

Understanding the Media Literacy of Digital Storytelling

Mark Dunford, University of Brighton, and Tricia Jenkins, Middlesex University

Keywords: digital Storytelling, media literacy, voice, impact

Abstract

Digital Storytelling is a workshop-based process in which participants gain the skills and knowledge needed to tell a personal story using their own words and imagery. This article draws on a MERJ conversation held during the Media Education Summit 2014 in Prague to deconstruct Digital Storytelling as means to understand the methodology and the stories told using it. It explores three specific themes:

Theme A: Process of production – finding the articulate and personal voice;

Theme B: Crafting the stories – creating meaning in a short form;

Theme C: Impact – understanding stories as texts and collections.

Prior to the session, delegates had the opportunity to consider literature covering an overview of digital storytelling practice, and extracts from key academic and practitioner-based texts which address the three themes. Selected stories were shown at the start of the session. The article uses the resultant discussions as a means to explore the specific media literacy of digital storytelling. It looks at the multiple creative processes underpinning Digital Storytelling and considers how they merge together within the individual text to create an individual story that can be viewed in isolation or seen as part of a larger collection of stories.

Introduction

‘Digital stories – when properly done – can be tight as sonnets: multimedia sonnets from the people.’ (Meadows, 2014)

This paper considers a series of questions around the literacy engendered by Digital Storytelling arising from our longstanding work as academics and practitioners. It doesn't seek to provide simple answers but it does engage with issues of concern to those

interested in understanding how new forms of expression require, expose and bring into being new forms of literacy; this article is an attempt to define and then explore the media literacy of Digital Storytelling. It is written to start a literacy-based discussion around what is largely uncharted territory and to move the consideration of the media literacy of Digital Storytelling practice beyond the project-based discourse that characterises many presentations and articles.

The authors of this article are both practitioners *and* academics. We wanted to bring the specifics of the digital storytelling method (as defined in the next section) to a broader environment to address questions of media literacy with colleagues who may not be familiar with the form.

What do we mean by Digital Storytelling?

As defined by the Center for Digital Storytelling, Berkeley, California:

A short, first person video-narrative created by combining recorded voice, still and moving images and music or other sounds. (Lambert, 2006)

As Lundby (2008) points out, the term digital storytelling is used to encompass a wide range of forms, ranging from gaming and interactive storytelling (Handler Miller, 2014), to the use of digital visual effects in film, to the proliferation of self-representations in a range of social media forms, from Facebook posts, to Tweets, to self-made movies shared on YouTube. The Digital Storytelling (DS) to which our research refers, however, is the specific media practice, defined by the Center for Digital Storytelling (CDS) in Berkeley, California, as 'a short, first person video-narrative created by combining recorded voice, still and moving images, and music or other sounds'. This method emerged over twenty years ago, its roots in community activism, its techniques evolving from media arts and radical theatre and its primary driver a 'response to the exclusion of 'ordinary' people's stories in broadcast media'(Hartley and McWilliam, 2009). The primary emphasis is on 'story', rather than 'digital' and the technique is firmly based in the facilitation of the 'Story Circle', the workshop practice that enables participants to tell (usually) personal stories that will become 'little nuggets of media called Digital Stories' (Lambert 2013:1).

Story Circle uses a range of activities and writing stimuli to develop trust within the group, to build storytelling techniques and visual literacy and, ultimately, to 'find' that story (more about the method and genre later). The 'Seven Steps' set out by Lambert in his Digital Storytelling Cookbook provide an underpinning set of principles and story-making components which, Lambert recognises, 'were never meant as a prescribed 'catechism' of

storytelling, more simply a framework for the discussion of the aesthetic quality of this particular form' (2013:53).

