

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

'Digital Storytelling' unplugged:

Public video voices and impression management in a participatory mobile media
project for youth in Khayelitsha, South Africa

by Silke Hassreiter (HSSSIL002)

A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree
of
Master of Arts

Faculty of the Humanities
University of Cape Town

2012

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature:

| |
|---------------------|
| Signed by candidate |
|---------------------|

Signature removed

Date: 15-11-2012

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

GRADUATE SCHOOL IN HUMANITIES

**DECLARATION BY CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER IN THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

I, (*name of candidate*)

Silke Hassreiter

of (*address of candidate*)

Graaf Florisstraat 100 B, 3021 CM Rotterdam, The Netherlands

do hereby declare that I empower the University of Cape Town to produce for the purpose of research either the whole or any portion of the contents of my dissertation entitled

'Digital Storytelling' unplugged:

Public video voices and impression management in a participatory mobile media project for youth in Khayelitsha, South Africa

in any manner whatsoever

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Signed by candidate | Signature removed | 15-11-2012 |
| CANDIDATE'S SIGNATURE | | DATE |

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of the Centre for Film and Media Studies at the University of Cape Town and to thank my supervisors Dr. Marion Walton and Dr. Gary Marsden for being with me in every step of 'giving birth to my first born', this piece of academic work. They took their time to introduce me to the exciting world of academia, and they taught me patience and endurance when paying attention to details. They exemplified through their own work how important it is to research *with* my participants and not *on* them.

I would also like to thank my parents Hildegard and Walter Hassreiter for all the opportunities they have given to me and for them always believing in me. To my partner Nomonde Xundu, I would like to thank you for all your love, patience and constant encouragement. A big thank you also goes to my friend Katherine O'Sullivan for all the proofreading, light bulb moments and the reassuring words in the middle of the night that made me keep going. Without all of them on my side I would surely now not sit here and finalize my dissertation with words of acknowledgement.

A special thanks goes also to the amazing group of people I had the opportunity to work with in Khayelitsha, Makhaza. I am very grateful to them and to Ikamva Youth for welcoming me with open arms into their lives and allowing me to get a peak into their world, which enabled me to write this dissertation. In this short amount of time that we had together, I grew fond of them and I am very happy that modern technology makes it possible so that we can still be in touch even if we are 10,000 km apart. I would like to offer a loving memory one of the volunteers of Ikamva Youth, Mphumzi Klaas, who helped me out so often during my fieldwork and passed away in 2011.

And finally I would like to say thanks to Nokia Research Kenya, which provided funding and allowed me to fully concentrate on this study and complete this dissertation.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Abstract..... | 6 |
| List of Tables..... | 7 |
| List of Figures | 7 |
| Chapter One: Introduction..... | 8 |
| General background of the study | 8 |
| Problem statement | 9 |
| Background to the research | 11 |
| Context of the study | 12 |
| Chapter exposition | 14 |
| Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework..... | 17 |
| Introduction..... | 17 |
| Defining ‘(Youth) Voice’ | 18 |
| Habermas’ public voice within the public sphere, Fraser’s subaltern counterpublics, and Fisher’s narrative paradigm..... | 21 |
| Bakhtin’s multi-voiced voice and speech genres..... | 25 |
| Youth voice and Digital Storytelling..... | 29 |
| Youth voice, Digital Storytelling and their audiences | 33 |
| Veblen’s conspicuous consumer and Bourdieu’s social capital theory | 36 |
| Conclusion..... | 40 |
| Chapter Three: Methodology | 41 |
| Introduction..... | 41 |
| Overview of methodology | 41 |
| Ikamva Youth and the Digital Storytelling workshop | 46 |
| Participant selection and participation..... | 49 |
| Meet the key informants | 51 |
| Method of data collection | 53 |
| Informal conversations and in-depth interviews..... | 56 |
| Group discussions and other workshop interactions | 58 |
| Video diaries | 60 |
| The digital stories..... | 61 |
| Data analysis..... | 63 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Multimodal analysis | 64 |
| Ethical considerations | 68 |
| Benefits for the participants | 69 |
| Limitations of the study | 70 |
| Conclusion | 72 |
| Chapter Four: Understanding Existing Media Practices And Local Communication | |
| Networks | 73 |
| Introduction to the first phase of the research | 73 |
| It is more than just a phone, it is a status symbol | 73 |
| The public phone and its little privacies | 78 |
| Mobile media, creative freedom and conspicuous consumption | 81 |
| Mobile media and impression management | 86 |
| The ideal audience and the nightmare readers of 'mobile media profiles' | 89 |
| Conclusion | 91 |
| Chapter Five: Exploring 'Public Voices' Through Digital Storytelling | 93 |
| Introduction to the second phase of the research | 93 |
| 'Powerful technology' versus 'powerful digital story' | 94 |
| Difficult topics and hostile audiences | 99 |
| 'We know what you want to hear' | 102 |
| Parallel impression management process and 'markers of cool' | 105 |
| Conclusion | 110 |
| Chapter Six: Multiple voices, multiple modes and multiple audiences – A multimodal analysis | 112 |
| Introduction to multimodal analysis | 112 |
| The digital stories | 113 |
| 'Crime' by Yanga: Constructing a journalistic persona in a multi-voiced narrative | 115 |
| 'Friendship' by Yola and Nothemba: Exploring intimacy and humour | 123 |
| Conclusion | 129 |
| Chapter Seven: Conclusion | 130 |
| Suggestions for future research | 136 |
| Works cited | 137 |
| Appendix A | 149 |
| Transcript 'Crime' by Yanga (m, 15) | 149 |
| Transcript 'Friendship' by Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) | 166 |

