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1. Background

The Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Project has been supporting communications workshops since July 2010. Unlike earlier workshops, with applicants from the eight countries surrounding the Bay of Bengal, this course was co-sponsored and hosted by the Malaysian Department of Fisheries and Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM). It was aimed at early-career marine scientists, with the overall objectives of: building communication capacity; improving presentation skills; and increasing confidence in talking with the media.

2. Introduction

The scientific presentation workshop was held from 24 to 27 November in the Biological Sciences Department of the Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang Malaysia. This was a follow-on from the scientific writing workshop held at USM from 29 September to 2 October. Only fifteen (15) participants from the scientific writing workshop returned from the writing workshop held from 29 September to 2 October 2014. Nine (9) additional participants were recruited and a total of 24 participants from nine different universities and government agencies attended (See Appendix I: Participants and affiliations; and Appendix VIII: Participants [with photos] and contact details). The workshop was supported by Dr Chris O’Brien (Regional Coordinator, Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystems (BOBLME) and organised by Dr Aileen Tan Shau Hwai (USM). The workshop was designed and conducted by Dr Peter Rothlisberg (Australia) with the assistance of four in-region facilitators/mentors: Dr Sevvandi Jayakody (Sri Lanka); Dr W.M.H. Kelum Wijenayeke (Sri Lanka), Dr E. Vivekananadan (India); and Dr Aileen Tan Shau Hwai (Malaysia). The workshop was opened and closed by Mr Ismail Ishak (Director, Malaysian Fisheries) who is the BOBLME National Coordinator for Malaysia.

2.1. Objective

The objective of the workshop was to provide training to enhance effective communication of the results of research projects to stakeholders and the broader scientific community through oral presentations. Here we built on the manuscripts prepared at the September-October scientific writing workshop. Some of the participants were able use the month between workshops to complete their manuscripts by consulting with co-authors and supervisors as well as some of the workshop mentors; while the new recruits were asked to bring enough material to build a 5 min presentation.

2.2. Approach

The course was designed to be an interactive – ‘learn-by-doing’ – workshop. The first 2 days of the 4-day workshop were divided into short lectures (25%) and practical exercises (75%) with the ultimate aim to produce a 5 minute scientific presentation by the end of the second day (Appendix II: Course agenda).
Participants were paired with a peer — a ‘Buddy’ — to provide feedback on various stages of the development of their presentation. Further, participants were assigned to a mentor (one of the four in-region facilitators) for feedback and advice throughout the workshop (See Appendix III: Participants, buddies & mentors). The student to mentor ratio was 6:1 which allowed a high degree of interaction.

The third and fourth days were spent delivering and videotaping the presentations and providing feedback to participants from peers and mentors. This year BOBLME hired a profession company to produce high quality videos. Each participant received an electronic copy of their presentation. In addition, there were short tutorials on preparing posters for scientific meetings and dealing with the media. Participants were also given a hand-out of selected slides (Appendix IX).

3. Workshop effectiveness

Participants were very enthusiastic, arriving early each morning and staying beyond the appointed finish time each day. Uptake of the workshop material was very high. This was surprising, given the different levels of experience and preparedness of the participants, with the majority gaining a great deal of insight into the presentation process. The amount of interaction amongst the participants and with mentors and facilitators was greatly enhanced compared to the scientific writing workshop the previous month. This is probably due to enhanced familiarity with and growing confidence by participants.

![Figure 1 Duration of presentations](#)

Participants were asked to create a 5 minute presentation (solid red line) based on the manuscript developed at the previous workshop. Only 22 participants prepared talks as two missed the second day of the workshop due to another workshop commitment. The overall average time of the 22 presentations was 5.8 min (dashed red line). On the first day the 12 talks had a mean time of 5.6 minutes and a range from 3.9 to 7.9 minutes. Clearly, these speakers had not paid enough attention to the given time limit. We talked about the importance of keeping to time and challenged the 10 speakers on the following day to do better. The mean time for day two was 5.8 minutes with a range of 4.4 to 7.1 minutes. Overall only five talks got within 30 sec of the allotted 5 min time limit (presenters 9, 11, 16, 18, and 21).
After each talk participants gave feedback to each speaker using a video playback reflection form as a guide (Appendix IV). The command of the English language was variable, but by and large the delivery of talks was very proficient and articulate. Use of power point technology was also of a high standard, in some cases very high. Beyond not meeting the time limit, the most common feedback from and to participants was the need for better ‘engagement’ between the speakers and the audience. While most participants spoke without notes, most had to turn their backs on the audience and speak to their slides – a little or a lot. This diminished audience engagement which is often the biggest difference between a good and bad presentation. Better engagement comes with confidence (organisation, preparation, and practice) and then experience.

