

ESF Exploratory Workshop on

**Visual Communication in  
Contemporary European Societies.  
Shaping Identities, Citizenship,  
Communities, Inclusion Strategies**

Forlì (italy), 1-4 April 2011

Convened by:  
**Ira Torresi**

---

**SCIENTIFIC REPORT**

---

## **1. Executive summary**

The workshop was held at the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies in Translation, Languages and Cultures (SITLeC) of the University of Bologna at Forlì over 4 days, two of which were devoted to participants' arrivals and departures. Participation numbered 16 people from 9 countries, plus 2 observers from the University of Bologna (Delia Chiaro, the head of the hosting department, and Valeria Carpené, a Research Assistance officer) and 1 "virtual" participant, Gill Valentine from the University of Leeds (UK), who could not participate in person but sent papers for group discussion as well as declaring her interest for future common research projects. Other 2 participants (Cristina Valdés from the University of Oviedo, Spain, and Anne Wagner from the Université du Littoral Côte d'Opale, France) could not make it at the last moment due to health and family issues, but stated their interest in perspective cooperation.

### Workshop objectives and overall conclusions:

The scientific objective of the workshop was to discuss the role of the visual in contemporary European societies by making the case for multimodality as inherent in human communication. A second objective was to establish an interdisciplinary platform for new synergies that may foster research where the visual dimension is central rather than marginal. Both aims were met. With reference to the first objective, in particular, although the workshop title focused on 'visual communication', the group's real object of analysis soon turned out to be more fittingly defined as 'multimodal' communication, encompassing all modes of non-verbal communication including the spatial as well as those forms of communication that entail other senses than sight. The framework of multimodality and multimodal analysis researched by Carey Jewitt and her colleagues at London's Institute of Education, as emerged from the various presentations delivered at the workshop, naturally accommodates discourses of intermodal/intersemiotic translation at the same time as it provides the basis to advocate for a system of communication and education that, relying on non-verbal as well as verbal elements, is truly inclusive and pursues equality of condition. With reference to the second objective, it is to be expected that the interpersonal and inter-institutional relations that emerged during the workshop will be kept up and constitute an informal network for the furthering of multimodality-based research. More formal opportunities for future cooperation that were discussed during the workshop are described under section 3 of this report.

### Workshop agenda:

The workshop was structured in 4 thematic plenary sessions plus 2 keynote speeches in which each participant had the opportunity to illustrate the kind of research s/he would like to share with the group on the issue of visual communication. In particular, the first session (following Prof. Carey Jewitt's speech on the multimodal basis of communication) was devoted to a multidisciplinary assessment of the reach and impact of visual media and products from the geographical, sociological and economic perspectives. The second session was about visual representations as carriers and shapers of identities. The third session, titled "From representation to participation: The case for visual media for all" ended the first day. The fourth session, "From participation to emancipation: Visual talking, visual knowing, visual being" opened the second day of the meeting and was followed by Prof. Géry d'Ydewalle's closing speech, which gave a psychological perspective on subtitling.

Each session was followed by discussion time; additional discussion time was allocated at the end of each day to highlight synergies between different strands of research. Additionally,

in the afternoon of April 3<sup>rd</sup>, a fifth session followed the more specifically research-oriented part of the workshop, during which opportunities for future joint research were presented by Valeria Carpené (with a substantial contribution by the ESF rapporteur, Dr. Balázs Kiss) and then discussed by the group.

Surroundings permitted additional informal interaction during the coffee breaks and communal meals as well as after dinner, since all of the participants were staying in Forlì for the duration of the workshop. This was particularly welcome as many of the attendees did not know each other prior to the workshop itself.

## **2. Scientific content of the event**

The workshop started with the welcome of the Head of the hosting department, **Delia Chiaro**, and with a brief yet detailed presentation by the ESF representative, Dr. **Balázs Kiss**, about ESF's role in promoting research and the opportunities it offers. The convenor, **Ira Torresi**, then proceeded to a few practicalities about how the workshop would be managed.