Abstract

Young people's peer relationships are characterised by a wide range of mobile media production and sharing practices. These peer networks and existing media production knowledge can be used for Digital Storytelling in the service of youth civic communication. While digital storytelling projects often make use of expensive video production equipment, this study employed pre-existing mobile phone technology and mobile media production and distribution practices already present in the research context to give the research participants the possibility to use their newly-gained public voice to actively participate in the democratic process after the completion of the research project. Central to this research are Bakhtin's dialogic framework (1979/1986), including multi-vocality and a discursive engagement with multiple audiences, in combination with multimodal analysis to examine and analyse the digital stories produced by participants.

Twenty Grade 10 youths from the after-school programme Ikamva Youth in Khayelitsha, Cape Town, South Africa took part in this project from July 2010 to December 2010. The participants received Nokia feature phones (Nokia X3 and Nokia 5530 XpressMusic) for the duration of the project to give them all the same production possibilities. Additionally, they attended weekly Digital Storytelling workshop sessions. This study documented the process of mobile Digital Storytelling with a particular focus on the development of civic awareness and voice as well as the participants' strategies to address multiple audiences of digital stories and to distribute their video creations through pre-existing peer-networks.

While the majority of the participants were highly engaged in the project and also finished their digital story, their reluctance to share their final digital stories within their peer networks yielded several important insights. Notably, gaining a 'public visual voice' cannot be reduced to a simple state of 'self-expression', the technical ability to produce video, or the means to accessing communications networks. This study suggests that for youth, accessing a public voice is neither an automatic nor a straightforward process. Instead, it is a complex undertaking that youths must dialogically negotiate (Bakhtin, 1979/1986) in response to different audiences as part of their ongoing complex processes of mobile phone impression management (Goffman, 1956), conspicuous consumption (Veblen, 1899) and the display of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986), all of which involve phones. Furthermore, the study also sheds light on the negative impact Digital Storytelling can have when addressing sensitive and controversial topics in the community. The outcomes of this study highlight the importance of considering the implications of Bakhtin's concept of addressivity in Digital Storytelling curricula.

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Final topics and messages of completed digital stories | 62 |
| Table 2: Example spread sheet for coding in-depth interviews | 63 |
| Table 3: Excerpt of transcription from the digital story 'Crime' | 67 |

List of Figures

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 1: Multiple Impacts of Digital Storytelling Model. Source Reed & Hill, 2010, p. 270 | 30 |
| Figure 2: Transcript 'You must feel the juice' | 126 |

University of Cape Town

Chapter One: Introduction

General background of the study

Almost forty percent of the current population of South Africa is between the ages of fourteen and thirty-five (Statistics South Africa, 2010). Once they reach voting age, these young people have a strong political influence at the ballot box and are widely courted by the country's politicians. In the past, the political and civic engagement of young black South Africans made a significant contribution to the struggle against apartheid; yet this often took place at the cost of young people's own educational and economic advancement. Consequently these youth were termed 'the lost generation' (Reed & Hill, 2010, p. 270). Given the important role youth played in South African political history, it would be easy to assume that post-apartheid youth would be a driving force in South Africa's new democracy. But the new generations of 'born free' young South Africans generally have not fulfilled such expectations, with many retreating from active political involvement, thus gaining the reputation of being a new kind of 'lost generation' (Reed & Hill, 2010, p. 270). While this is a local phenomenon, it also corresponds to academic debates about a global disengagement from formal politics by youth.