Seven Steps of Digital Storytelling

1. Owning Your Insights	What is the story you want to tell? What do you think your story means?
2. Owning Your Emotions	How does the story feel?
3. Finding The Moment	Was there a moment when things changed? Were you aware of it at the time? If not, what was the moment you became aware that things had changed?
4. Seeing Your Story	What images come to mind when recalling the moment of change in the story? What images come to mind for other parts of the story?
5. Hearing Your Story	How will you tell the story – how will you 'perform' your voice over? Would the story be enhanced by additional layers of sound – ambient sound or music?
6. Assembling Your Story	How will you structure your story? How will the layers of visual and audio narratives work together?
7. Sharing Your Story	Who is your audience? What was your purpose in creating the story? Has the purpose shifted during the process of creating the piece? In what presentation will your digital story be viewed? What life will the story have after its completion?

Source: Lambert (2013: 53-70)

Participants are taught how to record their voice-overs, capture their images, still or moving and edit their piece to run somewhere between two and three minutes. Digital

storytelling is now used around the world in a variety of contexts, from community engagement programmes to health and wellbeing projects, to different education settings to name but a few. Despite the plethora of personal narratives available through social media platforms such as YouTube and Facebook, the distinctive methodological approach captured in the story circle brings a unique form to Digital Storytelling with its own capacity to shape narrative, although each and every story is unique.

In her account of vernacular creativity and Digital Storytelling, Burgess (2006: 209-210) notes that the range of literacies required for digital storytelling 'cross the divide between formal and informal learning'. She describes how these include 'not only 'learned' skills like the ability to conceive and execute an effective narrative and use a computer' Burgess (2006:210), but also more intuitive modes of collecting and arranging textual elements such as words, photos or drawings, the oral narration and the combination of all this material to create the 'televisual flow' of the final story. In this piece, we argue that Digital Storytelling strays beyond the televisual and has since established itself as a form with its own distinctive codes and conventions. Burgess goes on to describe how she has observed in her work as a practitioner that different demographic groups adopt different styles of expression and contrasts the more journalistic tone adopted by older storytellers with the more personal and emotive work from younger people. Burgess was writing in 2006 yet our own work as academics and practitioners suggests that this generational distinction remains largely intact.

Sparking a Conversation

Digital Storytelling as a form has been gathering momentum as a 'movement' across the globe as more and more practitioners are trained and take the method into a wide variety of educational, community, activist, and even commercial research environments. Joe Lambert, founder of CDS, describes digital storytelling as having 'evolved to become an international movement of deeply committed folks working with story in virtually every field of human endeavour'. Lambert (2013:1). It is also gaining recognition within the academy, as researchers seek to both use the form as a pedagogic tool and to find ways in which to question, to analyse, to criticise and to define the form and the phenomenon, taking the evidence for its increasing visibility beyond the realms of practitioner anecdote.

As Hartley (2013) states, as well as the growing body of scholarship (Thumim, 2012; Chouliaraki 2012; Couldry et al (2010) and most recently Cregori- Signes and Brigado-Carachan (2014), there has been an international conference series since 2003, taking place in Wales, Australia, Portugal, Norway and Turkey, with the next one scheduled September 2015 in the USA. In parallel, there have been European conferences focusing on

digital storytelling in Obidos (2009), Valencia (2013) and Athens (2014) and, most recently, a symposium 'Digital Storytelling and Social Inclusion' at Nagoya University in Japan (November 2014). There is ample opportunity now for digital storytelling practitioners and longstanding and emerging academics to share and discuss their work together.

Finding the articulate and personal voice

Couldry (2010) identifies five new possibilities of voice enabled by digital technology, namely opportunities for new voices to speak and be heard; an increased mutual awareness flowing from a greater influence over distribution; new scales of organization for circulating material; the changing nature of the spaces required for political organisation and the potential for new intensities of listening as the space of media discourse is opened to new voices. He cites Digital Storytelling as an example of a vernacular form created through digitalization where makers or storytellers are able to exert a previously impossible degree of personal control over the development, production and distribution of their material. The first and last of Couldry's five possibilities of voice can be used to frame our understanding of media literacy within Digital Storytelling. This form of media production has its own distinctive patterns of meaning which draw on and extend the range of influences that shape Digital Storytelling, such as forum theatre, Photovoice and community organising. Each new storyteller is an additional media voice.