4. Workshop feedback

At the completion of the workshop, participants were asked to fill in a feedback form to gauge satisfaction with and suitability of elements, along with suggestions for changes to future workshops (Appendix V: Course feedback form). Nineteen (19) of the 24 participants returned the form – several left after lunch on Thursday to catch flights. A tabular summary of the feedback is provided in Appendix VI and written comments are in Appendix VII.

Overall the feedback was very positive. All but one participant ‘Strongly agreed’ or “Agreed’ to all six questions about suitability and organisation of the workshop (Appendix VI: Tabulation of workshop feedback results). One respondent ‘Disagreed’ with the element about time allocation, but provided no detailed commentary. The challenge of the 5-minute presentation was also mentioned by a few participants. While the 5 minute presentation length is arbitrary, it allowed the 22 talks to be heard and analysed in the 2 days available; and it is a demanding challenge on time management. All respondents would recommend the course to a colleague.

Seventeen (17) respondents successfully ranked the workshop elements 1 to 7, with 1 being the most valuable element (see Appendix V & Appendix VI). Respondents 13 and 19 ranked them all 1 and were not used in the analysis. Presentation principles was the element deemed the most valuable – seven placed it top; three placed it second; and four placed it third. Four participants wanted more of this element. Presentation delivery & feedback was the next most valued and six participants wanted more time dedicated to this element. This was followed closely by Concept planning, outline & storyboard and Audience engagement; four participants wanted more of these elements. Preparing posters and Dealing with the media were ranked least valuable; but three participants wanted more training in poster preparation. Ten (10) participants suggested a reduction in the amount of time on the Media element. I have a feeling that this represents the relative age and experience of the participants. Very few of the participants are in a position to need enhanced media skills at this stage of their careers.

At the conclusion of the workshop all participants were given a certificate of participation and a copy of Garr Reynolds’ presentationzen.
5. Future presentation workshops

Overall I think the workshop went very well. Most of the participants were ready to prepare a presentation; but I feel the late recruits who filled the unexpected vacancies were at a disadvantage (see comment 18 Appendix VIII). While participants were slow and even reluctant to interact and share constructive criticism with their peers and mentors at the outset of each workshop, they opened up and engaged as time went on and confidences was built; this was especially evident during the last 2 days of the presentation workshop. Participants were encouraged to share what they've learned by giving constructive feedback and advice when back at home base.
### Appendix I  Participants & affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Attended 1st workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teh Chiew Peng ‘Cherrie’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amelia Ng Phei Fang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chin Chee Keong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nur Aqilah Mohd Darif</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amirul Aizal Abdul Aziz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Poi Khoy Yen</td>
<td>USM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mohd Reza Mirzaei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lee Ze Hong</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jasim Uddain</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Phua Qian Yi</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kho Li Yung ‘Kelly’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Zufarzaana Zulkeflee</td>
<td>UPM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Aziani Ahmad</td>
<td>Universiti Teknologi Mara (Perlis)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Saadiah Ibrahim</td>
<td>FRI Penang</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Amatul Samahah</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Azmi Rani</td>
<td>FRI Johor</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fadzilah Yusof</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mohd Farazi Jaafar</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mohd Tamimi Ali Ahmad</td>
<td>SEAFDEC/MFRDMD, Chendering Terengganu</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Noorul Azliana binti Jamaludin</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Izarenah Mohd. Repin</td>
<td>JTLM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bahrinah Bahrain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mohd Rahimi Dollah</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Noran Alwakhir bin Sharaani</td>
<td>Jabatan Mineral Dan Geosains Malaysia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II  Course agenda