Worldwide, politicians and scholars have tried to address this alleged political disinterest in order to find a solution to increase young citizens' involvement in the democratic process and to give them a voice in the public discourse. Buckingham (2003), Lambert (2009), Reed & Hill (2010) and Rheingold (2008) are just a few of many contemporary scholars suggesting that media education and participatory media production are an effective way to engage youth in civic activities specifically, and to encourage them to express their concerns, ideas and desires to a wider public. These scholars argue that by telling their own personal stories via pictures, young video-makers can explore the persuasive function of televisual language, and that youth participation in such media production projects gives them the opportunity to turn their private voices into public voices by sharing their experiences and concerns with others through the distribution of these videos. Proponents further suggest that the production and distribution of participatory media creations may spark critical dialogue and lead to 'collective action for common purpose' (Kim & Ball-

Rokeach, 2006, p. 174). Such projects may therefore foster nascent forms of civic engagement.

This research concentrates on Digital Storytelling, a special form of participatory media production, which has its origins in the United States (Lambert, 2009) and is now a global phenomenon. Digital Storytelling is described as the 'uses or affordances of new media for new or innovative narrative forms' (Burgess, 2006, p. 206). It emphasizes the non-professional and non-commercial character of media produced by citizens with little or no media production experience who receive guidance from an experienced media producer in both informal and formal learning experiences in workshops (Burgess, 2006). However, the common aim of the workshops are to keep the influence of workshop leaders to a minimum in order to give the digital storytellers the chance to experiment with their 'own' voice (Hartley & McWilliam, 2009). This project shares these aims of the Digital Storytelling movement while questioning concepts such as 'authenticity' in relation to voice within these workshops, as well as investigating the challenges involved when marginalised young people voice their concerns within local communication networks.

Problem statement

Most existing research into youth voice and Digital Storytelling concentrates on first-time media producers using the latest media production technology and online distribution channels to circulate their media productions. In contrast to the participants in this study, research participants in Digital Storytelling projects (Chan, 2006; 'Youth,' 2012) are often relatively economically well-off youth with regular access to the latest media production technology, such as handheld cameras and computer editing software, and online distribution channels, such as Wikis, MySpace or YouTube. In Digital Storytelling projects that involve low-income youth without such resources, researchers (e.g. Mendoza, Renard & Goodman, 2008; Hull & Katz, 2006) mostly bring cameras, computers and temporary Internet access along with them and introduce these to the participants. Yet if this equipment is not possible to acquire, Digital Storytelling projects often cannot be realized (Levine, 2008). Video production in a traditional sense is a rather costly endeavour, which makes the Digital Storytelling experience for marginalized low-income youth less sustainable since as soon as the workshop is over and the expensive resources are gone, so too is the possibility for producing further digital stories. This study aims to explore the

possibility of creating a more sustainable Digital Storytelling experience in low-income areas by researching how existing resources such as mobile phone technology and offline social networks can be used for Digital Storytelling.

One of the main advantages of mobile phone technology is not only that they are less expensive than traditional video production equipment, but also that they have the technological capacity to act as compact media production units. Mobile phones allow the user to quickly and easily produce and distribute mobile media, in most cases without the need for any further devices. Especially in the Western world, uploading videos onto the web via mobile Internet is quite common, given the ease of access to flat- and low-rate mobile data plans and higher standards of living. However, in developing nations and low-income areas, which lack proper infrastructure and stable Internet access, the web is still questionable as an appropriate distribution channel. Furthermore, some scholars claim that offline community communication structures are actually the better choice for youth civic communication since youth topics are mostly local ones and digital stories should therefore address and reach local audiences (Levine, 2008; Ball-Rockeach, Kim & Matei, 2001). The research location of this study, Makhaza Khayelitsha Township, Cape Town, South Africa, is situated in an area where there is very limited access to Internet, which led to the decision to first map out alternative local communication networks and then explore their usability as Digital Storytelling distribution channels.

In 2008, a survey of Grade 11 students in low-income areas in Cape Town showed that they already frequently produced and exchanged photos and videos via their mobile phones (Kreutzer, 2009). Another more recent study of young people in two townships in Cape Town, Guguletu and Langa, identified similar practices and situated these in relation to a range of other 'mobile literacies' developed around sharing media and texting with peers on MXit and Facebook (Walton, 2010). These studies informed the design of the current project, which adopted an asset-based approach (Emmett, 2000) to Digital Storytelling and aimed first to explore local storytelling assets and then building upon them. I worked together with twenty young people in the low-income area Khayelitsha through a six-month critical action research and classroom ethnography conducted at the local NGO and after-school programme Ikamva Youth from June 2010 to December 2010.