Stories from outside media discourse may be told through Digital Storytelling; these 'lost stories' can contribute to a richer or poorer understanding of the past. For example, 'Marriage in the Middle of Ruins', is a Digital Story made by Anisora Stamante who recalls her March 1977 wedding in her home town of Vrancea, the epicentre of an earthquake which took 1,578 lives and injured over 11,000 people. She describes the wedding as 'the greatest misadventure of my life' and tells of passing hopeless people with endless sadness in their eyes on the way to her ceremony. This story provides a moving personal account but speaks of the historical past to provide a quotidian account of the wider forces shaping everyday life. In many ways, it is an archetypal digital story; a moving personal story yet somewhat rough around the edges without the sheen of professionally made media.

Literacy provides people with the means to speak and, in this way, it can restore memory; Digital Storytelling workshops provide a means for people to tell personal stories which would otherwise remain untold. 'Marriage in the Middle of the Ruins' is just one example of a distinctly personal story that can be taken as evidence or raw material for subsequent study. The selection and arrangement of the material within the Digital Story is key. Facts do not, as E.H. Carr (1961) famously pointed out, speak for themselves but, in the case of Digital Storytelling, it is the storyteller rather than the historian who decides

what to include and what to 'give to the floor'. Unlike Historians, Digital Storytellers are, however, telling a personal story, which may be about the past, and this may contribute to historical discourse by simply increasing the quality, range and amount of material for the historian to consider. These stories are simply a fragment of evidence for the historian. The veracity of Digital Storytelling is purely a matter of personal perspective.

Freeman (2010: 52) explores how life narratives can provide a means for introducing a measure of humanity into our understanding of the past. He warns that 'memory far from reproducing past experience as it was, is constructive and imaginative, maybe even fictive, in its workings'. Trying to make sense of past is often a personal task and this is especially the case with a reflective practice such as Digital Storytelling. Perspective may change depending on point of view and every individual's unique relationship with both past and present. In 'Marriage in Middle of Ruins', the story is told from the perspective of a successful marriage born out of an earthquake and it is simultaneously harrowing and life affirming; it would almost certainly have been lost to the floor if the marriage had not succeeded. In this way, Digital Storytelling draws in new voices so they can be seen and heard, yet it also affirms the rationale for telling the story, which may be both democratic and therapeutic.

Thumim (2012) notes the assumption that digital storytelling is most often encountered as a process that functions to democratise media spaces. In contrast, therapeutic outcomes are often ignored or understood as serving a project of self-improvement in opposition to a more widely conceived social good. This is exactly our own experience as practitioners where, for example, digital storytelling programmes have been commissioned or funded to provide skills for employment (www.digem.eu) foster the digital inclusion of older citizens (www.silverstories.eu) or facilitate intercultural dialogues (www.digi-tales.org.uk). Thumim challenges us to open out the frame of the therapy/democracy dichotomy to see what else is going on in contemporary digital storytelling. She argues that by focusing on the tension between discourses of therapy and democracy we may find more satisfying explanations of meaning within digital stories.

As practitioners, we have both seen the opening up of difficult memories or painful experiences during a workshop. Evidence gathered in Romania, Crisan/Dunford (2014) through focus groups suggest that there can be difficult subjects raised within the trusting environment of the storycircle which are either dropped entirely due to their sensitivity or reframed for telling in the final Digital Story.

All digital storytelling trainers ordinarily go through the workshop process to provide them with a sense of the demands placed on participants. Workshop facilitators are not therapists but they need to possess creative, pedagogic and social skills beyond those

required in most educational or training environments. Many Digital Storytelling projects engage directly with difficult issues or hard to reach communities so these require different aptitudes and skillsets. For example, working with young unemployed people is radically different from working with older people with early onset dementia and it is possible, indeed likely, that no one individual is equally skilled at working with both groups.