In the opening speech, **Carey Jewitt** presented an overview of multimodal approaches to research sketching the historical origins of this approach and the theoretical assumptions underpinning it. These include the need to understand language as one part of a complex ensemble of resource, the distinct roles that different modes have in communication, and the ways in which people orchestrate modes into multimodal ensembles. Drawing on a decade of research into teaching and learning Jewitt detailed how attention to gaze, gesture, posture, movement and the use of images, artefacts, and spatial arrangements contribute to learning environments and shape the construction of curriculum knowledge, pedagogic practices, and the processes of learning. In particular the presentation showed how the use of contemporary digital technologies was key in the reshaping of knowledge, and practices in the classroom. Jewitt made a case for multimodal research arguing that to focus on language alone in an increasingly visual and multimodal communicational landscape can result on significant aspects of meaning and identities being kept out of the analytical frame of research. After Jewitt's speech, all participants naturally shifted their terminology and perspective from a narrow focus on the visual to the more fitting and encompassing concept of multimodality.

After the coffee break, the group started the first session on the multidisciplinary assessment of the reach and impact of visual media by discussing two papers sent by **Gill Valentine**, who could not be present at the workshop but had agreed to cooperate on further research and wished to be involved in the project. Valentine has worked on Deaf geographies and how they are shaped by the use of the Internet. During the discussion, several issues were foregrounded: the (dis)embodiment of communication practices through digital tools, the focus on Deaf spaces vis-à-vis spaces that can be shared by the deaf and the hearing alike, the fact that Internet platforms are still largely verbal text-based (i.e., designed for people who do not have sign language as a native language).

The next paper was delivered by **Giselinde Kuipers**, who explored the circulation of (audio)visual culture from a sociological perspective. First, the presentation laid out three "circuits" of audiovisual exchange, organized around 1. geographical/cultural area; 2. medium and mode of distribution; 3. cultural form and genre. Each of these "circuits" has its

own logic, and sets its own boundaries. Using data from a research project on the international spread and reception of American television in four European countries, Kuipers specifically focused on the role of visual elements in problems and failures encountered in the course of exchange and circulation of cultural goods.

**Giuseppe Nocella** then talked about the market for (audio)visual media from an economic perspective, illustrating the film industry value chain and the factors influencing the demand and the supply of audiovisual products. He pointed to the risk of market failure, since guidelines are currently missing; the EU might be an important standard setter in this regard. EU policy in the field of audiovisuals may be implemented in four ways: through a regulatory framework that aims at creating an effective single European market for audiovisual media at the same time as it protects children (e.g. who use the Internet) and European film heritage; through funding programmes (e.g. MEDIA); through other measures – e.g. promoting online distribution of content and media pluralism; and through action outside the EU – especially defending European cultural interests in the WTO.

After a quick Q&A session and lunch, **Adrian Fuentes Luque** talked about tourism promotion websites and the representation of national identities. Providing several examples from different websites promoting Spain, or parts of it, as a tourist destination, Fuentes Luque argued that websites are a very powerful resource for destination promotion. Market-oriented design and the translation/adaptation of such websites, including appropriate use of stereotypes, culture and user expectations, is paramount to achieve successful results, especially in the case of countries where tourism is a strong source of income. The presentation pointed to the importance of multimodality related to the presence and use of stereotypes and cultural references in the fields of tourism, promotion, internationalisation and audiovisual productions.

The next paper on the same session was delivered by **Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli**. It dealt with the illustration of a research project about the image of womanhood in contemporary films. A recent Canadian film, *Incendies* (Scorched), directed by Denis Villeneuve, 2010, was discussed as a pilot study, because, it was argued, it lends itself to a fruitful analysis of the perception of traditional female roles, myths, and deeply rooted prejudices. The theoretical premise was that, since cinema is “an apparatus of social representation,” it no doubt also produces “effects of meaning and perception, self-image and subject positions” that contribute to form and/or consolidate the conceptualization of femininity in contemporary society (De Lauretis, 1984: 37). The paper demonstrated how the mythical dimension into which the heroine is projected was elaborated in such a way as to re-enforce the image of *mater dolorosa*, sacrificial victim, and only possible means of redemption, while representing the persistence of the duality between woman as a whore and woman as a Madonna (as man perceives her).