BOBLME – USM scientific presentation workshop
24-27 November 2014

Agenda

Day 1 – Define and organise the story
9.00 am  Welcome and introduction (PR)
09.30 am  Concept planning – define the audience and the story (PR)
10.00 am  Individual work on concept plan – review by Buddy and Facilitator
11.00 am  Presentations of 2 minute drill/pitch
12.15 pm  Lunch
1.15 pm  Organise the story – outlines and storyboards (PR)
1.45 pm  Individual work on outlines and storyboards
4.00 pm  Review of concept plan, outline, and storyboard – Buddy & Facilitator
4.30 pm  Revision outline and storyboard
5.30 pm  Finish

Day 2 – Presentation principles, audience engagement, build the presentation
8.30 am  Qualities of good and bad presentations (PR)
9.00 am  Presentation principles (1) (PR)
10.30 am  Use of figures and tables (PR)
11.00 am  Presentation principles (2) (PR)
12.15 pm  Lunch
1.00 pm  Individual work on presentation
3.00 pm  Review of presentation structure – Buddy and Mentor
3.30 pm  Revision following review
5.30 pm  Finish

Day 3 – Deliver the presentation + making posters
8.30 am  Individual presentations with peer and facilitator feedback
10.30 am  Revision of presentations
12.15 am  Lunch
1.00 pm  Individual presentations with peer and facilitator feedback
3.00 pm  Revision of presentations
4.00 pm  Making posters (PR)
Report of the BOBLME communications workshop on scientific presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.00 pm</td>
<td>finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4 – Deliver the presentation + dealing with the media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30 am</td>
<td>Individual presentations with peer and facilitator feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 am</td>
<td>Revision of presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 pm</td>
<td>Individual presentations with peer and facilitator feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 pm</td>
<td>Revision of presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 pm</td>
<td>Dealing with the media (PR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.45 pm</td>
<td>Workshop appraisal and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 pm</td>
<td>finish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix III  Participants, buddies & mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Buddy</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teh Chiew Peng (Cherrie)</td>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amelia Ng Phei Fang</td>
<td>Cherrie</td>
<td>Vivek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chin Chee Keong</td>
<td>Saadiah</td>
<td>Aileen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nur Aqilah Mohd Darif</td>
<td>Amirul</td>
<td>Kulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amirul Aizal Abdul Aziz</td>
<td>Aqilah</td>
<td>Kulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Poi Khoy Yen</td>
<td>Reza</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mohd Reza Mirzaei</td>
<td>Poi</td>
<td>Kulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mohd Tamimi Ali Ahmad</td>
<td>Farazi</td>
<td>Aileen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mohd Rahimi</td>
<td>Noran</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Noran Alwakhir</td>
<td>Rahimi</td>
<td>Vivek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Izarenah Mohd Repin</td>
<td>Bahrinah</td>
<td>Aileen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bahrinah Bahrin</td>
<td>Izarenah</td>
<td>Kulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Aziani Ahmad</td>
<td>Amatul</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Zufarzaana Zulkeflee</td>
<td>Qian</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lee Ze Hong</td>
<td>Jasim</td>
<td>Vivek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jasim Uddain</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Vivek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Phua Qain Yi</td>
<td>Zufar</td>
<td>Vivek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Saadiah Ibrahim</td>
<td>Chin</td>
<td>Kulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Amatul Samahah</td>
<td>Aziami</td>
<td>Aileen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Azmi Rani</td>
<td>Fadzilah</td>
<td>Aileen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fadzilah Yusof</td>
<td>Azmi</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mohd Fazari Jaafar</td>
<td>Tamimi</td>
<td>Kulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Noorul Azliana binti Jamaludin</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kho Li Yung (Kelly)</td>
<td>Noorul</td>
<td>Aileen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facilitator
- Dr Peter Rothlisberg

### Mentors
- Dr Kelum Wijenayke
- Dr Sevvandi Jayakody
- Dr Vivekanandan Elayaperumal
- Dr Aileen Tan Shau Hwai
Appendix IV  Video playback reflection form

