

WP1 Questionnaire Methodology

1. The first phase – Collaboratively Composed Questionnaire

a) aim and urgency of the questionnaire

The questionnaire is a research tool proposed and developed by WP1. Its main purpose is to analyse and develop cross-disciplinary communication and collaborative research methods within TRACES, for establishing profound reciprocal relations within the CCP teams and between them and the various stakeholders, as well as for future similar research and artistic production collaborations focusing on contentious heritage.

b) how - a short description of the questionnaire methodology

- the questionnaire is imagined as a tool which aims to link the specific research concepts, contents and questions developed by the different cross-disciplinary partners and teams (issues with re-defining the subject of research, research questions, etc. if different from other research projects).
- the questionnaire is imagined as a result of continuous discussions about different issues faced by the CCPs in the process of their work on contentious heritage, research, art production and curating the exhibitions presenting contentious heritage
- the cross-disciplinary and multi-directional discussions leading to the collaborative composing of a questionnaire are supposed to help the members of the teams to share the knowledge and ethical concerns raised throughout the project that could enable future similar collaborations to avoid some issues and anticipate eventual misunderstandings.

c) events – events related to the questionnaire

- 2 visits of WP1 to each CCPs
- first visit, during the process of composing of the questionnaire
- second visit- during the exhibitions or other events of the CCPs
- workshop during the mid-term meeting
- while CCPs present their methodology, research plans, and results, WP1 facilitates self-reflexive discussions that feed the questionnaire in processual and collaborative ways.

d) when-deadlines

- the final deadline for the questionnaire (22th month for the CCPs for formulating their specific questions in collaboration with WP1, 24th month is the deadline for the WP1 deliverable and report)
- timeline/pace of communication (skype or Basecamp-quarterly-this means 3 meetings/formal communications a year, but for us it could be more if not everybody can join each time)

The questions formulated through discussions will address various topics, e.g.:

1. Access
 - access to the research material (issues with locating various textual and visual materials and objects)
 - ownership, restitution
 - copy-rights for using data or images, etc.,
2. Collaborative working methods
 - specific approach and collaboration formats
 - interdisciplinary relations between researchers from different professional backgrounds (artists, ethnographers, anthropologists, curators)
 - triangular relations between artists, academic researchers, and the curators from hosting and other institutions
 - relations on institutional level between museums or other art institutions and different institutions dealing with contentious heritage, sustainability networks' initiative
 - Negotiation of motivations
3. Presentation
 - How to present visually research data and the analysis of the results and how to conceptualise art projects based on contentious heritage research: how to select the artistic media depending the representation politics contained in the objects of contentious heritage, if any.
4. Ethical conduct
 - whether contentious heritage calls for revising the ethical conduct of the researchers based on sensitive data?
 - Issues of Essentialisation vs. professional neutrality
5. How different general topics related to contentious heritage (applicable for all CCPs) are entangled with specific local issues unique to each CCP
6. Optional topics-please add here:

CCP3-03. November First Round of questions

Alenka Pirman/Jani Pirman, my questions so far (research phase)

START

How do you begin?

- What was there before your start?
- How do you establish a team (expectations & motives of each participant)
- How do you establish a working situation (open? Fixed?; team members' roles)

RESEARCH

What is your material?

- Where is it? Who is the gate-keeper? What is the protocol? (flexibility)

How do you work? (field trips, studying, discussions, interviews, hands-on? ...)

- How do you record it? (photo, camera, drawings, notes, reports, hybrid records ...)

- How do you share the experience of each other? How do you process your field work? (are all the team members involved and why not?)

- Do you involve public (media, gossip, blog, social media ...)? At what stage? Why? How?

What happens?

- How do you introduce changes to your way of working / collaborating?

- Who has the need for a change? Is there a lively debate, a consensus or passivity?

What is the effect of contentiousness of the researched material / topic on your work?

(self-censorship, extra caution, special approach)

- Have you questioned its contentiousness?

After the meeting in Krakow 17-18 March, and after the conversation with Tal, 20 March 2017, Berlin

Presentation and circulation of contentious images

- Whether and if yes, how we need to present and circulate the images and objects of contentious heritage in order to keep the memory of the existence of racism

- difference between circulating and discussing contentious images and objects in public spaces and in control spaces of academic context (book, conferences, etc.)

- whether someone reacted from the activist circles counter the production and circulation of the "Lucky Jew". If it's true that there were no such actions the other question would be

- why no one saw it as problematic...