The session on visual representations as carriers and shapers of identities was closed by **Ira Torresi**'s presentation. Her paper focused on the concept of the ‘woman-judge’ as it emerges from print advertising targeting men. Drawing on examples taken from a one-year collection of several men’s magazines published in 2005 in Italy, the US and the UK, Torresi illustrated how in several of them the female presence is presented as a judge of male handsomeness and ‘appropriateness’ in general – a concept that, in the American corpus, extends to the sexual sphere. This trend, however, cannot be taken to be a reversal of the ‘male gaze’ (Mulvern 1975) because the woman-judge is fictional and only exists in

advertising aimed at men, which actually reinforces the passive role of the female presence vis-à-vis the male perspective on the world (and oneself, as in this case).

After a general discussion the third session, entitled “From representation to participation: The case for visual media for all”, was started by **Rachele Antonini**, who presented an overview of how subtitling for the deaf and the hard of hearing is used on Italian television with particular reference to national channels (RAI and Mediaset) as well as in pilot projects in theatres and cinemas. The presentation also focused on the state of the art of research in this specific area of audiovisual translation and advocated for increased attention to the methodology of data collection and analysis.

In the following paper, **Elena Di Giovanni** focused on a new research path aiming at enhancing the provision of accessibility services for the sensory impaired. In particular, a study combining eye tracking research and its application to the drafting of audio description for films was presented, as well as a set of tests with the end users (blind individuals), which confirmed the validity of this line of research. Further developments have also been envisaged, all reinforcing the value and need for increasing multidisciplinary approaches.

In her paper on written materials in museums, **Alcina Cortez** talked about inclusive communication strategies as a way to add cultural capital to individuals, leading to the promotion of citizenship and cosmopolitan identities. Cortez pointed out that in order to be inclusive one has to acknowledge that every communication act falls into a shape – genre – that arises from social knowledge. Focusing on the case of museum exhibitions as a narrative representation system, Cortez advocated for exhibition texts that can lead visitors to ‘seeing’ what each exhibition is meant to exhibit and illustrated the notion of genre as a set of guidelines that govern textual production. In this perspective, genre is a valuable tool to step into the different phases of text design with the ultimate aim of guaranteeing textual competence, i.e., text accessibility.

The next paper, delivered by **Josélia Neves**, started with an illustration of the current perception of art museums, which are still largely seen as places for passive perception, not to be interacted with except through gaze. In this perspective, the blind are obviously totally impaired when they enter a ‘traditional’ art museum, but other groups of visitors, too (e.g., younger users) find this kind of non-interactive museum unappealing and distant. In order to find newer ways to make the museum more accessible for all users Neves, together with a Portuguese painter, has developed an experimental multi-sensory exhibition design, which encompasses visual art (painting), audiodescriptions, audioguides, ‘soundpainting’ (audiodescription with sound effects, subliminary information, music to simulate the feelings produced by art), verbal texts and tactile replicas.

**Riccardo Fusaroli**'s presentation dealt with the visual aspects of websites' structures and communication strategies and their consequences for blind web users. Blind Internet users typically access the web either through a braille reader that recreates a Braille line out of written text, or through an audio reading that reads out the written text as well as the page structure in programming language (e.g., html). The latter mode of accessibility was explored in depth, presenting the case study of Europa.eu with a focus on both informative and emotional aspects of blind browsing.

The ensuing general discussion of the session and of the first day of the workshop focused on the richness of multimodality and its inevitable impoverishment when 'accessibility' is meant as taking away one of the modes of communication without replacing it. For instance, it was pointed out that audio readings of websites often sound unnatural and are seldom enjoyable, because they either sound mechanical or are read by only one, sometimes little expressive, voice (with the exception of few websites aimed at children, which do employ different readers for different information units). Similarly, audiodescriptions of audiovisual materials ignore camera movements and scene cuts, perhaps fearing that blind users might find them 'distracting' (and, as Elena Di Giovanni reported, according to British guidelines technical terminology such as 'pan', 'angle' etc. should be avoided). On the other hand, in J.B. Conama's experience, hearing persons do find multimodality distracting when it comes to subtitles. Ideas and keywords were then collected to serve as a focus for the end-of-workshop discussion on Day 2; the list was then printed out and distributed to participants.

