

**Digital Storytelling and the Facilitation of Social Justice in Contexts
of Social Injustice**

Janeke D. Thumbran

August 2010

Digital Storytelling and the Facilitation of Social Justice in Contexts of Social Injustice

Janeke D. Thumbran

992465

Submitted as a partial requirement for the Master of Arts in Communication and
Information Sciences

Faculty of Humanities

Tilburg University

Supervisor: Professor Alfons Maes

Co-Reader: Professor Leonoor Oversteegen

Abstract

The objective of this study is to illustrate how digital storytelling can be used to facilitate social justice in contexts of social injustice. This is done by selecting and discussing case studies of digital storytelling initiatives in which social justice was facilitated in contexts where social injustice existed. The ways in which social justice has been facilitated are summarised into key points, and are then applied to another context of social injustice to suggest ways in which digital storytelling could facilitate social justice there. This context is the country of Rwanda, where social injustice is largely reflected in the culture of silence that permeates as a result of the genocide. Ways in which digital storytelling can address this culture of silence have been hypothesized for this context of social injustice, and this fulfills the objective of the study.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 - Digital Storytelling and the Facilitation of Social Justice	8
Scope of Study	8
Purpose	8
Motivation and Relevance	8
Research Question	9
Method	9
Chapter Overview	10
<i>Chapter 1</i>	10
<i>Chapter 2</i>	10
<i>Chapter 3</i>	10
<i>Chapter 4</i>	10
<i>Chapter 5</i>	11
Definitions	11
Digital Storytelling	11
Social Justice	14
<i>The Facilitation of Social Justice</i>	15
<i>Context of Social Justice</i>	15
<i>The Culture of Silence</i>	16
Chapter 2 - Development, Functioning and Challenges of Digital Storytelling	19
Development	19
From Traditional Storytelling to Digital Storytelling	19
History of Digital Storytelling	21
Functioning of Digital Storytelling	23
Steps in Creating Digital Stories	23

Technical Considerations in Creating Digital Stories	25
Challenges of Digital Storytelling	26
Chapter 3 - The Facilitation of Social Justice in Digital Storytelling Case Studies	31
Case Studies	31
Case Study 1: <i>Capture Wales</i>	32
<i>Background and Setup</i>	32
<i>Digital Stories</i>	33
Story 1: Fitting in	33
Story 2: I'm Not a Mad Axe-Murderer	34
Story 3: An Angel from Above	34
Story 4: Nobody Else Did That	34
Case Study 2: <i>Silence Speaks</i>	35
<i>Background</i>	35
<i>Digital Stories</i>	35
Story 1: The Camp Sheila Wellstone Project	35
Story 2: Digital Hero Book Project	36
Story 3: Digital Stories Migration Project	37
Literature review	37
Literature on <i>Capture Wales</i>	38
<i>Literature on Silence Speaks</i>	40
<i>Literature Review Summary and Criteria Selection</i>	43
Case Study Discussion	44
Capture Wales	45
<i>Digital Stories</i>	45
<i>Challenges</i>	45

Silence Speaks	47
<i>Digital Stories</i>	47
<i>Challenges</i>	48
Case Study Analysis and Key Points	49
Chapter 4 - Rwanda as a Context of Social Injustice	51
The Case of Rwanda	51
History	51
Background to the 1994 Genocide	52
The 1994 Genocide	55
Aftermath of the 1994 Genocide	56
Addressing Rwanda as a Context of Social Justice: Voices of Rwanda	59
Chapter 5 - Digital Storytelling and the Facilitation of Social Justice in Rwanda	62
Voices of Rwanda and Facilitation of Social Justice in Rwanda	62
Evaluation of Voices of Rwanda According to Key Points	62
<i>Key Point 1: The establishment of the initiative at community level</i>	63
<i>Key Point 2: Directing the initiative toward improving a sense of self and more particularly, to relieving trauma</i>	63
<i>Key Point 3: Allowing storytellers to tell any story of their choice and tell it out of free will</i>	64
<i>Key Point 4: Establishing an environment that is psychologically stable</i>	64
<i>Key Point 5: Attempting to provide long term educational and training resources</i>	64
<i>Key Point 6: Improving technological literacy</i>	65
<i>Key Point 7: Directing the initiative specifically towards social change through awareness, education and advocacy</i>	66
Key Point Evaluation Summary	66

How can digital storytelling facilitate social justice in context of social injustice such as Rwanda?	67
Key Point 1: The establishment of the initiative at community level	67
Key Point 2: Directing the initiative toward improving a sense of self and more particularly, to relieving trauma	68
Key Point 3: Allowing storytellers to tell any story of their choice and tell it out of free will	68
Key Point 4: Establishing an environment that is psychologically stable	68
Key Point 5: Attempting to provide long term educational and training resources	69
Key Point 6: Improving technological literacy	69
Key Point 7: Directing the initiative specifically towards social change through awareness, education and advocacy	69
Summary	71
References	72

Chapter 1

Digital Storytelling and the Facilitation of Social Justice

Scope of Study

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to illustrate how digital storytelling serves as a facilitator of social justice but more particularly, to illustrate how it can serve this purpose in the post-genocidal country of Rwanda as a context of social injustice. This purpose is illustrated through defining digital storytelling and social justice, establishing the connection between the two and setting the premise that digital storytelling is the tool by which social justice can be facilitated. This premise is then addressed through the research question, which is answered through the analysis of two of the most popularly documented case studies of digital storytelling projects around the world. It is then hypothetically applied to the case of Rwanda, where the ways in which social justice can be facilitated through digital storytelling are discussed against the backdrop of the country's most recent history of social injustice.

Motivation and Relevance

As one who has always been concerned with human rights issues, I travelled to Rwanda in 2008 as part of a study tour of the 1994 genocide. Although fourteen years after it had taken place, the pain and the trauma was as fresh as if it had occurred only months before. Due to the lack of resources, assistance in dealing with the enormous psychological and material consequences of this event (which has been placed in the context of social injustice in this study), have been and still are largely absent. It is with this in mind that the motivation was found to look at digital storytelling, not just in its own right, but to see it in line with the potential it has to facilitate the slow process of social justice. The way to do this is by looking at evidence that seems to testify to this potential and attempting to apply it to the case of Rwanda.

As digital storytelling is still an emerging field and is described in terms of its characterisation as new media, it is a relevant study to undertake given the scope of this current Communication and Information Sciences programme. This is particularly with its focus on the human aspects of information technology. Moreover, it is also relevant because it deals with an area of research (the use of digital storytelling in creating sustainable change) that, according to Miskelly (2008) has not been undertaken to a great extent. Thus, it forms part of a growing body of research.

The relevance of this study can perhaps best be justified when seeing it in line with the continued existence of social injustices and the urgency of addressing these in countries like Rwanda. The only way that research in this direction will cease to be relevant is when social injustice no longer exists.

Research Question

Given the motivation for the study and its relevance, the research question that this study aims to address is “how can digital storytelling facilitate social justice in contexts of social injustice such as Rwanda?” This research question suggests that social injustice can exist in various contexts, which will be seen in the case studies. A broader and more acute context exists in Rwanda, however, given the recency of the civil war and genocide.

Method

In order to address the research question, two prominent digital storytelling initiatives will be looked at as case studies to establish that social justice can be facilitated. These case studies will also illustrate how it can be done by analysing the initiatives themselves and some of the stories that are reflective of them. The findings of this analysis will be applied to the case of Rwanda, where digital storytelling has not yet taken off, but where it has enormous potential to facilitate social justice given the context of social injustice.

Part of the method used in this study is to provide a more in-depth description of the literature pertaining to the case studies in Chapter 3 than in any of the other chapters. This is

because Chapter 3 focuses specifically on the literature on the case studies, which is essentially where the key points that address the research question are drawn from. It is for this reason that the literature in other chapters is referred to briefly (by means of referencing) rather than described in detail. The literature in these chapters contribute to addressing the research question, but is not as pivotal is that of the literature review.

Chapter Overview

Chapter 1

This current chapter introduces the scope of the study but also provides the framework that will be used throughout. Definitions of the main concepts such as digital storytelling, social justice and what encompasses these will be discussed.

Chapter 2

The definition of digital storytelling discussed in Chapter 1 is furthered by the discussion on its development, the method that is used to create digital stories and the challenges that can be encountered, particularly if it is to be used to facilitate social justice.

Chapter 3

This chapter looks at some of the academic literature that has been generated on digital storytelling in general, but also summarises the findings of others who looked at the two case studies in question. This literature is then used to support my own analysis of the case studies by providing the criteria according to which the facilitation of social justice can be deduced. This will then establish the key points as to how digital storytelling facilitates social justice and will be applied to the case of Rwanda in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4

Chapter 4 provides background information on Rwanda and situates in within the context of social injustice. It also discusses an initiative called *Voices of Rwanda*, which is an organisation working towards the achievement of social justice and is also the closest that Rwanda has come to

running a digital storytelling initiative. The aim in looking at this project is to use it as the basis from which digital storytelling can be implemented to facilitate social justice.

Chapter 5

This chapter concludes the study by applying the key points made in Chapter 3 to the *Voices of Rwanda* project to identify its shortcomings and to make recommendations. These recommendations are discussed along with the challenges of digital storytelling in the context of Rwanda to conclude how social justice can be facilitated there.

Definitions

Since this study is concerned with digital storytelling and the facilitation of social justice in contexts of social injustice, clarity with regard to what is meant by each of these concepts is needed. Thus, definitions for digital storytelling, social justice, the facilitation thereof and the context of social injustice will be provided. **These definitions are discussed with specific reference to the authors that are mentioned here and are not composed of my own analysis. As such, the following section is based primarily on the works and ideas of others and is therefore largely descriptive.**

Digital Storytelling

Over the past two decades, digital storytelling has emerged as a form of art, self-expression and as a method to communicate something of meaning (Burgess, 2006). According to Digitaes (2004), and Subsol (2005), it incorporates the elements of traditional oral storytelling and combines them with digital tools to create short self narrated films, narrative computer games and interactive web-based stories. Digital storytelling is a developing field and thus as a concept can take on various meanings. One of the most widely used descriptions however, is related to digital storytelling as the creation of a short narrated film, according to Robin (2010). This idea was developed by Dana Atchely and Joe Lambert (Wilcox, 2009), who then implemented it with the forming of the Centre for Digital Storytelling (CDS) in 1998 (CDS, 1998). As mentioned by Klaebe (2006), this centre is

to date credited with being the primary authority on digital storytelling given its pioneering in the field and as such, this is the description that will be drawn on to construct a definition for this study.

The CDS defines the terms “digital story” as a “short, first-person video-narrative created by combining recorded voice, still and moving images, and music or other sounds” (1998). A digital storyteller is defined as, “anyone who has a desire to document life experience, ideas, or feelings through the use of story and digital media. Usually someone who has little to no prior experience in the realm of video production but can spend a few days participating in a workshop, exploring and sharing a story with creativity, and technical assistance from compassionate and talented technically-skilled CDS staff” (CDS, 1998). The CDS does not define digital storytelling as such, but as the pioneer in this field, a functional definition can be constructed from the terms it does define. Thus as a preliminary definition, digital storytelling can be defined as the exploring, documenting and sharing of life experiences, ideas or feelings through the creation of a short, first-person video narrative that combines voice recording, still and moving images, music and/or other sounds.

Although the CDS is the main authority on digital storytelling as defined here and has demonstrated this through its various initiatives, the constructed definition is supported, but also expanded on, in both academic literature and by other digital storytelling organisations. A researcher on the educational uses of digital storytelling at the University of Houston, Bernard R. Robin defines digital storytelling as that which “revolve(s) around the idea of combining the art of telling stories with a variety of digital multimedia, such as images, audio, and video” (2010). Other definitions of digital storytelling developed through research endeavors include that of Burgess (2006), where digital storytelling is referred to as “a workshop-based process by which ‘ordinary people’ create their own short autobiographical films that can be streamed on the Web or broadcast on television” and Klæbe’s (2006) definition as, “a new form of telling personally narrated stories, which originates from the University of California at Berkley’s Digital Storytelling Centre”. The

digital storytelling organisation, *Digitales*, defines digital storytelling as “an emerging art form of personal, heartfelt expression that enables individuals and communities to reclaim their personal cultures while exploring their artistic creativity” (2004). The constructed definition of digital storytelling seems to be bolstered by these descriptions, however, the dimension of personal expression and purpose as part of a process, has been contributed. As such, the constructed definition should include elements of digital storytelling as a process that is highly personal as well as expressive.

In keeping with the literature on digital storytelling, it is important to highlight that it is also defined not only in terms of how it is presented – as a short but expressive narrated film – but also as part of growing movement. According to Boa-Ventura & Rodrigues (2008), digital storytelling is a movement that developed a methodology geared towards empowering individuals and communities through the provision of tools with which they could tell their own stories. Burgess (2006) also describes digital storytelling as a “community media movement” in which the methodology is communicated through the process of workshops. This alludes to digital storytelling as more than the creation of an expressive short narrative film or even as part of a workshop process – it establishes digital storytelling as part of a (global) movement through which a specific objective can be obtained by those who utilize it. As this study is concerned with digital storytelling as a means to achieving an objective (social justice in the context of this study), this is an important aspect to highlight. For the purpose of this study and drawing on the definitions discussed thus far, digital storytelling can finally be defined as *the exploring, documenting and sharing of life's experiences, ideas or feelings through the creation of a short, first-person video narrative that combines voice recording, still and moving images, music and other sounds that form part of a movement aiming to achieve an objective.*

Defining digital storytelling as inclusive of the achievement of an objective implies that the development of this movement was rooted in the telling of stories for the attainment of a goal. As

this study is concerned with social justice as the attainment of this goal, a definition of social justice needs to be provided.

Social Justice

According to Clayton and Williams (2004), social justice is a rather broad term and emerged as a concept in the nineteenth century. Coined by the Catholic scholar Luigi Taparell, it is a concept that has been constructed from various religious and political movements, and can still be defined along these lines. In literature, social justice is very often defined in terms of John Rawls' *Theory of Justice* (1971;1999), in which it is asserted that this concept is premised on two principles. The first of these is that each person is to have equal rights to basic civil liberties, which includes freedom of speech and personal property, liberty of conscience, political liberty and freedom from arbitrary arrest. In the case where these liberties are not upheld, wherein social inequality exists, the greatest benefit should be given to the least advantaged in society. This second principle also asserts that positions and opportunities ought to be available to all on the basis of fairness and equality (Rawls, 1999). Thus, justice as applied generally in terms of Rawls' theory is premised on protective rights and equality at every level of society.

