight restrictions both during the planning period and at the time of the festival.

Table 4. Being Human 2021 – Regional Programming Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operational Plan Target</th>
<th>Programme Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of activities in Wales</td>
<td>16 in 2 towns/cities</td>
<td>15 in 3 towns/cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of places in Northern Ireland</td>
<td>More than 1 university in 1 city</td>
<td>2 universities in 2 towns/cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of activities in Scotland</td>
<td>36 in 7 towns/cities</td>
<td>41 in 5 towns/cities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAS monitoring data shows that events took place in 38 UK towns/ cities (in-person only), of which 23.7% (nine) are not home to a university. This percentage is consistent with previous years, as shown in Table 5. The reduction in total number of towns/cities may be a consequence of the pandemic.

**Table 5. Being Human 2018 to 2021 – UK Towns/ Cities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of UK towns/</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>all online</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of towns/</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.3.2. 2021 UK Live Audiences and Funding Distribution**

In Table 6, the distribution of 2021 events, audiences and funding are presented alongside the latest UK population estimate and a per head investment figure for each country or region. The per head investment figures came from dividing each country or region’s total funding allocation with their total live audience number. These total audiences were calculated by multiplying the overall Being Human mean live (i.e. attended during the festival period) audience of 89 by the total number of events allocated to each country or region in SAS’s monitoring data.

East of England was the only UK country or region where Being Human 2021 funding was not awarded, but events there still attracted 3.8% of the total audience. Other than this, the lowest cost of investment was in London, which received 14.9% of funding and attracted 26.1% of the total audience, with a per head investment of £2.12. Other countries or regions where the audience proportion exceeded the allocated funding proportion were East Midlands, North East and South West. The highest cost of investment was Scotland at £6.58 per live audience member, although this can be accounted for mainly by the COP26 Hub funding of £20,000.

Any readers who are comparing the per head investment figures for different countries or regions should bear in mind Being Human’s objectives to deliver place-based engagement and achieve national reach, and its aim to reach beyond ‘already engaged’ audiences, which typically require high levels of resourcing. These mean that other factors such as breadth of reach and the potentially under-served nature of some audiences or whole regions need to be borne in mind when comparing the value of any funding investment for different regions and countries.
### Table 6. Being Human 2021 - Geographic Distribution of UK Events, Live Audiences and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK country/ region</th>
<th>Mid-2020 % of UK Population</th>
<th>% of Total Events</th>
<th>% of Total Live Audience</th>
<th>% of Total Allocated Funding</th>
<th>Investment per head for live audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>£3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>£2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>£2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>£4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>£4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>£6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>£5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>£3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>£4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>£3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; The Humber</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>£3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Findings: Organisers’ Event Reporting

Using feedback collected from event organisers via survey, this Chapter firstly analyses the value of levered funding and in-kind investment for events, followed by information about event partnerships, interdisciplinarity, promotion and media coverage.

The evaluation received survey responses from 80 event organisers (includes the four Hub coordinators), which represents 76.9% of the full cohort of 104 organisers. Their feedback covered 154 events, 64.2% of the programme, all of which took place in the UK, with a wide geographic distribution. 63.8% had organised one event (64.4% in 2019), and the maximum reported by a single organiser was 13 events for one of the Hubs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being Human 2021 Organisers’ Event Reporting – Data Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• £138k raised in levered funding + in-kind investment = 177% of allocated Being Human funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 86.3% of organisers worked with partners: up from 79% in 2020 and mostly involving the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 326 individual partnerships reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 81.3% of events were multidisciplinary: 77.3% involving arts and 22.7% involving STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 41.3% secured media coverage for events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most common promotional channel was social media: used by 85% of organisers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1. Levered Funding and In-kind Investment for Events

32.5% of reporting organisers had received direct funding from Being Human, meaning a greater proportion of the programme was unfunded than in 2019, when 52.2% received Being Human funds. This reduction in the funded proportion is consistent with the operational target for any increases in events to come largely via the unfunded section of the programme.

46.3% of 2021 organisers stated that their event/s or Hub were supported by funds or financial support from another source (i.e. other than Being Human) and 40.0% gave a value for this levered funding. 53.8% reported that events received in-kind support, with 43.8% estimating a financial value for this in-kind investment (Table 7). The reported total for levered financial support in 2021 exceeded the total amount of Being Human 2021 funding by 6.6%, and the aggregate value of levered funding and in-kind investment exceeded Being Human funding by 77.1%, equating to a positive return on investment in both cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Being Human 2021 - Levered Funding and In-Kind Support Reported for Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reported Amounts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Funding (n=37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind Investment (n=43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leveraged funding and in-kind investment values were not reported for 2020, but were reported in 2018, 2019 as well as this year. As seen in Table 8, the proportion of 2021 organisers who received funding from other sources was similar to 2018 and lower than 2019. Both 2021 and 2018 were affected by uncertainty and disruption, the former due to the pandemic and the latter due to a major academic staff strike and global political uncertainty. The 2021 levered funding total held up well when compared to 2019, a year which was not affected by major uncertainty.

The value of in-kind investment, which organisers consistently say is difficult to estimate, was reported by far fewer organisers in 2021 compared to pre-pandemic, which could be due to several reasons. For example, online events not requiring venue hire or refreshments, which have previously been cited as typical examples of in-kind support. In addition, isolated work practices, i.e. remote working and working from home, may have reduced the likelihood of organisers even seeking in-kind support from colleagues.

| Table 8. Being Human 2018, 2019 & 2021 – Leveraged Funding & In-kind Support (Not Included in 2020 Evaluation Report) |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|            | 2018           | 2019           | 2021           |
| % of organisers report funding from other sources | 46.0%           | 54.4%           | 46.3%           |
| Leveraged Funding Total                          | £48,500         | £106,804        | £83,606         |
| % of organisers report in-kind investment        | 88.1%           | 76.5%           | 53.8%           |
| In-kind Investment Estimated Total               | £156,000        | £134,196        | £55,322         |

3.2. Partnerships

Partnerships were a significant feature in 2021 events, as 86.3% of organisers indicated that their Being Human event/s or Hub involved at least one partnership, slightly higher than 79% in 2020. This finding is consistent with Being Human’s 2021 operational priority to promote collaborative public engagement.

Partnership engagement levels were similar to 2020:

- 39.1% of organisers who worked with partners engaged with one partner (35% in 2020)
- 37.6% engaged two or three partners (50% in 2020 engaged between two and five)
- 23.2 % engaged four or more partners (15% in 2020 engaged six or more)

As shown in Fig. 1 below, most 2021 organisers who reported partnerships had engaged with arts partners, the same as in 2020. Partnerships with individual artists or performers were most common and reported by 55.1% (51% in 2020), followed by arts organisation partnerships, reported by 40.6% (29% in 2020), and community organisation partnerships, reported by 39.1% (23% in 2020). Partners in the ‘other’ category were mostly described as local consortia or private sector businesses.
In total, there were 326 individual partnerships, maintaining 2019 and 2020 numbers. It is notable that this was achieved despite a backdrop of ongoing uncertainty caused by the pandemic.

**Table 9. Being Human 2018 to 2021 – Partner Numbers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no. of partners</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 provides a category analysis of the 326 partnerships reported in 2021, which confirms the standing of individual artists or performers in Being Human’s partnerships profile.

**Table 10. Being Human 2021 – Partner Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Partnership</th>
<th>No. Reported</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual artist or performer</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organisation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts organisation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage organisation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/ HEI other than your own</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational organisation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority (town or city council etc.)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other partner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent research organisation other than your own</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality organisation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Interdisciplinarity

Fig. 2 demonstrates that the festival, in most cases, achieved the SAS priority to connect humanities researchers across disciplines and sectors, as 81.3% of organisers reported that their event/s or Hub were multidisciplinary. Other than cross-disciplinary working within the humanities (97.0%), organisers were most likely to report collaboration with arts disciplines (77.3%). All descriptions in the ‘other’ category mentioned law.

3.4. Promoting Events

As in previous years, 2021 organisers reported how they used multiple promotional channels to publicise events. Social media channels were most prominent: 85.0% of respondents used their organisation’s social media; 70.0% used personal social media (Fig. 3); and around half of ‘other’ answers referred to event partners’ social media outputs.
3.5. Media Coverage for Events

Overall, 41.3% of organisers reported that their events received some form of media coverage, which was mainly local. The equivalent figure in 2019 was 54.7%. In 2020, when this aspect was assessed differently, 26% reported a media output as legacy from their event.

The fact that over half of 2021 organisers reported no form of media coverage suggests that more could potentially be done to optimise their efforts in this area. This is important if the full benefits are to be realised from Being Human’s strategic priority to provide a focus for media interest in the humanities at local and regional levels.

Organisers’ comments indicate that, whilst partnerships are generally beneficial, they can sometimes affect the visibility and prominence of the Being Human brand, e.g. when partnerships involve international and more publicly visible brands, or when significant local organisations or brands are involved.

“You have to be aware that some of your partners may be better-known than Being Human, so they attract more media and public interest than Being Human can do.” (Organiser)

“It’s a balancing act when there are multiple brands involved, e.g. an event may be part of both the ESRC festival and Being Human. You could give prominence to the organisation that gave most funding to our events, but equally you could choose the brand or name that the public is most likely to recognise, which may be different to the main funder.” (Organiser)
4. Findings: Organiser Profile

This Chapter analyses information provided by all organisers about their demographics and sectors, along with career stage information, public engagement experience and relationship with festival funders for university-based organisers. It concludes with an exploration of organisers’ aims for taking part in Being Human, which draws on interviews with Hub coordinators as well as survey feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being Human 2021 Organiser Profile – Data Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target achieved for reducing proportion identifying as white.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly university staff/students – 28.2% early in their careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most have a previous relationship with Being Human and experience in public engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most took part to reach new audiences and try out new public engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most also wanted to develop/initiate relationships with community/cultural partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 78.7% identified as white: reduced from 83.7% in 2020
- 22.7% London-based
- 86.3% from university sector
- 28.2% of university organisers were ECRs or Doctoral Students, a fall from 39% in 2020
- Main public engagement aims: 82.5% to engage a new audience and 71.3% to try out or test new public engagement
- Main partnership aims: 60.0% to further develop and 55.7% to initiate relationships with community/cultural partners

4.1. Organiser Demographics

Based on survey feedback, 28.8% of 2021 organisers were age under 35, similar to the audience proportion of 26.5% in that age range. At 40.0%, organisers were most likely to be age 35 to 44. *(PNtA = Prefer not to answer)*

![Fig. 5. Organiser Age Groups, n=80](image-url)
70.0% of organisers identified as female and 21.3% as male, similar proportions to previous years. 10.0% identified as D/deaf, or disabled, or having a long-term health condition that impacts on their daily life. 93.8% were based in the UK, with 22.7% of these based in London, consistent with the geographic distribution of events.

78.7% of UK respondents identified as ‘white’, meaning the festival achieved its target for lowering the number of organisers who describe themselves as ‘white’ from 83.7% in 2020.

![Fig. 6. Organiser Ethnic or Racial Identity, n=75](image)

Table 11 demonstrates that the proportion of organisers identifying as ‘white’ has reduced year-on-year, which is indicative of Being Human making conscious efforts to be more inclusive and diverse in all aspects.

| Table 11. Being Human 2019 to 2021 – Ethnicity or Racial Identity of Organisers (Excluding Prefer Not To Say) |
|---|---|---|
| **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Asian or Asian British | 1.2% | 3.9% | 4.0% |
| Black or Black British | 0.0% | 4.8% | 1.3% |
| Mixed or Multiple | 4.7% | 2.9% | 5.3% |
| White groups | 90.7% | 80.8% | 78.7% |

4.2. Organiser Sectors

86.3% of respondents to the organiser survey reported that they work at a university, a similar proportion to previous years. 11.3% represented a heritage organisation (e.g. museum, archive or library) and 2.5% answered ‘other’, which were described as a learned society and a publisher. None represented an independent research organisation (IRO), although this was a specified answer option.
4.3. University Organiser Profile

At 10.9%, the proportion of university-based organisers who were Early Career Researchers (ECRs)\(^6\), was lower than 2020 (26%) and 2019 (35%). Conversely, at 17.2%, the 2021 proportion of postgraduate students was higher than 2020 (13%) and 2019 (0%).

