Ref. Ares(2019)2912364 - 30/04/2019

Horizon 2020 Grant nº 770309
Religious Toleration and Peace
Tartu-30/4/2019

Deliverable 1.10

Intermediate report internal meeting 2

Contributor(s):	Riho Altnurme; Christophe Schellekens; Patrick Pasture
Institution:	University of Tartu
Contact:	riho.altnurme@ut.ee

Related project task:	1.1
Type of document:	Report
Document reference:	D1.10
Version number:	1
Status:	Final
Last revision date:	30/04/2019
Verification date & verifying subject:	30/04/2019
License:	/
Other, if applicable:	/

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement n° 770309.

Table of contents

Introduction: General Set-up of the Meeting 3

Clippings. Demands and Evaluation 4

Presentations of Researchers and Discussion 5

Conclusions and Further Suggestions 7

Future Cooperation and Collective Volume 7

Introduction: General Set-up of the Meeting

The internal meeting of Work Package 3 (WP3) convened on 25 and 26 April 2019 at the Erbacher Hof, Tagungshaus des Bistums Mainz (courtesy of the Leibniz Institute for European History) in Mainz – a place used already for a kick-off meeting and internal meeting of WP2. It was a logistically good option, concerning the central location.

The main aim was set to evaluate the first research results on historical and present representations of religious coexistence. A second and according to the timetable even more current/urgent task was to discuss the standards for clippings, the systematization of clippings on the website and other issues concerning the work with clippings (e.g. copyright issues). A third task was to take a look at the future cooperation, to make plans for the collective volume and to encourage the discussion inside WP3.

Team leaders and researchers of WP3 were the core participants. From WP3 the task coordinators Elena Arigita (UGR) and Riho Altnurme (UTartu) were present. Riho Altnurme led most of the discussions. The report was prepared in cooperation by both task leaders. Laura Galián and Merve Reyhan Kayikci represented UGR; Stefanie Sinclair OU, Marija Manasievska UKIM, Mikko Ketola (also PI) and Árpád Welker HELUNI, Tamara Sztyma UniWarsaw, Madis Maasing, Priit Rohtmets and Kaarel Kuurmaa UTartu. John Maiden (OU), Lea Altnurme (UTartu, PI), Nadia Hindi (UGR) and Ivan Stefanovski (UKIM) from WP3 were excused, but they have sent their personal reports in advance.

Some WP2 members were present as well: Henning P. Jürgens, Christophe Schellekens (both IEG), Bram De Ridder (KULeuven) and Lidija Georgieva (UKIM). It enabled a vivid exchange of experiences and elaboration of common standards. WP4 was represented by Ilenia Laudito (IEG, data manager). Also present were PL Patrick Pasture (KULeuven), (Violet Soen (KULeuven), Michal Choptiany (UniWarsaw) and Irene Dingel (IEG). They participated and gave their advice during parts of the meeting

The meeting documentation (conclusions, powerpoint presentations) was shared after the meeting.

Agenda of the meeting:

April 25th, Thursday

9:00-9:20 **Welcome note**, news of RETOPEA (Patrick Pasture, Christophe Schellekens, Riho Altnurme)

9:20-10:20 **Clippings.** Terminology, website, metadata, tags (Ilenia Laudito)

Experiences of WP-2 with clippings (Henning Jürgens)

10:20-10:40 *Coffee break*

10:40-12:00 **Clippings**. Focus topics, first examples (Riho Altnurme). Discussion

12:00-13:00 *Lunch*

13:00-14:20 **First research results** (Madis Maasing, Tamara Sztyma, Merve Reyhan Kayikci, Marija Manasievska) *Researchers have 15 minutes for each presentation*

14:20-14:40 *Coffee break*

14:40-16:00 **First research results** (Kaarel Kuurmaa, Mikko Ketola, Árpád Welker, Stefanie Sinclair)

16:00-16:20 *Coffee break*

16:20-18:00 **First research results** (Laura Galián, Priit Rohtmets). **Discussion**

April 26th, Friday

9:00-10:20 **Conclusion**. Guiding remarks for completing the research (Patrick Pasture, Lidija Georgieva, Elena Arigita, Riho Altnurme)

10:20-10:40 *Coffee break*

10:40-12:00 **Collective volume for WP 3**. Book project (Patrick Pasture)

Perspectives of collaborative research and preparing of reports (Patrick Pasture, Christophe Schellekens, Riho Altnurme)

Although the timetable could not be followed precisely due to vivid and stimulating discussions, all the topics were dealt with and got the attention they deserved.