### Video Playback Reflection

Make a note of what you and others observed about your performance in the presentations, with a particular focus on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Energy</th>
<th>Stance</th>
<th>Use of Gestures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Projection</td>
<td>Vocal Tone</td>
<td>Vocal Articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Range</td>
<td>Vocal Pace</td>
<td>Use of Pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Engagement</td>
<td>Value of Storytelling</td>
<td>Value of Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Message</td>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>What you were feeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix V  Course feedback form

### BOBLME – USM scientific presentation workshop

24-27 November 2014  
Penang, Malaysia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback form</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The workshop was well organized.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshop met my expectations/needs.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshop has assisted me in my presentation skills and in the preparation of talks and media interviews.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions and examples were clear and understandable.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The format of the workshop was relevant and well organized.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time allocation for the workshop components was appropriate.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you recommend this workshop to your colleague?</td>
<td>Yes □  No □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Which aspect of the workshop did you find most valuable (please rate in order with 1 as the most valuable)**

- Concept planning and focus
- Outlines and storyboard
- Presentation principles
- Audience engagement principles
- Presentation delivery & feedback
- Preparing Posters
- Dealing with the Media
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which session would you have liked to have had more time for?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which session would you have liked to have had less time for?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional comments or suggestions about this workshop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: (Optional)........................................................................................................
### Appendix VI Tabulation of workshop feedback results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Concept planning</th>
<th>Outline &amp; Storyboard</th>
<th>Presentation Principles</th>
<th>Audience Engagement</th>
<th>Presentation delivery &amp; Feedback</th>
<th>Preparing Posters</th>
<th>Dealing with Media</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VII  Participant feedback comments

Participant 2¹ – Well done. Very helpful. Bring/show more examples of the bad and good presentations.

Participant 3 – I think this workshop will be beneficial for every participant. I wish this type of workshop will be organized frequently.

Participant 4 – Maybe next time the sitting arrangements can be a classroom instead of the meeting setting because in classroom setting everybody can easily face the front. Good job! Thank you!

Participant 5 – Very well organised. Video recording & reviewing for individual’s keeping really cool! Functionality is maintained throughout. Great mentoring. Mentor helped to put things in better perspectives. Peter’s lecture is short and sweat. Good control over the time for questions and feedback. Just a suggestion: break the class into 2 or 3 groups to have first round of presentations in small groups. Then later can have a 2nd round with everyone involved (or maybe mentor can identify or participants can volunteer to present second round).

Participant 8 – To give more time for presentation since 5 minutes is not enough for scientific presentation. Can apply 5 mins talk but maybe have to put points needed in 5 mins talk.

Participant 9 – Organise this kind of workshop every year. Expose to other scientific work.

Participant 10 – Including more people from different area of scientific research.

Participant 11 – This time is quite stress during the last 2 days. However, it had train us to present better. Well, this has helped us a lot in improving our slides.

Participant 12 – Interactive workshop involving all participants. It will be good if can do a “before-after” presentation workshop evaluation.

Participant 13 – Very good, can we have a 3rd workshop on poster presenting? 😊

Participant 14 – Very informative. Helped me a lot.

Participant 15 – Thank you very much 😊.

Participant 17 – It was very interesting and beneficial.

Participant 18 – For participants from non-research base agencies, they should be told earlier that they have to be prepared with a complete result of study, before they came to the workshop. So, they prepare themselves better.

Participant 19 – Hope I can join again this workshop.