Table 12 compares the combined percentage of ECRs and Doctoral/postgraduate Students for the past four festivals, as both categories can be considered as being in the early stages of an academic career. It shows that the combined figure fell in 2021, at 28.1%, compared to the two previous years, although it was still more than double the 2018 percentage. As training the next generation of humanities researchers is an SAS priority, the SAS team may wish to consider actions that they or the funders could take to increase ECRs’ involvement in Being Human. Examples of such actions could range from ECR-specific promotional messaging or using ECR-dedicated marketing, to offering a funding stream that is ring-fenced for ECRs.

Table 12. Being Human 2018 to 2021 – Early Career University Organisers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % for ECRs + Doctoral Students</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) ECR defined as within 8 years of award of PhD or equivalent professional training, or within 6 years of first academic appointment.
As Fig. 8 shows, 48.4% of university-based organisers in 2021 reported they have never worked on research funded by Being Human’s main funders - AHRC or the British Academy. In 2019 and 2020, 66.2% and 63% respectively had never been funded by either organisation. These figures are not directly comparable, as, unlike 2021, those for 2019 and 2020 exclude individuals who could have worked on projects funded by AHRC or British Academy grants awarded to other researchers.

![Fig. 8. University Organiser Experience of AHRC or British Academy Research, base n=64](image)

Most 2021 organisers had considerable prior experience of putting on public engagement (PE), which they reported at similar levels to 2020. All who had no previous experience of PE were postgraduate students, which suggests that Being Human provided this group with a development opportunity, and aligns to the SAS priority to train the next generation of humanities researchers.

![Fig. 9. University Organiser Public Engagement Experience, n=68](image)
4.4. Organisers’ Prior Familiarity with Being Human

Only 8.9% of organisers were not aware of Being Human before the 2021 festival, with a range of awareness levels being reported. At 79.7%, most organisers had heard of Being Human before, 45.6% had organised events in previous years, and 24.1% had otherwise been involved (Fig. 10), meaning, in total, 69.7% had been involved in some form before. 43.8% in 2019 reported previous involvement, meaning there is a suggestion that the festival has, year-on-year, been developing relationships with organisers who take part repeatedly.

![Fig. 10. Organiser Prior Awareness of Being Human, base n=79](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heard about festival</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited as audience member</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised event</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise involved</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5. Organisers’ Public Engagement & Professional Development Aims

Organisers’ main public engagement aim was to reach new audiences, which was reported by 82.5%, similar to 2020. 71.3% wanted to test/develop new engagement formats and 50.0% sought to develop public engagement skills, suggesting that organisers perceived Being Human to be an opportunity for public engagement innovation and developing public engagement capabilities, which aligns to the festival’s stated objectives and priorities.

![Fig. 11. Organiser PE & Professional Development Aims, base n=80](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-produce public engagement</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new engagement skills</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with new audience</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with career development</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform research through PE</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise profile of me/ research</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try out new engagement ideas</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6. Organisers’ Partnership Aims

Organisers’ aims regarding partnerships were dominated by wanting to create or further develop relationships with community or cultural partners, which emphasises the significance of these types of organisations to the festival. These aims align with Being Human objectives and priorities to link researchers with communities and cultural organisations, to promote co-production, and to support local, place-based engagement with the humanities within a national framework.

4.7. Organisers’ Aims Relating to Audiences

The survey invited organisers to describe audiences that they wanted to reach, their intended impacts for these audiences, and any specific steps they had taken to make events accessible and inclusive for target audience groups. Their answers are summarised in this section.

4.7.1. Target Audience Groups

Being Human organisers in 2021 targeted a varied and wide range of audience groups, which included groups that are associated with Being Human and SAS priorities for improving diversity and inclusion in humanities public engagement:

- **Those within the education system** - schools and FE students and teachers; HE colleagues/academics and researchers from both within and outside of the humanities.
- **Professionals/organisations outside academia** - from museums, libraries & archives; creative arts practitioners; writers; artists; health practitioners; businesses/industry; Ethicists; NGOs; EDI organisations, such as LGBTQIA+ organisations or disability charities.
- **Young adults.**
- **Children/young people** - through youth organisations or youth schemes, not formal education.
- **Families** - children, parents/carers/intergenerational groups.
- **Older people** - veterans, community elders, retirees, those in residential settings.
- **Specific communities** - refugee and asylum seekers, local community groups, migrants from other nations, interest groups, craft/arts organisations etc.
- **EDI (Equality, Diversity & Inclusion) communities or groups** - disability groups, LGBTQIA+ groups, Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic people, people of faith, those with lived experience of poverty, those with low educational attainment etc.

A significant proportion of events were reported to have been designed for audiences with existing interest or prior experience of a topic, theme, or venue/place, which somewhat contradicts the Being Human objective to reach beyond ‘already engaged’ audiences. However, other events had been designed to reach audiences with little or no knowledge or experience of the content, or were unfamiliar with an event setting, e.g. not visited a venue before, do not normally attend events run by a university.

Around a third of organisers reported that their events targeted ‘general public’ or ‘local audiences’ either as their main aim, or in addition to a specific target audience group. **Reaching out to local audiences is consistent with Being Human’s stated objective and priorities around local engagement and community-relevant engagement.**

### 4.7.2. Making Events Inclusive and Accessible

Organisers consistently reported that accessibility was at the heart of their event planning. This is indicative of the degree to which **making events inclusive was a significant consideration, which supports festival and SAS priorities to improve diversity and inclusion.**

For in-person events, organisers gave examples of a variety of accessibility considerations and approaches. These included: ‘barrier-free’ places and spaces (disability access and facilities; trusted and familiar local or community venues; sites that could be easily reached by public transport etc.); timings suitable for target audiences; BSL interpreters and multilingual staff; working with trusted community partners or facilitators to run events; offering incentives such as free refreshments or catering.

The value and importance of accessibility was also evident from organisers’ planning for online and hybrid events. These formats were cited as having reached audiences who might not be able to attend in-person, e.g. due to health issues or carer commitments, or were otherwise unable to travel easily to in-person events. They were also deemed to have broadened geographical reach across the UK and internationally. Specific steps taken to optimise online inclusion were reported as: ensuring questions and comments could be read in live chats; using automated captioning/subtitles or accessible online formats (e.g. Twine online theatre); making transcripts available during and after events; recording events so they could continue to be accessed afterwards; allowing people to be engaged in the process as much as they felt comfortable (e.g. allowing cameras to be on or off).

Several organisers also described how they built relationships with target audiences and/or conducted pre-event audience research by gathering information through community partners and booking systems, which helped shape activities to better meet the needs and wants of specific target audience groups. A common theme throughout organiser feedback was the importance and value placed on collaborating with stakeholder partners to help create successful, relevant accessible and impactful events, which highlights the value of collaboration and partnerships in producing locally-relevant or place-based engagement.
4.7.3. Intended Impact on Audiences

Organisers’ intended impacts were similar for specific audience groups and general audiences, regardless of their levels of background knowledge or familiarity of a topic. They were wide-ranging and have been categorised here using the Generic Learning Outcomes (GLOs), which are part of The Inspiring Learning For All improvement framework for the arts and culture sector [https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/measuring-outcomes/generic-learning-outcomes](https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/measuring-outcomes/generic-learning-outcomes). The GLOs use a broad definition of learning covering the entire spectrum of benefits that individuals can potentially gain from all kinds of interactions with the arts, heritage and culture.

As Table 13 shows, increasing audiences’ knowledge and understanding of particular topics or themes, including their global and societal relevance, featured prominently as a desired impact. Organisers also hoped to connect people with humanities research in a fun and valued way; influence positive attitudes towards humanities subjects; and inspire individuals to take action or make changes as a result of what they heard or saw at events.

**Table 13. Being Human 2021 – Organisers’ Intended Audience Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLO Category</th>
<th>Examples of Organiser Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; understanding</td>
<td>“Understanding of the role creative practice and imagination can play in policy and vision.” “Develop an understanding of air pollution as a global issue.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>“To teach them about a new form of writing that they can use (the manifesto).” “To broaden their practical skills through workshops in which they could make things to take away.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes &amp; values</td>
<td>“I wanted to them think more about the language that they use.” “To have an increased pride in their background and what it/they can contribute to the UK.” “We hoped to inspire participants to rethink their own histories and family stories, seeing them as sites of evidence for female achievement.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity, behaviour &amp; progression</td>
<td>“To give them time to reflect and find ideas to make change in their lives.” “To encourage: Debate and discussion on key issues; further interest in the Being Human Festival; further interest in our company.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment, inspiration &amp; creativity</td>
<td>“A very fun, relaxing and renewing day and to see that art galleries and Universities can be welcoming and inclusive.” “Inspiring further personal interest and engagement with the topics.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Findings: Organiser Experiences

This Chapter analyses organisers’ ratings of their experiences in Being Human 2021, including overall views and opinions about specific elements of support and information provided by the central SAS team. It also presents some suggestions for future editions of Being Human.

**Overall experience and support received were highly rated, particularly support from SAS team.**

Main suggestions – streamline organiser information, tailor masterclasses according to background experience, provide more knowledge-sharing opportunities, and better manage evaluation expectations.

Organisers’ aims were met – especially reaching new audiences and innovating in public engagement. Cultural/community partnership aims also widely met.

- 95.0% rated their overall experience positively
- 98.7% rated central SAS team support above average: 69.6% as excellent
- main suggestions: streamline supporting information, tailor masterclasses, increase knowledge sharing, and better manage expectations for evaluation responsibilities

5.1. Organisers’ Ratings for their Overall Experience

Most organisers were satisfied with their experience of Being Human 2021. In total, 95.0% gave an above average rating, and there were no below average ratings.

As table 14 shows, organisers’ satisfaction levels were similar to the two previous years. This was not assessed in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above average ratings</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Around one-quarter of 2021 organisers explained their ratings in survey comments. The main factors for a positive rating were: the support received from SAS; and impacts on individuals or organisations.

Organisers particularly valued and appreciated the support provided by the central SAS team.

“As always, the Being Human core team are an exceptional group of human beings for whom nothing is ever too much trouble. The team responded so positively and quickly to any changes we were required to make due to circumstances beyond our control. A professional and brilliant team with whom I love working.” (Organiser)

“Couldn’t have asked for more from those at Being Human, didn’t feel at any stage as though we needed more info or assistance than was already available. Communication always very clear and helpful.” (Organiser)

Personal impacts included organisers developing new skills and greater confidence in engaging audiences with research, but also enjoying taking part in the festival and feeling inspired to do more public engagement. These personal impacts support the festival objective and SAS priority to develop engagement skills for humanities researchers.

“Discovering new ways of presenting our research was wonderful and seeing how audiences engaged with it (and were very excited about it) was extremely rewarding.” (Organiser)

“I’m really glad that I got to have this experience. It’s been a way bigger task than I anticipated, but I have learned so much and feel inspired to try to do more things like this in the future.” (Organiser)

Organisational impacts were focused on the development and strengthening of partnerships, which confirms event reporting in section 3.2 and indicates progress was made both towards Being Human’s capacity-building and collaboration objective and priorities, and with regards to objectives to demonstrate significance in local communities and deliver place-based engagement.

The main reasons for rating experiences as average or good, rather than excellent, were: uncertainty and impact of COVID-19 restrictions; lower than expected turnouts to events; changes to personal circumstances; pressures on time due to other commitments; lack of buy-in or support from their university; not having funding for events (including not realising unfunded organisers would be responsible for evaluation); and inadequate communications between event partners.