Rawls' theory is not without criticism, particularly due to the disjuncture that seems to exist between providing the greatest benefit to the most disadvantaged while still ensuring opportunities for all – even those who are not disadvantaged (Clayton & Williams, 2004). This theory does, however, form the basis of social justice as a concept.

In practice, social justice also seems to be based on the idea of protective rights and equality, particularly for the members of society that are considered to have been deprived of these. Organisations claiming to be working towards social justice and equating this with the achievement of equality are the International Labour Organisation (ILO) (2010), Oxfam International (2010) and Amnesty International (2010), to name but a few. Other organisations that claim to work towards the same goal are not only similar in their mission, but are also comparable in terms of defining

social justice as that which brings equality. Equality is then the relative term that has encapsulated Rawls' theory, but can also be applied to social justice as an organisational practice and indeed, as a goal that is worked towards through mobilisation and consistent effort (Callinicos, 2000; Clayton & Williams, 2004).

Given the theoretical and organisational concepts of social justice, it can thus be defined as the consistent movement towards equality. According to Callinicos (2000), equality is a broad concept and can be applied to the social, political and economic spheres and beyond. The most inclusive definition of equality that encapsulates and transcends these spheres can be constructed *as the state in which all individuals have the same status (social, political and economic) in a society, accompanied by access to services in which that status can be maintained.*

In providing a final definition for social justice as it will be used throughout this study, it can be defined as *the consistent and collective movement towards equality, in which even social standing and the access that accompanies this can be achieved and maintained.*

The Facilitation of Social Justice

The definition of social justice as used in this study will be referred to numerous times throughout the following chapters, and will be described in terms of its facilitation. It is thus important to clarify what is meant by facilitation.

Facilitation can be described as the act of making something easier or more possible (McKean, 2005). Thus, when referring to the facilitation of social justice, it is the use of digital storytelling to make the achievement of even social standing more possible. There is therefore no idealistic assertion that digital storytelling will eradicate all social issues and that social justice will be simply and easily established in all places where such projects are undertaken, but rather that it is one way that the achievement of social justice can be made more possible. This also acknowledges that the attainment of social justice is a long-term goal that cannot be achieved simply, but rather through consistent initiatives, one of which can be digital storytelling.

Context of Social Injustice

In order for social justice to have emerged as a concept that can be facilitated, and indeed, to have been defined here as that which brings equality, it is important to highlight that a condition in which this equality was restricted, must have existed. This condition can be referred to as social injustice and goes hand in hand with social justice as the force that attempts to combat its intrinsic inequality.

As with social justice, many definitions of social injustice exist, but since this study is concerned with how social justice is facilitated, the meaning of social injustice is secondary. It will therefore be referred to as the antecedent of social justice – as the societal context which constrains and hinders the facilitation of even social standing. As such, the context of social injustice will be described in this paper in terms of the culture of silence, which constrains the facilitation of social justice.

The Culture of Silence

According to Tyler & Smith, (1995) and Chong (2001), the silence of individuals or members of a community in any given society is one of the greatest obstacles to achieving equality. This is because the needs, hopes and aspirations of these individuals are not communicated to those who have the power to affect this because they have been effectively silenced. Renowned educationist and social theorist, Paulo Freire attributes this to what he calls a culture of silence. Described in his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2000) the culture of silence is the absence of a public voice in a context that is experienced as culturally imperialistic, particularly in educational settings that form a reflection of society at large. Morrow and Torres (2002) assert that this occurs where individuals of a society do not belong to the dominant group and as a result are oppressed or marginalised. Their culture – which is conceptualised here as everything that is central to their being – is controlled and dictated to by the dominant group, effectively silencing them. The culture of these individuals is reduced to such a level of silence that, in the exceptional case where they are presented with a

platform to assert a voice, the dominant group chooses their words for them (Freire, 2000). In this sense, the culture of silence translates into a lack of social presence – an invisibility that plagues those who do not form part of the “mainstream” or the “norm”. This is often experienced by immigrant communities or ethnic minorities (Morrow & Torres, 2002).

According to Goldman (2001), a culture of silence can also refer to the lack of public¹ awareness, acknowledgment and dialogue on sensitive issues and abuses such as domestic or sexual violence, drug abuse, the contraction of HIV, disability, etc. This silence stems from the shame that is associated with any of these experiences and the reinforcement of cultural norms in which bringing these issues into the public is considered inappropriate. In certain contexts where these issues are acknowledged and debated, the stigma associated with publicly acknowledging such an experience can fuel the silence to an even greater extent. Thus, the culture of silence is even perpetuated in contexts where openness is the norm, but where the emotional safety to acknowledge such experiences publicly is absent.

The culture of silence is therefore both the marginalisation from mainstream society and with it the absence of a social presence, as well as the unspoken nature of social issues and abuses (Goldman, 2001). In relating this to social justice as the movement towards equality where even social standing can be achieved and maintained, the culture of silence can be identified as a clear obstacle to this and as symptomatic of a context in which social injustice exists. **Thus, for the purpose of this paper, the context of social injustice is any context in which the culture of silence can be found and where it needs to be addressed in order to facilitate social justice. As such, the culture of silence is not a prerequisite for the existence of social injustice, but is merely suggested as a manifestation that can be addressed in order to achieve social justice.**

Addressing the culture of silence can be achieved through the action that is most commonly described as “breaking the silence”. According to Chong (2001), this involves consistent action towards the public acknowledgment of abuses but also towards providing a voice for marginalised

¹ “Public” can refer to society at large or to the individual's own community (Marquand, 2004).

individuals. As these are the manifestations of the culture of silence, bringing them to the fore vocally “breaks the silence” so to speak. This then enables social justice to be facilitated as the public acknowledgement that comes with hearing the voices of the marginalised and those that have experienced abuse elevates them to even social standing with the dominant group. Although this only takes place in terms of having their voice heard (Chong, 2001), this measure of even social standing and the achievement of social justice comes about in one aspect, and does not render it any less significant. According to Miller (1999), it signals a start for the achievement of even social standing in other respects, as being able to communicate needs and aspirations can determine the action for them to be achieved.

Breaking the silence by public acknowledgement can take place in various forms, but the basic premise is that the past experiences, hopes and aspirations for the future are vocalised (Goldman, 2001). Creating and sharing digital stories is one way that this can be achieved as it not only captures the experiences and hopes, but also shares them with a wide and diverse audience, thereby establishing a social presence. In the facilitation of social justice, digital storytelling addresses the culture of silence by breaking it: by providing a voice to the marginalised and voiceless, in which their experiences, hopes and aspirations can be vocalised and in which actions to bring about change can be taken (Chong, 2001). Change might not necessarily be affected immediately or in even in the life of a storyteller who shares their experiences, but the mere fact that it is being highlighted can mobilise action from others with similar experiences and hopes for the future. It can also create awareness amongst members of the dominant group on the voicelessness experienced by marginalised individuals. As individuals who possess social presence and a voice, who constitute the “norm” and who generally have greater access to resources, individuals belonging to the dominant group are able to affect the change that can elevate the voiceless to a level of equal social standing.

Chapter 2

Development, Functioning and Challenges of Digital Storytelling

Although digital storytelling was defined in the previous chapter, a better understanding of what this encompasses is needed in order to address the question of how it can be used to facilitate social justice. As such, the history of digital storytelling (how it came to be digital storytelling) as well as its functioning and challenges will be discussed here. This will then be linked to the chosen case studies, which will confirm the premise that digital storytelling can indeed facilitate social justice and will provide an analysis as to how it is able to do this with ultimate use for the case of Rwanda. Thus, although the chapter focuses on some general aspects of digital storytelling, it must be read within the context of how this information contributes to answering the research question.

The development of digital storytelling as well the steps to creating digital stories are related specifically with constant reference to the literature and therefore do not stem from my own ideas. I do however, highlight some of the challenges to digital storytelling and this forms the bulk of my own analysis in this chapter.

Development

Tracing the development and function of digital storytelling would be incomplete without briefly exploring the history of traditional storytelling, which is essentially at its core. As part of this, what is meant by a story and storytelling must also be clarified.

From Traditional Storytelling to Digital Storytelling

According to Altman (2008), the word “story” is often used interchangeably with the word “narrative” to refer to an account of a real or imagined event that is communicated to others in either a written or spoken form. In this study however, a story refers to an account (description) that is told for entertainment, or to relate the past experiences of a person's life. As such, “story” will not be used interchangeably with narrative but rather with the word “account” to refer to a description that is communicated to others to give meaning (Van Hulst, 2008) or to entertain. “Storytelling”

would thus refer to the sharing or communicative aspect of this description and refers to oral as opposed to written communication.

According to Pellowski (1990), the first known examples of storytelling date back to the Ice Age, where knowledge and skills were conveyed to others as a means of survival. For instance, stories would be conveyed through gestures and expressions to describe a hunting expedition, the skills that would be needed to succeed and the challenges that would be experienced. Thus, it would serve as a means of training for younger generations in the methods of survival. Evidence that such stories were told can be seen in rock paintings like the Chauvet Cave in France. Although this is storytelling in the earliest written form known to man, these accounts were likely to be related orally through expressions before being put to stone (Pellowski, 1990).

As different skills were required with the progression of time, stories that formally aided survival became known as legends, and knowledge that passed from one generation to the next became infused with group-specific norms and values, translated into culture. According to Champion (2008), storytelling initially served the purpose of ensuring physical survival but gradually developed into a tool of social and cultural cohesion within a given group. The telling of stories that would be carried over from one generation to the next in which cultural conventions were communicated became known as oral tradition. This storytelling practice exists to this day in various parts of the world, but also indeed in Africa, Rwanda as a case in point being no exception (Pellowski, 1990; Champion, 2008).

With the development of oral tradition through the centuries came the communication of actual human experiences with the fusion of fictional events, characters and settings. It is from this fusion that the elements of stories such as plot, character and setting developed and from which stories were constructed for the purpose of entertainment (Pellowski, 1990). This construction was not only done orally but developed alongside the advancement of the printing press. Storytelling thus took on a written form and with increasing literacy rates during the nineteenth and twentieth century in

even the most remote locations, the oral communication of stories was limited to societies with a strong oral tradition (Champion, 2008).

Although the telling of stories increasingly took on book form and developed into an individual activity, drama – another form of oral storytelling – continued to proliferate. With a story being directly and actively related to an audience, this infused oral storytelling. (Murphet as cited in Fulton, 2005) suggests that it eventually led to it being captured on film and retold to audiences through this medium. The result is that still or moving images, dialogue, and sounds have been used over the past decade to develop digital stories, which in this capacity, can be referred to as a fusion of film and traditional storytelling. According to Murphet as cited in Fulton (2005), this fusion involves the cultural element of traditional oral storytelling and technical aspects of film.

It is important to mention that the concept of traditional storytelling as used here refers specifically to a person as a storyteller, directly telling a story to a physical audience, as opposed to using film as a method to do this. Digital storytelling bridges this divide and this can be seen by looking at its development and its functioning.

History of Digital Storytelling

As mentioned at the start of this chapter, digital storytelling developed through the efforts of Dana Atchely and Joe Lambert, and according to Wilcox (2009), began to take off with their establishment of the Centre for Digital Storytelling (CDS) in 1998 (Wilcox, 2009). There was, however, a slight forerunner to the method of digital storytelling (the sharing of stories to give meaning and inspire change) which some have suggested has contributed to its development. *Photovoice* was developed in 1992 as a joint effort by researchers at the University of Michigan and the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) at the University of London (Carlson & Engebreston, 2006). The method involves identifying challenges in communities, representing those in photographs, constructing stories to accompany those photographs and planning a course of action to influence policy makers in contributing to communities in need. *Photovoice* was first used

by women in rural China who displayed the photographs of their community at public exhibitions. These photographs were used to appeal to policy makers, who then provided educational scholarships to rural girls, as the lack of access to education was one of the challenges faced by these communities (Wilcox, 2009).

The idea of sharing stories to achieve an aim was thus not new, however, the representation and sharing of it through the use of multimedia was somewhat innovative. This was first undertaken by media artist Dana Atchely when he developed his autobiography, *The Next Exit*. This story reflected twenty years of his life which he had spent touring the United States in a storytelling-based roadshow. Atchely teamed up with Lambert, a dramatic consultant, to produce his autobiography through the use of multimedia. As they presented the video-based autobiography, an interest in sharing life stories developed amongst their audience. According to Beeson and Miskelly, (n.d.), Atchely and Lambert began to develop ways in which multimedia software could be used to assist people in telling their own stories. By 1994, Nina Mullen joined the team and the San Francisco Digital Media Centre (SFDMC) was born. This was where the training methods of the Standard Digital Storytelling Workshop was developed as well as the seven elements of digital storytelling, which laid out the method of producing a first person account and the workshop training that this involved (CDS, 1998).

By 1998, employees at several organisations in the San Francisco Bay Area had been trained in creating their own first person narratives, with programmes like *Digitally Abled Producers With Disabled and Able-bodied Youth* and *Digital Griot with African Americans* being established. Several educational organisations were also trained in the uses that digital storytelling could have in the classroom and the SFDMC had relocated to the University of California Berkeley, becoming known as the Centre for Digital Storytelling (CDS) (CDS, 1998). Supported by the Kellogg Foundation, the CDS launched a community development digital storytelling project in rural areas across two vast states. Workshops to facilitate the training of creating digital stories continued to be

held in various parts of the country, with projects then being undertaken globally. By 2002, training workshops had been held in New Zealand, Australia, the United Kingdom, and Japan, across the education, health and civil service sectors (CDS, 1998). These training workshops, apart from being based on a set of steps, were also based on a set of founding principles.

The founding principles of the CDS are important for the development of digital storytelling as the very first digital storytelling workshops were based on these. As such these need to be elaborated on as part of its development.

The first and most fundamental principle is that every individual has a story to tell (CDS, 1998). This is premised on the idea of equality in that no story is more important than another. The next principle of importance, particularly with the focus on social justice in this study, is that sharing of stories can lead to positive change and that the power and emotive quality of the digital format can inspire actions that achieve or maintain equality amongst people. Other principles of the CDS include the fact that truly being able to listen is a challenge for most people and is thus an important skill to cultivate; that stories are told from different points of view – there is no right or wrong way of telling; and finally, that creativity is a human activity and that it is a powerful tool when coupled with technology (CDS, 1998).

These principles were the starting point of the general method used to create digital stories. They led to the development of the seven elements or steps and are interwoven throughout. The functioning of digital storytelling, in other words, the way that digital storytelling works or is produced, is outlined in these steps, as well as in some brief technical considerations.

