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The national and European dissemination activities

All nine IME research teams engaged with national dissemination activities with a variety of audience. Major events are listed below:

**Bulgaria**

**Title of the event:** Is There a European Identity in Bulgaria? – a public debate  
**Date:** 5 April 2012  
**Venue:** Pesha Nikolova hall, The Red House Centre for Culture and Debate

The Red House Centre for Culture and Debate organises and presents socio-political, artistic, cultural as well as socially engaged and educational programmes. The public debates, lectures and presentations of socio-political analyses focus the attention on important political, social and cultural issues. As a part of its political and social programmes, The Red House organises public lectures of prominent intellectuals on topics which concern society in general. The lectures are published in newspapers and magazines or in in-house publications.

The information of the event was featured in several media (Bulgarian Indymedia; Events; News.den.bg), while the event itself was attended by 4 media representatives (168 Hours, Kultura, Deutsche Welle, and Osservatorio Balcani e Caucaso).


Croatia

Title of the event: Jean Monnet seminar ‘Methodology of the EU Law’
Date: 4 February 2012
Venue Villa Antonio, Opatija, Croatia

Dissemination activity was organized inside a Jean Monnet seminar ‘Methodology of the EU Law’ held on 4th February 2012 in Opatija, County of Rijeka, Croatia. The seminar was held in the Inter-University centre in Villa Antonio.

Due to the fact most participants were from the field of legal studies, only results on Bologna reform of higher education were presented. Bologna reform is also a highly contested issue on the national level and therefore it was reasonable to disseminate this issue since it can encourage a debate.

Finland

Title of the event: Greece, Finland and the future of European higher education
Date: 5 March 2012
Venue: University of Helsinki

The Finnish IME- team focused on finding a mode of dissemination that would highlight both the long term development, but especially the recent changes in the public Finnish discourse on EU, Europe, and particularly Greece. Organizing a seminar directed at people with e.g. Bologna expertise and know-how on Europe and EU (both academic and others) with two of the partner teams presenting key finding from IME was therefore understood to be a fruitful way of carrying out the task. Listening to the loud voices on the internet but also to Finnish politicians and mainstream media needed somehow to be put in place or at least be met with detailed and critical discussion. A half day seminar on what constitutes Greece and Finland in an education context was thereby organized.

France

Title of the event: IME dissemination event
Date: 26 January 2012
Venue: Sciences Po

This event was meant to present the main results of the survey to the French ordinary citizens who had been interviewed during the fieldwork.

The event was successful. The number of attendees (18 persons) was quite optimal for the discussion. The few encountered difficulties were intrinsic to the collective discussion and seem therefore hard to avoid: as in every discussion within a group, a few people tend to take an affirmative stand and display a leadership behavior which may inhibit other participants. Contrary to what happens in a genuine focus group, it is more difficult for the moderators of the debate (here, the researchers) to intervene actively in the discussion so that the opportunity to speak would be shared in a fairest way. However, most of the participants seemed to appreciate the opportunity to
know more about a survey to which they had generally devoted a couple of hours of their spare time (most of the interviews had been conducted in an intensive way, and lasted from 1 to 3 hours). At least 3 persons came from Nice and Montpellier (hundreds of kilometers from Paris), which shows the interest displayed by people for hearing about what has been done with the opinions they expressed. Besides the interest for the academic and political interest of the event, it should be noticed that the prestige of the setting (Sciences Po, Paris), the opportunity to come with their partner and have a chat over a drink played a considerable part in the success of the event.

**Germany**
**Title of the event: ‘Interkultur’ in Theory and Practice**
**Date: 24-25 April 2012**
**Venue: The Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities (KWI) in Essen**

The conference was announced in the local press and a national radio broadcast of the ‘Deutschlandfunk’ (the total length of the broadcast was 25 minutes) and addressed the broad public as well as the scientific community and political and civil actors, which were also invited to the conference. As you can see from the program, the conference was designed in a way that made it possible to discuss the results of the IME study in a broad political and social context. In order to achieve this goal it was hosted in cooperation with the research group ‘Interkultur’ of the Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities. Within the conference the political implications of the problems of multicultural - national as well as European - societies, which had been elucidated by the German IME-Study, were discussed in the light of new theoretical concepts like ‘inter-culture’. This concept of inter-culture seems to cover the study’s results in conflict-laden bargaining of ethnically and socially connoted conflicts between minorities and majorities as well as the problem of integration of migrants much better than the concept of “multiculturalism” that has been used previously when presenting IME-results. Since the term “inter-culture” covers the problems of the progressing pluralization of societies more adequately than other concepts, the conference aimed to develop it further in order to establish it as centerpiece of a new theory of cultural reciprocity in multicultural societies.