“Perhaps because I was involved in an event not part of the funded Hubs, but there were certain pieces of information not evident - for example, I didn’t realise that there were official Being Human festival evaluation forms we were responsible for distributing to event attendees until it was mentioned in the final ‘Being Human Masterclass’. Although the information will have been on the Being Human website organiser page, I feel this should have been more explicitly conveyed to event organisers.” (Organiser)

“We feel that we could have had more visitors if it wasn’t for the current COVID restrictions and the number of cases going up.” (Organiser)

“The guidance and help from the festival was fantastic - in fact it was too much to keep up with, but I was glad it was there as a resource. However, my own university did very little and my takeaway was that it was harder to work with the festival via my uni than to have just made the decisions independently. This is in part because the ESRC fest was running at the same time and our PE team and events were flat out. It was still disappointing that my uni could not be leveraged to help with planning or promo and in the end just delayed and complicated the process.” (Organiser)
5.2. Organisers’ Ratings of SAS Support and Resources

Organisers rated all forms of festival support as above average. In feedback that was consistent with their reasons for overall ratings, support from the SAS team was highest rated, with 98.7% rating this above average and 69.6% rating it as ‘excellent’. The Being Human website and central marketing and messaging received positive, above average, ratings, of 95.1% and 86.3% respectively.

![Fig. 14. Organiser Ratings of Being Human support, n=80](image)

Most explanations for average ratings suggested that the festival toolkits and online guides should be more streamlined, e.g. it was reported that some of the toolkits provided different information about the same topic, such as social media.

“I wished that certain things were a little clearer from the get go, including how to claim expenses afterwards, how and when to pay our cultural partners. This was not immediately clear to me and has caused some anxiety.” (Organiser)

“Some of the toolkits were confusing particularly with multiple toolkits providing different information about the same thing for example social media promotion.” (Organiser)

A small number of respondents explained that they were unable to attend the Being Human masterclasses but had made use of the toolkits and online guides. Among those who had attended masterclasses, it was suggested that these could be targeted more specifically, taking account of organisers’ varying levels of prior experience and expertise in event planning, promotion or delivery.

“Being Human masterclasses scored average for me personally as I didn’t feel I gained a great deal from them due to previous experience being involved with many events (although not as an organiser). For a total beginner who has no applicable prior experience, I don’t doubt they were excellent.” (Organiser)
5.3. Organisers’ Suggestions and Recommendations

As mentioned above, organisers’ main suggestion for Being Human was to streamline the guidance and information that was sent to them, and to make it as practical in nature as possible e.g. best online platforms, sources of help with accessibility such as BSL interpreters.

“There was a lot of information and it was great that the emails were staggered, but perhaps there could be a brief summary at the top of each email of key tasks.” (Organiser)

“Maybe hold an in-person organisational meeting. Less emails.” (Organiser)

There were also suggestions around creating more opportunities to share best practice, including learning from Hub coordinators and others experienced in the festival.

“Further access to previous events and innovative ideas.” (Organiser)

“It would be useful to draw on the resource of past and present organisers to share experiences and dos and don’ts. The advantage of this is that it also begins to create a strong network of academics working in public engagement beyond one institution.” (Organiser)

A third category of suggestions related to publicity and promotion. They focused on the ordering of promotional resources; the range of available graphics; and wanting more notice or greater coordination around production of promotional materials e.g. films or social media campaigns.

“I found the way the resources page to order banners etc. was laid out was difficult to order or know what I could order. The online background template didn’t work if you had more than one person on the screen which meant we couldn’t use it.” (Organiser)

“Would appreciate a wider range of graphics to be able to use for promotions, such as details of fonts, colour schemes, graphic separate graphic elements, etc. Depending on the event/audience/publicity method/purpose needed, the leaflet templates could be quite restrictive.” (Organiser)

“Perhaps a bit more time to produce the clip for the BH trailer. I would have liked to have been in it, but with only two days’ notice it wasn’t possible.” (Organiser)

Suggestions for the evaluation were clear about needing simpler, more accessible materials (for audiences and organisers) and managing expectations, e.g. more notice about evaluation requirements, and making it clear from the outset that organisers would have to be involved in data collection, including for unfunded events, which was particularly unexpected. Another particular issue was identified about having to coordinate the Being Human evaluation with the evaluation requirements of event partners, funders and other supporters, with organisers expressing concern about events and audiences becoming ‘over-evaluated’.

“Please shorten and simplify your feedback forms. There are too many questions being asked here (as an organiser) and the evaluation forms for the participants were far too complicated - especially if you are aiming at attracting a diverse audience, who don’t necessarily have high levels of education.” (Organiser)

“It would be appreciated to receive evaluation materials or at least details of evaluation plans further in advance to aid with planning. For some activities which are part of larger collaborations and projects, we need to take into consideration the evaluation needs of multiple partners and it’s hard to do this when Being Human evaluation materials don’t get sent through until about a week or two beforehand. We want to be able to develop approaches that satisfy as much of the evaluation needs as possible without burdening the audiences with multiple feedback mechanisms.” (Organiser)
There was also a specific suggestion that the evaluation survey for organisers should recognise that not all respondents would be researchers, and that some respondents who are researchers would be running events which do not feature their own research.

“This form is designed for a single event organiser not for someone who collects the feedback from a number of team members. I also feel there is an assumption that it’s academics only who do this work, when in fact a lot of professional service staff do the work, e.g. as a PS I wouldn’t say it informed MY research or established new collaborations with researchers in MY discipline.” (Organiser)

There were two clear suggestions that related to Hubs: firstly, establishing and a network of Hub coordinators to share learning and best practice and help create a network of humanities public engagement ambassadors or champions; secondly, providing greater flexibility for uploading event information to the online programme, which it was felt worked well for single events but did not allow organisers of multiple events to upload partial information and fill in gaps later. This feedback also applied to non-Hub organisers of multiple events in the programme.

“It would be great to establish a network of Hub Coordinators across the country, to offer support and share reflections on their work.” (Organiser)

“Just one suggestion, but I’d like to stress that this is very minor: uploading of event content for the programme- the system asks you to input all information for an individual event in one go - you can’t upload some and then fill in the gaps. I just wondered whether there might be a little leeway for Hub organisers (not for those organising individual events where the system makes perfect sense) to upload info in a slightly different way?” (Organiser)
6. Findings: Organiser Outcomes

This Chapter is based on organisers’ feedback about specific public engagement (PE), partnership and professional development outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being Human 2021 Organiser Outcomes – Data Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organiser Aims met – especially reaching new audiences and innovating in public engagement.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural and community partnership aims widely met.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public engagement skills and confidence frequently enhanced.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 93.8% engaged with a new audience, 88.8% raised their profile, 83.8% inspired to innovate in PE
- 60.0% developed new public engagement formats
- 63.5% increased and 62.2% initiated relationships with cultural/ community partners
- 86.1% developed skills and 80.5% improved confidence in event planning/ management
- 58.2% developed skills and 61.0% improved confidence in presenting to public
- 59.7% improved confidence in obtaining audience feedback on research
- 57.0% developed skills and 57.1% improved confidence in co-production

6.1. Organisers’ Public Engagement Outcomes

A wide range of public engagement outcomes was achieved, with over half of organisers reporting impact for all seven outcomes specified in the survey. As Fig. 15 shows, the most common, at 93.8%, was engaging with a new audience, which is consistent with organisers’ main public engagement aim described in 4.5. Generally, the reported outcomes mapped onto equivalent aims and reflected organisers’ positive feedback about experiences, as described in Chapter 5.

**Fig. 15. Organiser Public Engagement Outcomes, base n=80**

- Engaged with a new audience for my research/ work/ institution: 93.8%
- Gained access to resources/ support for developing new public engagement ideas: 58.8%
- Felt inspired to develop new ways of working in public engagement: 83.8%
- Obtained ideas/ information with the potential to inform my future research: 60.0%
- Reached the audiences I wanted to: 78.8%
- Raised profile of me/ my research or work/ my institution: 88.8%
- Introduced to new methods/ models for public engagement: 56.3%
Further public engagement impact on organisers was evidenced in the form of legacy outputs from events (Fig. 16). 60.0% of organisers reported that they gained model formats for engagement and 42.5% created or developed materials or resources as a result of taking part in Being Human. Notably, only 5.0% of organisers reported no form of legacy output at all.

In particular, organisers’ comments about public engagement outcomes highlighted considerable learning about audience development and targeting; as well understanding more about online engagement; and gaining ideas for future engagement.

“I reached some of the audience that I was interested in, but this was a lot more challenging than I realised. With that said, this event feels like just the beginning and I’m excited to see what comes out of the new relationships I have formed over the course of this process.”
(Organiser)

“I think it was ambitious to reach those who don’t know anything about [description of topic] as the audience in both sessions were mainly those who had some knowledge ahead of time.”
(Organiser)

“While our turn out was small, the workshop design worked well and adapted easily to a digital environment. I’d like to tailor the workshop in the future to target families/older children.”
(Organiser)

6.2. Organiser Public Engagement Outcomes vs. Being Human Objectives and Priorities

The public engagement outcomes that organisers reported provide evidence that Being Human 2021 fulfilled festival and SAS priorities to lead innovation in public engagement, to develop skills, and to increase opportunities for humanities researchers to undertake public engagement.
6.3. Organisers’ Partnership Outcomes

As shown in Fig 17, and again reflecting positive experiences, organisers’ reported partnership outcomes that were also significant, particularly those involving community or cultural partners. 62.2% developed new relationships with such partners, and 63.5% developed existing partnerships of these types. Responses were also consistent with organisers’ partnership aims described in 5.4.

![Fig. 17. Organiser Partnership Outcomes, base n=74](image)

- Established new relationship/s with community or cultural partners: 62.2%
- Further developed existing relationship/s with community or cultural partners: 63.5%
- Established new collaboration/s with researcher/s in my discipline: 41.9%
- Further developed existing collaboration/s with researcher/s in my discipline: 48.6%
- Established new multidisciplinary collaboration/s: 47.3%
- Further developed existing multidisciplinary collaboration/s: 29.7%

6.4. Organiser Partnership Outcomes vs. Being Human Objectives and Priorities

The reported partnership outcomes show that Being Human 2021 contributed to the festival’s strategic objective and operational priority to build capacity for place-based public engagement; and the operational priority to promote collaborative, co-produced public engagement. The reported collaborations are also likely to have contributed meaningfully to the SAS priorities for connecting humanities researchers with practitioners and improving local inclusivity.
6.5. Organisers’ Professional Development Outcomes

The SAS team was particularly interested to find out about any potential professional development outcomes for organisers, as this aspect aligns to the priority about training the next generation of humanities researchers. Professional development impacts were reported by organisers with all levels of experience in public engagement, which included the 44.9% of organisers who had extensive experience or where public engagement is a major part of their role.

As Fig. 18 shows, skills gains and improved confidence were widely reported in a range of areas. Event planning and management was the main area of impact, with 86.1% of respondents reporting improved skills and 80.5% increased confidence in this area.

Over half reported improved skills and increased confidence in presenting to the public (58.2% and 61.0% respectively); obtaining feedback to inform research (51.9% and 59.7%); co-production (57.0% and 57.1%); and community collaboration (54.4% and 57.1%).

Descriptions of ‘other’ outcomes related to technical skills (e.g. design software, online meeting software) and crafting skills.

As the next generation of humanities researchers, ECRs and Doctoral Students were key target groups for professional development impact. As Fig. 19 shows, they were more likely to report professional development skills and confidence outcomes than the whole cohort of organisers.

- 94.4% and 83.3% of organisers in this group reported improved skills and increased confidence in event planning/ management.
- 80.0% and 81.3% respectively improved skills and increased confidence in co-producing public engagement.
76.5% and 81.3% respectively improved skills and increased confidence in obtaining audience feedback to inform their research.