Based upon the problem statement, the main research question for the study was determined:

How will young participants in a Digital Storytelling workshop in Khayelitsha, South Africa, appropriate existing mobile media production resources, practices and distribution networks to voice their concerns and ideas in public forums?

This research question was then divided into the following sub-questions:

- What are the meanings and roles of existing mobile media production practices in young people's lives?
- How do young people use the affordances of their phones and visual mobile media to make their voices heard through Digital Storytelling?
- In what ways do young people make use of the different semiotic modes of mobile videos in order to communicate their concerns and ideas to their imagined audiences?

Background to the research

I am a thirty-four year-old former female journalist, camera operator and video editor, born in the South of Germany. In my current position as a media production lecturer at the University of Applied Science, NHTV Breda, the Netherlands, I work with first-year students and train them in professional TV production. These young first-time TV producers bring fresh ideas and new tricks and impress me every year with their out-of-school experience in video production. Through my teaching, I became increasingly interested in exploring the media production practices of young people. My preliminary literature review exposed me to the work of Buckingham (2003), Burn (2003), Mendoza, Renard and Goodman (2008) and Sefton-Green (2006), which motivated me to pursue research into the area of participatory media production and media education. After reading Kreutzer's research (2009) about mobile media production in the low-income areas of Cape Town, South Africa, I contacted his supervisor, Dr. Marion Walton, who invited me to participate in a project funded by Nokia Research Kenya investigating young people's use of mobile phones for media production. I was able to take one year of unpaid leave from my teaching position to concentrate solely on my research, and I accepted the offer and joined the Nokia research team.

The broader project aimed to document the needs of these young people and communicate them to Nokia, who may wish to redesign handsets to accommodate the practices we observed (Walton, Marsden, Hassreiter, & Allen, 2012¹). But within the scope of this project I also had the possibility to do my own research on youth media production practices and how these could be integrated in the (semi-) formal learning environment of a Digital Storytelling workshop. This then led to a third aim of the project: the development of a tailor-made Digital Storytelling curriculum, which became the property of the after-school programme Ikamva Youth, the organisation through which I conducted my research. As a non-profit organisation, Ikamva Youth has become active in advocating for digital literacy in low-income areas of South Africa: For example, in the Ikamva Youth 'Media, Image and Expression Workshops' participants are regularly introduced to new technology, which they are encouraged to use for self-expression. The workshops are aimed at fostering 'self-expression, build[ing] confidence and provide[ing] a safe space in which learners can communicate their personal views and experiences, build on their ideas, discuss societal issues and learn to use different media to record local issues and history' (Ikamva Youth, 2010, para. 1). Since 2008 Ikamva Youth has been inviting UCT regularly to work together on several projects, and UCT students have been leading media production and Internet workshops or tutoring Ikamva Youth students. Furthermore several UCT students were invited to conduct their research at Ikamva Youth, as with this research.

Context of the study

The project took place in Makhaza, in Khayelitsha, an urban settlement about forty kilometres from of the centre of Cape Town, South Africa. In contrast to the wealth of their counterparts growing up in the suburbs, the twenty participants of this study, who live on geographic margins, were economically, educationally and socially marginalized. Khayelitsha was established in the mid-1980s and was named as 'new home' for many relocated black South Africans during apartheid (Worden, 1994; Robins, 1999, as cited in Skuse & Cousins, 2008, p. 14). Over 71 % of the people in the mostly isiXhosa speaking low-income area live below the poverty line (Fair

¹ Full paper accepted at ACM SIGCHI's International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services (MobileHCI), Sept. 21-24, 2012

Share, 2005). The exact population size of Khayelitsha is difficult to measure owing to the fact that many residents live in informal settlements, however the 2005 census estimated about 400,000 inhabitants in Khayelitsha with two-thirds of the population younger than 30 ('The Population Register Update: Khayelitsha 2005', 2005).

Growing up in a South African township such as Khayelitsha means being faced daily with 'pervasive violence, very high unemployment rate, poor schools, families and communities that struggle' (Bray et al., 2010, p. 294). For example, just after the conclusion of this research project, a petrol bombing took place at the research site, with two of the volunteers barely able to rescue themselves in time. Only a few weeks later, one of the two was killed in a stabbing. Incidents like this make youth in townships feel constantly unsafe, even in their own neighbourhood and at home (Bray et al., 2010). Likewise, social instability stemming from extreme poverty (which forces many into prostitution just for basic necessities such as food or clothes) or peer pressure to consume alcohol and drugs (which results in extremely high rates of addiction) or to have unprotected sex (which increases risk of contracting HIV and AIDS), are serious challenges for township youth (Bray et al., 2010). Likewise, a number of reasons have led to South Africa having one of the highest rates of youth unemployment worldwide (Emmett, 2004), but a great deal of blame can be laid at the door of the insufficiently resourced and staffed township schools, which educate the students poorly and send them onto a 'labour market which offers few opportunities to unskilled workers' (Bray et al., 2010, p. 23).