Functioning of Digital Storytelling

Steps in Creating Digital Stories

According to the CDS (1998), digital stories are created through the application of seven elements or steps as developed during the initial establishment of the CDS. These steps comprise the methodology of digital storytelling and are carried out in a two to three day training workshop.

They form an important part of the functioning of digital storytelling, as they prescribe the way that digital stories are composed and shared.

The seven elements or steps are addressed personally to the storyteller,² the first three of which comprise **owning your insights and emotions, and finding the moment**. This means that the storyteller finds an experience that is meaningful and that he/she would like to share with others as a story (CDS, 1998). Kadjer et. al. (2005) explains that the storyteller owns insight by identifying why the experiences constitutes a meaningful story and then owns the emotion not only by acknowledging those experienced during the actual encounter, but also those that will resonate with the story. As the third step, Lambert (2010) suggests that finding the moment is where the storyteller identifies a moment that encapsulates the experience they want to relate as a story. For example, the storyteller may have chosen to tell a story about a school trip that was meaningful because it illustrated a particular period in her life where she encountered many challenges. The storyteller owns insight into this trip as symbolic of a difficult period in her life and then chooses a moment in this trip that encapsulates this. The moment is then created into a digital story.

In the next two steps **seeing and hearing your story**, Lambert (2010) suggests that the storyteller chooses an image that comes to mind when he/she reflects on the moment, and then uses images that portray this most accurately. According to Kadjer et. al. (2005), this could come on the form of photographs, drawings, or video footage. This is followed by the narration of the story, in which the storyteller writes a script and then reads this while making an audio recording of his/her voice. Choosing sounds or music that complement the telling of the story and that reinforce the emotion are also part of the task (Lambert, 2010).

The last two steps in the process of creating a digital story are **assembling and sharing your story**. At this point the storyteller has identified what the story is about and what he/she wants to

² The words “storyteller” and “author” and used interchangeably.

communicate through it. The task is thus to put the story together, which is done through storyboarding. This is the laying out of images in a sequential manner for visual production (Robin, 2010). The script, which was recorded in the storyteller's voice, is taken and distributed over the images to create structure, such as a beginning, a middle and an end. Lambert (2010) suggests that the greatest task in this process is finding the ways in which the visual and audio content complement each other, particularly to ensure that the story reflects what the author is trying to communicate.

The premise of storytelling is that the story is shared with an audience. After the story has been assembled, it needs to be contextualised and shared with an audience of the author's choice. This could be an audience of one person, or perhaps even thousands if shared on the Internet (Lambert, 2010).

Technical Considerations in Creating Digital Stories

The seven steps outlined above illustrate the ways in which digital stories are created and the method developed by the CDS as the pioneering organisation in digital storytelling. It must be noted however, that these are merely guidelines in creating digital stories and that other steps could be incorporated or substituted. For example, there are other organisations and institutions that have used the method slightly differently and have adapted it to four basic steps, as described by Kadjer, et. al. (2005) and Bull and Kadjer (2004):

1. Selecting a topic and the purpose of a story and gathering visual and audio materials for it;
2. Making a final selection from the gathered materials and combining this with a script;
3. Recording the narration and publishing the story; and
4. Sharing the story

To physically create the digital story, these steps need to be combined with the relevant technical skill and software requirements. One of the advantages of digital storytelling that falls in line with the purpose of social justice as far as this study is concerned, is that the skill required to produce

such a story can be learnt easily given the availability of the software and the training of basic computer literacy skills (Lambert, 2010). As mentioned in the seven steps, the story can be organised through the use of a storyboard, which can be found in standard office software, but can also be used in digital storytelling software such as *Photo Story*. The selected images can be photographed or scanned, the voice recording can be made with an audio recorder and all of these can be exported into the variety of digital storytelling software that exists, Robin (2010) suggesting *Photo Story* as one of the numerous examples of this.

The functioning of digital storytelling thus includes both the method used by the CDS and the technical requirements to create digital stories. In discussing this, the premise that digital storytelling facilitates social justice has been highlighted. Although this will be discussed in depth in the next chapter with the case studies as examples of this, it seems to confirm that by adhering to the principles and methods that results in a digital story, even social standing is already promoted. For instance, the principle that all stories are equal regardless of their content creates a sense of even social standing and facilitates actions to sustain this by following the method of sharing the stories. Although this hardly amounts to the collective and consistent action that was included in the definition of social justice and what it means to facilitate this, it does imply that digital storytelling by its very nature possesses this potential. There are, however, pitfalls to be aware of if this potential is to be utilised fruitfully.

Challenges of Digital Storytelling

Although this chapter has dealt with digital storytelling in a more general sense, it has been aimed towards explaining digital storytelling in the broader context of this study which is concerned with how it facilitates social justice. As such, the challenges of digital storytelling will be addressed in terms of how it hinders the facilitation of social justice. **These challenges have been put together by the author through looking at the pitfalls that stem from the functioning of digital storytelling, and although they are primarily the author's own observations of the challenge**

that it poses to facilitating social justice, it is supported by academic literature, which will be referred to in this capacity.

The first challenge that can be identified is with regard to the steps of digital storytelling, which seem either too prescriptive or too vague. In the sense that is it too prescriptive, storytellers might feel inhibited by the step-by-step process if it is followed too precisely.³ For example, the first three steps of digital storytelling can occur differently for each storyteller – some might find it easier to own the emotions first, then the insight and then to find the moment. The same can be said for steps four and five, seeing and hearing your story. Some storytellers may prefer to hear the story and then to see it, or may even choose to do this before owning the emotions of the story. Implementing these steps too rigidly could not only inhibit the creativity of the storyteller, but could also result in no story being told at all because too much attention is paid to the steps in creating it. This same challenge has been highlighted by Miskelly (2008), who found that digital storytelling initiatives could sometimes lead to the facilitators having too much control over the creative process, which brings into question who the story is even about.

When it comes to digital storytelling and the facilitation of social justice, it is clear that this prescription of method can manifest in a control by the facilitator and dependency by the storyteller, neither of which lead to even social standing and the maintenance of this.

The other side of the coin to this first challenge is that the steps can also be considered too vague. Without absolute clarity of what is meant by phrases like, “finding the moment” or “owning your insight”, storytellers may have a different idea of how to go about the process, leading to valuable time being lost, and once again to no story being created in the end. As every story is equal and contains value, this is a reality to be faced when time and resources may only be at the disposal of a storyteller for the period of time that the digital storytelling initiative is running. These observations are also confirmed by Miskelly (2008), a freelance digital storytelling facilitator, and also highlight

³ This holds true for both the CDS' methods and those adapted by the other organisations as mentioned on page 6.

the challenge they pose to the facilitation of social justice. The lack of clarity that may result in a story not being created translates into the silencing of a voice that may desperately need to be heard. As suggested in Chapter 1, one possible way that social justice can be facilitated through digital storytelling is by breaking the culture of silence and providing a voice to the voiceless. By misunderstandings in the vague communication of the steps in digital storytelling, even social standing is not promoted as it can result in the perpetuation of the culture of silence.

A second challenge that can be mentioned is with the regard to the larger context in which digital stories are created. As can be seen from some of the academic literature that has been generated on digital storytelling, (Klaebe & Foth (2006), Burgess (2006), Nutt & Schwartz (2008), Wilcox (2009) and Hull (n.d.)) the context is usually a community setting, in which financial support has been provided by an external body. Depending on the function of the external body or organisation, the expectation is often that the stories that are created will be in line with the function of the body that provided the funding. This can lead to stories being manipulated to suit the purpose that the funding was provided for. For example, if an organisation provides funding for the creation of stories of victims of domestic violence, there is an expectation that the stories will be on this topic specifically. This restricts the freedom that storytellers have to tell stories of their choice and also refutes the first three steps in the process. Burgess (2006), whose research on digital storytelling was primarily based on its creativity and democratic potential, remarked that it does not exist without some form of institutional control, and this confirms that the context in which stories are created can result in a degree of control and manipulation. This is indeed a serious challenge to the facilitation of social justice, as the culture of silence which inhibits this is often enabled by the control that the dominant group has over those that are voiceless and marginalised. A great deal of care needs to be taken when the context in which stories are told is created.

A third and additional challenge – perhaps the most pivotal to mention when looking at the facilitation of social justice in developing countries such as Rwanda – is that digital storytelling is

resource intensive. Without the provision of resources from an external body, digital storytelling initiatives will not be undertaken, especially in the context where the culture of silence is attributed to the lack of resources. This can create a dependency and is linked to the above challenge where it is translated into the creation of stories that have been determined by the external body or organisation. It also extends into the issue of ownership, as those who are dependent on external sources may also have no copyright over their own material because it is used for the purposes of the organisation. Klæbe et. al. (2007) confirm this observation by stating that the ethical implications with regard to the ownership of stories can be complex and perhaps even disempowering to those who tell their stories. The issue of digital storytelling and its resource intensive nature thus extends to other challenges, all of which can hinder the facilitation of social justice because they may not place the resources in the hands of the voiceless sustainably nor may they extend the full rights of ownership to the storytellers.

Lastly, a challenge that is particular to contexts of injustice such as post-genocidal Rwanda is the fact that many storytellers, if given the freedom of choice, may wish to create stories that relate highly traumatic incidents their lives. Although this can be a therapeutic process, it is not therapy in itself and storytellers may not be aware of the consequences that this may have on their psychological wellbeing if not conducted with the assistance of a psychologist. Miskelly (2008) also highlights this point, which in turn illustrates that if the creation of a story with heavy emotional content may hinder the facilitation of digital storytelling because it does not promote the sustained psychological stability that can be equated with even social standing.

All the above challenges do not prevent the facilitation of social justice indefinitely – they merely indicate that there are deterring aspects that need to be taken into account during a digital storytelling initiative if social justice is to be facilitated.

These challenges will be related to the case studies under question in Chapter 3 (refer to p. 45) as they will be used in the creation of the key points. These challenges relate to digital

storytelling more generally than specifically to the case studies, but due to their general nature, can be anticipated in the case studies as well. (There is however, no empirical evidence in the case studies that suggests that these challenges were necessarily encountered.)

Chapter 3

The Facilitation of Social Justice in Digital Storytelling Case Studies

Having outlined the purpose and the structure of this study, defined the key concepts and identified the challenges to two of the key concepts (digital storytelling in terms of facilitating social justice) in the two previous chapters, this chapter will focus on two case studies. These have been chosen primarily because they are two of the most popularly documented case studies that can be found in academic literature and are reflective of most digital storytelling initiatives that have taken place worldwide in the past few years, according to Hartley & McWilliam (2009).

The aim in looking at these two case studies is to illustrate that digital storytelling does facilitate social justice which is the premise of this study and to identify how it does this, which is the purpose of this study. In order to fulfill this purpose which extends to the case of Rwanda, a basis from which to identify how social justice is facilitated is needed. A list of criteria thus needs to be developed to apply to the case studies in order to illustrate how social justice was facilitated. This list of criteria can be found by looking at some of the literature that has been generated on the case studies. From there, the criteria can be applied to **my own** analysis of the case studies, which will then result in key points that can be applied to the case of Rwanda in order to determine how digital storytelling can facilitate social justice there.

Case Studies

Before analysing the case studies according to the particular set of criteria, the case studies themselves will be presented. The background to each case study is given, as well as an example of the stories that were created during the initiative in question. Due to the fact that this study is concerned with the facilitation of social justice in the context of social injustice and due to the fact that the culture of silence subsists in this context, the featured stories were chosen because they reflect the culture of silence, which includes experiences of exclusion, marginalisation and voicelessness. Thus, stories that reflect the culture of silence will be analysed to find the above-

mentioned criteria to determine how social justice was facilitated.

Case Study 1: *Capture Wales*

Background and Setup

In 2001, Cardiff University and the Welsh division of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) teamed up to create a multimedia storytelling project that would enable the BBC to connect more closely with the communities it broadcasts to (Klaebe, 2007). A digital storytelling pilot was set up and launched three months later as the first *Capture Wales* workshop. Over a period of seven years (Boa-Ventura & Rodrigues, 2008), a workshop was held on a monthly basis in a Welsh town or village. The objective was two-fold: to take personal and family stories to the public level so as to shine a light on an invisible nation; and to extend the BBC's track record of “listening to the voices of the people” (Meadows, 2003).

The *Capture Wales* workshops took place over a period of five days, two of which were spent on script construction and image capturing, and the remaining three on producing the end product. A team of ten Welsh and English-speaking experts were on hand to train the participants or storytellers, among those of who were computer-illiterate, experienced learning barriers, or were asylum seekers (Beeson & Miskelly, n.d.). What set the project apart from others that preceded it in terms of capturing the stories of the people of Wales and turning the spotlight on “ordinary people” was firstly, that it was a digital storytelling project, which until that point had not yet been attempted in Wales. Secondly and most importantly, the material for the digital stories was not only generated by participants or storytellers but also edited by them. This was one of the first instances in which the subjects of a multimedia production had control over the shaping of the final product (Meadows, 2003).

Coming to an end in 2008, a continuation of *Capture Wales* has been sustained by the mobilisation of community BBC studios (Boa-Ventura & Rodrigues, 2008), where storytellers from the pilot project could return to and create other digital stories. In recent years, a number of

partnerships have been set up between the BBC and cultural and community organisations, intended for the growth of digital storytelling in Wales (Meadows, 2003).

The motivation in launching *Capture Wales* was to give a voice to the “average” Welsh citizen with the intention of sharing this with the rest of the country. Part of this was also to highlight the experiences of individuals that were “underrepresented in the media” (Boa-Ventura & Rodrigues, 2008) and it is in this sense that the democratic participation established in the literature review can be seen. Whether there is evidence that social justice was facilitated can be seen by looking at the stories in the next section, which will form part of the analysis.

Digital Stories

Over the seven years that the *Capture Wales* project was running, more than 500 hundred digital stories were created, specifically in line with the CDS's established idea that everyone, even the most “ordinary” person, has a story to tell. Many of the 500 hundred stories are on positive experiences with family and friends, hobbies, holidays, values and many more. The stories here however (as narrated by the author of this study) have been created by people whose experiences seem to denote a context of social injustice as they communicate some form of exclusion, marginalisation and silence. Thus, although they are not reflective of the initiative, their presence constitutes some attempt at giving a voice to the voiceless. Whether this will match the criteria will be seen in the analysis.