Following the discussion, the convenor closed the first day of the workshop and informal discussion continued over dinner.

The second day of the workshop opened with the session titled "From participation to emancipation: Visual talking, visual knowing, visual being". The first paper on the session was given by **Graham Turner**, who illustrated the role of sign language in granting the Deaf access to communication as well as citizenship. Although in several parts of the world signed languages are now recognised as full linguistic systems, there still remain substantial obstacles to a full acknowledgement of Deaf persons' citizenship rights. Institutional audism, in particular, is taken deeply for granted and being able to hear and speak is usually thought to be 'the norm', e.g. in establishing safety standards (sound alarms) or emergency services (largely accessible only through emergency phone lines). A change in this respect, Turner argued, might be brought about by institutional realization that sign languages provide a richer multimodality than verbal, aural-based languages.

The paper by **Ernst D. Thoutenhoofd** on ocularcentring techniques in (e-)education pointed to the contemporary emergence of a new scopic regime that is driven by a combination of research technologies such as data-visualisers and monitoring systems, social software, and a general drift towards self-regulation in (lifelong) learning. With this sociotechnical symbiosis of monitoring technologies and personal responsibility for public self-management arises urgent need to research issues of power, equality, and democratic rights that are encompassed in lifelong learning and collective enrolment in monitoring technologies. The various ways and means by which individuals actively learn to self-regulate and self-monitor effective social participation were also taken into consideration, with the particular claim that being present in real, virtual and imagined spaces is a sociotechnical achievement, drawing on forms of learning that are badly understood.

The following presentation, delivered by **Sonja Erlenkamp**, explored the impact of visuality on three different modalities of communication: signed language, spoken language, and tactile language. Specific foci were how our experience of visual information is mirrored in spoken, signed and tactile communication; how iconicity – for example as part of gestures – is represented in the three modalities of communication taken into consideration; and how we can explain the cognitive dimension of creating virtual objects in visual communication as a means of constructing meaning.

The session closed with the paper by **John Bosco Conama**, which set out by remarking how the legal recognition of signed languages is often administered under the framework of the disability policy. One of the major consequences of placing signed languages under the disability umbrella is that it undermines the importance of the language and culture of Deaf people because signed languages are treated as a compensatory tool. Conama proposed that an equality of condition framework (rather than a liberal-egalitarian perspective or one focusing on basic equality) should be adopted to ensure substantial equality for Deaf people.

The post-session discussion focused mainly on the role of institutions and the law in the setup of civil rights, and consequently in changing the public discourse and opinion on diversity. The following discussion and recap for sessions 1-4 revolved around ideas and keywords that had been collected by the convenor at the end of Day 1. The emotional affordances of multimodality, intersemiotic (or inter-modal) translation, the embodiment of communication practices, equality of condition, and reception vs. perception emerged as main topics of interest.

After lunch **Géry d'Ydewalle** delivered the closing speech. D'Ydewalle reported on a groundbreaking project on the perception of translated subtitles and their impact on language acquisition, carried out in Belgium in the 1980s. When watching subtitled movies, one has three partially overlapping sources of information available: the image, the soundtrack in a language one does not understand (or understands only in part), and the subtitle in one's native language. The experimental design was aimed at investigating whether one of such modes had prevalence over the others, e.g. if subtitles were ignored if one understood the language of the soundtrack, or if the soundtrack was ignored if one did not understand the original language. Several combinations of subtitle duration (2, 4 or 6 seconds) were tested on viewers proficient in both languages or only in one, who were exposed to movies having both subtitles and soundtrack or only subtitles; eye position was measured every 20 milliseconds using an eye-tracker. The main result was that with 6-second subtitles the separate groups of viewers (exposed to subtitles only or to subtitles and soundtrack, proficient or non-proficient in the original language) did not show any significant difference in terms of duration of eye fixation on the subtitle area, meaning that subtitles are looked at even when the viewer would not need them for language comprehension, while with faster presentations subjects knowing the language no longer read the subtitles as extensively. The same result was obtained in a separate experiment with grade 4 and 6 schoolchildren, while 2<sup>nd</sup>-graders were shown to spend less time looking at subtitles when watching subtitled cartoons. Further experiments were conducted on Deaf vs. Hearing subjects (Deaf persons showing a preference for subtitles), adults of different age groups including elderly people (no significant difference), and different genres of audiovisual material (viewers tended to fixate more on subtitles in captioned news rather than captioned movies).