Clippings. Demands and Evaluation

The first point of the agenda focused on practicalities of the clipping production. Ilenia Laudito (data manager) gave the guidelines to homogenize the work, explained the most important issues to bear in mind about the technicalities (terminology, website, metadata, tags and translation) and deadlines, also having in mind the scheduled work for the rest of the WPs.

The participants went through the templates from WP4, which have to be used by all clippings. One has learned that the clippings in many cases do not meet the high demands of the readibility tests. Vivid discussion concerned the language editing and translation of clippings. As the metadata have to be translated as well, the conclusion was that arguably more time would be needed to finalize the clippings. It was decided (on condition of agreement of the PO) to have all clippings ready by August – preferably earlier though – but that still some editing and especially the translations could be completed still later. However, the clippings should be ready for use by the end of year 2019, before the piloting of the docutubes. Incidentally WP 2 and WP 3 need to install a selection and quality control process with regard to the clippings as well in function of their use in the docutubes.

The workflow for the work with clippings was conveniently organized within the Seafile-system, which is already operating. The participants also learned how the clippings will actually look like on the webpage – a test version was used to demonstrate this. Videos will need to have written transcript (also then translated). If media is used beside the simple text, the separate sheet of metadata needs to be completed, but not in case of linked material from internet.

Henning Jürgens shared the achievements and solutions that WP 2 developed regarding the selection of materials and how to produce suitable contents for a targeted audience of youngsters. The major concern about the final outcome is less the selection of contents as the adaptation to its audience. In this regard, also the revision of translated contents is something that will require an extra effort of all supervisors. Some minor questions about the copyright permissions will be consulted with experts from KU Leuven. Particularly the rights and restrictions to the use of videos and movies available on the internet requires clarification. Some discussion was dedicated to the issue whether to add some explanatory questions to the material that may lead the students to some obvious answers or whether one should keep the clippings without directing questions. In general the opinion was that the questions can be added, if they are open and direct to discussion rather than some solitary answer. The idea of "contextual clippings" – clippings that draft a wider context instead of containing some primary source material and thus would set a general scene for some of the more concrete source clippings – was accepted. Those clippings will need to be identified as "entry points" for the students to start exploring the material.

The discussion about topical focuses and subjects was started. This discussion was finished during the making of conclusions (part 4).

Presentations of Researchers and Discussion

All together 10 presentations from researchers were heard at the meeting (as mentioned in the preliminary plan earlier). Also some references were made during the discussion to the work and reports of those four researchers who were not present. Powerpoint presentations were made available on Seafile system after the meeting.

In general it was exciting to hear the results, and the often very vivid descriptions from the various research fields. Some researchers also expressed what can be the general leading idea of their clippings. One of the leading remarks in the discussion was that we should not present the material in clippings just as it is but we should provide it with the meta level (Stefanie Sinclair) and perhaps with our own conclusions about the research we made. This remark on the other hand raised the question about normativity and the possibility to leave the student alone in deciding what is the idea of his/her docutube or what is the sense of particular event/opinion described in the clipping. How much can the teachers and other educators influence the reception of clippings, and should we give any guidelines also for teachers and other educators? As the docutubes are supposed also for informal education (in museums,

youth clubs etc,) then the clippings should be rather self-explanatory. The explanatory texts should still not be very long, perhaps 150 words max (in addition to the main text of clipping). In terms of making the texts readable, some editing of the clipping texts should be necessary, although doubts were raised whether the actual wording of quotations can be changed in favor of readibility.