¹ Participant (respondent) numbers are not the same as Appendix 1, 3 & 8; they are simply the order in which the feedback forms were received and relate to Appendix 6.
### Appendix VIII  Participants & contact details

|   | ![Cherrie Teh Chiew Peng](image1.png) | Cherrie Teh Chiew Peng  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
+6010-2315262  
cherrie_tcp@yahoo.com |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | ![Amelia Ng Phei Fang](image2.png) | Amelia Ng Phei Fang  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
+6016-8517908  
amelia_npf@yahoo.com |
| 3 | ![Amirul Aizat Abd. Aziz](image3.png) | Amirul Aizat Abd. Aziz  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
+6014-9257093  
amirulaizalabdulaziz@gmail.com |
| 4 | ![Chin Chee Keong](image4.png) | Chin Chee Keong  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
+6016-4879751  
kevinck19@gmail.com |
| 5 | ![Nur Aqilah Muhammad Darif](image5.png) | Nur Aqilah Muhammad Darif  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
+604-653 6299  
aqilahdarif@yahoo.com |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mohammad Reza Mirzaei</td>
<td>Universiti Sains Malaysia</td>
<td>+6011-2455910</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mirzaei.mr@gmail.com">mirzaei.mr@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poi Khoy Yen</td>
<td>Universiti Sains Malaysia</td>
<td>+6014-5995003</td>
<td><a href="mailto:khoyyen@yahoo.com">khoyyen@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lee Ze Hong</td>
<td>Universiti Sains Malaysia</td>
<td>+6013-7858282</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leezehong91@gmail.com">leezehong91@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jasim Uddain</td>
<td>Universiti Sains Malaysia</td>
<td>+6010-2874832</td>
<td><a href="mailto:uddain.jasim@gmail.com">uddain.jasim@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Phua Qian Yi</td>
<td>Universiti Sains Malaysia</td>
<td>+6016-4996439</td>
<td><a href="mailto:qianyi.phua@gmail.com">qianyi.phua@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>Phone Numbers</td>
<td>Fax Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Zufarzaana Zulkeflee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zufarzaana@upm.edu.my">zufarzaana@upm.edu.my</a></td>
<td>+603-89438109</td>
<td>+603-89467468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+603-89468076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mohammad Rahimi Dollah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rahimi@doe.gov.my">rahimi@doe.gov.my</a></td>
<td>+603-88712200</td>
<td>+603-88884070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Noran Alwakhir bin Sharaani</td>
<td><a href="mailto:noran@jmg.gov.my">noran@jmg.gov.my</a></td>
<td>+6019-5777924</td>
<td>+605-5406100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Izarenah Md. Repin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:izardenah@nre.gov.my">izardenah@nre.gov.my</a></td>
<td>+6019-2321332</td>
<td>+603-88861414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+603-88880489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bahrinah Bahrim</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bahrinah@nre.gov.my">bahrinah@nre.gov.my</a></td>
<td>+6012-8010203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Aziani Ahmad</td>
<td>Universiti Teknologi Mara (Perlis)</td>
<td>+6019-5274345, +604-9882164 (General office), Fax: +604-9882526, <a href="mailto:aziani@perlis.uitm.edu.my">aziani@perlis.uitm.edu.my</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kho Li Yung</td>
<td>Fri Tanjung demong, Besut Terengganu</td>
<td>+6013-8511281, <a href="mailto:kliy_87@hotmail.com">kliy_87@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mohd Tamimi Ali Ahmad</td>
<td>SEAFDEC/MFRDMD, Chendering Terengganu</td>
<td>+60139678451, +609-617594 (General office), Fax: +609-617 5136/+609-6174042, <a href="mailto:tamimi@seafdec.org.my">tamimi@seafdec.org.my</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Noorul Azliana binti Jamaludin</td>
<td>SEAFDEC/MFRDMD, Chendering Terengganu</td>
<td>+609-617 5940, <a href="mailto:noorul@seafdec.org.my">noorul@seafdec.org.my</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Saadiah Ibrahim</td>
<td>Fri Penang</td>
<td>+6017-4306477, <a href="mailto:sadibasri7@gmail.com">sadibasri7@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Amatul Samahah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Gelang Patah, Johor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+6017-3858132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:amatul@dof.gov.my">amatul@dof.gov.my</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Azmi Rani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Gelang Patah, Johor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+6017-3858132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:azmirani2005@gmail.com">azmirani2005@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fadzilah Yusof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Gelang Patah, Johor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mohd Farazi Jaafar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Gelang Patah, Johor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Facilitators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Facilitator Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Assoc. Prof. Dr Aileen Tan Shau Hwai  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
+604-6533508  
aileen@usm.my |
| 2 | Dr Peter Rothlisberg  
Csiro Marine & Atmospheric Research  
Peter.Rothlisberg@csiro.au |
| 3 | Dr (Ms) J.A.D.S.S. Jayakody  
Wayamba University of Sri Lanka  
sevvandi_jayakody@yahoo.com |
| 4 | Prof. E. Vivekanandan  
Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, India  
evivekanandan@hotmail.com |
| 5 | Dr W.M.H.K Wijenayake  
Wayamba University of Sri Lanka  
dileepa_dc@yahoo.com |
Appendix IX  Hand-out