Story 1: Fitting in

Rahul Singh tells the story about growing up in the only Indian family in Abernant, Wales. He was treated differently to his peers in school and often felt excluded from his peer group. This was exacerbated by the gangs that would gather outside his parents' shop to hurl racist insults at him. Through two strong friendships, Rahul was able to build his self-confidence to the extent that by the time he reached high school, he had learnt not to pay attention to the racism and stereotyping leveled against him. This gave him the incentive to invite members of the Abernant community to family

celebrations and cultural events in an attempt to show that their “difference” from the rest of the community could be a positive thing. This bridged the barrier between Rahul's family and the Abernant community, and they found that greater acceptance and tolerance towards their culture was achieved. Although racism was a constant feature in his life, this story is about how Rahul learnt to overcome this and how he still deals with this challenge to a certain extent (Singh & Capture Wales, 2004).

Story 2: I'm Not a Mad Axe-Murderer

This is a story told by “Sian S”, who has what she calls “an invisible difference”. On the outside she looks “ordinary”, but a personality disorder causes her to be perceived by others as crazy or as an “axe-murderer”. She wants to work to support herself, but is told that her needs are too great to be accommodated by the job market. Doctors tell her that she is too ill to work and even to live at home with her family. Sian also feels that people are afraid of her, which excludes her even more from society and these feelings of exclusion (not having a social presence) are what this story relates (Sian S & Capture Wales, 2005).

Story 3: An Angel from Above

In 2001, Louise Clark's mother passed away and this story relates her feelings of loneliness after experiencing this loss. Having no other family to help her through this time, the loss was especially difficult. Soon after her mother's death, Louisa became pregnant. Overjoyed at having a reason to live, she calls her son Conrad “an angel from above”. Although Louise is also homeless, she feels that her son gives her the motivation to strive towards a better future (Clark & Capture Wales, 2003).

Story 4: Nobody Else Did That

“Diana D” tells the story of the painful experience of molestation that caused her to feel ashamed and to remain silent on it for more than thirty years. She describes the relief and improved sense of self at being able to express her anger and hurt through the creation of her digital story (Diana D & Capture Wales, 2004).

Case Study 2: *Silence Speaks*

Unlike *Capture Wales*, *Silence Speaks* is an initiative that partners with different organisations around the world to create digital stories. Thus, it is not one digital storytelling project but given its international partnerships, forms a large-scale initiative aimed at breaking the silence on social issues and thereby promoting change.

Background

Silence Speaks was founded in 1999 by Amy Hill, a former CDS facilitator and digital video producer with a history in working on women's health issues (Hartley & McWilliam, 2009). It was founded in order to promote justice and healing for victims of violence, abuse, displacement and marginalisation through the creation and sharing of digital stories (Jacobson, 2009). It partners with organisations around the world, not only to capture stories, but also to provide training and education programmes on health and social issues.

The objective that *Silence Speaks* hopes to achieve is premised on the belief that the skillful presentation and sharing of stories can bring attention to issues in society that are often ignored such as poverty and exploitation. The rationale is that once the attention is brought to the general public, further action can be mobilised at a policy making level (Silence Speaks, 2010).

Digital Stories

Silence Speaks has worked with other organisations to be part of over forty digital storytelling partnerships. The stories shared here are reflective of most of these partnerships as they are in line with the objectives mentioned above. Examples of the partnerships are the The Camp Sheila Wellstone Project (USA), Digital Hero Book Project (Uganda) and Digital Stories Migration Project (across sub-Saharan Africa). One story from each partnership will be looked at and will be evaluated according to the criteria.

Story 1: The Camp Sheila Wellstone Project

Initiated through a partnership between *Silence Speaks* and the Sheila Wellstone Institute, an

organisation that works for the end of violence towards women and children (The Sheila Wellstone Institute, 2010), this partnership captured and shared the stories of women who have been accused of causing parental alienation syndrome in their children. This so-called syndrome is often used by father's rights groups in the United States to refer to women that purposefully try to alienate children from their fathers after a divorce or separation, with the result that sole legal custody is often awarded to the fathers. This can often occur despite evidence of domestic abuse and violence from the fathers (Silence Speaks, 2010). The following story illustrates this:

Anonymous had been physically and verbally abused by her husband for fourteen years. When she finally started divorce proceedings, she related the abuse to the courts, but despite this was told that she would alienate the children from their father and that therefore, sole custody would be awarded to him. After an attempt on her life by her ex-husband and her children constantly living in fear of their father, Anonymous decided to speak out against the so-called parental alienation syndrome she was accused of possibly causing, as this enabled her ex-husband to continue his abuse towards their children. Creating a digital story and sharing it was one way that Anonymous chose to break the silence about her experience of abuse and this so-called syndrome. She also wanted to tell her story to create an awareness of a situation where women have to witness the abuse of their children due to the so-called parental alienation syndrome that awards custody of their children into abusive hands. (Anonymous, Camp Wellstone & Silence Speaks, 2007).

Story 2: Digital Hero Book Project

REPSSI is an organisation that partnered with *Silence Speaks* to create and share the stories of young people in Uganda who are exposed to poverty, conflict, displacement and HIV through the digital sharing of their hero books. The hero books were created on paper through art activities, and were meant to encourage young people to find the hero in themselves that corresponds with someone they admire. The Digital Hero Book Project allowed them to share their hero book through the creation of a digital story (Silence Speaks, 2010).

Richard tells the story of how he was abducted and forced to fight as a child soldier in the conflict in northern Uganda. After managing to escape, he returned home only to find that both his parents had been killed. He found a job on a coffee plantation and managed to return to school. Richard's dream is to become a doctor and this seems to be materialising as he has the opportunity to resume his education and to work through the difficulty of his past experiences. His hero is his facilitator, who continuously encourages him to believe in his future (Duuki Richard, REPSSI & Silence Speaks, 2006).

Story 3: Digital Stories Migration Project

Silence Speaks partnered with the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) to create and share stories in which the issues of migration in sub-Saharan Africa, such as xenophobia, extreme working conditions, and possible deportation, could be highlighted. Eight men and women from various countries were recruited, given a camera to capture certain aspects of their lives visually and provided with training to tell their stories digitally (Silence Speaks, 2010).

The story told by Anonymous deals specifically with labour migration and tells the tale of his long, arduous and dangerous journey from Zimbabwe to South Africa by foot. He is employed by farmers who ill-treat and exploit him but eventually manages to find a job as a security guard. In an attempt to find a place of belonging, he looks for female companionship but due to misinformation and unprotected sex, contracts sexually transmitted diseases. After a difficult year, he manages to bring his wife to South Africa and his working conditions improve. He acknowledges, however, that many challenges still lie ahead for him in making a new life in a country that has a growing epidemic of xenophobia. He tells his story, hoping that somehow it will make conditions more bearable for migrant labourers, but is also happy to share his sense of accomplishment at being able to create some semblance of a life in his country of migration (Anonymous, IOM & Silence Speaks, 2007).

Literature review

Since the information on the case studies themselves has been provided, the literature that has

been generated on these initiatives will be outlined here. This will assist in the creation of the criteria that will be used to analyse this particular case study and in turn, to generate the key points as to how digital storytelling facilitates social justice.

Literature on *Capture Wales*

Klaebe (2006) touches on the *Capture Wales* initiative by discussing it within the context of her own project of digitally capturing community history, which she was able to undertake having received training from both the CDS' Joe Lambert and Daniel Meadows, the creative behind *Capture Wales*. Her further elaboration on *Capture Wales* is with reference to its focus on placing the voices of “ordinary” people at a national level, thereby alluding to the democratic media participation mentioned by Burgess (2006). In an article co-authored by Burgess (2007), Klaebe refers to *Capture Wales* in the context of a community development initiative undertaken by public historians. It was asserted the digital storytelling enhanced the practice of public history and evidence of this was found in post-workshop interviews. Klaebe compares this to the Kidd's findings in her post *Capture Wales* workshop interviews (2006), which included participants' experiences of the workshops as therapeutic with positive contribution to personal growth.

Also seeming to have contributed a number of articles to the topic of digital storytelling, Miskelly, a freelance digital storytelling facilitator, has authored an article which provides background information on the workings of digital storytelling (2008) and has co-authored another in which he questions the coherence of digital storytelling for use in community settings (n.d.). With reference to the former article Miskelly (2008) briefly mentions *Capture Wales* as a digital storytelling project that produces community-based digital stories from across Wales. In the latter article, which is co-authored with Beeson, Miskelly (n.d.) uses *Capture Wales* as an example of a digital storytelling project that produces individual stories with great coherence, but which he argues does not contribute to community coherence in the sense that the workshops itself will not mobilise community action.

In a similar vein as community action, Boa-Ventura and Rodrigues (2008), look at digital storytelling in terms of the active citizenship that goes hand in hand with community action. They mention *Capture Wales* with respect to the way that digital storytelling, as digital media, is altering the practice of journalists and conclude that digital storytelling initiatives account for the emerging democratic process where the average, “ordinary” citizen becomes active as a journalist in his/her own right, impacting on the way that news will be broadcast in the future.

Meadows, as one of the creators of the *Capture Wales* project, writes about the phases of establishing the initiative. Apart from explaining the purpose and set up of the initiative, Meadows (2003) is quite firm in his assertion (based on the work of philosopher Ivan Illich and his *Tools for Conviviality*) that digital storytelling is a way for individuals to master the tools that are made available to them – that individuals, owing to digital storytelling initiative like *Capture Wales*, no longer have to play a passive role in someone else telling their stories. This once again alludes to the democratic participation and active citizenry referred to in both the Burgess (2006) and Boa-Ventura & Rodrigues (2008) articles.

Perhaps the most relevant literature on *Capture Wales* is the article by Jenny Kidd (2006), who based her PhD on *Capture Wales*. The article⁴ focused on the impact that the initiative had on those who told their stories within the framework of active citizen participation. Kidd first asserts that digital storytelling in itself is a form of alternative media with an ethos of democratization that can often be used as a form of therapy. She then questions if this holds true for an initiative that is linked to the BBC, which represents a traditional form of media and as such removes the component of active citizenry. Kidd uses the findings of her post *Capture Wales* workshop interviews to address this question. Among her findings are that storytellers told their stories because they wanted to convey a message, to share a passion, to commemorate the life of a loved one, or to deal with a trauma; that storytellers claimed that participating in the workshops improved

⁴ Kidd also collaborated on an article with Meadows on *Capture Wales*. This article is featured in Hartely and McWilliams' *Story Circle*. The findings are similar to those of the article under discussion.

their sense of self; that many storytellers improved their technological skills despite their initial apprehension, but that they felt the resources to continue creating digital stories were out of their reach. In conclusion, Kidd deduced that *Capture Wales* connected with communities, enabled them to connect with themselves, allowed storytellers to feel a sense of accomplishment and to relieve trauma. She also found that ultimately, it did promote democratic participation.

Literature on Silence Speaks

As with the previous literature review, the most relevant literature pertaining to *Silence Speaks* is briefly outlined here and only focuses on the aspects that will assist in creating the criteria that will be used to analyse this particular case study.

Perhaps the most comprehensive work on past digital storytelling initiatives, Hartley & McWilliam (2009) refer to *Silence Speaks* among the three hundred other digital storytelling projects worldwide that were analysed quantitatively, many of which claim to use digital storytelling in the capacity of community and nation building, as well as self expression. Pertaining particularly to *Silence Speaks*, Hartely and McWilliam, as editors of the collection of articles, address the notion of digital storytelling as that which is thought of as providing a “voice”. They assert that this is problematic because providing a voice does not necessarily signal inclusion, nor does silence necessarily signal oppression. For this reason, they suggest that digital storytelling initiatives aiming to provide a voice need, firstly, to establish that silence was due to an imposed “culture” of silence and not out of choice, and secondly, to acknowledge that simply providing a voice is not enough to signal inclusion. *Silence Speaks* has been referred to here as an initiative that provides a voice (of their own free volition) to those whose silence was imposed on them by others and also as an initiative that acknowledges that inclusion will not be achieved by simply holding a digital storytelling workshop.

In line with this characterisation of *Silence Speaks* as context-appropriate and goal-directed is Jacobson's thesis, written during an internship at the CDS, in which she came into contact with the

work done by *Silence Speaks*. Jacobson referred to *Silence Speaks* as a more successful and focused implementation of digital storytelling than that used by the CDS. She asserts that, because the CDS workshops and methods are not specifically directed at achieving social justice, the potential change that they associate the creating and sharing of stories with through their founding principles, cannot come to pass. Having confirmed this through the analysis of the methods used by the CDS and *Silence Speaks*, Jacobson asserts that *Silence Speaks* was in a far better position to achieve an objective such as positive social change because it was specifically directed at this goal. She also makes mention of the flexibility of the methods employed by *Silence Speaks*.

McLellan (2007) looks at digital storytelling from a goal-oriented perspective as well, although she explores this from the perspective of its use in higher education. A reference is made to *Silence Speaks* when she looks at the use of digital storytelling in the field of community development, and how students can learn to make use of this tool at universities so as to be better prepared for its possible use in the field of practice. McLellan also looks at the different types of stories that can be generated in community practice to achieve different goals, for example, stories on health care can be aimed at improving the health care system in a particular community. This article ties in with a number of abstracts taken from the American Public Health Association (APHA) Conference of 2001, where *Silence Speaks* was discussed as a tool for the promotion of health and health activism, particularly for women in situations of violence and domestic abuse (APHA, 2001).

De Tolly's Master's thesis (2009) picks up on this issue of digital storytelling for the use of activism by investigating the role that digital storytelling as a form of technology plays in mediating social change. Although the focus is more on technology in general as the facilitator for change, rather than digital storytelling as in this study, de Tolly concludes that *Silence Speaks* formed an important part in gearing technology towards its use in social change. This was found to be through the use of specific workshop methods (specifically those used with the Sonke Gender Justice Network project in South Africa – mentioned in the paragraph below), which went hand in hand

with sustainable community education projects, and a goal oriented focus, which de Tolly characterised as providing a voice to individuals who do not have the resources (such as technology) to be heard.

To conclude on the literature that deals with *Silence Speaks*, Reed & Hill (2010) write about their findings in a digital storytelling project undertaken with youth in the rural Eastern Cape of South Africa. In partnership with the Sonke Gender Justice Centre, *Silence Speaks* aimed to provide a voice for a group of marginalised youth to share their experiences, hopes and aspirations as part of the broader aim towards social change. An important aspect⁵ of this article is the explanation of the method by which they aim to promote social change in general, but also in the case of this project. This method includes the creation of digital stories to facilitate reflection and personal growth, then the sharing of the stories to promote education and awareness, followed by the momentum and community action that has been promoted through the sharing of stories and then finally the policy advocacy or change (leading to social change) that has been brought about through the community action. Digital storytelling is thus described as the catalyst to social change, similarly to the focus of the study where it is referred to as the facilitator for social justice.