After the Q&A session for the closing speech, **Valeria Carpené** from the ARIC (research assistance) office of the University of Bologna presented the research funding instruments currently available at European level. Dr. Balázs Kiss integrated the presentation with information about the COST programme and advice on how to further collaborative research among the participants. The group discussed at length the potential of several instruments, focusing in particular on COST and 7<sup>th</sup> Framework programmes (see section 3 below). After practical agreements on the management of the post-workshop stage, the workshop was officially closed, while discussion on possibilities for collaborative research was resumed around the dinner table.

### **3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcome**

A first result of the workshop was the (re)statement of multimodality as a vital part of communication, participation and equality of condition. Multimodality cannot be ignored if one wishes to analyse classroom practice and interaction (Carey Jewitt), representations of gender or national identities (Bollettieri Bosinelli, Fuentes-Luque, Torresi), and language at large (Sonja Elenkamp). Similarly, it is to be expected that a shift away from ocularcentrism/audism and towards broader multimodality in education, language policy and the media would ensure better equality of condition for all citizens, regardless of their ability and background (Rachele Antonini, Elena Di Giovanni, Josélia Nives, Ernst Thoutenhoofd, Graham Turner, John Bosco Conama).

A second result was the acknowledgement of the multidisciplinary nature of the discourse on multimodality: one may look at specific means of multimodal communication as shapers of landscapes and spaces in the geographical sense (Gill Valentine), fields as defined in sociological terms (Giselinde Kuipers) or economic markets (Giuseppe Nocella). Or one can look at the semiotics of multimodal technologies (Riccardo Fusaroli), at the text-object relations in multimodal spaces such as the museum (Alcina Cortéz), or at the psychological aspects of using a multimodal product such as a subtitled film (Géry d'Ydewalle). Multimodal studies, visual semiotics, intersemiotic translation were all recurrently referred to as other theoretical backdrops against which the analysis of multimodal interaction can be set. This brings us to the third result of the workshop, which naturally stems from the previous two – i.e., the sharing and comparison of different theoretical frameworks and research methods that can be employed in the analysis of multimodality in communication.

As to what concerns more practical outcomes, after discussion inspired by the ESF rapporteur, Dr. Balázs Kiss, and Valeria Carpené from the Research assistance office of the University of Bologna, the group focused on two separate instruments that may provide the opportunity for joint activities. First, the group agreed to apply for a COST action, which would allow further networking and would strengthen the interdisciplinary, interinstitutional and interpersonal ties that were set up by the workshop. Second, an application for the 2011 FP7 call coming out in July 2011 will be seriously considered, in the hope that the kind of research pursued by the group fits one or more of the topics or challenges defined by the call. For both applications, the group agreed that other partners, particularly from Eastern Europe, should be involved to ensure that more diverse geographical as well as cultural areas are represented. The three members of the team who were unable to participate but declared their interest in future cooperation – Gill Valentine, Anne Wagner and Cristina Valdés, see section 5 below – will also be involved in decisions and discussions about applications and any informal initiatives aimed at further cooperation.



## 4. Final programme

### Friday 1 April 2011

Afternoon *Arrival*

20.00 Dinner at restaurant "Bella Romagna", at Hotel della Città

### Saturday 2 April 2011

09.30-09.40 **Welcome by the Head of the Hosting Department**  
**Delia Chiaro** (SITLeC, University of Bologna at Forlì, Italy)

09.40-10.00 **Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)**  
**Balázs Kiss** (ESF Standing Committee for Social Sciences (SCSS))

10.00-10.20 **Housekeeping: introduction of participants, workshop objectives and plan, administrative paperwork**  
**Ira Torresi** (SITLeC, University of Bologna at Forlì, Italy)

**10.20-10.50** **Introductory speech**

**Making the case for a visual/multimodal basis to communication**  
**Carey Jewitt** (London Knowledge Lab, IoE, London, UK)