Science Presentation Workshop
Peter Rothlisberg
24 to 27 November 2014
Penang, Malaysia

Setting the stage
How you engage
Message
What’s your point?
Audience
Why does it matter?
Impact!

The Power of a Story
Conflict
Contrasts
Problem, Cause, Solution
Emotions

"Forget PowerPoint and statistics, to involve people at the deepest level you need to tell stories"  Robert McKee

Define the Story
Core of message/story
Focus
Too much for one presentation?
Tailor message/story to Audience!
Conclusion: Take home message

Define the Story (2)
Need
Approach
Supporting evidence
Evaluation
Conclusion

"I don’t know where our ideas came from but it wasn’t a laptop"  John Cleese

Define the Story (3)
2-minute drill – narrative
Too long?
Too much?
Unfocused?
Did they get it?
Who’s confused?
Content tighter & clearer – to you & listener
Early exposure – vulnerable & confronting
Example
Report of the BOBLME communications workshop on scientific presentation

**Depth vs Scope**

- Scope
- Depth

**Organise the Story**

Roadmap – Story board
Set out sections:
- Need
- Approach
- Supporting evidence
- Evaluation
- Conclusion – take home message

Fill in sections:
- 2 to 5 points → possible text slides
- Possible graphs, tables, illustrations

**Slide design – more analogue**

**Slide sorter**
Building the Presentation

You've focused the Story
You know the Audience
You've got the Roadmap
You know the Venue
You have a Time limit
NOW it’s time to build the Presentation

Qualities of good/bad talks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Read slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>Incoherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous</td>
<td>Too fast/slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational</td>
<td>Didn't engage with audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>No feeling/emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credible</td>
<td>Wrong slides – voice/slides disconnected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong visuals, limited text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentation principles (1)

Presentation don't need slides
Simplicity & Clarity = Impact
Slides MUST complement not compete
Use a Handout for detail
Most pub. tables & graphs unsuitable
Graphs > tables
Stick to time
Never need to apologise

Publication vs. Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience – narrow/expert</td>
<td>Audience – broader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>Listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences, paragraphs</td>
<td>Phrases, dot points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time – lots (hours)</td>
<td>Time – litte (4 sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance – arm's length</td>
<td>Distance – metres to vast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail</td>
<td>Broad brush [→]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Supporting evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables &amp; Figures</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion &amp; Conclusion</td>
<td>Take home message</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six x six 'rule'

- No more than six dot points
- No more than six words/point
- No more than six dot points
- No more than six words/point
- No more than six dot points
- No more than six words/point

Banana prawn stock collapse: 3 hypotheses
Report of the BOBLME communications workshop on scientific presentation

Less is More

Information hierarchy in Notes Page view

Headline

Graphic

Narrative

Climate change & sea level rise

People

Place

Change

Simplicity!

Hara hachi bu

Eat only 80% full.

Empty space can convey a feeling of quality, sophistication and importance

Slideument!

Which is better?