In terms of the findings that this article aimed to present, Reed and Hill found that, given the lack of access to resources mostly due to the rural location of the community, the young storytellers were desperately in need of a platform to make their experiences of poverty, HIV/AIDS and domestic violence known. This was in order for them to ease the burdens of these daily occurrences, but also to bring attention to the issues that compound these experiences, like inadequate housing, water and electricity. Reed and Hill found that the project enabled these young people to learn new technological skills, to share experiences in a therapeutic manner, as well as hopes for the future, and to identify needs with the possibility of mobilising community action to achieve them.

⁵ Other important aspects mentioned in this article are with regard to the training and resources that *Silence Speaks* attempts to contribute sustainably to communities, the storyteller's ownership of copyright and the access to psychological support they require storytellers to have.

Literature Review Summary and Criteria Selection

In order to analyse the case studies and to indicate that social justice is facilitated through digital storytelling, it must first be established if the previous investigations into the case studies serve as pointers in the direction of digital storytelling as the facilitator of social justice. This can be done by summarising their findings.

With regard to the literature on *Capture Wales*, the common consensus appears to be that this initiative was: community-based; inspired connections between individuals in communities; promoted active democratic participation; enabled personal growth, therapeutic relief and an expression of experiences, hopes and aspirations; and improved sense of self and technological literacy.

Literature on *Silence Speaks* seems to find that digital storytelling in this initiative was: oriented towards social change; enabled personal growth, education, awareness and technological literacy; relieved burdens and traumas; and promoted community action and advocacy.

When combined, the literature review on both case studies seem to share the idea that digital storytelling enables democracy and empowerment, which can be related to social justice in the sense that all three concepts exist in society because their characteristics were constrained and restricted in some way (Miller, 1999). Moreover, the literature in the section of social justice (Clayton & Williams, 2004; Callinicos, 2000) equates democracy and empowerment with its description of even social standing in this study. Therefore, it can be concluded that the literature does point to digital storytelling as a facilitator of social justice. It must be asserted, however, that when dealing with social justice in contexts of social injustice, the more common association with social justice is empowerment rather than democracy. This is because empowerment is characterised by the same consistent and collective action that is particular to social justice (Chong, 2001), and is generally action that will be taken by those who have been marginalised and are voiceless. As such, the literature review on the case study that is more consistent with the

characteristics of empowerment – *Silence Speaks* – will primarily be drawn on to establish the criteria, but the characteristics that it shares with the more democracy-oriented review – *Capture Wales* – will also be drawn on. The combination would finally result in the following criteria for evaluating the facilitation of social justice. The case studies should demonstrate that they were:

- community oriented;
- directed towards achieving social change by means of awareness, education (including technological literacy) and advocacy; and
- directed towards improving a person's sense of self in relation to reliving trauma.

Case Study Discussion

The purpose in analysing the case studies is to evaluate it according to the criteria that show evidence of the fact that social justice was facilitated. However, given the fact that the stories were chosen due to the context of social injustice that they represent, and given the fact that this context (with the culture of silence intrinsic to it) presents a challenge to the facilitation of social justice, the challenges mentioned in Chapter 2 will also be used to analyse the case studies. Thus, the stories will be discussed according to the criteria and each case study as whole (referring to the literature and background information) will be discussed in terms of the challenges mentioned in Chapter 2. The discussion on the stories and the case study as a whole will be combined into an analysis, from which key points will be drawn as to how social justice was facilitated in the case study and how it can be applied to the case of Rwanda, which will be discussed in Chapter 5. **This analysis is primarily based on my own observations and interpretation of the literature as there is limited empirical evidence in the literature to refer to specifically. The general conclusions of the authors are, however, used to substantiate some of my observations and as such have been referred to.**

Capture Wales

Digital Stories

In looking at the selected stories of the *Capture Wales* initiative, two of the three criteria has been met.

In the first instance, all four stories were created at a community level. Story 1 and 2 emphasise this in particular as they speak of exclusion or marginalisation from a larger community. Thus, the first point of criteria of social justice is met. The second point of criteria – working towards social change – was not met. Although Story 1, 2 and 4 communicate experiences that a greater awareness needs to be created on, they were not told or created for the purpose of inspiring change. Rather, as can be seen specifically with Story 3, they were told as an improvement of sense of self, which meets the third criteria. An extension of the third criteria is the relieving of a trauma, which can be seen in Story 4.

These stories as reflective of *Capture Wales* thus facilitate social justice according to two criteria, and this is the setting of the initiative at a community level and the direction towards the improvement of sense of self and the relieving of a trauma.

Challenges

With regard the first challenge, the facilitation of social justice was described as being hampered by the vagueness and or over-prescription of method. Due the democratic nature of the initiative, but also due to the fact that it was not directed towards the achievement of a specific goal such as social change as in the case of *Silence Speaks*, a vagueness or over application of method did not seem to present much of a challenge here and is not mentioned in the literature on the case study.

In looking at the second challenge, *Capture Wales* also seemed to facilitate social justice in that it gave storytellers the freedom to tell a story of their choice. However, due to the fact that the initiative was targeted at the ordinary Welsh citizen who would then constitute part of the dominant group, those who have experienced a form of exclusion and marginalisation and want to convey this

in a story may not feel comfortable in sharing this when the norm seems to dominate the experience. As mentioned in Chapter 1 in the discussion of the culture of silence and supported by the work of Goldman (2001), being given the platform to discuss traumatic experiences away from stigmatisation doesn't necessarily mean that it will be done given the fact that the emotional safety to share such experiences may be absent. The emotional safety will most likely be present in a context such as the one provided by *Silence Speaks* where the marginalised dominate the experience. It must be said however, that if the storytellers of Story 1, 2, 3 and 4 could feel comfortable enough to relate their experiences of marginalisation, then a relative amount of emotional safety must have been available which signals that social justice was facilitated in respect to this challenge.

The third challenge to the facilitation of social justice was the time and resource intensive nature of digital storytelling as well as the issue of ownership. It can be seen in the *Capture Wales* initiative that the storytellers were highly dependent on the resources provided by the BBC and the technical skill of the facilitators. Although Meadows mentioned that additional opportunities would be provided for the creation of further digital stories, Kidd (2006) found that many participants did not have the resources available to them to continue. Despite this, participants acknowledged an improved level of technological literacy. On the issue of the ownership of stories, it is not clear who the stories belong to – whether they are the property of the BBC or whether the storytellers have the rights to share them on additional platforms. On the grounds of improved technological literacy as seen as a form of education, social justice was facilitated.

The final challenge was with regard to the creation and sharing of stories with traumatic content that might cause further psychological harm if told without the support of a psychologist. Since this initiative did not feature many stories in which storytellers related traumatic experiences, this challenge only seems applicable to the very few that did. There is no evidence that suggests that this was done with the assistance of a psychologist, however, Kidd's (2006) findings (supported by

Klaebe, et al. 2007) suggest a sense of relief and positive feelings towards self, which does not communicate a sense of psychological harm. Thus, as far as a provision of a stable psychological environment is concerned, social justice was facilitated in this respect.

Silence Speaks

Digital Stories

In looking at the selected stories of the *Silence Speaks* initiative, all three of the criteria has been met.

In the first instance, all three stories were created at a community level. Story 1 speaks of exclusion or marginalisation from the broader community based on the parental alienation syndrome that the storyteller is accused of causing. Story 2 is also set at a community level in which young people with shared experiences of conflict and displacement tell their stories and in this sense form a community. Story 3 reflects this as well, and highlights a community of migrant labourers who are largely marginalised by the dominant group in the country of migration. All of these stories demonstrate that the criteria has been met.

The second point of criteria – working towards social change – was also met in the sense that all stories are created and shared in the belief that change will come about. With Story 1 this is with regard to assisting those who are accused of the similar syndrome and whose children are enduring abuse. In Story 2 it is hope in the belief that the dream of becoming a doctor will come true, changing the current circumstance of the storyteller's life and in Story 3, is the hope that conditions will improve for migrant labourers. In all three of these stories, it is clear that the aim in telling them is to create an awareness that will inspire change. The second point of criteria has thus been met.

As far as the third point of criteria is concerned, all three stories communicate an improved sense of self or the relieving of a trauma. In Story 1 it is relieving the trauma of fourteen years of domestic violence and the battle for custody of her children; in Story 2 it is relieving the trauma of forced conflict and in Story 3, it is the improved sense of self in sharing the better life that the

storyteller has been able to make for himself. These stories as reflective of *Silence Speaks* thus facilitate social justice according all three criteria.

Challenges

With regard the first challenge, the facilitation of social justice was described as being hampered by the vagueness and or over-prescription of method. Due to the fact that the initiative is specifically oriented towards the achievement of a goal, it may be possible that the methods may be over-prescribed, thus causing the storytellers to feel inhibited. Jacobson (2009), however, described the methods as flexible, yet successful at achieving its aim, and as such, it appears that this challenge does not seem to be present in *Silence Speaks*.

In looking at the second challenge, which was with regard to the manipulation of certain stories through the funding provided by external organisations, it may be very likely that this would happen, given the fact that *Silence Speaks* is an initiative that is aimed at a specific goal, and as such, stories would need to be reflective of that goal. When looking at the initiative as a whole, it is evident that stories only communicate experience of marginalisation, exclusion and voicelessness. However, this does not necessarily mean that the stories were manipulated to achieve a purpose as storytellers participate out of their own volition (Hartely & McWilliam, 2009) indicating that it is their own choice to relate a story of marginalisation. In this sense, it could be asserted that social justice is facilitated in the fact that stories of voicelessness are told out free will.

The third challenge to the facilitation of social justice was the time and resource intensive nature of digital storytelling, which could lead to a dependency, as well as the issue of ownership. *Silence Speaks* is an initiative that involves its partners by not only providing the resources for digital storytelling to take place but also for additional education and training to be provided, not only in terms of improving technological literacy during the digital storytelling creation process, but also in terms of attempting to equip communities with technological and other educational resources to sustain the process of change (Reed & Hill, 2010). With respect to the issue of ownership,

storytellers receive a copy of their own stories in a form of multimedia of their choice and are able to use it for their own purpose. Permission is obtained from the storyteller before it is used as a form of production from a particular partnership (Silence Speaks, 2010). In this respect, social justice is facilitated through the provision of resources and training for sustainable community use. It is also facilitated with respect to the fact that storytellers own the copyright to their own stories.

The final challenge was with regard to the creation and sharing of stories with traumatic content that might cause further psychological harm if told without the support of a psychologist. Since this initiative features many stories that have highly traumatic content, it is likely that psychological assistance would be needed. There is no evidence that the assistance of a psychologist has been used in the various partnerships, however, in its methodology, *Silence Speaks* claims to only include storytellers that are able to access professional help after the workshop process has been completed. Therefore, by confirming that storytellers are able to access the necessary psychological support after the creation of the story, *Silence Speaks* creates a psychologically stable environment for storytellers to tell their stories in.

Case Study Analysis and Key Points

The discussion on stories and the challenges as mentioned in Chapter 2 have culminated in an analysis of how social justice has been facilitated through the case studies and how this is reflective of digital storytelling for the purpose of this study. This analysis presents the common findings of the criteria and the challenges of both case studies.

The criteria that was met in the *Capture Wales* initiative included the fact that it was community oriented and directed towards improving a person's sense of self in relation to relieving experienced trauma. With regard to the challenges, they were refuted by the storyteller's choice of topic, by the improvement of technological literacy and by the establishment of a psychologically stable environment in which to create stories.

In relation to *Silence Speaks*, the criteria that was met also included the fact that it was community

oriented, directed towards improving a person's sense of self in relation to reliving experienced trauma and directed towards achieving social change by means of awareness, education (including technological literacy) and advocacy. The challenges were refuted and social justice was facilitated through the telling of stories out of free volition, the attempt to provide long term educational and training resources, the storyteller's right of ownership to his/her own story and also the provision of a psychologically stable environment.

These findings illustrate how social justice was facilitated in the case studies as reflective of digital storytelling. They can be combined and narrowed down to key points to apply to the case of Rwanda and the use of digital storytelling to facilitate social justice there. These key points are that digital storytelling facilitates social justice by:

- establishing the initiative at community level;
- directing the initiative toward improving a sense of self and more particularly, to relieving trauma;
- allowing storytellers to tell any story of their choice and tell it out of free will;
- establishing an environment that is psychologically stable;
- attempting to provide long term educational and training resources;
- improving technological literacy; and
- directing the initiative specifically towards social change through awareness, education and advocacy.

These key points have emerged from the literature and from the stories as samples of the case studies and illustrate how digital storytelling facilitates social justice. As this is the purpose of the study particularly with regard to the case of Rwanda, these points will be applied to the context of social injustice in this country.

Chapter 4

Rwanda as a Context of Social Injustice

The previous chapter of this study illustrated how digital storytelling can facilitate social justice in contexts of social injustice and how two particular case studies can be seen as evidence of this. The aim in doing this was to compile a set of key points on how the same can be done in the country of Rwanda given its context of social injustice. Before this can be done, however, the context of social injustice needs to be established. As such, the history of Rwanda and the 1994 genocide will be outlined, followed by the aftermath in which the current situation of social injustice in Rwanda can be summarised.

The project *Voices of Rwanda* will then be looked at as an attempt to address social injustice by digital means. The aim in doing this is to illustrate how this basis can be used with a digital storytelling initiative to facilitate social justice. **Although this will be discussed in the following chapter by contrasting the work of *Voices of Rwanda* with the key points that have been developed, this chapter forms the basis of this argument. As such, it is a largely descriptive chapter and is drawn from the work of researchers that are referred to.**

The Case of Rwanda

The most common association with Rwanda and its history is the 1994 genocide, in which close to a million Tutsis and moderate Hutus were murdered in an orchestrated massacre. According to Hubbard (2007), this genocide was symptomatic of artificially constructed ethnic identities, enabled by the previous colonial regime and enacted by Hutu extremists. In establishing the aftermath of this genocide as a manifestation of a context of social injustice, and having established the facilitation of social justice in contexts of social injustice as the focus of this study, it is necessary to trace the origins of this event. This will be done by looking at the early history of Rwanda and tracing this to the actual genocide.

History

The early history of Rwanda stretches back to the Ice Age, after which human habitation began. Through the centuries came the emergence of three groups: the majority being the Hutu, and the minority the Tutsi and the less commonly known Twa. According to both Hubbard (2007) and Prunier (1997), there were no rigid ethnic distinctions between the groups as the same language and cultural practices were common to all three, accompanied by frequent intermarriages, particularly among the Hutu and Tutsi. Any distinctions that did emerge were economic, resulting in those of a higher socio-economic status being referred to as Tutsi.