10.50-11.05 *Coffee Break*

**11.05-12.30** **Session 1: A multidisciplinary assessment of the reach and impact of visual media**

11.05-11.25 **"The role of the Internet in shaping Deaf geographies" (*discussion of two papers sent by the author*)**

**Gill Valentine** (School of Geography, University of Leeds, UK)

11.25-11.45 **"The sociology of (audio)visual fields"**

**Giselinde Kuipers** (Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands)

11.45-12.05 **"The economics and marketing of audiovisual products"**

**Giuseppe Nocella** (School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading, UK)

12.05-12.30 **Session discussion: Q&A, exploring synergies**

12.30-14.40 *Lunch*

**14.40-16.10** **Session 2: Visual representations as carriers and shapers of identities**

14.40-15.00 **"Tourist promotion websites and the representation of national identities"**

**Adrián Fuentes Luque** (Departamento de Filología y Traducción, Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Sevilla, Spain)

15.00-15.20 **"Gender representations in contemporary films"**

**Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli** (SITLeC, University of Bologna at Forlì, Italy)

- 15.20-15.40 **"The representation of gender identities in print advertising and its normative dimension: a comparative study"**  
**Ira Torresi** (SITLeC, University of Bologna at Forlì, Italy)
- 15.40-16.10 **Session discussion: Q&A, exploring synergies**
- 16.10-16.35 *Coffee break*
- 16.35-18.45 Session 3: From representation to participation: The case for visual media for all**
- 16.35-16.55 **"Translating the aural into the visual: sub/surtitling of audiovisuals and live shows for the deaf and the hard of hearing"**  
**Rachele Antonini** (SITLeC, University of Bologna at Forlì, Italy)
- 16.55-17.15 **"Translating the visual for the blind: audio description research and practice"**  
**Elena Di Giovanni** (Dip.to di ricerca linguistica, letteraria e filologica, University of Macerata, Italy)
- 17.15-17.35 **"When text leads to seeing: written materials in museums"**  
**Alcina Cortez** (Centro de História da Sociedade e da Cultura, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal)
- 17.35-17.55 **"Museums for all: translating exhibitions for visitors with sensory impairment"**  
**Josélia Neves** (Escola Superior de Educação, Instituto Politécnico de Leiria, Portugal)
- 17.55-18.15 **"Navigating by sight? Internet accessibility for the blind"**  
**Riccardo Fusaroli** (Center for Semiotics, Århus university, Denmark)
- 18.15-18.45 **Session discussion: Q&A, exploring synergies**
- 18.45-19.15 **Day 1 recap: identifying key areas for collaboration and future research**
- 19.30 *Dinner*

## Sunday 3 April 2011

- 09.40-12.25 Session 4: From participation to emancipation: Visual talking, visual knowing, visual being**
- 09.40-10.00 **"Shaping signed citizenship: models and modes of understanding"**  
**Graham H. Turner** (School of Management and Languages, Heriot-Watt University, Edimburgh, UK)
- 10.00-10.20 **"Ocularcentring techniques in (e-)education"**  
**Ernst Thoutenhoofd** (Orthopedagogy Department, Fac. of Behavioural and Soc. Sciences, University of Groningen, the Netherlands)
- 10.20-10.40 **"The use and importance of visual based iconicity in three different communication modes: spoken Norwegian, Norwegian Sign Language and Tactile Norwegian Sign Language"**  
**Sonja Erlenkamp** (Dept. of Teacher & Interpreter Education, University College of Sør-Trøndelag, Trondheim, Norway)

10.40-11.20	<b>“From participation to emancipation: Equality of condition as a solution for signed language communities?”</b> <b>John Bosco Conama</b> (Centre for Deaf Studies, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland)
11.20-11.35	<i>Coffee Break</i>
11.35-12.05	<b>Session discussion: Q&amp;A, exploring synergies</b>
12.05-13.00	<b>Recap and conclusions of sessions 1-4: (a) new synergies for the study of the visual mode and (b) establishing common ground for future research</b>
13.00-14.30	<i>Lunch</i>
<b>14.30-15.00</b>	<b>Closing speech</b>  “Film scene perception, subtitling and language acquisition: a psychological view” <b>Géry d’Ydewalle</b> (Royal Academy of Science, Brussels, Belgium)
<b>15.00-18.00</b>	<b>Session 5: Opportunities for further cooperation</b>
15.00-16.00	“Presentation of FP7 perspectives and other possible European research programmes” <b>Valeria Carpené</b> (ARIC–research assistance office, University of Bologna, Italy)
16.30-17.00	<b>Discussion, decision and planning of future research and applications</b>
17.00-17.15	<i>Coffee Break</i>
17.15-18.00	<b>Exploring agendas for future cooperation</b>
19.30	<i>Dinner</i>