**Fig. 19. ECR and Doctoral Student Professional Development Outcomes, base n=16 to 18**

- **Community collaboration**: 62.5% improved skills, 53.3% increased confidence
- **Co-producing public engagement - partnering with audiences to plan, develop and/or deliver events/activities**: 80.0% improved skills, 81.3% increased confidence
- **Event planning/management**: 94.4% improved skills, 83.3% increased confidence
- **Media communications/working with media or press**: 62.5% improved skills, 62.2% increased confidence
- **Obtaining feedback from audiences to inform my research ideas/plans**: 76.5% improved skills, 81.3% increased confidence
- **Presenting to public**: 76.4% improved skills, 70.6% increased confidence

**6.6. Organiser Professional Development Outcomes vs. Being Human Objectives and Priorities**

The reported professional development outcomes demonstrate that **Being Human 2021 fulfilled the strategic objective and SAS priority to develop researchers’ public engagement skills, with practical skills being particularly significant.** They are also evidence that the 2021 festival contributed significantly towards the objective to build engagement capacity, both through general engagement skills and learning, and in relation to specific skills and confidence for undertaking collaboration and co-production, which should have ongoing positive impact on humanities engagement infrastructure and capacity.
7. Findings: Stakeholder Profile

The Being Human 2021 evaluation methods included an online survey that organisers were asked to share with their speakers, presenters, panellists, partners and any other event stakeholders. Collectively this group was referred to as ‘stakeholders’, and it incorporates the group that SAS refers to as cultural partners, but also includes community groups and commercial partners, as well as researchers who presented or otherwise contributed at events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being Human 2021 Stakeholder Profile – Data Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More likely than organisers to identify as white.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half were university-based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Played a significant role in promoting events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly taking part to engage with a new audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 50.8% from a university: 25.0% of which were ECRs or Doctoral Students
- 26.8% London-based
- 86.4% promoted Being Human events
- Main aim: 71.2% wanted to engage with a new audience

7.1. Stakeholder Sectors

Although 50.8% of stakeholders reported that they work at a university, they were less likely than organisers to represent universities, as 86.3% of organisers came from the university sector. Stakeholder representation for the heritage sector was higher at 16.9% compared to 11.3% of organisers. As no organisers worked in the arts or community/third sectors, the fact that 16.9% and 8.5% of stakeholders respectively came from these sectors suggests that they complemented university or research input to events. Descriptions for ‘other’ sectors were churches, schools and a publisher. As with organisers, none of the survey respondents represented an IRO.

Fig. 20. Stakeholder Sectors, n=59

![Stakeholder Sectors Pie Chart]

- University (staff or student) 50.8%
- Arts (e.g. artist, performer, producer, gallery, theatre) 16.9%
- Community or third sector (e.g. charity, community group) 8.5%
- Heritage (e.g. museum, archive, library) 16.9%
- Other 6.8%
7.2. Stakeholder Demographics

Stakeholders had a slightly different age profile to organisers. At 32.2% the proportion age under 35 was similar to the 28.8% for organisers, but the most common age range was older at age 45 to 54, compared to age 35 to 44 for organisers. In total 45.8% of stakeholders were age 45 or older, compared to 27.5% of organisers.

Stakeholders were more likely than organisers to identify as white, at 87.5%, compared to 78.7% of organisers.

72.9% of stakeholders identified as female and 25.4% as male, which are similar proportions to organisers and audiences. 20.3% identified as D/deaf, or disabled, or having a long-term health condition that impacts on their daily life, a higher proportion than organisers or audiences.

94.9% were based in the UK, with 26.8% of UK stakeholders being based in London, consistent with the geographic distribution of events.
7.3. Stakeholder Demographics by Sector

Analysis of stakeholder demographics by sector (Table 15) suggests that charity/third sector participation in events broadened the ethnic, age and disability profiles of those involved in Being Human 2021.

Table 15. Being Human 2021 - Stakeholder Demographics by Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arts n= 10</th>
<th>Charity/Third n= 5</th>
<th>Heritage n= 10</th>
<th>University n= 30</th>
<th>Other n= 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic or Racial Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Black or other ethnically diverse people</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify as d/deaf, or disabled, or have a long-term health condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4. University Stakeholder Profile

As shown in Fig. 23, at 25.0%, the total proportion of university stakeholders who were ECRs and Doctoral Students was similar to the 28.1% reported by organisers. At 50.0%, the proportion of senior researchers/ academics was higher than for organisers, where it was 28.1%.

No university stakeholders were participating in public engagement for the first time, but overall they were less experienced than organisers. A total of 33.3% either reported extensive experience or that public engagement was a major part of their job, whereas the equivalent for organisers was 59.1%.

Stakeholder involvement in research funded by AHRC or the British Academy was similar to organisers, as 48.3% reported no current or previous such involvement and the figure for organisers was 48.4%.
7.5. Stakeholders’ Prior Familiarity with Being Human

Stakeholders were less likely than organisers to be familiar with Being Human. 43.9%, compared to 8.9% of organisers, reported no previous awareness of or involvement before the 2021 festival. None of the charity or third sector stakeholders had heard of Being Human before. Half of those who had previously organised a Being Human event came from the university sector, with the remainder of previous organisers divided equally between the arts and heritage sectors.

![Fig. 25. Stakeholder Prior Awareness of Being Human, base n=57](image)

7.6. Stakeholders’ Aims and Motivations

Reported by 71.2%, the main public engagement/ professional development aim of stakeholders was to engage new audiences, the same as for organisers. It was followed by wanting to raise their own or their organisation’s profile, and trying out new ideas or formats, as reported by 50.8% and 45.8% respectively.

![Fig. 26. Stakeholder Public Engagement Aims, base n=59](image)
7.7. Stakeholders’ Aims Relating to Audiences

The target audiences that stakeholders described were very similar to those reported by organisers in 4.7, but with more emphasis on engaging with researchers and students, which were target audiences for stakeholders in all sectors. Alignment of stakeholder and organiser aims was further emphasised by the fact that some stakeholders wanted to engage individuals who had some degree of background familiarity with topics, and others targeted audiences with no prior knowledge or no background in subjects.

There was one difference in target audiences, with stakeholders mentioning funders as a target group in their feedback, which was not reported by organisers.

Stakeholders’ intended audience impacts also mirrored those reported by organisers, which importantly suggests they had shared ambitions. As with organisers, increased audience knowledge and understanding of topics or themes featured prominently as a desired impact. Stakeholders also hoped events would be an enjoyable experience that would help to develop interest in or connection with a topic or theme, as well as develop new skills.

7.8. Being Human’s Importance for Stakeholders

Stakeholders reported a range of views about the importance of their events being part of the festival. A total of 38.5% indicated it was very or extremely important to be part of Being Human, and a total of 22.0% indicated being part of the programme was of limited or no importance.

Just under a quarter of stakeholders explained their importance ratings, all of which were positive and fell into three main areas: being part of a well-established festival with national reach; the reputation of Being Human; and the festival being new to stakeholders.

“Having an event in Festival gave it a better profile and meant that we had access to support for organisation and publicity which we would not otherwise have had.” (Stakeholder)

“The Being Human brand has considerable cultural recognition and purchase.” (Stakeholder)

“I did not know about the festival but now knowing it seems very important to me and every year I will follow it.” (Stakeholder)
7.9. Stakeholders’ Promotion of Being Human

86.4% of stakeholders promoted their Being Human events via at least one means, indicating their importance as a channel for raising awareness for specific events and, potentially, for the festival as a whole.

Stakeholders from across all sectors mostly promoted events using personal contacts and via personal or organisations’ social media channels. However, mailing lists were one of the main methods used by arts or heritage sectors’ stakeholders, but less frequently used by stakeholders from charity/ third sector or universities. University stakeholders were most likely to have told their colleagues or students.

**Fig. 28. Stakeholder Promotion of Events, base n=51**

- My organisation’s email list/ mailing list of contacts: 41.2%
- My organisation’s events brochure/ flyers/ posters: 21.6%
- My organisation’s social media channels: 60.8%
- My organisation’s website: 39.2%
- My personal social media channels/ personal website: 58.8%
- Through a community group (e.g. community centre, church, club): 23.5%
- Told my colleague/s: 66.7%
- Told my friend/s or family: 52.9%
- Told my student/s: 29.4%
- Other: 3.9%
8. Findings: Stakeholder Experiences and Outcomes

This Chapter presents stakeholders’ feedback about their experiences in Being Human, their suggestions and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being Human 2021 Stakeholder Experience - Data Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Human experience highly rated.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Primary aims met – reaching new audiences and developing/initiating cultural or community partnerships.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 98.3% rated their Being Human experience above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 88.1% engaged with a new audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 74.6% inspired to develop new ways of working and raised their profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 61.0% further developed community or cultural relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1. Stakeholders’ Ratings for their Experiences

98.3% of stakeholders rated their experience of Being Human 2021 above average, with 64.4% giving the highest ‘excellent’ rating. This is similar to proportions who gave positive ratings in 2018 (94.1%) and 2019 (96.0%). Stakeholder feedback was not disaggregated from organiser feedback in 2020.

![Stakeholder Ratings of their Experience, n=59](image)

Half of stakeholders who provided feedback commented on their experiences in Being Human 2021. The majority were positive and related to stakeholders’ own personal enjoyment; organiser support or partnership working; and the audience reactions they encountered.

“I am so proud to have been a part of the being human project. I hope I can engage in future being human projects.” (Stakeholder)

“A pleasure to work with a well organised, professional and relaxed group of professionals to deliver inspiring material to participants in the community.” (Stakeholder)
“I really enjoyed engaging with the public - the discussion was even more enjoyable than I expected, and raised ideas that I hadn’t previously considered. I felt really inspired by the way the participants got involved!” (Stakeholder)

“The event was technologically complicated but it worked really well. The participants were very engaged and it was all quite moving.” (Stakeholder)

Although stakeholders’ comments about their experiences were generally positive, there were specific cases of frustration around publicity, poor communication leading up to events, and disappointment about low turnouts to events. These suggest that there is scope to include some content in masterclasses about communicating with stakeholders and involving them in planning publicity.

“I did two events with two different unis - seems like PR for the events was poor, hardly any turnout (audience numbers of 1 and 2). It’s a lot of work for us to design and put on these sessions. It’s very disappointing to have them so poorly attended.” (Stakeholder)

“There wasn’t any communication beforehand (I guess it all went through my University organiser and the panel chair) - so some further info would’ve been nice. But the event went very smoothly and I think it was a success!” (Stakeholder)

“The process of planning the event was difficult, with a lot of uncertainty around participant numbers, but on the day the experience was very good and the quality of the session exceeded my expectations.” (Stakeholder)

8.2. Stakeholder Suggestions

Just over one-quarter of stakeholders provided feedback and recommendations for the SAS team. This was again generally positive, both regarding their support for stakeholders and the festival as a whole.

“The BH organisers are fabulous. Professional, committed, excellent communicators. Bravo!” (Stakeholder)

“Great that this is taking place and that people can see how so many different disciplines/ art forms informs our understanding of being human.” (Stakeholder)

“A great opportunity to engage people from a wider audience through the Being Human Festival. Also a platform for community level groups to share their work.” (Stakeholder)

In line with the challenges mentioned in ratings comments, stakeholders’ suggestions for the SAS team focused on promotion. Mostly, this was about increasing audience numbers, but also included querying the sustainability of giveaway materials.

“Recording sessions to go online or live streaming these events.” (Stakeholder)

“I’d have liked it if BH central team could have helped us to advertise [the] morning - drumming up a crowd was tricky.” (Stakeholder)

“For those not on social media or with access to internet - to have aids/help for sharing about festival and means of doing so in different sensory formats for being able to encompass as many people as possible.” (Stakeholder)

“It’s nice to have decorative stuff and things for people to take away, but I wonder whether the badges (especially), which are difficult to recycle or reuse, are a good investment.” (Stakeholder)
8.3. Stakeholders’ Public Engagement Outcomes

Being Human delivered multiple public engagement outcomes for stakeholders. The most common was 88.1% reaching a new audience, which was also the main public engagement outcome reported by organisers. This was followed by 74.6% of stakeholders being inspired to work in new ways, the same proportion raising their profile, and 72.9% reaching their intended audiences.

![Fig. 30. Stakeholder Public Engagement Outcomes, base n=59](image)

8.4. Stakeholder Public Engagement Outcomes vs. Being Human Objectives and Priorities

Stakeholders’ reported public engagement outcomes aligned to those for organisers, and confirm that Being Human 2021 fulfilled the festival’s broad intention to strengthen and support innovation in public engagement with the humanities. This was achieved both within the research sector and more widely across the other sectors that are part of the whole engagement community that contributes both to the festival and to humanities public engagement more widely.
8.5. Stakeholders’ Partnership Outcomes

Stakeholders’ main partnership outcomes also mirrored those reported by organisers. Impacts on creating new or developing existing community or cultural partnerships were most significant, and reported by over half of respondents, with 61.0% developing existing collaborations and 54.2% creating new partnerships.