Creating Meaning in a Short Form :

If citizens are to make their own TV on the kitchen table – as it were – then it is important that Big Media provides them with forms which can be readily learned, elegant forms which allow for an articulate contribution. We should make good Digital Stories, not bad television ... Digital Stories are indeed multimedia sonnets from the people, but let's not kid ourselves that they grow on trees. (Meadows et al, 2006:3)

Although the ambitions underpinning digital storytelling have consistently focused on alternative narratives to mainstream media – the voices of ordinary people – they still utilize institutional languages of media and of storytelling itself. Hartley (2013: 77) points out that 'digital storytelling is not *opposed* to mainstream media narrative; it is on a continuum with it ... digital storytellers need to know enough about the 'costly signalling' game to be able to use their messages'. Digital storytellers progress through a facilitated workshop practice that enables them to find their individual voices; it also draws on the expertise of the workshop facilitator and both the participants' and the facilitators' innate understanding of the processes of signification within multimedia presentations. The exercises and processes that contribute to the Story Circle teach the underlying principles of story telling in a multimedia format. Digital Storytelling participants are introduced to the classic narrative structure, they have to consider the 'performance' of their authorial voice, they go through processes of image deconstruction prior to reconstructing them to make their stories 'work'. The storytelling process is reverse engineered so in this respect it is the opposite of much mainstream media.

Storytellers need to identify their narrative voices in relation to their perceived audiences and they need to consider issues of ownership both in terms of an awareness of copyright when using externally sourced assets to enhance their own photographs or self-created sound tracks, *and* in terms of what permissions they themselves wish to grant for wider distribution of their work. They also noted that, as with most current output on

social media channels such as YouTube, the short 2-3 minute piece is what has now come to be the acceptable length of published self-made movies. Certainly, nothing longer would get a click on busy Facebook timelines.

However, these conventions have followed long after the form was established in the early days of digital media, before Web 2.0 modes of self-publication went viral. The point of the form is that it enables the teller to construct intense meaning that packs an emotional punch most effectively *because* of its brevity; in this way the form, at least partly, determines the content.

Digital storytelling centres on a co-creation approach. The Story Circle activities, which enable individual storytellers to 'find' their stories, are led by trained facilitators, each of whom themselves has gone through the Story Circle process and created their own story. Facilitators should know what it *feels* like to make that journey of deep reflection, listening to self and – most importantly – to others, and finding and sharing what could be a deeply personal and perhaps emotionally fraught experience. The classic CDS model for a digital storytelling workshop lasts three days and usually facilitator training adopts this model. However, although the short form of the finished product is fixed to two-three minutes, practitioners may adapt the model to suit their own participants' needs. For example, the Silver Stories partnership <http://arts.brighton.ac.uk/projects/silver-stories>) is piloting the use of the digital storytelling models with older people at the time of writing, ranging from active older people in community settings to those who may be living with dementia or memory impairments. Workshop schedules have been adjusted to meet the needs of the different groups. If the digital storytelling workshop is their first encounter with computers, then additional time is required simply to introduce basic skills with the machine before attempting to make a digital story.

Brushwood, Rose and Low (2013: 36) examine the crafting of meaning from the perspective of analysing the narratives produced in two community-based multimedia storytelling projects in Toronto and Montreal. They noted that in this context, participants not only faced technical challenges but also had little or no experience of (knowingly) interpreting or constructing a visual narrative.

'...facilitators worked quite hard to develop these skills amongst participants, offering workshop sessions exclusively on photography and discussing the nuances of visual narrative, including the difference between visual illustration and metaphor'.

In paying greater attention to developing these media literacy skills, Brushwood Rose

and Low note 'the potential to open up new modes of self-representation'. This resonates particularly with projects that are working with displaced people and one of the case studies describes the way participants without photographs of their own with which to make their stories and without using stock images (in this case as a workshop 'rule') are assisted to find alternative ways of creating visual representations to enhance their audio stories. Questions of representation were opened up by discussion about, in this case, the nature of images available of Afghanistan on the internet and the process of constructing alternative ways to depict the memories of childhood in a conflict zone enabled the participants to construct more symbolic, less stereotypical imagery that could be more powerful within the context of the story of an individual, rather than using the imagery of a journalist's report from a war zone.