## Monday 4 April 2011

Morning/afternoon *Departure*

### 5. Final list of participants

#### ESF Representative:

**Balázs KISS**, Institute for Political Sciences, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

#### Convenor:

**1. Ira TORRESI**, Dept. of Interdisciplinary Studies in Translation, Languages and Cultures (SITLeC), University of Bologna (Italy)

#### Participants:

**2. Rachele ANTONINI**, Dept. of Interdisciplinary Studies in Translation, Languages and Cultures (SITLeC), University of Bologna (Italy)

**3. Rosa Maria BOLLETTIERI BOSINELLI**, Dept. of Interdisciplinary Studies in Translation, Languages and Cultures (SITLeC), University of Bologna (Italy)

**4. John Bosco CONAMA**, Centre for Deaf Studies, School of Linguistic, Speech and Communication Sciences, Trinity College, Dublin (Ireland)

5. **Alcina CORTEZ**, Centro de História da Sociedade e da Cultura, Universidade de Coimbra (Portugal)
6. **Elena DI GIOVANNI**, Dip.to di ricerca linguistica, letteraria e filologica, University of Macerata (Italy)
7. **Sonja ERLenkAMP**, Dept. of teacher & interpreter education, University College of Sør-Trøndelag, Trondheim (Norway)
8. **Adrián FUENTES LUQUE**, Departamento de Filología y Traducción, Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Sevilla (Spain)
9. **Riccardo FUSAROLI**, Center for Semiotics, Aarhus University (Denmark)
10. **Carey JEWITT**, London Knowledge Lab, IoE, University of London (UK)
11. **Giselinde KUIPERS**, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Amsterdam (The Netherlands)
12. **Giuseppe NOCELLA**, School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading (UK)
13. **Géry VAN OUTRYVE D'YDEWALLE**, Royal Academy of Sciences, Brussels (Belgium)
14. **Josélia Maria DOS SANTOS JOSE NEVES**, Escola Superior de Educação, Instituto Politécnico de Leiria (Portugal)
15. **Ernst THOUTENHOOFD**, Orthopedagogy Department, Fac. of Behavioural and Soc. Sciences, University of Groningen (The Netherlands)
16. **Graham H. TURNER**, School of Management and Languages, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh (UK)

**Observers:**

17. **Delia CHIARO**, Head of the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies in Translation, Languages and Culture (SITLeC), University of Bologna (Italy)
18. **Valeria CARPENÉ**, ARIC — Unità professionale Scienze umane, University of Bologna (Italy)

**Unable to attend but providing presentation and participating in further discussions:**

**Gill VALENTINE**, School of Geography, University of Leeds (UK)

**Unable to attend but participating in further discussions:**

**Cristina VALDÉS**, Departamento de Filología Anglogermánica y Francesa, Facultad de Filología, Universidad de Oviedo (Spain)  
**Anne WAGNER**, Laboratoire de Recherche et d'Analyse Juridique (LARJ), Université du Littoral Côte d'Opale (France)

## 6. Statistical information on participants

All information provided in this section is referred to the 16 participants who were physically present at the workshop. The ESF rapporteur, the observers, and the three persons who were unable to attend are not included in the calculations.

Age bracket: Participants were aged from 29 to 70, with an average age of 45.

Countries of origin:

Italy (4) – 25%	UK (3) – 18.75%
Portugal (2) – 12.5%	The Netherlands (2) – 12.5%
Belgium (1) – 6.25%	Denmark (1) – 6.25%
Ireland (1) – 6.25%	Norway (1) – 6.25%
Spain (1) – 6.25%	

Gender:

Over a total of 16 participants, 7 (43.75%) were male and 9 (56.25%) were female.