![Fig. 31. Stakeholder Partnership Outcomes, base n=56](image)

8.6. Stakeholder Partnership Outcomes vs. Being Human Objectives and Priorities

These outcomes are evidence that Being Human 2021 contributed to developing the national infrastructure for engagement, which is an SAS priority, and met the festival’s objective and priority to build engagement capacity and promote collaborative public engagement.
9. Findings: Audience Reach for Being Human 2021

Overall audience demographics and socio-economic characteristics are profiled in this Chapter. Followed by a comparison of the profiles of those who attended events in-person and online.

The presented information is based on 990 survey responses across 160 separate UK events, which corresponds to feedback about 67% of Being Human 2021’s UK programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being Human 2021 Audience Profile – Data Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educated audience, younger and more ethnically diverse than in 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More likely to be London-based and engaged with arts/culture than UK general population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to have attended public events featuring university research before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main motivations: educational/professional reasons and appeal/relevance of topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some profile characteristics varied between online and in-person audiences, suggesting that in-person events were more likely to attract a more diverse, less likely to be experienced in engaging with culture, the arts or university research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 26.5% age under 35: up from 21% in 2020
- 3.5% identified as ‘Black, African, Caribbean, Black British’: meeting 2021 target and growing from 3% in 2020 and 2% in 2019
- 79.5% identified as ‘White’: meeting 2021 target and reducing from 89% in 2020 and 82% in 2019
- 14.9% identified as D/deaf, disabled or having a long-term health condition: meeting 2021 target of 15%
- 88.4% live in the UK: London (25.5%) over-represented compared to UK population (13.4%)
- 80.3% university educated: 55.7% at postgraduate level and 75.5% with an arts/humanities/social science degree
- 80.2% engaged with museum/gallery and 81.3% with arts in 12 months prior to Being Human 2021, more than the UK general population
- 71.8% attended public events about university research in 12 months before Being Human - 46.3% attended 3 or more
- 21.3% not attended Being Human before: decrease from 34% in 2020
- 31.4% motivated to attend for professional or educational reasons
- 28.3% attended because topic was interesting, directly relevant to them or something they wanted to learn about
- In-person audience more likely than online cohort to be younger and male; less likely than online to be white, D/deaf or disabled, have a postgraduate qualification, or frequently attend events about university research
9.1. Audience Age, Gender, Disability, Ethnicity

2021 audience age ranges were mixed (Fig. 32). The most common age range was 55 to 64 at 20.7% and the median age was 45 to 54, the same as in 2020. However, 26.5% were age under 35, a small increase from 2020’s equivalent proportion of 21%.

As shown in Table 16, the proportion of younger audience members (age under 35) was highest in 2018 and 2019 when all events were held in-person, and was higher in 2021 for a hybrid programme than in 2020, when everything was online. This is consistent with the finding in 9.7 that the audience for 2021 in-person events was younger in profile than the 2021 online audience.

Table 16. Being Human 2018 to 2021 – Audience Age Profile Age 16+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 16 to 35</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 35 to 54</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 55 and older</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous evaluations of Being Human have discovered that the festival consistently attracts a higher proportion of females than present in the whole UK population. This year, respondents to the audience survey were again predominantly female (68.7%), with 25.4% identifying as male, 1.7% as non-binary and 1.5% self-describing.

14.9% of respondents identified as D/deaf or disabled, or as having a long-term health condition that impacts on their daily life, which was in line with the 2021 target of 15% and a slight increase on 14% in 2020.
In total, 17.0% of UK-based respondents identified as Asian, Black or other ethnically diverse people. 3.5% identified as ‘Black, African, Caribbean, Black British’, meeting the festival’s 2021 target figure for this group, and increasing from 3% in 2020.

At 79.5%, the proportion of respondents who identified as ‘White’ decreased from 89% in 2020, meaning the festival achieved its 2021 target for the proportion of white attendees being less than the national average of 86%.

The data presented in Table 17 indicates that the audience for Being Human has become more ethnically diverse over the past four years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Black or other ethnically diverse people</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2. Audience Location

Most (88.4%) respondents to the audience survey indicated that they live in the UK. Of those from outside the UK, 4.8% were living in a European country, 3.3% in USA or Canada and 1.1% in India.

As shown in Fig. 34, a total of 73.8% of the UK audience were living outside London. Mid-2020 population statistics show 86.6% of the UK population living outside London, meaning more respondents were London-based when compared to the general population. At 13.4% and 7.9% respectively, the proportions for Scotland and Wales, where two of the 2021 Hubs were located, were also greater than their respective published population figures of 8.2% and 4.7%.
The data also show that the proportions of audience survey respondents exceeded the proportions of Being Human events in the East of England, North West, South East, South West and Wales, meaning organisers in those areas could be a source of best practice for audience data collection.

**Fig. 34. UK Audience Country or Region, n=546**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Mid-2020 UK Population %</th>
<th>Being Human 2021 Events %</th>
<th>Being Human 2021 Audience %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and The Humber</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9.3. Audience Education and Occupation**

Being Human events in 2021 attracted an educated audience. 80.3% were university educated, with 55.7% having a postgraduate qualification. The total is slightly less than in 2020, when 86% of the audience were university-educated. Around half of those who responded ‘other’ in 2021 were, at the time, studying for a postgraduate degree.

**Fig. 35. Audience Highest Level of Education, n=970**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary to age 16 (GCSE/ O level etc.)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary to age 19 (A level etc.)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - undergraduate</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - postgraduate</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
75.5% of audience members with a degree indicated that it was in an ‘arts/humanities/social sciences’ subject. 18.8% reported that their degree was in ‘sciences/engineering/maths or medical’. ‘Other’ descriptions were mostly business or architecture, or subjects that respondents regarded as spanning both groupings, e.g. geography. In 2020, the proportion of respondents with a degree in the humanities was 67%.

Over half of the total audience, at 57.2%, said they were in employment or self-employment, including 13.7% employed as university researchers or academics.

9.4. Audience Engagement with Culture, Arts, University Events

The Being Human 2021 operational plan cited the UK Government Taking Part Survey as an indicator of audience cultural and arts engagement. As presented in Fig. 37, when compared to the latest Taking Part data, which covers the year to 31st March 2020, respondents were more likely than the general population to engage with heritage, culture and the arts. This is consistent with findings for the 2020 festival, which was deemed to have attracted ‘experienced event goers’.

Based on audience survey feedback, 95.3% of the 2021 audience had visited a museum or gallery at least once in the year to March 2020, compared to 51% in the Taking Part Survey. The equivalent figure for engaging with the arts was 93.5% for the Being Human audience, also higher than the 76% in the Taking Part Survey. Taking Part proportions have remained stable for a number of years.

Whilst still greater than equivalent Taking Part proportions, at 80.2% and 81.3%, the proportions of the Being Human survey respondents engaging with museums/galleries and the arts were lower in the year prior to the 2021 festival than the year to March 2020, which could be a consequence of pandemic restrictions. Comparative Government data for 2020/21 have not yet been published.

Most audience members also reported having previously attended events that feature university research, with 76.2% having done so in the year to March 2020 and 71.8% in the year prior to Being Human 2021. 43.1% and 46.3% respectively reported attending three or more such events in these periods, suggesting they frequently seek knowledge through public engagement with research. Engagement with university public events has not been explored in Government data,
but the information collected for Being Human 2021 provides a benchmark to which future festival audiences can be compared.

**Fig. 37. Audience Event Attendance, to Mar 20 n=652 to 662, to Nov 21 n=930 to 953**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Pre-Pandemic</th>
<th>Year to Nov '21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum/gallery</td>
<td>47% 27.5% 29.6% 38.2%</td>
<td>19.8% 34.6% 22.8% 22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts event</td>
<td>65% 22.9% 30.4% 38.8%</td>
<td>18.7% 36.2% 24.7% 20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public event on university research</td>
<td>23.8% 33.1% 21.6% 21.5%</td>
<td>28.2% 27.5% 18.1% 26.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.5. Audience Awareness and Publicity for Being Human

Overall, audience prior awareness of Being Human 2021 was higher than in 2020, but prior attendance at festival events was lower. 59.0% of survey respondents were aware of the Being Human festival before attending, compared to 50% in 2020.

21.3% had attended the festival before, lower than 34% who had previously attended in 2020, but similar to 2019 when the equivalent was 20%.

**Fig. 38. Audience Awareness of Being Human, n=987**

Yes, I’ve attended other Being Human events previously, 21.3%
Yes, and this was my first Being Human festival event, 36.3%
No, I found out at the event, 35.0%
No, I found out from this survey, 6.0%
Unsure, 1.5%
As shown in Fig. 39, audiences heard about the Being Human events through a variety of channels, demonstrating the value of using multiple and widespread promotional methods and tools. A total of 26.6% heard about events from central channels, i.e. the Being Human website, social media and email. Being told or recommended by someone involved in an event was the most common single channel at 20.9%. When this figure was combined with marketing or email from a venue or organiser and local listings, the total of 37.5% highlights the overall importance of local promotional channels in raising awareness of festival events. Social media, which in all forms totalled 24.3%, was also significant.

A comparison of promotional channel types with 2020 and 2021 suggests that having in-person events in a programme increases the importance of local channels, which is consistent with the analysis in 9.7.

Table 18. Being Human 2020 & 2021 – Audience Main Promotional Channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel Type</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth (combined with local channels in 2020 reporting)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local channels (event listings/ mailings)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Human website</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Human email/newsletter</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other website</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.6. Audience Motivations for Attending Events

Audiences attended Being Human 2021 events for a variety of reasons. The most common reason for attending was educational/professional interest at 31.4%, similar to 2020 when 29% were attending ‘to aid my own studies or research’, but higher than 2019 when 17% attended ‘to aid my work or studies’. It is recommended that the 2021 question wording for this option is retained in future to enable direct comparison and to exclude the possibility of any shift being due to different phrasing.

Other than educational or professional interest, an event’s subject or topic was the most important motivating factor. A total of 28.3% of respondents indicated that they attended events to learn more about a subject/topic, or because a subject/topic was directly relevant to them in some way.

[Fig. 40. Audience Reasons for Attending Events, n=957]

- Accompany children or young people: 2.7%
- Entertainment/leisure/social: 17.1%
- Educational/professional interest: 31.4%
- Being Human reputation/name: 1.2%
- Reputation of organisation/s putting on event: 2.6%
- Reputation of speakers/presenters: 9.0%
- Subject/topic directly relevant to me, my life, where I live etc.: 10.7%
- Find out about new research: 2.8%
- Learn something new about a subject/topic: 17.6%
- Multiple reasons: 4.2%
- Other: 0.5%
9.7. Audience Profiles for Online and In-person Events

Whilst the evaluation brief did not specify examining the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, a comparison of the audience profiles for online and in-person attendees gives some insight to any effect the pandemic may have had on who attended Being Human 2021.

In addition, the evaluation of Being Human 2020, which took place wholly online, found the audience that year had become more female, older, and more likely to regularly visit museums, galleries and similar institutions than previously. The 2021 Operational Plan anticipated that including in-person events within a hybrid programme could potentially diversify the audience from 2020, which is assessed in this section using a crosstab comparison of profile information for online and in-person respondents, which identified some variations and similarities between these cohorts.

48.3% of 2021 audience survey respondents attended events in-person and 51.1% attended online, with very few attending in a hybrid format or via some other remote means, e.g. postal pack, self-guided tour. In-person respondents were under-represented and online respondents were over-represented in the feedback when compared to the distribution of events in the programme, which was 56.7% for in-person and 36.3% for online.