Darcy Alexandra's (2008: 102) work with undocumented migrants in Ireland also adapts the classic CDS model 'to invite more in-depth and sustained enquiry into the storytelling process and the formation of *communities of practice* (Wenger 1999)'. The workshop was designed as an on-going weekly two-hour workshop over five months. Alexandra also worked with participants who lacked images from within their personal archives, or were understandably reluctant to use their own family images for fear of recognition. In one case study, a storyteller, who was from Bangladesh, decided to create his own images because he was unable to source any appropriate images of people from the Internet to enable him to tell his story who were not white.

Clearly, for vulnerable groups it is of utmost importance to ensure that they are fully equipped to make their digital stories both practically and in terms of developing their media literacy skills. As the media theorist Henry Jenkins (2006: 176) argues, 'we should not assume that someone possesses media literacy if they can consume but not express themselves', and, in doing this extends the notion of media literacy to embrace production.

Facilitators are often experts not only in digital storytelling, but also in their specific field in which they are using the method. They can also be motivated by artistic or political considerations. Many Digital Storytelling workshops are funded projects – commissioned, or grants – and these will have their own drivers around the expected 'outputs' required by the funder. From some social science perspectives, this raises issues around authenticity of voice. The stories may indeed be personal to the individual storyteller in origin and their recorded voice over literally their own recorded voice, however the question that these raise is how authentic is a story that has been shaped with the assistance of a facilitator to fit with, for instance, a themed commission? In 2008-9, our company DigiTales was commissioned by the British Council to lead a digital storytelling project with migrant and ethnic minority young people from nine countries in south-east Europe, 'Imagine

Your Future'. The British Council wanted to use digital storytelling to identify and promote young leaders and, in doing so, help deliver its 'intercultural dialogue institutional guiding pillar'. This is clearly a more direct intervention in the storytelling process than the use of story prompts that are characteristically part of the Story Circle's activities. The key issue is around the extent to which it curtails what can or cannot be said.

That perennial question, 'Does the end justify the means?' is meaningless as it stands; the real and only question regarding the ethics of means and ends is, and always has been, 'Does this particular end justify this particular means?'. (Alinsky 1971: 25)

Hartley (2008: 203) points out that the artistic or political leanings of the facilitator, or those of the facilitator's paymaster could influence or shape content because self-made media should not need the input of 'someone external to the self whose story is being narrated'. This could be seen as somewhat idealistic in that it assumes that the story can be told without the intervention of the facilitator. The balance is the key factor and, again it goes back to the skills of the facilitator. However, the strength of the form lies in its focus on the group engaged in the Story Circle process, the reflective process and the finding the storyteller's voice through a collaborative process as opposed to perhaps the more simultaneous individual productions that dominate the social mediasphere.

Understanding stories as individual texts and collections

If Digital Storytelling is to gather its own momentum and to play a significant role in public culture, the next step is to move beyond the focus on production at the local level, however much participants benefit from being part of the workshops, and however much the cultural institutions benefit from engaging members of the community as co-creators. (Hartley 2008: 202)

One criticism that Hartley has made consistently is the Digital Storytelling movement's focus on small-scale productions that are rarely shared beyond the specific communities that participated in the digital storytelling intervention – i.e. family, friends, interest groups and funders. His view is that despite the term 'digital' in the practice, digital storytelling is only digital in production and not distribution or exhibition; it is not 'native' to the internet. The consequence is that there is in effect no significant audience beyond the immediate for many Digital Stories. Texts 'belong' to the storytellers and remain within

their possession; they rarely, if ever, go viral. This is not necessarily an entirely new problem, for example, in the UK during the 1980s community media productions made through the Channel Four funded workshop movement rarely attracted an audience.

Digital Storytelling is distinguished from this earlier work in two ways; firstly, the stories are made and told by the storyteller rather than a third party filmmaker and secondly, the potential offered by the internet is radically removed from the world of 1980s TV. Shirky (2010) makes a related point when he argues that because we are increasingly producing and sharing media, we need to reconceptualise media and find ways in which new and different forms of media, such as Digital Storytelling, can reach an audience. Hartley returned to this theme in his article 'A Trojan Horse in the Citadel of Stories' (2013), in which he develops his earlier writings (2008, 2009) about the potential of Digital Storytelling to achieve accessibility and value to a larger group beyond those who have participated in a digital storytelling workshop and their immediate viewers/listeners. The opposite model to the former mainstream media approach of scaling up audiences, Hartley talks about scaling up stories, grouping them so that they make sense to wider groups of people. He talks about shifting digital storytelling from self-expression, the individual, to something that can appeal to wider communities – 'the 'we' communities (or 'demes')'.