Number of bikes sold (Bike 2007)

Over 6,000 bikes sold in 2007

from presentationzen (2008)
Reference collection

6 Genera 16 Species 5 Penaeus

- *P. esculentus* Brown tiger prawn
- *P. semisulcatus* Grooved tiger prawn
- *P. merguiensis* Common banana prawn
- *P. latissimus* Western king prawn
- *(P. indicus* Indian banana prawn)*

Use of colour

Don't EVER write in **RED** on a blue background

or in **BLUE** on a red background

Use of colour (2)

DON'T use **GREEN** and **RED** to highlight text

or **GREEN** and **RED** in a graph

Use of colour (3)

If you need lots of colours in a graph it's probably too complicated

4 to 6 max!

http://colorbrewer2.org/
Fonts

**Style**
Serif (Times New Roman), Sans Serif (Helvetica)

**Size**

- Age of audience / 2 or ≥ 30pt
- 16 18 20 24 30pt

**Weight** - contrast, not size alone

It's not about you, it's about them

**Case** - upper/lower identification IDENTIFICATION

Presentation principles (2)

DON'T read - notes or slides
Include only the most important points
Speak slowly
Speak clearly
Be natural & show interest in subject
Engage, re-engage the audience

Presentation principles (2)

DON'T read - notes or slides
Include only the most important points
Speak slowly
Speak clearly
Be natural & show interest in subject
Engage, re-engage the audience

Confidence

- Organisation builds confidence
- Preparation builds confidence
- Practice builds confidence

Audience engagement

Make them comfortable
Use first and second person (I/You)
Eye contact = honesty
Smile = glad to be there
Inflection & the power of the pause
Body language = hands, gestures
Podium = barrier, separation, fortress
Effective content

Balance

Data Facts Content
Simplicity Clarity Emotion
= Engagement
Report of the BOBLME communications workshop on scientific presentation

Punchy & Sticky

- Personal
- Unexpected
- Novel
- Challenging
- Humorous

1. Simplicity
2. Unexpectedness
3. Concreteness
4. Credibility
5. Emotions
6. Stories

(Reynolds 2011)  (Heath & Heath 2007)

Sticky vs. Scientific

Sticky ideas are:
- Simple
- Unexpected
- Concrete
- Credible
- Emotional
- Story

Science speak is:
- Complicated
- Perplexing
- Abstract
- Suspicious (to some)
- Detached
- Numbers

(Heath & Heath 2007)  (Cook 2014)

Leave time for Questions

- Courteous – well prepared & organised
- Chance to expand talk
- Valuable feedback from audience
  - did they get it?
  - was the message clear?
  - advice for subsequent manuscript
- New lines of research, job opportunities

Troublesome questioner?

Helpful hints

- Don’t use outline – Get into the story
- Avoid excessive bullet points
- Laser pointer or slide highlights
- Conclusion not regurgitation
  - Synthesis, Impact & Application
- Take home message
- Ending alternatives
- Slides up your sleeve

Opening & closing most important

- Don’t use outline – Get into the story
  - Avoid excessive bullet points
  - Laser pointer or slide highlights
  - Conclusion not regurgitation
    - Synthesis, Impact & Application
  - Take home message
  - Ending alternatives
  - Slides up your sleeve

TED

Technology – Entertainment – Design

Rob Harmon
Sarah Kay
Report of the BOBLME communications workshop on scientific presentation

Posters

- Catch the eye
- Statement to arouse interest
- Justification with data
- Stimulate engagement – a conversation

Dealing with the media

- What’s your message?
- Why is it important?
- Interview preparation
- Stay on message – use bridging answers if needed
- Get media training!!

Looking back

Speaker-audience interaction = communication
You don’t need slides – they only enhance
Audience cannot read & listen at the same time
Don’t confuse Slides with Notes or Handouts – beware of the Slideument!
PowerPoint is a tool not the Messenger
Organisation, preparation, & practice give confidence & allow a natural presentation

Impact!

- Clarity
- Simplicity

Presentation websites

Presentationzen by Garr Reynolds
http://www.presentationzen.com/

Seminar by Garr Reynolds
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DZ2vtQCE5pk

Technology, Entertainment, Design (TED)
http://www.ted.com

Additional reading


[Second edition 2012, 296p.]


Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand are working
together through the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Project to lay the foundations
for a coordinated programme of action designed to better the lives of the coastal populations through
improved regional management of the Bay of Bengal environment and its fisheries.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is the implementing agency for the BOBLME Project.

The Project is funded principally by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Norway, the Swedish
International Development Cooperation Agency, the FAO, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration of the USA.

For more information, please visit www.boblme.org