The **in-person audience was younger in profile than the online cohort**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age under 35</th>
<th>Age 35 to 54</th>
<th>Age 55 and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-person</strong></td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online</strong></td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **in-person audience was more likely to be male than the online cohort**, although both were predominantly female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Non-binary</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Self-describe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-person</strong></td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online</strong></td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **in-person audience was less likely to identify as white than the online cohort**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian, Bangladeshi, Chinese, Indian, Pakistani, Asian British</th>
<th>Black, African, Caribbean, Black British</th>
<th>Mixed or Multiple</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other ethnic/racial group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-person</strong></td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>75.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online</strong></td>
<td>5.28%</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>84.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **online audience was more likely than the in-person cohort to identify as D/deaf or disabled, or have a long-term health condition that impacts on their daily life**, at 15.6% compared to 13.4% for the in-person cohort.

Unsurprisingly, the **in-person audience was more likely than the online cohort to live in the UK**, at 98.5% compared to 79.1% of the online cohort.
The in-person audience was more likely than the online cohort to include school or college students, with 6.6% in this category compared to 0.8% of the online cohort. All other occupation categories were similarly represented in both cohorts.

The online audience was more likely than the in-person cohort to have a university postgraduate education at 63.7% vs. 47.0% of the in-person cohort. Reported degree subject areas were very similar for both cohorts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>No formal education</th>
<th>Secondary to age 16 (GCSE/O level etc.)</th>
<th>Secondary to age 19 (A Level FE, etc.)</th>
<th>University – undergraduate</th>
<th>University – postgraduate</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The online audience was more likely than the in-person cohort to have previously attended a public event featuring university research or to be frequent attenders of such events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attended at least 1 PE event Year to March 2020</th>
<th>Attended 3 or more PE events Year to March 2020</th>
<th>Attended at least 1 PE event Year to Nov 2021</th>
<th>Attended 3 or more PE events Year to Nov 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance and frequency of attendance at a museum or gallery and arts events were very similar for both in-person and online cohorts.

In-person audiences were more likely than the online cohort to be unaware before an event that was part of Being Human, with 46.1% being unaware compared to 36.0% of the online cohort.

In-person audiences were more likely than the online cohort to have heard about events from someone involved as an organiser or speaker etc., with 36.5% reporting this promotional route compared to 16.4% of the online cohort.

In-person audiences were more likely than the online cohort to have attended events for entertainment/leisure or social reasons, with 28.0% choosing that reason compared to 7.1% of the in-person cohort.

9.8. Audience Profile vs. Being Human Objectives and Priorities

Reaching diverse audiences and improving diversity and inclusion is a strategic objective for Being Human. It is also mentioned in the festival’s 2021 priorities and broad aims, and in SAS priorities. In-person events attracted more diverse audiences than online events and their presence in the programme was a factor in improving inclusion and diversity.

The evaluation found that, overall, the audience in 2021 was more ethnically diverse and more likely to be D/deaf or disabled than previous years, which indicates success with regards to these characteristics of audience diversity and inclusion.

However, the Being Human audience in general, as in previous years, was educated and experienced in going to events, which means aims to reach beyond ‘already engaged’ audiences was generally not met. Again, in-person events achieved most in attracting audiences who were less likely to have postgraduate qualifications or were less experienced in university event-going.
10. Findings: Audience Experiences and Outcomes

The Chapter is based on audience survey feedback about event ratings, highlights, suggestions and outcomes.

**Being Human 2021 Audience Experience – Data Summary**

*Events were highly rated, as in previous years.*
*More than half said no improvements were needed.*
*Main outcome was greater understanding of humanities topics’ relevance to everyday life.*

- 68.3% gave the highest ‘excellent’ rating
- Main success factor was ‘thought-provoking content’: reported by 77.4%
- 51.3% reported ‘no improvement was needed’
- 64.0% increased their understanding of a topic’s relevance to everyday life, higher than in 2020 and 2019
- 61.6% were inspired to find out more about a topic

10.1. Audience Ratings and Descriptions of Events

Respondents rated events highly in the audience survey and, as in Table 19 below, in similar proportions to previous evaluations. 91.1% of the 2021 audience rated events above average, with 68.3% giving the highest rating of ‘excellent’. There was no variation in event ratings given by the online and in-person audience cohorts.

![Fig. 41. Audience Ratings of Events, n=990](image_url)
Event rating levels for Being Human have remained stable since 2018 and indicate that the pandemic and shift to online formats have not affected audience opinions about the festival.

**Table 19. Being Human 2018 to 2021 – Audience Event Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (not very good in 2020)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor (Poor in 2020)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in this word cloud, respondents’ ‘three words descriptions’ of events endorsed the high audience ratings. Over 430 separate words were used and almost all were positive.

**Fig. 42 Audience ‘3 word’ Descriptions of Events**

The 10 most commonly used words to describe events, as shown in Table 20, provide evidence of events having delivered an audience experience that was simultaneously educational and enjoyable.

**Table 20. Being Human 2021 – Most Common Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>% of respondents base n= 930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought-provoking</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.2. Audience Highlights

Audience survey feedback covered in-person and online events. For both formats, audiences highlighted three main success factors:

- thought-provoking content reported by 77.4% [73% in 2020, when it was reported as a proxy for leaning ‘a lot’ about a subject]
- engaging speakers/presenters, 68.4%
- entertaining or enjoyable experiences, 61.6%

Highlights in the ‘other’ category were specific features of content or topics.

There was one variation between online and in-person audience highlights. At 70.1%, the in-person audience was most likely to select entertainment or enjoyment as a highlight, compared to 58.5% of the online cohort.

Fig. 43. Audience Highlights, base n=651

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlight</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content was thought-provoking</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt I could express my views if I wanted to</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found it entertaining/enjoyable</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It featured university research</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers/presenters were very engaging</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/topic was directly relevant to me/my life/where I live or come from</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other highlight</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptions of highlights broadly matched audiences’ main motivations for attending, indicating that their expectations were met. Respondents who cited professional or educational interest commented positively on this being a feature of the events they attended.

“Chimed with my own areas of research.” (Audience member)

“I am training as an energy healer and it made me more aware of hidden disabilities/challenges and the extra work it takes those who have them, to cope and join community events. Loved the examples.” (Audience member)

“Made me realise my own work was on the right track.” (Audience member)

Those who attended to learn something about particular topics or subjects appreciated not only what they learned during events, but also being signposted to further sources of information.

“Great discussion, lovely long Q&A, good additional of more resources to continue learning on this topic.” (Audience member)
“I learned a lot and [the presenter] provided relevant material for further engagement with the topic.” (Audience member)
“I came straight from work which had been fast paced and I’d had to be very reactive, therefore the event was a complete - and very welcome - contrast, to be transported into the quiet, thoughtful space of the inner ear... I found it very relaxing and allowed me time to reflect properly on the information being presented to me.” (Audience member)

Audience members who were attending for entertainment, leisure or social reasons enjoyed the entertaining and creative aspects of events, as well as the opportunity to meet others.

“Enjoyed creative aspects, having fun & learning about other communities and local in-depth insights of topical issues.” (Audience member)

“Powerful entertainment which provoked emotion and thought while passing on information and stimulating interest without feeling didactic.” (Audience member)

“A chance to meet old friends and make new ones.” (Audience member)

10.3. Audience Suggestions

Over half of audience survey respondents (51.3%) indicated that events needed no improvement. The most common improvement was better signposting to further information to follow-up events followed by more background information. This is consistent with audiences mentioning ideas for follow up or signposting to further information in their highlights and confirms an appetite for organisers to provide pre- and post- information for events, it can also be considered a characteristic of an educated audience that seeks further knowledge, as described in Chapter 9.

Suggestions in the ‘other’ category focused on: enhancing online engagement (e.g. ensuring microphones were muted to optimise sound, or enabling everyone to contribute by accepting both written and spoken comments; and, for both online and in-person events, allocating more time generally or specifically providing more time for audiences to interact with experts.

Apart from the ‘other’ improvements to enhance online engagement, feedback on improvements was consistent for the online and in-person cohorts.

![Audience Suggestions](image-url)
10.4. Audience Outcomes

The most common outcomes reported in the audience survey correlated to the finding that interest in or personal relevance of topics or subjects was a significant motivating factor for attending events (section 9.6).

Events delivered audience impact in almost all cases. Only 2.6% of survey respondents reported no outcomes. At 64.0%, *increased understanding of a topic’s relevance to everyday life* was the main audience outcome, and was higher than in 2020, when the equivalent was 47%. This outcome is particularly notable as it relates directly to Being Human’s stated purpose “to demonstrate why humanities research is vital to society and directly relevant to the lives and interests of people across the UK.”

At 61.6%, being inspired to find out more about a subject or topic was the next most common outcome, and higher than 2020, when it was 51%. Outcomes in the ‘other’ category were mainly described as emotions stimulated by a topic or place; and being inspired by events’ content to read, draw or listen to music.

There was no variation in the outcomes reported by the online and in-person audiences.

![Fig. 45. Audience Outcomes, base n=963](chart)

10.5. Audience Experiences and Outcomes vs. Being Human Objectives and Priorities

Audience highlights and outcomes indicate that the 2021 festival made good progress in relation to Being Human’s objectives to demonstrate and celebrate the significance of humanities research and improving public understanding of its relevance. This is evidenced in high levels of enjoyment or entertainment that were reported, alongside thought-provoking content as a highlight, and the main outcome being improved understanding of the relevance to everyday life of humanities research topics and subjects.
Questions to explore audience outcomes have been worded differently and assessed using different answer options in Being Human evaluations over the years. In 2021 and 2020, respondents were asked to select any outcomes that applied to them, whereas in 2018 and 2019 they were asked to select from ‘not at all’, ‘a little’ and ‘a lot’. Whilst these variations mean direct year-on-year comparison is not possible, the closest equivalents for each year are presented in Table 21 for information.

As mentioned above, a notable achievement in 2021 was the increase proportion who improved their understanding of a subject’s relevance to everyday life. Conversely, the proportion who learned more about research into a subject or topic fell from the 2020 level, but in that year the question assessed awareness not learning, which may have contributed to this variation.

### Table 21. Being Human 2018 to 2021 – Audience Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased understanding of a subject’s/ topic’s relevance to everyday life</td>
<td>56.7% a lot</td>
<td>53.3% a lot</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired/ encouraged to find out more about a subject/ topic</td>
<td>67.1% a lot</td>
<td>64.8% a lot</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learnt more/ increased awareness about research into the subject/ topic</td>
<td>65.8% a lot</td>
<td>60.7% a lot</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparked an interest in university research about a subject/ topic</td>
<td>Not an answer option</td>
<td>Not an answer option</td>
<td>Not an answer option</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparked an interest in university research about the humanities in general</td>
<td>Not an answer option</td>
<td>Not an answer option</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had no real impact on me</td>
<td>Not an answer option</td>
<td>Not an answer option</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other impact</td>
<td>Not an answer option</td>
<td>Not an answer option</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Discussion: 2021 Priorities and Aims

This Chapter draws out themes and learning for each of the SAS priorities, followed by comments on evaluation findings in relation to the festival’s Operational Priorities and Broad Aims for 2021.

11.1. SAS Priorities for Being Human

11.1.1. SAS Priority 1: Train the next generation of humanities researchers

The evaluation findings demonstrate that Being Human 2021 provided a significant development opportunity for participating organisers.

Organisers from a range of public engagement backgrounds and all levels of seniority increased their skills and confidence in several areas of public engagement (section 6.5). This was most significant for event planning/management, where 86.1% improved their skills and 80.5% increased their confidence. Over half also reported improved skills and increased confidence in presenting to the public; obtaining feedback to inform research; co-producing activities; and community collaboration.

Skills and confidence gains were highest for Early Career Researchers and Doctoral Students which, being the ‘next generation’ in research, are the key target group for this priority. As reported in section 6.5, professional development outcomes were greater for this group than for the whole cohort of organisers. The fact that the proportion of organisers who were in the early stages of their careers fell in 2021 compared to 2020 (section 4.3) suggests that there is scope for them to be targeted more specifically to enhance involvement, e.g. through funding streams, invitations to take part etc., thus enabling Being Human’s training and development benefits to reach the largest-possible percentage of early career researchers.