This question is not related only to the case of Lucky Jew (which may not be so relevant as such), since it is relevant for other parts of our research. For example, the participatory action against the Triumphal Arch in Skopje made clearer its contentiousness. Yet, the third question would be

- whether an object is contentious only if there are public outbursts against it?

27.04. 2017 BASECAMP additions (ping about the new questionnaire session)

Tal Adler, WP1, WP5 member, CCP4 team member

Great, thanks.

From my point of view, there are two directions that are especially interesting for me:

1. In the context of 'art-production', what are your processes, decisions and strategies so far. What are the ideas for (artistic) outcomes/products. How and if artistic processes are negotiated and shared with the various partners/stakeholders. How is your work being seen/conceived/reflected in your local 'art networks'. How do you deal with questions of authorship and attribution, especially when it comes to 'art products'.

2. In the context of relations to other CCPs and especially CCP4: your ideas and reflections on the possible relations and connections between these project (I know from Karin that you have some interesting insights regarding the death masks and the skulls collections)

1

SM

[Yesterday at 2:01pm via web](#) Notified 6 people [Applaud](#)

SM

Suzana Milevska, WP1 member

In addition to the points which Tal already mentioned (e.g. the process of art production) I am particularly interested to focus on the ways of dealing with contentious heritage (in this case research of death masks) in the final phase-the presentation of the art project in a context of a concrete exhibition -individual or group one: e.g. I find pertinent to this (and other artistic research projects) the question how to present the research results and the final work without risking overwriting one with another?

-Also, how to deal with the objects and images of human remains in contemporary exhibition.

Hi CCP5 here

These are just some comments / observations that your initial set of questions pose for us Friday 16th June 2017, 28 July and 3th September

1. Access

objects : We are developing a special display to present our work in the form of a mobile "touring exhibition". This element and an accompanying book of the images and text will provide access to the research to a broad public, both in Ireland and internationally. Photos and objects can be exhibited in larger venues with a paired down show of photographs that are easily packed transported can be used for touring show to libraries etc. The artist book will address a local and international

audience, with essays contextualizing our research within broader debates about museumology, participatory art and contentious heritage in the European context.

Sun 9th July 2017 : In addressing Suzana's observation about issues of access, we did not gain access to the prison itself in the course of this research. We applied to visit the site back in summer 2016 through Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM). We had ministerial approval for our application but as yet have had no official response either allowing or denying access to the site. Aisling did a artist in residency for 1 month in the jail in the late 90's when it was still operational but the early release scheme had started under the terms of the 1998 Good Friday Agreement.

Since our 2016 application to gain access to the former prison the Stormont Executive collapsed there has been the Brexit referendum, a local; election and a general election. This throws up interesting questions regarding first hand access and first hand research.

Does the 'no response' to our application reflect anything of the political limbo that has left decisions regarding the future of the site in stalemate

How can one research a site without access?

What does this tell us about the nature of the site and the very live issues that mean it is still contested?

Restitution: Could the exhibition after touring finally find a home? Could it be part of addressing sensitive legacy issues?

2. Collaborative working methods

Formats: Dialogical, what do we mean by this? outlining our methods and timescales interdisciplinary relations : Who are our collaborators? , participants, ex prisoners, visitors, prison staff etc institutions archaeologist, curators etc Could a diagram be made to show this dynamic?

contentious heritage, sustainability networks' : Community museums their role as custodians, private collections, objects on mantelpiece, objects deteriorating in attics, remembered objects, forgotten objects

Motivations: The importance of legacy for thinking about the future, guarding against sentimentalising the past

Sun 9th July 2017, CCP5 :

Collaboration between Martin and Aisling.

Aisling based in Belfast Martin in Vienna

Pragmatic considerations,

How to collaborate on a site specific project across such distance?

Research Visits, skype, email, modes of communication

Issues of timetabling

Interviews, site visits (community museums individuals groups etc), photoshoots, workshops etc. How practically to do this?

Importance of frequent clear communication, division of tasks etc

We are also working with archaeologist Laura McAtackney who is based in Aarhus Denmark and is attached to WP2. Has Laura seen this questionnaire?

To date Laura worked with us on who and how we approached project participants and on the conference preparation, content and presentation. Our cross disciplinary discussions with Laura have been very fruitful and opened up ways of approaching the project

How do collaborations across disciplines deepen and enrich research ?

3. Representation and Presentation

Photo book, touring exhibition, theory book, events, are these forms of lobbying?

4. Ethical conduct

sensitive data:]Ethics approval through UU affording full accreditation or anonymity depending on request of participants

professional neutrality: What is neutrality? Questioning the term (When you live in the middle of a love and constantly changing situation)