He calls the Digital Storytellers to action:

Given that digital media and social networks have already made what constitutes 'our' deme more risky, complex, open, uncertain and multivalent than ever before, it is urgent for progressive innovations like the digital storytelling movement to catch up. (Hartley 2013: 103)

The task now is to find new and different ways and means for digital stories to find and retain an audience. As Matthews and Sutherland (2013: 98) observe:

Although personal digital life stories now abound, relatively little attention has been given to the parallel acts of listening – across various and many contexts – that need to occur if we are to hear, value and respond to people's self-documented lives and experiences.

They point out that there is little or no written evidence or academic research into the use of digital stories themselves. The emphasis has been on reflection and the reflective practitioner, rather than the storyteller(s) and the stories. In the same article, Matthews and Sunderland also highlight the lack of attention that has been given to the 'parallel

acts of *listening* – across various and many contexts – that need to occur if we are to hear, value, and respond to people’s self-documented lives and experiences’. Matthews and Sutherland (2013:98). This act of listening requires space to hear and understand stories individually and collectively. The arguments posed in this article, in a sense, represent the polar opposite of Lambert’s focus on ‘the movement’ of digital storytelling – the act itself. Matthews and Sunderland are interested in the efficacy of digital life story narratives as data for academics, policy makers and practitioners. Lambert – like many other practitioner accounts of digital storytelling – focuses on the unique, the individual, personal experience. Matthews and Sunderland (2013: 97) view the stories as, potentially, ‘large-scale multimedia qualitative datasets’, whilst acknowledging the shortcomings of, for example, using large-scale databases to make stories ‘listenable’ to policy makers.

Listening can often be taken for granted and is often relegated below telling, even though ‘Listen Deeply, Tell Stories’ is the mantra of the Center for Digital Storytelling. Yet, as O’Donnell, Lloyd and Dreher (2009) point out, in the analysis of story-based practices within the field of cultural studies, listening is under-discussed in comparison to questions of voice. There is no shortage of observations, such as Rossiter and Garcia’s (2010: 49) ‘participant produced digital stories constitute a rich and relatively unexplored source of qualitative data’. There are pockets of evidence in the form of project evaluations and reports and localised examples of impact, such as the remarkable effect of the work of Patient Voices (www.patientvoices.org.uk), who in a recent project used digital stories they had produced with mental health service users to influence the trustees of Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust, who were addressing poor patient and staff satisfaction survey scores in relation to dignity, respect and communication. Two years into the project, stories are now shown at the beginning of every Board meeting and in staff recruitment and selection interviews ‘to remind staff and Board *why* they are there’ Hardy (2013).

In the specific use of digital storytelling within health promotion research, Gubrium focuses on the participation of storytellers and the positive impact on them as the value in digital storytelling and notes the importance of ethical practice when working with vulnerable people in terms of sharing their stories. In a forthcoming article, Jenkins and Hardy note that, in the words of Margaret Mead, ‘Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has’. The role of stories created in facilitated workshops and shown to audiences, for example, via the Patient Voices website (www.patientvoices.org.uk) is that of an important social movement with the potential to effect change at individual, community and societal levels.