Through masterclasses and guidance information (section 5.2), support provided by the central SAS team was deemed to have afforded considerable development opportunities for organisers from different backgrounds and with varying levels of experience. Central team support was very highly regarded in general, although there is scope to optimise some specific aspects: e.g. tailored targeting of masterclasses based on experience; streamlining some of the guidance information; and facilitating further networking and knowledge-sharing opportunities to maximise learning from experienced organisers, including Hub coordinators (section 5.3).

11.1.2. SAS Priority 2: Devise innovative methods for new discoveries

Through their participation in Being Human 2021, organisers and stakeholders were able to implement innovative approaches to public engagement and develop formats that were relevant and appealing to their target audiences, which included groups and individuals with existing interest or background knowledge, as well as audiences who were new to a topic (sections 4.7 and 7.7).

Innovation was reported in the form of 83.8% of organisers (section 6.1) and 74.6% of stakeholders (section 8.3) being inspired to develop new ways of working in public engagement. In addition, 60.0% of organisers were enabled to develop or test new public engagement formats and resources, including many with potential to provide a legacy beyond the timeframe of the festival (section 6.1).

Although the evaluation as specified in the brief did not focus on the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is important to note that Being Human 2021 implemented a COVID-19 strategy and
provided guidance to organisers about dealing with the environment for engagement that resulted from pandemic concerns and constraints. Organisers’ feedback and evaluators’ observations of events found evidence of how addressing COVID-19 restrictions and seeking to broaden audiences had encouraged the implementation of hybrid formats and innovative approaches within both in-person and online activities.

11.1.3. SAS Priority 3: Connect humanities researchers and practitioners across disciplines and sectors

All feedback indicates that a key success factor in every facet of Being Human 2021 was the prominence, excellence and impact of partnership working.

Collaboration underpinned all aspects of Being Human at a local level (section 3.2). Partnerships with individual artists (55.1% of organisers) and arts organisations (40.6%) helped organisers to create appealing events and entertaining experiences for their audiences. Partnerships with community organisations (39.1%) and the heritage sector (34.8%) were invaluable in targeting and reaching audiences, especially specific audience groups. Partners of all types provided promotional channels, venues, facilitators, and, in some cases, financial support (sections 3.1, 3.4 and 7.9).

Interdisciplinary collaboration within the research sector was also significant, and 81.3% of organisers reported that their events were interdisciplinary (section 3.3). Of particular prominence were partnerships between researchers in different humanities subjects, although collaborations between the humanities and other research disciplines, especially the arts, were also evident.

Making new connections and strengthening existing collaborations were key impacts of Being Human for both organisers (section 6.3) and stakeholders (section 8.5). Mostly, these featured community or cultural partnerships, which were established or developed by 62.2% and 63.5% of organisers respectively. The equivalent figures for stakeholders were 61.0% and 54.2%.

11.1.4. SAS Priority 4: Boost the national infrastructure for Humanities through the development of our unique resources and capabilities to enable new methods and support the growth of ideas

Organisers welcomed the capacity-building and skills development support they received from being part of a national undertaking, although it was suggested that this aspect could be more tailored to different levels of organiser experience or existing capacity levels, and include more practical advice, e.g. access to BSL interpreters, advisors on inclusivity etc. (section 5.3).

Stakeholder perceptions about the value of Being Human to their events varied. At 38.5%, less than half thought it was very or extremely important for events to be part of Being Human (section 7.8), which suggest there is scope to strengthen perceptions about the value of the festival to stakeholders, e.g. specific and consistent messaging about benefits that organisers can use when engaging with partners and other stakeholders.

There was evidence that the festival supported innovation for over half of organisers, as 56.3% were introduced to new ideas and methods for public engagement, and 58.8% gained access to support for developing public engagement (section 6.1). This was also the case for stakeholders, where the equivalent figures for these outcomes were 59.3% being introduced to new methods or models for public engagement and 57.6% gaining access to support for developing public engagement (section 8.3).
11.1.5. SAS Priority 5: Achieve inclusivity and national reach

There was considerable evidence that organisers were seriously committed to planning and delivering inclusive, accessible events (sections 4.7.1 and 4.7.2). This resulted in the festival achieving its targets for increasing audience diversity and inclusivity.

The 2021 Being Human audience as a whole was more diverse in terms of protected characteristics than in 2020. Targets were met for reducing the proportion of audience members who identify as ‘white’ (79.5%) to below the national average; for 3.5% of the audience to identify as ‘Black, African, Caribbean or Black British’; and for 15% to identify as D/deaf or disabled or having a life-affecting long-term health condition (section 9.1).

However the audience, as in previous years, was mostly well-educated and experienced in event-going, meaning there is scope to diversify these socio-economic characteristics in future and to reach beyond ‘already engaged’ groups. 80.3% of audience members were university-educated, with 55.7% educated to postgraduate level (section 9.3), and the proportions who visit museums and galleries or engage with the arts were higher than national figures (section 9.4). In additional evidence of the engaged nature of this audience, over 70% attended events featuring university research in the year prior to Being Human 2021.

Organisers identified specific barriers to access for audiences, such as digital poverty and travel difficulties due to health conditions or carer responsibilities, which they sought to address through inclusion of in-person and online formats respectively. In-person and online events attracted audiences with different demographic characteristics, demonstrating the value of a hybrid programme in broadening reach and providing access for all. In relation to Being Human operational targets for inclusion, in-person attendees were less likely than online audiences to identify as white, less likely to have a university postgraduate education and less likely to have previously attended a public event featuring university research. In contrast, online attendees were more likely than in-person audiences to identify as D/deaf or disabled, or have a long-term health condition that impacts on daily life (section 9.7).

Like attendees, organisers were more ethnically diverse in 2021 compared to previous years, which met the operational target for reducing the proportion of organisers who identify as white (section 4.1). As discussed under SAS priority 1, there is scope to increase ECR representation in Being Human and broaden inclusion in that respect. Inclusion and diversity for Being Human as a whole was enhanced through the involvement of charity/third sector partners as event stakeholders (section 7.3).

Being Human’s emphasis on local, placed-based engagement manifested itself in the UK-wide location of events (section 2.3), which, along with community or other local partnerships (3.2), meant organisers were able to target varied and wide-ranging audience groups in order to meet their own strategic objectives and local priorities and respond to local interests, as well as contribute to the festival’s national aims.

In general, Being Human achieved national reach throughout the UK. As in previous years, the proportion of events in London exceeded the regional population proportion, which was also the case for countries and regions outside London that hosted a Hub, confirming the value of Hubs as a mechanism for boosting geographic reach and engagement.
### 11.2. Comment on Operational Priorities and Broad Aims for 2021

#### Operational Priorities for 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Priority</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Connecting humanities researchers with communities and cultural partners.</td>
<td>As discussed for SAS priority 3 (section 11.1.3), Being Human 2021 was successful in supporting partnerships that involved researchers in collaboration with community, arts and heritage organisations, as well as partnerships with individual artists and performers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promoting collaborative, co-produced PE (public engagement) that increases the impact of humanities research.</td>
<td>Partnerships (section 1.11.3) were a significant feature in Being Human 2021 and over half of organisers gained skills and confidence in co-producing PE activities. The main audience outcome was 64% increasing their understanding of a humanities topic’s relevance to everyday life - higher than in 2020 when it was 47%, indicating increased impact in this key area. At 45.9%, the proportion who learned more about research into a subject or topic was lower than the 57.3% who, in 2020, increased their awareness of research in a subject. The change in question wording may have been a factor in this variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enabling small-to-medium scale PE projects not supported in other ways.</td>
<td>This priority was not directly assessed through the 2021 evaluation, but it could most effectively be assessed via a question the application process to be part of the festival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leading innovation and best practice in PE delivery and methods.</td>
<td>Innovation was evident in programming and new ways of working in PE reported by event organisers, as discussed for SAS Priority 2 (section 11.1.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Providing a focus for media interest in humanities research locally, regionally and nationally.</td>
<td>The evaluation assessed local and regional media coverage. Over half of organisers reported no media coverage for events (section 3.5) and stakeholders felt promotion could be enhanced (section 8.2), which indicates that there is scope to give this priority greater attention, e.g. specific support for attracting local or regional media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improving inclusion and diversity in the festival programming and provision.</td>
<td>As discussed for SAS Priority 5 (section 11.1.5), 2021 audiences and organisers were more ethnically diverse than in previous years. In-person events attracted audiences with greatest ethnic and education diversity. In general, scope remains to extend reach beyond the ‘already engaged’ to less experienced event goers and ‘seldom-heard’ audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Emphasising place-based activities, representing a range of communities and interests across the four nations of the United Kingdom, creating a national festival that is rooted in local place.

Programming targets for national and regional reach were met, as discussed for SAS Priority 5 (section 11.1.5). The focus provided by Hubs enhanced reach in particular countries or regions, and, more generally, partnerships appear to have optimised local relevance and impact. Over one-third of attendees cited the locally-relevant or personally relevant nature of events as highlights, which is an indicator of place-based engagement.

**Broad Aims for 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Aim</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Deliver a broad ranging, high quality and truly national festival connecting people outside higher education with new research in the humanities.</td>
<td>At 95.0%, 98.3% and 91.1%, above average ratings (section 10.1) of Being Human 2021 were high for organisers (section 5.1) stakeholders (section 8.1) and audiences (section 10.1), which is indicative of high quality. The festival reached people outside higher education. Just under half of stakeholders did not work in the university sector (section 7.1) and 69.1% of the audience were not employed in university research or not studying at university (section 9.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Synthesise learning from Being Human 2020 to offer a programme that delivers both high quality digital engagement and meaningful, safe in-person interaction (or hybrid formats).</td>
<td>The Being Human 2021 programme included in-person, online and hybrid event formats. 48.3% of the audience attended in-person and 51.1% attended online. There was no variation in satisfaction levels for the different formats and all were rated highly (section 10.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Renew and refresh the festival’s focus on reaching beyond ‘already engaged’ audiences and participants.</td>
<td>Although targets for geographic distribution of events (section 2.3) and protected characteristics of audience diversity were met, the Being Human audience generally remained well-educated and experienced event goers (sections 9.3. and 9.4), indicating that reaching beyond the ‘already engaged’ remains a long-term aim, which may require further specific inputs and targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Conclusions and Recommendations

This Chapter presents conclusions for each of the evaluation aims that were outlined in the 2021 Being Human evaluation brief. It also makes a statement about progress towards the Being Human objectives up to 2025, and presents some strategic and operational recommendations for the SAS team to consider.

12.1. Conclusions

12.1.1. Success or otherwise of the festival in meeting its stated targets for the year

The following tables outline achievements for each of the Operational Plan’s stated targets that were assessed through the evaluation. Some targets, e.g. number of applications, social media campaigns and media coverage, were monitored by SAS and are outside the scope of the external evaluation. They are not included here.

Being Human 2021 successfully met most of the targets that were assessed through the evaluation, with the COVID-19 pandemic being a factor for some programming targets not being met.