**Greece**
**Title of the event: ‘Greece in Europe: between tradition and modernity?’**
**Date: 13 April 2011**
**Venue: ELIAMEP**

On Wednesday 13 April 2011 Hara Kouki gave a research seminar at ELIAMEP, Athens, entitled ‘Greece in Europe: between tradition and modernity?’ She presented the rationale of IME project and the research findings that had up to this point emerged from the fieldwork conducted in Greece by ELIAMEP team as related with civil society actors and lay people in the country forming European and national identity. More specifically, Hara shortly presented the theoretical background and methodological framework to move on to the main research questions and the way these are tackled in the case of Greece. Contradictions, research hypotheses and main concluding remarks were presented in the form of questions and subsequently discussed with the researchers attending the seminar.
Departing from IME axes of research, the discussion among ELIAMEP researchers and other visitors, however, soon shifted towards the particularities of the Greek case and whether these actually build up a distinct case within the EU or reflect a whole world of complexities coming up and touching upon a variety of other countries.

**Title of the event:** The Greek economic and political crisis and what it means for Europe  
**Date:** 19 April 2012  
**Venue:** Stanford University, California, USA

On April 19th, 2012 Ruby Gropas gave a Research Seminar at Stanford University in California, USA on The Greek Economic and Political Crisis: What it Means for Europe. The Research Seminar was co-hosted by the Center on Democracy, Development and the Rule of Law and the Europe Center at Stanford’s Freeman Spogli Institute.

In this seminar she discussed the ongoing Greek economic and political crisis, and what it means for the future of the European Union and monetary system. The following questions were explored: Is the crisis in Greece ‘internal’ or is it symptomatic of a wider European failure? Is the Greek crisis the result of failed modernity, or rather a precursor of things to come? Why has Greece become so important and why has it dominated global politics and world news for the past two years? Are its malignancies purely domestic or are they representative of a wider malaise within Europe and possibly beyond? The collapse and orderly default of a eurozone country at the heart of the Western financial system arguably marks the end of an era. It has brought with it the deepest social and political crisis that modern Greece has faced since the restoration of democracy and it has also led to Europe’s deepest existential crisis. With the EU struggling to effectively managing the eurozone crisis and the burst of recent movements opposing neo-liberal orthodoxy and the “Occupy” movements – what does this mean for Europe? What does it mean for modernity and the ‘modernity paradigm’ as it has been presented through the European Union?

For more, see:  
http://fsi.stanford.edu/events/the_greek_economic_and_political_crisis__what_it_means_for_europe/

Hungary

**Title of the event:** Dissemination Event for Civil Organizations  
**Date:** 20 March 2012  
**Venue:** Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary

The dissemination event was organized with the goal to present our broader findings to as wide a range of civil organizations working on educational policies as possible (list of the invited 46 organizations is attached). Because of the wide range of NGO-s we expected to attend we designed presentations that incorporated most topics we conducted research on, from history education to multiculturalism and from religion to liberalization/globalization in education. Although we invited most of these organizations in person, over phone and email, and most of them indicated their interest in the event, on the day of the meeting unfortunately only representatives of six organizations came. Some of the organizations later apologized for not attending; the reasons they
gave for their absence were mainly related to the huge difficulties they face because of the changing and worsening financial environment and the resulting lack of personnel. However, those present were highly engaged in the discussions following our presentations, and were interested in a wide range of topics, both on educational issues from our Hungarian findings, and the broader results of the IME research on Europe, modernity, religion, globalization in the other participant countries.

**Title of the event: Dissemination Event for Academics**
**Date:** 17 April 2012
**Venue:** ELTE University, Department of Sociology, Budapest, Hungary

This dissemination event was organized with the goal to present our findings to advanced university students who have already some background in social sciences and identity studies, on the one hand, to get them interested in this type of research, on the other hand, to help them interpret and apply/use findings of such research. In social sciences in Hungary there is a marked imbalance towards quantitative studying of identity processes and thus it is only very little research and knowledge of qualitative research methods that could help in carrying out a wider set of research on identity construction programs. Since these MA students will get employment as researchers, academics, and policy makers in civil and government organizations, we thought that this type of dissemination of our findings would have the widest possible impact on Hungarian decision making.