Hubbard (2007) asserts that prior to colonisation, a system of patronage existed in which a patron would ensure that his client had enough grazing land and would settle any disputes with regard to this or any other pastoral activities. In return, the client would align himself with the patron and pledge his unquestioning loyalty to him. A king or mwami presided over this system and although the structure was altered, it remained in place throughout colonial rule until independence in 1962.

Rwanda was brought under colonial control in 1898 by Germany but after World War One, a mandate for its administration was given to Belgium. The identity that was once fluid became cemented through this colonial regime by the issuing of identity cards in which people were classified as either Hutu or Tutsi (Hubbard, 2007). This developed from the colonial practice of examining physical characteristics and by associating these with the so called Western features of the Tutsi and the “negro” characteristics of the Hutu (Prunier, 1997). According to Meredith (2005), Tutsis were increasingly seen by the colonisers as more Westernised and upper class and were favoured in education and leadership positions. Over the years, the Hutu became increasingly resentful of this preferential treatment.

Background to the 1994 Genocide

Towards the end of the Second World War, when the ideas of Pan-Africanism swept across

Africa and independence movements sprung up in various nations, the Hutu majority saw the opportunity to put an end not only to colonial rule, but to the dominance of the Tutsi elite. The revolution of 1959-1960 saw the rise of Hutu politicians who preached and solidified the idea of Hutu hegemony by portraying Tutsis as the enemy (Meredith, 2005). Hubbard (2007) asserts that this sparked a spate of attacks against Tutsis and the seizure of any positions of power they held. Approximately 130,000 Tutsis fled to neighbouring countries.

By 1963, many of these exiled Tutsis formed insurgency groups (called *Inyenzi*, meaning cockroaches – later becoming a popular discriminatory term for Tutsis) and carried out cross-border raids in an attempt to restore Tutsi social and political dominance in Rwanda. According to Meredith (2005), one such raid sparked the nation-wide pronouncement that Tutsi terrorists were seeking to re-impose their rule and resulted in Hutu mobs across the country attacking and murdering Tutsis at random. Even more Tutsis went into exile and approximately 10,000 were killed. This had an effect on neighbouring Burundi, where the Tutsi minority had managed to maintain political power. In an attempt to avenge these attacks in Rwanda, Tutsi extremists set about removing the “Hutu threat” in Burundi. Waugh (2004) asserts that by 1972, as many as 200,000 Hutus has been killed as another 200,000 fled into Rwanda, causing even further “ethnic” tensions and political instability.

This set the stage for the dictatorship of Juvénal Habyarimana, who made it mandatory for every citizen of the country to carry an identity card, not only with their “ethnicity” stated on it, but also with their place of residence.⁶ According to Meredith (2005), Tutsis were subject to the same discrimination as before, but no additional persecution was leveled against them. Being more concerned with amassing his own wealth and with the maintenance of foreign aid into the country, the so-called Tutsi problem was an issue of minor importance to Habyarimana. This was an

⁶ This would be one of the factors that made it possible for a genocide of such a large scale (approximately 1 million) to be carried out in such a short period of time (100 days) as the identity card made it possible to trace Tutsis and moderate Hutus to their homes (Prunier, 1997).

aversion to Hutu extremists, who soon grew tired of Habyarimana's marginal tolerance of Tutsis, but also of his corrupt regime. As calls for an end to his leadership came, a Tutsi army known as the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), composed of the Rwandese exiles – the *Inyenzi* – made its way into the country in 1990 (Waugh, 2004).

After a disastrous campaign, the RPF retreated into Uganda, and Habyarimana, given the political agitation furthered by the RPF invasion, was forced to abandon his one party system. A coalition government was formed in 1992 and talks with the RPF were initiated. This enraged Hutu extremists in the north of the country (an entourage linked to Habyarimana's wife), who unbeknown to those outside the immediate political circle, started a movement known as *Hutu Power* (Meredith, 2005). According to Prunier (1997), this movement aimed to rid Rwanda of the “Tutsi problem” but also to remove all moderate Hutus that did not agree with their objectives. Groups in support of Hutu power soon sprang up in the army, universities and the media. A youth militia called the *Interahamwe* was formed, recruiting young people with promises of jobs and security should they join the campaign. They were trained, equipped with weapons and prepared to root out the “*Inyenzi*”.

According to Meredith (2005), with the forming of the *Interahamwe* came the drafting and circulation of a memorandum in 1992 in which Tutsis were identified as the primary enemies of the Hutu and that all who tolerated Tutsi were accomplices. This was followed by the media's identification of Tutsis and moderate Hutus in a similar manner.⁷ Following this ferment of hate, organised killings of Tutsis, particularly women and children, took place in the Bugesera region.

Reports on Hutu extremism, the spate of organised killings and the manufacturing of an impending genocide were complied by human rights groups in 1993. This attracted little attention from the West. France in particular, continued its support of Habyarimana's coalition government,

⁷ Serving as a powerful force of influence, the media – radio in particular – had the most links to *Hutu Power* and served as a vehicle through which it could further its ideology.

and was also fully aware of the formation and intentions *Hutu Power*. Both Prunier (1997) and Meredith (2005) assert that they even provided training to its militant force, the *Interahamwe*. It must be stated here that, although Habyarimana's wife backed the of *Hutu Power* movement, Habyarimana himself was considered to be a moderate Hutu and was thus an obstacle to the aim of establishing Hutu supremacy in Rwanda. Although he was also aware of the *Interahamwe's* intentions towards the Tutsis, his plan was to use this to secure his own power base, and did not stem from any particular intention to rid Rwanda of the “Tutsi problem” (Meredith, 2005).

After stalling the process for almost a year since talks began, Habyarimana finally signed a peace agreement with the RPF in 1993. In this Arusha Accords, it was set out that democratic elections were to be held, which would include the representative from Habyarimana's government, the RPF and other opposition parties (Meredith, 2005). According to Barnett (2002), a United Nations peacekeeping force was sent to stabilise the situation until the elections could be held, but events in neighbouring Burundi dismissed any chance of establishing stability, peace and democracy in Rwanda. The democratically elected Hutu president of Burundi, who had only been elected in June 1993, had been kidnapped and murdered by Tutsi extremists in October. Both Hutus and Tutsis took up arms against each other, resulting in the death of 150,000 people. About 300,000 Hutus fled to Rwanda, telling the tales of their torture at the hands of Tutsis. This was all the proof that *Hutu Power* in Rwanda needed to incite more violence against Tutsis and all those that did not see the threat that the “*Inyenzi*” posed (Prunier, 1997).

The 1994 Genocide

By 1994, little progress had been made to the Arusha Accords as Habyarimana was unwilling to give up his power. Having attended a meeting with other African leaders on this very issue in Tanzania on 6 April, 1994, Habyarimana boarded his plane and set course for Rwanda. Soon after take-off, the plane was shot down and Habyarimana was killed. Accusing the *Interahamwe* of having planned this assassination, RPF forces advanced into Rwanda, while the *Interahamwe*

carried out its carefully planned genocide (Meredith 2005).

According to Hubbard (2007), moderate Hutus of prominence – doctors, lawyers, politicians, and teachers – were murdered first, followed by the remaining Tutsis who held positions of power. Armed with clubs, machetes and homemade weapons, the *Interahamwe* went from house to house, demanding identity cards and murdering all those who were identified as Tutsi. Roadblocks were set up all over the country to prevent Tutsis from escaping. Although French, Belgian and UN troops were stationed in Rwanda, they did little to prevent the massacre, nor did the international community act to intervene given the fact that not many had a vested interest in Rwanda (Barnett, 2002).

As Tutsis would seek refuge in their neighbour's homes, churches, hospitals and schools, they would be betrayed and handed over to the *Interahamwe*. It happened frequently that Tutsis would be murdered by neighbours, family members whose identity cards classified them as Hutu, or even by some of their closest friends. Both Meredith (2005) and Hubbard (2007) assert that Hutu women whose children were identified as Tutsi⁸ would be forced by the *Interahamwe* to murder their own children, often before they were murdered themselves for having produced “cockroach” offspring.

These massacres continued, with more than 10,000 people murdered every day. After 100 days, approximately 800,000 had been murdered, and notwithstanding the countless Tutsi women who were raped and tortured as a byproduct of the genocide (Hubbard, 2007). Once the RPF finally advanced towards the south of the country, the *Interahamwe* and *Hutu Power* leaders, as well as the general Hutu population, fled to Tanzania, fearful of the revenge that the RPF might exact on them. This effectively brought the genocide to an end (Meredith, 2005). The process of grappling with the aftermath, however, was only beginning.

Aftermath of the 1994 Genocide

Once the RPF had seized control of the country, a government of national unity was established

⁸ In Rwanda, the “ethnicity” of the father determined that of the child's. Therefore, if the father of the child was Tutsi, the child would be identified as Tutsi, regardless of the “ethnicity” of the mother (Hubbard, 2007).

and was comprised of eighteen Hutus, with the RPF's Paul Kagame (a Tutsi) as the vice president (Waugh, 2004). According to Meredith (2005), the Hutu who had fled to Tanzania, including the *Interahamwe*, were portrayed as refugees by the media and received so much international attention that aid and relief poured in from numerous international organisations and donor countries. This was while hardly any attention had been given to the actual genocide, nor to the largely Tutsi victims that had experienced such atrocities.

As many Hutus began to return to Rwanda where the infrastructure had virtually been destroyed, they were fearful of attacks by surviving Tutsis. Although the process of returning was largely peaceful, accusations of genocide were loosely flung around once people had returned to their former residences. According to Neuffer (2003), whether Hutu or Tutsi, many saw an opportunity to settle old scores that preceded the genocide. Due to the hundreds of arbitrary accusations that were made at this time, prisons becoming overrun with “genocide suspects” and suspicion seemed to lurk everywhere. In response to this and in an attempt to locate the “real” perpetrators, a truth and reconciliation community based model was used, and was known as the Gacaca tribunals (Prunier, 1997).

Meredith (2005), asserts that there was also the task of rebuilding destroyed roads, buildings, hospitals, schools; reconnecting electricity and providing uncontaminated drinking water (many of the water sources had been contaminated by rotting corpses). In support of this effort, hundreds of development NGOs sprung up in Kigali, many of which were also focussed on the task of locating the family of children who had been misplaced by the conflict, if indeed any family members were still alive. According to a Human Right Watch report (2003), once the number of orphans had been established, the task of building orphanages and finding alternatives for them to be cared for was also a priority.

At the end of the genocide, the year's harvest had been lost and many, especially those who had managed to survive the slaughter by hiding in caves, forests, or in the homes of sympathetic Hutus,

were completely undernourished. The land that had once been so well-cultivated had been turned into a killing field and the rotting corpses of victims could be seen everywhere (Meredith, 2005). The enormously difficult task of identifying the bodies of these victims, locating and informing the family that survived began, as well as the re-cultivation of the land. Daily tasks from which livelihood could be sustained were taken up again, while mass graves were dug and mass funerals were held (Prunier, 1997).

According to Favila (2009), the enormous task of sustaining the material needs of victims were so overwhelming that the time or the resources to deal with the psychological impact of the genocide seemed absent. For women in particular, many of whom had been raped, tortured and infected with HIV while watching their family being murdered before their very eyes, the psychological impact would indeed be severe, as it would for children who had witnessed such atrocities. With the emphasis on the immediate material needs, the psychological needs of these victims seemed to be swept under the rug (Staub, et.al. 2005; Favila, 2009).

Sixteen years after the genocide, life has returned to something of what it used to be. Roads, schools, and hospitals have been rebuilt and although the current leadership of Paul Kagame has been described by Reyntjens (2004) as a dictatorship rather than a democracy, the government is seen as relatively stable in comparison to other states in the Central African region. Despite the infrastructural development that is well on its way in Rwanda, the psychological scars remain and have largely been unaddressed. Favila asserts that a 2009 study on the treatment of post traumatic stress revealed that firstly, statistics on the prevalence of post traumatic stress in sub-Saharan Africa are rare because so few studies have been conducted. This confirms the lack of access that victims have to be able to deal with this trauma. Secondly, the study reveals that, of the four that have been conducted on post traumatic stress with reference to Rwanda, the incidence among woman and children who were victims of the genocide is high, with 80 percent of the woman showing signs of trauma and up to 62 percent of the children showing signs of probable post traumatic stress disorder.

In addition, this study indicates that the high incidence of post traumatic stress and trauma is largely attributed to the widespread silence that pertains to the telling of individual stories. This is due to the fact that the resources with which to relate these stories (as part of a trauma counselling programme) have been absent or only accessible to a few women in the capital city (Favila, 2009). It is also because the government has, according to McLean Hilker (2009) restricted the freedom to discuss the genocide as it fears that it might spark the same “ethnic” divisions that enabled the massacre⁹. As such, a general silence on the individual stories of the genocide, with an absence of a platform on which to tell them in order to break the culture of silence, still persists.

Addressing Rwanda as a Context of Social Injustice: *Voices of Rwanda*

In establishing what was meant by the context of social injustice in Chapter 1, it was described as any situation in which the manifestation of the culture of silence could be seen. The culture of silence was referred to as that which needs to be addressed in order for social justice to be facilitated. As such, the culture of silence in Rwanda needs to be identified in order for it to be addressed and in order for social justice to be facilitated.

Looking at the case of Rwanda and the aftermath of the genocide, the culture of silence is evident given the lack of access to a platform on which the voices of victims and the experiences of their trauma could be heard. It is also evident in the fact that these victims form a minority group and that minority groups are often silenced by the dominant group (Hubbard, 2007) in the case of Rwanda this silencing was done literally) which is symptomatic of the context of social injustice. As such, this context is prevalent in Rwanda, the extent of which can be attributed to the voicelessness on the prevalence of post-conflict trauma. One attempt to address this voicelessness and to facilitate social justice in this context of social injustice is *Voices of Rwanda*, a project aimed at digitally capturing testimonies of the genocide.

⁹ Since then end of the genocide, the terms “Hutu” and “Tutsi” are no longer referred to in Rwanda. People are obliged to refer to each other as Rwandese and discussions on a these previous ethnic classifications, particularly on a public level, are discouraged (McLean Hilker, 2009).

Voices of Rwanda is focused on creating a digital archive of the history of the genocide, but also on sharing these stories with the rest of the world as a means of educating and informing on the genocide (Voices of Rwanda, 2010). According to Moore (2008), the project was founded in 2006 and has captured more than 500 hours of testimonies. Talyor Krauss, the founder, hopes that these testimonies will enable journalists, researchers and psychologists to come to a deeper understanding of the genocide in the hope that such an atrocity can be prevented in the future. This is an important part of *Voice of Rwanda's* mission, as this genocide took place with the implicit permission of the international community through their inaction (Voices of Rwanda, 2010). According to Voice of America (2008), Krauss also sees this as an opportunity for the people of Rwanda to heal through the telling of their stories.