Operational Targets for 2021 – Programme Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Design Target</th>
<th>Was It Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase UK event numbers to 285 [2020: 262] with the increase to come largely via the unfunded section of the programme.</td>
<td>No 238 UK events, short of the target, which could be partly attributed to the pandemic. But, unfunded events made up almost half the programme (48.8% of events), which could be used as a target for this aspect in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain 4 -5 UK hubs, including theme specific hub for COP26. [2020: 4]</td>
<td>Yes 4 Hubs, including a COP26 Hub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain number of towns and cities featuring at least one Being Human event around our average of 53 for 2017-2020.</td>
<td>No (likely due to COVID-19 pandemic restricting the No. of in-person events) 38 town/cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain number of activities in Wales [2020: 16 in 2 towns/cities].</td>
<td>Yes for towns/ cities, No for events 15 events in 3 towns/cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of places in Northern Ireland from 1 university in 1 city to at least one new participant, either region or university [2018-2020: 1]</td>
<td>Yes 2 universities in 2 towns/ cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain number of activities in Scotland across multiple towns and cities, including Glasgow [2020: 36 in 7 towns and cities].</td>
<td>Yes for events, No for towns/ cities 41 events in 5 towns/ cities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Operational Targets for 2021 – Diversity and Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity and Inclusion Target</th>
<th>Was It Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of attendees describing as ‘white’ to return to pre-pandemic improvement on national average of 86%. [2019: 82%; 2020: 89%].</td>
<td>Yes 79.5% of attendees identified as ‘white’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of attendees identifying as ‘Black, African, Caribbean, Black British’ to 3.5% [2020: 3%].</td>
<td>Yes 3.5% of attendees identified as ‘Black, African, Caribbean, Black British’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase diversity of organisers, speakers and panellists involved in the festival – lowering the number who describe themselves as ‘white’. [2020: 83.7% identifying as ‘white’]</td>
<td>Yes for all and organisers, No for stakeholders 82.4% combined, 78.7% of organisers and 87.5% of stakeholders (partners, speakers etc.) identified as ‘white’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain 2020 target for number of attendees who describe themselves as having a disability at 15% [2020: 14%].</td>
<td>Yes 14.9% of attendees reported they were D/deaf, or disabled, or have a long-term health condition that impacts on their daily life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience numbers amongst people who attend events such as festivals, art shows, free university events, etc. to more than the national average (based on ‘Taking Part Survey’).</td>
<td>Taking Part numbers exceeded 80.2% of attendees engaged with museum/gallery [51% in Taking Part Survey] and 81.3% engaged with the arts in 12 months prior [76% in Taking part Survey]. 71.8% of attendees engaged with public events about university research [Not measured in Taking Part].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of towns/ cities without a university.</td>
<td>Target no. not specified 23.7% of events took place in a town/ city without a university [27.7% in 2019].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Operational Targets for 2021 – Audience Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience Outcome Target</th>
<th>Was It Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve ratio of attendees saying that they learn ‘a lot’ about the subject/ research under discussion at Being Human event to 80% [2020: 73%].</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The 2020 Evaluation Report (p.8) used the % of attendees who agreed that an event was thought-provoking as a proxy for learning ‘a lot’ about the subject/ research under discussion. Therefore, the 2021 figure for finding events thought-provoking is reported here to enable direct comparison.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Audience Outcomes for 2021 are also summarised alongside their 2020 equivalents as suggestions for the basis of future audience outcome targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In that 77.4% of attendees found content thought-provoking, compared to 73% in 2020.

68.3% increased their understanding of a subject’s/ topic’s relevance to everyday life [47.6% in 2020], which relates directly to Being Human’s stated purpose “to demonstrate why humanities research is vital to society and directly relevant to the lives and interests of people across the UK.”

61.6% were inspired to find out more about a subject/ topic [51.1% in 2020].

45.9% learned more about research into a subject/ topic [57.3% in 2020 increased awareness].

**Operational Targets for 2021 – Marketing and Communications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing and Communications Target</th>
<th>Was It Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase organiser satisfaction with website [2020: 56% rating it as excellent].</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase percentage of audience that are aware of the festival before attending an event [2020: 35%].</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.8% of organisers rated the website as excellent (95.1% rated it above average, 92% in 2020).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.0% of attendees were aware of Being Human before an event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**12.1.2. Experiences of organisers of Being Human activities and events**

Being Human 2021 delivered a positive experience for organisers from a range of backgrounds and different career stages, which included 69.7% who had been directly involved (i.e. organisers or speakers etc.) in previous years and 8.9% who were not previously aware of the festival.

95.0% of organisers rated their overall experience positively. Support from the central SAS team was particularly highly rated, with 98.7% rating it above average. Organisers’ main suggestions were: to streamline supporting information; tailor masterclasses according to experience; increase knowledge-sharing opportunities; and better manage expectations for evaluation responsibilities.

Organisers’ aims were met, especially reaching new audiences, innovating in public engagement, and making or strengthening cultural and community partnerships.
Organiser outcomes were wide-ranging and covered all aspects of public engagement and partnership development:

- 93.8% engaged with a ‘new’ audience, 88.8% raised their profile, 83.8% were inspired to innovate in public engagement
- 60.0% developed new public engagement formats
- 63.5% increased and 62.2% initiated relationships with cultural/ community partners
- 86.1% developed skills and 80.5% improved confidence in event planning/ management
- 58.2% developed skills and 61.0% improved confidence in presenting to public
- 59.7% improved confidence in obtaining audience feedback on research
- 57.0% developed skills and 57.1% improved confidence in co-production

12.1.3. Experiences of other stakeholders in the festival (e.g. cultural/ community partners involved in the planning and delivery of events)

Being Human 2021 was a positive experience for stakeholders from research, heritage, arts and third/ charity sectors, as well as representatives from community organisations.

98.3% of stakeholders rated their experience as above average, which they attributed to personal enjoyment; organiser support or partnership working; and the audience reactions they encountered.

There were some specific frustrations around publicity, poor communication leading up to events, and disappointment about low audience turnouts. These suggest that there is scope to include some content in masterclasses about communicating with stakeholders and involving them in publicity.

Stakeholders’ feedback for the SAS team was positive, both regarding the support they received and the festival as a whole. Suggestions focused on promotion, which was mostly about increasing audience numbers, but also included querying the sustainability of giveaway materials.

Stakeholders benefited from multiple outcomes:

- 98.3% rated their Being Human experience above average
- 88.1% engaged with a new audience
- 74.6% inspired to develop new ways of working and raised their profile
- 61.0% further developed community or cultural relationships

12.1.4. Experiences of audiences at Being Human festival events

Being Human events in 2021 delivered a positive experience for in-person and online audiences.

91.1% of attendees rated events above average, with 68.3% giving the highest rating of ‘excellent’. Descriptions indicate that they found their experiences to be simultaneously educational and enjoyable. For both online and in-person events, audiences highlighted three main success factors:
thought-provoking content; engaging speakers/presenters; and entertaining or enjoyable experiences.

Over half of attendees said that events needed no improvement. The most common improvement was better signposting to further information to follow-up events followed by more background information, which is indicative of an audience that was seeking knowledge.

As presented in section 12.1.1 on audience outcome targets, Being Human events delivered positive audience outcomes in most cases. Outcomes correlated to personal interest in or personal relevance of topics or subjects, which were significant motivating factors for attending events.

12.1.5. Comparative success of the festival year-on-year in meeting its stated targets

Where data are comparable with previous years, they have been presented in tables throughout the Findings Chapters in this report. As agreed with SAS, these comparisons span 2018 to 2021. Conclusions from directly comparable data are:

- UK-reach outside London in all years has been influenced by the presence of a Being Human Hub, which increases event and audience numbers (Table 3)
- The proportion of organisers who report leveraged funding for their events (2018, 2019 and 2021 only) has remained relatively stable, whereas the proportion who secured in-kind investment fell in 2021 (Table 8), assessing this in future should indicate how much this was affected by the pandemic.
- The number of partnerships reported by organisers maintained 2019 and 2020 levels (Table 9).
- A lower proportion of organisers who identify as ‘white’ fell in 2021 (Table 11).
- The audience, as in 2020, was mainly well-educated and experienced in event-going, suggesting that activity to reach beyond ‘already engaged’ audiences could be strengthened in future.
12.2. Progress towards Objectives

A statement regarding the 2021 festival’s contribution to Being Human’s five objectives to 2025 is presented below. The objectives are:

- Demonstrate, and celebrate, the national value and significance of humanities research.
- Build capacity for place-based public engagement with humanities research, demonstrating its interest and significance to local communities.
- Strengthen the public’s understanding of the range and relevance of humanities research by extending its reach across diverse communities.
- Develop skills for humanities researchers seeking to engage with publics and increasing opportunities for all researchers to do so.
- Embed the festival as a sustainable, high-impact national fixture.

Progress towards these objectives was evidenced in particular by audiences’ positive experiences and outcomes (Objectives 1 and 3); organisers’ efforts to establish local partnerships and feature topics of local interest (Objective 2; festival-wide efforts made to improve inclusion and broaden audience reach (Objective 3); plus positive outcomes for organisers in developing skills and building capacity for public engagement (Objective 4). The fact that Being Human is in its eighth year is indicative of progress for Objective 5, which can only be properly assessed by including feedback from funders; senior management in universities, and representatives of the wider public engagement landscape, e.g. NCCPE.

12.3. Recommendations

All feedback indicates that Being Human 2021 was generally very successful. A few considerations for the future emerged in the findings, which are presented here as strategic and operational recommendations.

12.3.1. Strategic Recommendations

R1: With an eight-year track record, Being Human is in a position to plan a sustainable future. The festival should be setting, and agreeing with funders, a consistent set of short- medium- and long-term SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time bound) goals for each of its existing objectives to assess if these are achieved, and to develop and prioritise its next strategic direction of travel.

R2: Being Human core funding has remained stable for most of the festival’s history. If strategic plans are to grow the festival, not necessarily in terms of audience numbers, but growing the profile, developing the training and capacity-building element etc., then it is crucial to invest in the future. A funding strategy should be developed to accompany the SMART goals, and additional sources of funding, such as those used to support the COP26 Hub, should continue to be explored.

R3: Hubs provide a strategic development opportunity for Being Human. Creating a network around successful Hub coordinators would ensure best practice and learning is shared throughout humanities research, and could form the basis of a Being Human Community of Practice to support humanities public engagement more widely, as well as inform the future development of the festival. If funding were available, commissioned Hubs, such as this year’s COP26 Hub, could be used to raise the profile of Being Human in specific target regions, including outside London and emphasising the festival’s UK-wide reach. In addition to enhancing organiser learning and
sharing, a Community of Practice would provide a source of ideas, expertise and experience that could help shape the festival’s future direction. It could also raise Being Human’s profile nationally and at a strategic level within universities.

**R4:** Develop a dedicated strategy and guidance for reaching beyond ‘already engaged’ audiences, defining what these are, and consider ring-fencing an amount of funding for events/organisers to work specifically with such audiences. As it takes time to build relationships and trust with less-engaged audiences, funding could be longer-term in nature, e.g. support events over two or three years. It could be valuable to use the experiences of previous organisers, including previous Hub coordinators, to inform this strategy.

### 12.3.2. Operational Recommendations

**R5:** Align operational targets to SMART Goals and share them with organisers to optimise the likelihood that they will be monitored and achieved. Selected targets could also be used as criteria for funding or acceptance in the Being Human programme, to help ensure that key priorities are addressed in all organisers’ planning and delivery.

**R6:** In 2021, Being Human delivered significant training and development outcomes for organisers, which could be optimised by streamlining or de-duplicating some of the organiser guidance and tools, and offering different tiers of training opportunities, i.e. fundamentals of event planning and organisation for those who are less experienced; specific topics linked to Being Human priorities, such as audience inclusion, promotion with partners, ECR involvement or media engagement, or particular support requirements, for those with more experience.

**R7:** As external partnership is such an important feature of Being Human, and one that contributes significantly to events having local identity and relevance within a national festival, consideration should be given to optimising ways in which local branding and Being Human branding can co-exist and be recognised. This would help to maximise local stakeholders’ and partners’ buy-in, which is important as they represent a significant opportunity to help raise the local profile of Being Human. Formal acknowledgement of their role should be included in the application process and all materials, guidance etc., to help ensure that the benefits from stakeholders acting as local champions for Being Human can be realised as fully as possible.

**R8:** Building on learning from operating within a global pandemic, Being Human should continue with a hybrid programme or hybrid events, allowing in-person and online access to optimise inclusivity and provide equality of opportunity for the broadest range of audiences to engage with Being Human.

**R9:** Once SMART strategic goals have been set, they should be used to review and streamline the evaluation, ensuring that it focuses on the most important and most relevant information.

**R10:** Being Human evaluation questions and priorities have changed over time. Wherever possible, the same wording for key evaluation indicators and questions should be used each year to optimise the validity of year-on-year comparisons.

**R11:** Reporting and evaluation expectations were the same for funded and unfunded events. The evaluation requirements were perceived to be burdensome for the level of funding involved and the evaluation would benefit from prioritisation about what questions are essential, which would have the added benefit of making it easier to develop accessible, inclusive audience evaluation materials. Earliest-possible notice, i.e. on acceptance into the programme, about evaluation
expectations should be given to organisers, to enable them to integrate Being Human evaluation with local evaluation needs, including the needs of local funders and partners.