**Turkey**

**Title of the event: National Dissemination Event Directed Towards Academics and Media**
**Date:** 22 February 2012
**Venue:** Istanbul Bilgi University

The event was held in Turkish and attendees were: Ali Çarkoğlu, Aslı Aydın, Ayhan Kaya, Ayşe Kadioğlu, Bianca Kaiser, Cem Başlevent, Erhan Doğan, Gülperi Vural, Kadri Gürsel, Kenan Çayır, Meyda Yegenoğlu, Müge Ayan, Özge Genç, Refika Saldere, Senem Aydın Düzgit, Tunga Yılmaz, Zümray Kutlu (Annex B). Academic group meeting held on 22 February 2012 was very successful in the sense that it was very well attended, and it has provided the researchers with a very good feedback. The scholars concentrated on the ways in which cultural diplomacy is recently being designed by the state actors through the Yunus Emre Cultural Centres. Culturalist and civilizationist rhetoric of the Centres was also emphasized by the participants. The other issue which took a great attention is the Europeanization of Turkish higher education (Bologna Process). The participants also expressed their concerns about the rise of EU scepticism, which is partly reproduced by the ruling government due to their assumption that EU no longer politically pays off. Finally, the participants also embraced the fact that the research was very timely,

**The UK**

**Title of the event: Social cohesion and ‘Europe’**
**Date:** 22 Wednesday 2012
**Venue:** Kingston University, UK
The event was organised to discuss one of the major findings from the UK case study, the issue of social cohesion. The aim of the event was to introduce one of the UK briefings of findings on the issue of social cohesion to members of public as well as to inform them of the IME consortium’s work. In order to facilitate the discussion, Brendan Donnelly, Director of the Federal Trust, a think tank, was invited to act as a discussant. The invitation to the event was sent to a large number of organisations including the Kingston branch of major political parties, civil society organisations working on the issues related to social cohesion, trade unions, student organisations and media organisations. Those who were interviewed during the fieldwork stage were invited as well as local councillors, local MPs and London MEPs. The invitation was extended to staff and students of Kingston University.

The discussion was more focused on the British perception of Europe than on social cohesion, the two topics the British briefings took up. This was partly encouraged by the discussant but also indicative of how ‘Europe’ is dealt with in public debate in the UK – it often revolves around the question of how to make the British voters interested in Europe. The participants appeared to find the discussion engaging and stimulating, with some feedback such as ‘a very good opportunity to discuss Britain and Europe’, ‘British are simply not interested in Europe’ was given. A few participants stayed beyond the end of the event and continued to debate various issues. In this sense, the event succeeded in engaging with the wider public.

**European dissemination event**

**Title of the event:** Who needs European identities today?

**Date:** 29 February 2012  
**Venue:** European Commission Representation in Belgium, Brussels, Belgium

The ‘Who needs European identity today?’ targeted policy makers at the European level as well as the research community. The event aimed to disseminate major findings from IME research and to engage with discussions with stakeholders at the European level. Originally three themes were planned to be presented: the place of religion in education, cultural diplomacy and national/European identities and methodological issues in researching European identities, but the last theme was dropped in order to make the event less academic and more policy issues focused and David Pollock, President of the European Humanist Federation, was recruited to facilitate a more policy-focused discussion.

**The IME Final Conference**

**Date:** 28 March 2012  
**Venue:** Hotel Antoinette, Kingston, UK

At the sixth project meeting (June 2011, Helsinki), the consortium decided to hold a more policy-focused European dissemination event and a more academic final conference to showcase IME’s comparative work. The aim of the final conference was therefore to present IME’s comparative work to a wider audience and to stimulate exchange of ideas among researchers working on European identities. The programme was therefore designed to preset six thematic comparative reports from Work Package 9 and two FP7 projects, ENRI-EAST (represented by Dr Lyudmila Nurse,
Oxford XXI) and Religare (represented by Dr Prakash Shah, Queen Mary University of London), were invited to join.

In order to make IME’s comparative work more relevant to a wider audience including civil society actors and politicians, conscious efforts were made to recruit civil society actors as discussants. Simon Barrow, Ekklesia, a think tank working on the relationship between religion and society and Hugo Brady (replaced by Edward Burke on the day) from the Centre for European Reform agreed to participate, and Joan-Anton Carbonell from the International Office, Kingston University, also joined to add practitioners’ views.

The event was widely publicised using the mailing lists complied by Partner 1 for previous dissemination activities and more academic mailing lists. The consortium members as well as discussants also publicised the event using their contacts. Simon Barrow’s Ekklesia let its followers know of the event via Ekklesia’s web site, for instance: http://www.ekklesia.co.uk/node/16470. Several interested parties who could not attend the conference got in touch with Atsuko Ichijo asking for the copies of the papers. Sarah Ludford MEP and Councillor Penny Shelton (Kingston Council) in particular sent personal apologies for not being able to come and to express their support for the event.

At the conference, copies of the compilation of national briefings as well as the Commission’s publication ‘Pluralism and religious diversity, social cohesion and integration in Europe: Insights from European research’ were made available to the participants, thus increasing the visibility of the project.