Voices of Rwanda (2010) describes its method as that which encourages individuals to tell stories of their childhood, to share proverbs and songs, or to relate any happy memory or aspect of life in Rwanda before the genocide. This is to give credit to a history of Rwanda that stretches beyond conflict and trauma. Individuals then share their experiences of the genocide and are encouraged to share only that which they feel comfortable with. While these testimonies are being related, they are captured on film. There is no time limit to these testimonies and at times they can run for up to ten hours with no interruption (Voices of Rwanda, 2010). According to Stanton (2007), these digital testimonies are then translated from Kinyarwanda (the local language) into English, labelled and archived according to the individual's first name to respect their privacy and security. Maintaining a high standard of visual and aesthetic quality is an important part of the methodology as *Voices of Rwanda's* aim is also to capture and present these testimonies in a way that is respectful of the courage shown by those who wish to share their stories (Voices of Rwanda, 2010).

Voices of Rwanda communicates a sense of urgency in documenting the testimonies of victims. This is due to the rapid pace at which the elderly survivors are passing on, but also due to deaths of those that contracted HIV, largely as a result of the genocide. With each passing day that a

testimony is not documented, a part of the history of the genocide and indeed, of the country of Rwanda, is lost (Voices of Rwanda, 2010). To ensure that these stories are captured given the limited time, Krauss trained a small team to work as cameramen and translators and that assist in making sure that these histories are not lost (Moore, 2008).

Voice of America (2008) asserts that the training that was provided to the *Voices of Rwanda* team is reflective of the education that is central to the organisation's mission. The testimonies that have been recorded to date are currently being used to create a genocide curriculum for high school students across the United States. This is to enable young people to recognise the dangers of genocide and to speak out against situations in which genocide is being carried out, such as the situation in Darfur. To make this curriculum more personally accessible to young people, *Voices of Rwanda* is developing interactive web-based tools from which the testimonies can be retrieved.

The aim to capture the testimonies of genocide survivors and to share them on a platform in which people across the world can become aware and be inspired to take action against such atrocities is evident in *Voice of Rwanda's* work. This initiative in which the voices of survivors can be heard breaks the culture of silence that is symptomatic of a context of social injustice and enables a move towards the even social standing that is social justice.

Since this study is specifically concerned with how digital storytelling facilitates even social standing in Rwanda and since this project is not a digital storytelling initiative but a digital oral history project, the research question still needs to be answered. The aim in looking at *Voices of Rwanda* was to illustrate that it forms the basis from which the key points can be applied and recommendations as to how digital storytelling can facilitate social justice in Rwanda can be made.

Chapter 5

Digital Storytelling and the Facilitation of Social Justice in Rwanda

Thus far the study has attempted to provide evidence that digital storytelling can facilitate social justice by looking at the literature on the case studies, forming an analysis on the case studies themselves and creating key points which specify how social justice was facilitated. In this chapter, these key points are applied to the context of Rwanda by looking at the digital oral history project *Voices of Rwanda* in order to address the research question as to how social justice can be facilitated in this particular context. *Voice of Rwanda* is thus seen as a basis from which a digital storytelling initiative can be created and as such, needs to be evaluated to identify the shortcomings that can be augmented with digital storytelling in order to facilitate social justice in this context of social injustice.

Voices of Rwanda will be evaluated according to each of the key points and each of the instances in which social justice was not facilitated will be accompanied with a recommendation as to how this can be addressed. The challenges to undertaking a digital storytelling initiative in a context of social injustice such as Rwanda will then be discussed, after which the recommendations and challenges will be brought together to finally answer the research question.

Voices of Rwanda and Facilitation of Social Justice in Rwanda

Although *Voices of Rwanda* is **not** a digital storytelling initiative, it is the closest that Rwanda has come to having such an initiative. The aim in applying these key points to this project is to establish the areas in which it falls short of facilitating social justice. This is in order to suggest that it can be combined with a digital storytelling initiative and that it can result in the facilitation of social justice.

Evaluation of Voices of Rwanda According to Key Points

In order to evaluate the ways in which *Voices of Rwanda* falls short of facilitating social justice, each key point has been numbered. Whether *Voices of Rwanda* facilitates social justice or not will

be discussed according to each of these points. Due to the fact that these key points were developed in Chapter 3 and were taken from the findings of the case studies – *Capture Wales and Silence Speaks* – these two initiatives will be referred to throughout the evaluation.

Key Point 1: The establishment of the initiative at community level

In recording the testimonies of ordinary Rwandans that were affected by the genocide, *Voices of Rwanda* has set its work at a community level. This can also be seen in the urgency that the project communicates, as the need to capture the valuable history of ordinary people before it is lost attests to the grassroots level that this point refers to. Despite this however, the methodology of *Voices of Rwanda* mostly includes recording testimonies at their studio in Kigali (Voices of Rwanda, 2010), meaning that survivors have to leave their communities in order to share their stories. In this sense, *Voices of Rwanda* does not lend itself to the community as a resource. It therefore does not fully establish itself at the community level, particularly not if seen in conjunction with *Capture Wales and Silence Speaks*, where the initiative was presented within the community itself over a period of time. As such, *Voices of Rwanda* does not facilitate social justice with respect to this key point.

Key Point 2: Directing the initiative toward improving a sense of self and more particularly, to relieving trauma

The aim of *Voices of Rwanda* is to capture the voices of individuals in the history of the country and the genocide, and to share these voices with the rest of the world to create awareness (Moore, 2008). Thus, the project is not specifically directed towards improving a sense of self or towards relieving trauma, although it is true that this key point is achieved for some survivors as a byproduct. Indeed, some survivors who shared their stories expressed a measure of relief, while others expressed a sense of fulfillment at knowing that their testimony will be heard by people around the world with the intention of creating awareness on this and other genocides (Moore, 2008; *Voices of Rwanda*). In this sense, social justice was facilitated with respect to this key point.

Key Point 3: Allowing storytellers to tell any story of their choice and tell it out of free will

Although the survivors are interviewed, they are free to choose whatever story they would like to tell about their childhood or to share only what they choose to with regard to their survival of the genocide (Stanton, 2007). The premise of giving a testimony, however, is that a part of it will deal with their experience during the genocide, which raises questions to whether or not they are really free to share that which they wish to. Moreover, the funding and sponsorship for *Voices of Rwanda* is geared towards the creation of an archive on the genocide which will also be used for educational purposes (Voices of Rwanda, 2010), and as such, testimonies cannot focus specifically on childhood memories prior to the genocide. This is however, no different to the approach used by *Silence Speaks*, which in this respect was considered to have facilitated social justice as it still enabled free choice within the structure of the initiative. Thus, as far as this key point is concerned, social justice was facilitated.

Key Point 4: Establishing an environment that is psychologically stable

Part of the methodology of *Voices of Rwanda* is to allow survivors to share their testimonies for as long as they wish to without interruption. As has been mentioned in the previous chapter, some testimonies have continued for as long as ten hours without interruption (Moore, 2008), which suggests that the survivor feels an emotional safety to share his/her story. However, given the fact that this point was primarily deduced from the *Silence Speaks*' approach to ensure that storytellers have access to counselling or therapy after their story has been shared, simply providing an environment in which the storyteller feels an emotional safety is not enough to facilitate social justice. This is particularly given the trauma that survivors have experienced. As such, as far as this point is concerned, social justice is not adequately facilitated.

Key Point 5: Attempting to provide long term educational and training resources

The educational objective of *Voices of Rwanda* is very clear and is geared towards the long term in the sense that technological tools are created to widen access to testimonies, but also in the sense

that a curriculum on the genocide is planned for educational use in American high schools (Voices of Rwanda, 2010). The educational objective can also be seen in the training that was provided to local people who now form part of the *Voices of Rwanda* team. However, this key point refers specifically to providing long term educational and training services to survivors and their communities as opposed to providing educational resources to schools in the United States. Although a typing training course was also provided to twenty-six survivors (leading to four being hired as part of the *Voices of Rwanda* team) (Moore, 2008), the long term educational plan of *Voices of Rwanda* does not include as much education and training for the survivors as it does recording their testimonies. As can be seen in the *Silence Speaks* initiative, stories are often created along with training and education programmes that can be sustained as a community resource in the long term. Thus, although *Voices of Rwanda* has an educational objective, that objective is not aimed at the education and training of survivors, which is what this key point entails. In this respect, social justice is not facilitated.

Key Point 6: Improving technological literacy

Linked to the above point, *Voices of Rwanda* improved the technological literacy of some of the locals by providing the typing classes mentioned above as well technological literacy in the form of camera techniques for the use of film or documentary production (Moore, 2008). This was however, mostly to survivors that would work as part of the team and was thus not directed towards the survivors that shared their testimonies. In looking at the *Capture Wales* and *Silence Speaks* initiatives, the technological literacy of the storytellers themselves was improved as they received training to create their own stories, rather than to have someone record it for them and to not develop skills that could be used in the future. By approaching the project in this manner, *Voice of Rwanda* does not work towards improving technological literacy and thus as far as this point is concerned social justice was not facilitated.

Key Point 7: Directing the initiative specifically towards social change through awareness, education and advocacy

Awareness is at the centre of *Voices of Rwanda's* mission, as the testimonies they record are not only to enable survivors to share their stories, but also to share the stories on an international platform so that awareness of the impact of the genocide can be created. Education is also a prominent aspect as can be seen in the use of the testimonies for the creation of a genocide curriculum in the United States (Moore, 2008; Stanton, 2007). The emphasis on awareness and education are both aimed at promoting social change in the sense that the impact of genocide and the complicity of the international community is made visible, prompting this to be changed in the future with regard to other sources of conflict (Voices of Rwanda, 2010). With regard to social change through advocacy however, *Voices of Rwanda* seems to fall short. There is no aim to use the testimonies as a way to represent the broader needs or issues in communities as can be seen with the *Silence Speaks* initiative and in this sense it appears that social justice was not facilitated to the fullest extent. However, since the education and awareness aspect are evident and are geared towards social change, social justice is facilitated as far as this key point is concerned.

Key Point Evaluation Summary

In summarising the evaluation of *Voices of Rwanda* according to the key points, it must be stated that this project does not necessarily have the same objective as those that have been outlined with regard to digital storytelling in this study. As such, nothing should be taken away from this project as there is clear evidence that it does indeed work towards its aims, particularly given the fact that the project is only four years old and has already made significant gains. However, seeing that this project is the only basis from which the facilitation of social justice through digital storytelling can be hypothesised for Rwanda, it needs to be evaluated according to the key points. As such it would seem that *Voices of Rwanda* only facilitated social justice with regard to three of the seven points. Thus, recommendations as to how this can be used as a basis to facilitate social justice through

digital storytelling need to be made on Key Points 1, 4, 5 and 6. These recommendations will come in the form of addressing the research question and attempting to establish how digital storytelling can facilitate social justice in Rwanda.

How can digital storytelling facilitate social justice in context of social injustice such as Rwanda?

As digital storytelling has not yet been used in Rwanda, *Voices of Rwanda* was seen as a basis for this given its method of digitally recording and preserving the testimonies of survivors. By using a project like this from which to launch a digital storytelling initiative and by working to implement the key points, social justice can be facilitated through digital storytelling. This can be illustrated by an elaboration on each of the key points, which by implication includes recommendations as to how social justice can be facilitated.

In order to facilitate social justice in Rwanda in the more general sense, a digital storytelling initiative can be created in collaboration with an organisation such as *Voices of Rwanda*, which has already seemed to establish the technological facilities needed to create digital stories. Development NGOs can also be consulted to provide resources such as trained professionals and valuable knowledge on how to deal with community issues based on the work that the NGO has previously done. In a sense, digital storytelling can be implemented in a very similar way to the *Silence Speaks* initiatives in order to facilitate social justice in Rwanda.

Key Point 1: The establishment of the initiative at community level

A digital storytelling initiative can be started in a particular community and can be done in collaboration with an NGO that has already undertaken development work there. This would mean that a basic infrastructure such as a reliable power supply and a building or structure from which to work would already be provided. As a pilot project, survivors of this community can then be provided with the skills and training to create their own digital stories and once this has been completed, an initiative in a different community can be created, while working with development

NGOs to sustain the first initiative.

Key Point 2: Directing the initiative toward improving a sense of self and more particularly, to relieving trauma

Given the general culture of silence that persists amongst survivors, any digital storytelling initiative in the context of Rwanda would almost automatically be directed towards the improving a sense of self and relieving trauma, regardless of the story that is told. The initiative, must however, initially be targeted towards survivors as these are the members of the given community that possess the greatest need to improve a sense of self and to relieve trauma. Thus, by launching an initiative in a particular community and communicating that it is directed towards survivors (young survivors in particular) for them to share their experiences or to communicate any other aspect of their lives, social justice can be facilitated.

Key Point 3: Allowing storytellers to tell any story of their choice and tell it out of free will

Survivors should first be allowed to decide if they wish to share any story at all, after which they can be guided to choose their own story and assisted with the means to be able to convey that story visually. As already mentioned in point 2, any story which survivors would choose to create would already be in line with the aims of the initiative, given their traumatic experiences, and as such, any story that is told out of free choice would facilitate social justice.

Key Point 4: Establishing an environment that is psychologically stable

In establishing the initiative at a community level with the assistance of development NGO's, specifically those that deal with post-traumatic stress (and have already established methods by which they can overcome language barriers to be able to work with survivors), an environment that is emotionally safe and psychologically stable can be created. This is of particular importance because it will ensure that survivors get the assistance that they need in the long term, rather than just for the duration of the digital storytelling initiative if launched as a pilot project. For the duration of the initiative, social justice can be facilitated by including professionals in the workshop

process and can also provide counselling once the story creation process is completed.

Key Point 5: Attempting to provide long term educational and training resources

Once again, if a digital storytelling initiative is launched in collaboration with an NGO that has already developed educational and training resources to deal with certain community challenges, the initiative can complement these by providing the technological resources, such as computer and Internet access to further some of these educational aims. In addition, training to become a digital storytelling facilitator can also be provided so that survivors can guide others in telling their stories. In this way, the educational and training resources can be sustained in the long term and social justice can be facilitated.

Key Point 6: Improving technological literacy

In establishing the initiative at a community level, the focus of the digital storytelling initiative can be on young survivors, who, generally having had the opportunity to go to school, would have some basic level of computer literacy. The initiative can provide additional training over a certain period of time to not only enable storytellers to create their own digital stories, but also to be able to learn skills that they could use to improve their employment opportunities, and this would include typing skills and a knowledge of media software. By not only improving technological literacy but also investing skills into young survivors that can be used for both personal and community development, social justice can be facilitated.