Conclusions

Different forms of literacy are brought into being by different cultural forms, so in this way the literacy of digital storytelling is obviously different from that of say a feature film, a novel or even an oral history testimony. Not only does the brevity of the form place specific constraints on what can and cannot be said, but both the democratic and therapeutic components of the story circle shape the content in unpredictable ways. The processes involved in story circle provide rich opportunities to develop media literacies. Activities involving reading images, to encourage participants to squeeze the most meaning from the limited amount of images the form demands, for example are rooted in classic media education approaches to 'denotation/connotation' exercises. A word game involving the construction of a short narrative from a shared lexicon that has been constructed by the group is an effective way to encounter questions of point-of-view. The act of construction within a set of formal constraints can lead to broader questions of form/content and genre. Questions of the authorial voice, the ownership of the story and the audiences for it provide an accessible springboard for opening wider discussions about ownership and control and ethical questions about distribution via the Internet, for example. As a practitioner, it is never possible to know what story is going to be told yet it is possible to envisage how it may be told. This tension between the restricted form and the unpredictable content make Digital Storytelling an exciting, productive area for both practitioners and academics. The real difficulty is finding the appropriate route to an audience; this is both a question about reaching a larger number of people and about reaching the right audience for particular stories. This is the real imaginative challenge facing everyone concerned with shifting this emancipatory form of new media beyond the workshop.

Digital Stories Presented for Discussion at the World Café

1. Casatorie Printre Ruine (Marriage Amongst the Ruins), Romania, 2010.
2. Sauna Sisters (Finland, 2011)
Funded by the EU Lifelong Learning Programme Grundtvig. Stories can be viewed from the Extending Creative Practice website. www.extendingcreativepractice.eu.
3. Hello Fish Mate, UK, 2014
4. Agora vou para o lar. (Now I'm going to the Nursing Home), Portugal, 2014.
Funded by the EU Lifelong Learning Programme Transfer of Innovation. Stories can be viewed from the Silver Stories website <http://arts.brighton.ac.uk/projects/silver-stories>.
5. Deep Diversity (USA, 2008). This story is no longer online.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the following contributors to the MERJ conversation in Prague on 21st November 2014 for their input:

Dan Ashton – Bath Spa University, UK

Merrill Brown – Mont Clair Sate University, USA (sp)

Donna Chu – The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China

Ilana Elea – Nordicom, Sweden

Isabella Rega – Bournemouth University, UK

Jasmin Sung – Czech Republic

References

- Meadows, D. Digital Storytelling. Available: <http://www.photobus.co.uk/>. Last accessed 10th Oct 2014.
- Hartley, J. (2013). A Trojan Horse in the Citadel of Stories. *Cultural Science*. 6 (1), 72 (REF Margaret Mead, 1901 – 1978, used with permission).

Bibliography

- Alexandra, D. (2008), 'Digital Storytelling as Transformative Practice: Critical Analysis and Creative Expression in the Representation of Migration in Ireland'. *Journal of Media Practice* (9:2) 101/1.
- Alinsky, Saul D. *Rules for Radicals*. (1971). Vintage: London.
- Brushwood Rose, C. and Low, B., (2014) 'Exploring the 'craftedness' of multimedia narratives: from creation to interpretation'. *Visual Studies* (29) pp.30-39.
- Burgess, Jean (2006) *Hearing Ordinary Voices: Cultural Studies, Vernacular Creativity and Digital Storytelling*. Continuum: *Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 20 (2): pp 201-214.
- Carr, E.H. (1968). *What is History?* Pelican, London.
- Cobley, P. (2014) *Narrative*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge.
- Cobley, P. and Haeffner, N. (2011) 'Narrative supplements' in R. Page and B. Thomas (eds) *New Narratives: Stories and Storytelling in the Digital Age*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Couldry, N. (2008). 'Mediatization or mediation? Alternative understandings of the emergent space of Digital Storytelling'. *New Media Society* 10:373.
- Couldry, N. (2010). *Why Voice Matters – Culture and Politics after Neoliberalism*. London: Sage.
- Crisan, C. Dunford, M. (2014). 'Understanding Inclusion through Digital Storytelling: A Case Study assessing the impact and effectiveness of workshops across Romania.'