Quite often the topic of intellectual property rights came out, particularly concerning the movies, TV series, YouTube channels, but also textbooks, parliamentary speeches or texts from museums. It appeared that using the movie trailers or in case of YouTube links to YouTube at least for clippings should not be a problem. Further legal analysis is needed for using the material in docutubes themselves. If the material is used solely for educational purposes, the rules should not be so strict.

At the end of the sessions on the research reports of individual researchers, also the lists of topical focuses and subjects (used to classify the clippings on the website) were discussed. The following lists to be used both for WP2 and WP3 were decided:

Topical focuses:

1) Family life
2) Gender and Sexuality
3) Clothing and dress
4) Religious practice
5) Places and buildings
6) Migration, trade and travel
7) Law, police and public order
8) Peace and conflict resolution
9) Ideas about toleration
10) Discrimination and being different
11) Propaganda, stereotyping and communication
12) Memory and heritage

Topical focuses need further a short clarification for each, these are the first level descriptions for the groups of clippings for users.

Subjects in metadata (understood as sources of clippings)

- School textbooks
- Museums and exhibitions

- YouTube channels
- TV Series
- Political speeches
- Organisations and initiatives

Conclusions and Further Suggestions

The conclusions were introduced by PL Patrick Pasture. He expressed the encouraging impression the presentations gave about the progress of the work of researchers. Also the main conclusions derived from discussions after the presentations were once again brought out and systematized.

- Text clippings should be short bits of text (max 150 words) – that is shorter than it was supposed earlier. Explanatory texts to clippings can be up to 150 words as well. Web material can be linked to the clipping.
- PI's should offer concrete guidance to the collaborators, and collaborators should consult regularly with the PIs. PI-s and task coordinators for WP2 and WP3 will give feedback about the clippings in order to ensure the quality.
- Researchers working with the similar topics or sources (e.g. museums or political speeches) should discuss their research with each other. Even if it is difficult to keep up the general discussion in a large WP such as WP3, the work in small groups (following the example of WP2) can be encouraging and fruitful for researchers.
- The number of clippings is not to be reduced. The quality of clippings is the most important point of attention.
- The clippings should be usable on their own, using the short explanatory texts and the use of "contextual clippings".
- Text clippings in their first edition, before language editing, should be ready by August for the deliverable. The editing (and translating) process comes immediately after that to ensure that the pool of clippings is ready by the end of the year.
- The policy recommendations is the next step in the work. As it appears, there are some issues to be stressed. First deliverables of that nature should be ready already by December 2019.

Future Cooperation and Collective Volume

Among the different possible forms of collaboration within WP 3, two main points were brought up.

- Firstly the writing of a collective volume was discussed. The proposal was made by PL Patrick Pasture, with the working title "Representations of Religious Diversity in Europe: the Presence of the Past". Leuven University Press (in cooperation with Cornell University Press) was considered as publisher. Other proposals were Routledge and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Elements to consider are the academic reputation of the publisher on the one hand and the need for open access, without paying exorbitant publishing fees (which were not budgeted). A joint publication would enhance and intensify the internal collaboration and communication within the team of WP 3 as well. The collaborators with similar subjects could write a common article. In addition to the themes foreseen in WP3, an additional chapter based on work done by WP2 was proposed, outlining the origins of today's diversities and forms of coexistence. Moreover, also a chapter on contemporary surveys of public opinion towards religious diversity (European Value Studies, the recent Pew survey on attitudes towards religious minorities in Europe etc.) is planned. The drafts of articles should be ready in March 2020, by the second year meeting in Granada. Articles can be quite lengthy, 8-10 000 words.
- Another possible cooperation opportunity is to create some panels for the conferences that are enabling to disseminate the results. For the ESSHC (European Social Science History Conference) in March 2020 in Leiden, the Netherlands, three panels are prepared with RETOPEA researchers.