Key Point 7: Directing the initiative specifically towards social change through awareness, education and advocacy

Although the above key points have alluded to the fact that digital storytelling in a context such as Rwanda would by its very nature be aimed at social change through awareness and education, particularly for the survivors, the element of advocacy and how this can lead to the facilitation of social justice through digital storytelling has not been mentioned. By launching a digital storytelling initiative at a community level and using the variety of stories that would be generated in allowing

survivors to tell any story of their choice, issues or challenges in the community can be brought to the attention of policy makers or external organisations to place pressure on policy makers in order to bring about change. Social justice can then be facilitated in this capacity.

Summary

At the start of this study, social justice was defined as the consistent and collective action towards even social standing and its maintenance. In a context of social injustice, even social standing cannot be achieved or maintained when the silence that pertains to many of the individuals in that society is so prevalent. By addressing this silence in a community driven initiative that not only provides the freedom to tell stories, the platform on which to tell it, and the resources with which to invest in the lives of those who tell it, even social standing, in which all the voices of Rwanda can be heard can be achieved. In continuing with such an initiative across different communities, the consistent and collective action will be taken and even the social standing that was initiated can be maintained, not only in terms of putting an end to the culture of silence, but also in terms of creating and sustaining the resources to maintain this.

A number of aims and possibilities have been highlighted in this study, and although seemingly idealistic, many of the structures to make this possible are already in existence. Thus, the aim of the study was to address the question as to how digital storytelling could facilitate social justice, and this was answered by not only highlighted in the structures that are in existence, but also finding ways in which to make use of these.

Ultimately, the purpose of this study was achieved firstly by looking at the concepts of social justice, social injustice and the culture of silence. It was then achieved by discussing digital storytelling in the general context and describing its development and its use in the two case studies. Digital storytelling was then placed in the context of social injustice, where its potential to facilitate social justice was indicated through the case studies and the development of a set of criteria from which this potential could be evaluated. Finally, it was applied to Rwanda as the context of social injustice, where the application of the key points rendered a final indication of how digital storytelling can facilitate social justice in context of social injustice such as Rwanda.

References

- Altman, R. A. (2008). *Theory of Narrative*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Amnesty International. (2010). *Who we are*. Retrieved June 1, 2010, from <http://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are>
- Anonymous, Camp Wellstone & Silence Speaks. (2007). *A Journey Out of Abuse*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from <http://www.silencespeaks.org/case-studies/42.html>
- Anonymous, IOM & Silence Speaks. (2007). *The Other Side*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from <http://www.silencespeaks.org/case-studies/39.html>
- Barnett, M.N. (2002). *Eyewitness to Genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda*. New York: Cornell University.
- Beeson, I. & Miskelly, C. (n.d.) *Digital Stories of Community: Mobilization, Coherence and Continuity*. Retrieved from School of Information Systems, University of West England. Web site: <http://web.mit.edu/comm-forum/mit4/papers/beeson%20miskelly.pdf>
- Boa-Ventura, A. & Rodrigues, I. (2008). Making News with Digital Stories: Digital Storytelling as a Forma of Citizen Journalism – Case Studies Analysis in the U.S., UK and Portugal. *Prismo* 7, 239-259. Retrieved from http://prisma.cetac.up.pt/239_Making_news_with_digital_stories%20digital_storytelling_as_a%20forma_of_citizen_journalism_Ana_BoaVentura_Ines_Rodrigues.pdf
- Bull, G. & Kadjer, S. (2004). Digital Storytelling in the Language Arts Classroom. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 32(4), 46-49. Retrieved from <http://www.digitalstoryteller.org/docs/DigitalStorytelling.pdf>
- Burgess, J. (2006). Hearing Ordinary Voices: Cultural Studies, Vernacular Creativity and Digital Storytelling. *Journal of Media & Culture Studies*, 20(2), 201–214. Retrieved from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/6243/1/6243.pdf>
- Callinicos, A. (2000). *Equality*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Carlson, E.D. & Engebreston, J. (2006). Photovoice as a Social Process of Critical Consciousness. *Qualitative Health Research*, 16(6), 836-852. Retrieved from <http://qhr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/16/6/836>
- Centre for Digital Storytelling. (1998). Retrieved May 28, 2010, from <http://www.storycenter.org/index1.html>
- Centre for Digital Storytelling. (1998). *History*. Retrieved May 28, 2010, from <http://www.storycenter.org/history.html>
- Centre for Digital Storytelling. (1998). *The Evolution of Digital Storytelling*. Retrieved May 28, 2010, from <http://www.storycenter.org/timeline.html>

- Centre for Digital Storytelling. (1998). *Values and Principles*. Retrieved May 28, 2010, from <http://www.storycenter.org/principles.html>
- Champion, T. B. (2008). *Understanding Storytelling Among African American Children: A Journey from Africa to America*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.
- Chong, D. (2001). *Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clayton, M. & Williams, A. (Eds.) (2004). *Social Justice*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Clark, L. & Capture Wales. (2003). *An Angel from Above*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from http://www.bbc.co.uk/wales/arts/yourvideo/media/pages/louise_clark_01.shtml
- De Tolly, K. (2007). *Digital Stories as Tools for Change: a Study of the Dynamics of Technology Use in Social Change and Activism*. (Master's dissertation, University of Pretoria, 2007). Retrieved from <http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-10282008-163901/unrestricted/dissertation.pdf>
- Diana D. & Capture Wales. (2004). *Nobody Else Did That*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from http://www.bbc.co.uk/wales/arts/yourvideo/media/pages/diana_d_01.shtml
- Digitales. (2004). *About Digital Storytelling*. Retrieved May 28, 2010, from <http://www.digitales.us/about/index.php>
- Duuki Richard, REPSSI & Silence Speaks. (2006). *Richard the Hero*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from <http://www.silencespeaks.org/case-studies/41.html>
- Favila, I.Z. (2009). Treatment of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder in Post-Genocide Rwanda. *Global Grassroots*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from <http://www.globalgrassroots.org/pdf/PTSD-Rwanda.pdf>
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Continuum.
- Goldman, L. (2001). *Breaking the Silence*, 2nd ed. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Hartley, J. & McWilliam, K. (2009). *Story Circle: Digital Storytelling Around the World*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hubbard, J.A. (2007). *Breaking the Silence: Women's Narratives of Sexual Violence During the 1994 Rwandan Genocide*. (Master's dissertation, Virginia State University, 2007). Retrieved from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-04262007-155513/unrestricted/HubbardThesis.pdf>
- Hull, G.A. & Katz, M. (n.d.) *Draft Paper: Crafting an Agentive Self: Case Studies on Digital Storytelling*. Retrieved from University of Delaware. Web site: http://www.uclinks.org/reference/research/hull_katz.pdf

- Human Rights Watch. (2003). *Lasting Wounds: Consequences of Genocide and War on Rwanda's Children*. (Report, No. 15 (6)). Retrieved from <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/rwanda0403/>
- International Labour Organisation. (2010). *About the ILO*. Retrieved May 28, 2010, from: http://www.ilo.org/global/About_the_ILO/lang--en/index.htm
- Jacobson, Z. (2009). *Seeing Through the Screen: Telling and Sharing Stories in the Digital Age*. (Senior's dissertation, University of California at Santa Cruz, 2009). Retrieved from: <http://communitystudies.ucsc.edu/undergraduate/theses/08-09ThesisPDFs/zoejacobsonthesis.pdf>
- Kadger, S., Bull, G. & Albaugh, S. (2005). Constructing Digital Stories. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 32(5), 40-42. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ697311.pdf>
- Kidd, J. (2006). *Digital Storytelling at the BBC: The reality of innovative audience participation*. Retrieved from University of Manchester. Web site: <http://yle.fi/ripe/Papers/Kidd.pdf>
- Klaebe, H. (2006). *The problems and possibilities of using digital storytelling in public history projects*. Retrieved from Queensland University of Technology. Web site: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/6017/1/6017_1.pdf
- Klaebe, H. & Foth, M. (2006). *Capturing Community Memory with Oral History and New Media: The Sharing Stories Project*. Retrieved from Institute for Creative Industries and Innovation, Queensland University of Technology. Web site: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/4751/1/4751_1.pdf
- Klaebe, H., Foth, M., Burgess, J. & Bilandzic, M. (2007). *Digital Storytelling and History Lines: Community Engagement in a Master-Planned Development*. Retrieved from Queensland University of Technology. Web site: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/8985/1/8985.pdf>
- Lambert, J. (2010). *Digital Storytelling Cookbook*. Berkley: Digital Dining Press. Retrieved 8 June, 2010 from: <http://www.storycenter.org/cookbook.pdf>
- Marquand, D. (2004). *Decline of the Public – The Hollowing out of Citizenship*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- McLean Hilker, L. (2009). Everyday Ethnicity: Identity and Reconciliation Among Rwandan Youth. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 11(1), 81-100. Retrieved from http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/874612_751305279_910836031.pdf
- McLellan, H. (2007). Digital Storytelling in Higher Education. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 19(1), 65-79. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/w533j4562064626v/fulltext.pdf>
- McKean, E. (2005). *New American Oxford Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meadows, D. (2003). Digital Storytelling: Research-Based Practice in New Media. *Visual Communication* 2, 189-193. Retrieved from <http://vcj.sagepub.com/content/2/2/189.full.pdf>
- Meredith, M. (2005). *The State of Africa – A History of Fifty Years of Independence*. Johannesburg:

Jonathan Ball.

- Miller, D. (1999). *Principles of Social Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard College.
- Miskelly, C. (2008). *Amplifying voices and perspectives through digital storytelling*. Retrieved May 28, 2010, from <http://panos.org.uk/?lid=23124>
- Moore, J. (2004, December 4). Voices of Rwanda: Healing the Wounds of Genocide. *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/The-Culture/2008/1204/voices-of-rwanda-healing-the-wounds-of-genocide>
- Morrow, R.A. & Torres, C.A. (2002). *Reading Freire and Habermas – Critical Pedagogy and Transformative Social Change*. New York: Teacher's College.
- Murphet, J. (2005). Stories and Plots. In H. Fulton (Ed.), *Narrative and Media*. pp.47-59.
- Neuffer, E. (2001). *The Key to My Neighbour's House: Seeking Justice in Bosnia and Rwanda*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Nutt, M., & Schwartz, G. (2008). The Story Economy: Digital Storytelling in Economic and Community Development. *Proceedings of the Prato CIRN 2008 Community Informatics Conference: ICTs for Social Inclusion: What is the Reality?* Retrieved from Centre for Community Networking Research. Web site: <http://www.ccnr.net/pratoconf2008/NuttFinal.pdf>
- Oxfam International. (2010). *About us*. Retrieved June 1, 2010, from <http://www.oxfam.org/en/about>
- Pellowski, A. (1990). *The World of Storytelling*, (Rev.ed.). S.I.
- Prunier, G. (1997). *The Rwanda Crisis: A History of Genocide*. London: C. Hurst & Co.
- Rawls, J. (1971; 1999). *A Theory of Justice*, (Rev.ed). Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Reed, A. & Hill, A. (2010). “Don’t Keep It To Yourself!”: Digital Storytelling with South African Youth, *International Journal of Media, Technology and Lifelong Learning*, 6(2), 268-279. Retrieved from http://www.seminar.net/images/stories/vol6-issue2/Reed_prcnt_26Hill-Don_prcnt_26_prcnt_23039_prcnt_3BtKeepIttoYourself.pdf
- Reyntjens, F. (2004). Rwanda, Ten Years On: From Genocide to Dictatorship. *African Affairs*, 103, 177-210. Retrieved from <http://afraf.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/103/411/177>
- Robin, B.R. (2010). *The Educational Uses of Digital Storytelling*. Retrieved May 28, 2010, from: <http://digitalstorytelling.coe.uh.edu/>
- Sian S. & Capture Wales. (2005). *I'm Not a Mad Axe Murderer*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from http://www.bbc.co.uk/wales/arts/yourvideo/media/pages/sian_s_01.shtml

- Silence Speaks. (2010). *Case Studies*. Retrieved May 28, 2010, from <http://www.silencespeaks.org/>
- Singh, R. & Capture Wales. (2004). *Fitting In*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from http://www.bbc.co.uk/wales/arts/yourvideo/media/pages/rahul_singh_01.shtml
- Stanton, A. (2007, October 1). Brophy, Yale alum giving Rwandans a voice through film. *Arizona Central*. Retrieved from <http://www.azcentral.com/community/phoenix/articles/1001phx-taylor1003.html>
- Staub, L., Pearlman, L.A., Gubin, A. & Hagengimana, A. (2005). Healing, Reconciliation, Forgiveness and the Prevention of Violence after Genocide and Mass Killing: An Intervention and its Experimental Evaluation in Rwanda. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(3), 297-334. Retrieved from: <http://world.std.com/~gubin/Rwandafiles/Staub,%20Pearlman,%20Gubin%20and%20Hagengimana.pdf>
- Subsol, G. (Ed). (2005). *Virtual Storytelling – Using Virtual Reality Technologies for Storytelling*. Strasbourg: Springer.
- The Sheila Wellstone Institute (2010). *Our Programs*. Retrieved May 28, 2010, from <http://www.wellstone.org/our-programs/camp-sheila-wellstone/learn-more-about-camp-sheila-wellstone>
- Tyler, T.R. & Smith, H.J. (1995). *Working Paper: Social Justice and Social Movements*. Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, University of California, Berkeley.
- Van Hulst, M. (2008). *Town Hall Tales: Culture as Storytelling in Local Government*. Delft: Eburon.
- Voice of America. (2008, April 9). American Filmmaker records 'Voices' of Rwanda's Genocide Survivors. *Voice of America*. Retrieved from <http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/africa/a-13-2008-04-09-voa54.html>
- Voices of Rwanda. (2010). *Education*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from <http://voicesofrwanda.org/education/>
- Voices of Rwanda. (2010). *Methodology*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from <http://voicesofrwanda.org/methodology/>
- Voices of Rwanda. (2010). *Urgency*. Retrieved June 28, 2010, from <http://voicesofrwanda.org/urgency/>
- Waugh, C.M. (2004). *Paul Kgame and Rwanda: Power Genocide and the Rwandan Patriotic Front*. Jefferson: McFarland and Company.
- Wilcox, W. (2009). *Digital Storytelling: A Comparative Case Study in Three Northern California Communities*. (Master's dissertation, University of Wisconsin at Madison, 2009). Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/71w6n7qd>