- Mapping Heterogeneity: Qualitative Research in Communication. Ivan, L et al.
- David A. and Weinschenker D. (2012). 'Digital Storytelling and Authoring Identity', Constructing the Self in the Digital World, (Ching, C. and Foley. B, eds.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp 47-75.
- Dreyer, T. (2012)'A Partial Promise of Voice', Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy Quarterly Journal of Media Research and Resources, vol.142, pp157-166.
- Dyke, J.(2007). DigiTales A European Perspective in Inclusion Through Media (2007). In Downmunt, T. et al. Inclusion Through Media. Open Mute. London.
- Freeman, M. (2009). Hindsight: The promise and peril of looking backward. Oxford University Press.
- Gubrium, A. (2009). Digital Storytelling: An Emergent Method for Health Promotion Research and Practice, in Health Promotion Practice, 10 (2): pp 186-191.
- Hardy, P. & Sumner, T. Presentation 8th October 2013 at Global Mental Health Exhibition, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Accessed October 8th 2014, <http://www.patientvoices.org.uk/pdf/presentations/20131008%20LSHTML.pdf>
- Hartley, J. (2008). Problems of expertise and scalability in self-made media. In: Lundby, K. Digital storytelling, Mediatized Stories. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc. 197- 211
- Hartley, J and McWilliam, K. (2009) Story Circle, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Hartley, J. (2013) 'A Trojan Horse in the Citadel of Stories?' Journal of Cultural Science, Vol.6, No 1.
- Jenkins, H. (2006), Convergence Culture. Where Old and New Media Collide. New York: New York University Press.
- Klaebe, H., M. Foth, J. Burgess, and M. Bilandzic. (2007). Digital Storytelling and History Lines: Community Engagement in a Master Planned Development, in Proceedings 13th International Conference on Virtual Systems and Multimedia, Brisbane. Available at <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/8985/1/8985.pdf> (Accessed 20 July 2014).
- Lambert, J. (2013). Digital Storytelling: Capturing Lives, Creating Community. 4th Edition: Routledge.
- Lambert, J. (2013). Seven Stages: Story and the Human Experience. Digital Diner Press.
- Lambert, Joe (2000). 'Has Digital Storytelling Succeeded as a Movement? Some Thoughts'. dStoryNews Issue 2.
- Lundby, K. 2008. Digital Storytelling, Mediatized Stories – Self Representations in new media. Lang, New York.
- Matthews, N. and Sunderland, N. (2013). 'Digital Life Story Narratives as Data for

- Policy Makers and Practitioners: Thinking Through Methodologies for Large-scale Multimedia Qualitative Datasets', *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 57:1, pp97-114.
- Meadows, D., Digital Storytelling. Available: <http://www.photobus.co.uk/>. Last accessed 10th Oct 2014.
- Meadows, D. (2003) 'Digital Storytelling: Research based practice in New Media'. *Visual Studies*, 2, p189-193.
- O'Donnell, P. Lloyd, J. and Dreher T. (2009). 'Listening, pathbuilding and continuations: A research agenda for the analysis of listening'. *Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 23(4), pp423-439.
- Poletti, A. (2011). Coaxing an intimate public: Life narrative in Digital Storytelling. *Continuum*, 25 (1), 73-83.
- Riessman, C. (1993) *Narrative Analysis*: SAGE Publications: London.
- Robin, B. (2006). The Educational Uses of Digital Storytelling. In C. Crawford et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference 2006* (pp. 709-716). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.
- Rooke A and Slater I, (2012). *Extending Creative Practice*. Centre for Urban and Community Research. Goldsmiths University of London. Available at http://www.extendingcreativepractice.eu/?page_id=110. (Accessed January 2014).
- Rossiter, M. Marsha, and Garcia, P.A. Penny A.. 'Digital storytelling: A new player on the narrative field.' *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*. 2010.126 (2010): 37-48.
- Schegloff, E. (1997) 'Narrative analysis' thirty years later, *Journal of Narrative*.
- Shirky, C. (2010). *Cognitive surplus: Creativity and generosity in a connected age*. Penguin UK.
- Stenhouse, R., Tait J., Hardy, P. and Sumner, T (2013). 'Dangling Conversations: reflections on the process of creating digital stories during a workshop with people with early stage dementia'. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 20: 134-141, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2850.2012.01900.x
- Taachi, J (2009): Finding a Voice: Digital Storytelling as Participatory Development in Southeast Asia, in *Storycircle*, Hartley, J. and McWilliam, K. (eds), pp.167-175.
- Thumim, N. (2012). *Self Representation and Digital Culture*, Palgrave Macmillan: London.
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.