Thus, while their peers in wealthier areas have regular access to computers and the Internet at school and at home, township youth must compensate with mobile phones. Studies show that the majority of young people own a mobile phone, while those without their own phones still have access to a mobile phone of friends and family (Kreutzer, 2009). Walton (2010) found that teens' 'mobile-centric' web use focused on searching (Google), social networking (Facebook), and a 'delinked' mode of interacting with media driven by downloading, saving and sharing media via Bluetooth, rather than 'surfing' or browsing media online. All twenty research participants grew up under these circumstances or something similar, and every single one of them contributed very different and valuable information. (More information is given about the research location and several key participants in Chapter Three.) For the ease of reading, this research makes use of the term 'participants' or 'video-makers' throughout when referring to the young men and women participating in the Digital Storytelling workshop.

Chapter exposition

Chapter Two focuses on providing the theoretical framework chosen for this research in order to contribute to the academic discourse around youth 'voice' and participatory media production, namely Digital Storytelling. First, theories of 'voice' are presented: The first section establishes the definition of 'youth voice'; the second section examines Habermas' popular theory of the public voice (1962/1995) and corresponding critiques, such as Fraser's subaltern counterpublics (1990) and Fisher's narrative paradigm (1989, as cited in Kim & Ball-Rokeach, 2006); and the third section reviews Bakhtin's theories of dialogism, heteroglossia and multivocality (1979/1986). The chapter then presents the core ideas of Digital Storytelling as media production for democratic ends. Additionally, audiences of public youth video voices are discussed in more detail. In a Bakhtinian sense, these audiences have a strong influence on youth voice, and for this reason audience is one of the key areas in this research. The chapter then presents Goffman's theory of impression management (1956), since, according to Fraser (1990), subaltern publics not only give space to deliberate, but also give space for identity formation and negotiation, which are all essential when dealing with the transformation of private voices into public voices. Finally, this chapter examines Veblen's (1899/1994) theory of conspicuous consumption and Bourdieu's (1986) notions of capital. Digital media and consumer electronics are also part of consumer culture and used as means for self-expression and representation within a social communication system.

Chapter Three offers a detailed presentation of the methods used to design and evaluate the qualitative portion of this study. The chapter gives more insight into the scientific approach of this research based on the 'new sociology of childhood' perspective (James & Prout, 1997), which sees youths as active agents and shapers of their social world. Critical action research and combined multiple qualitative research methods from an ethnographic framework formed the basis for this research. The practical reasons for choosing a classroom ethnography (rather than a full-immersion ethnography) and a two-phase research design are offered. Next, the research location and the participants are described, including detailed biographies on key informants. Furthermore this chapter discusses the methods of data collection, such as participant observation, group discussions, informal encounters and conversations, loosely structured in-depth interviews and mobile media collection. It also elaborates on the chosen data analysis techniques, such as topic and analytical coding and multimodal analysis (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). Finally,

it covers ethical issues in relation to research involving minors, with special attention given to the high crime rate at the research location.

Chapters Four, Five and Six present the findings of this study, contextualising them within the specific circumstances found in the research location and discussing them in relation to the main theories used in this research. In particular, Chapter Four concentrates on mapping out existing media production resources, practices and communication networks and how the participants might be encouraged to make use of these for Digital Storytelling. It examines the ways in which participants and their peers, much like online social network profile owners, create 'mobile phone profiles' via their mobile phones, and through the strategic display of mobile media, negotiate status. The importance of mobile media became clear during this phase of research, since youth in Khayelitsha consider mobile media their only 'real' possession; as such, the files play an important role in the impression management process and in the communication of cultural capital. Furthermore, this chapter gives insight into the conspicuous consumption of mobile phone technology within the participants' peer group. In relation to youth voice, this chapter shows how status is transferred into agency within the peer group and can transform individuals into opinion leaders. In order to make use of existing capital for Digital Storytelling, this chapter describes the established mobile media production skills of the participants and two seemingly possible peripheral distribution channels for digital stories: the lively peer phone exchange network and the Bluetooth exchange network.

Chapter Five elaborates on both the extent to which and the means by which the participants integrated the production of mobile media into the existing structures and practices in order to prompt civic communication with their peers. It shows that participants' involvement in the Digital Storytelling workshop helped them to gain social capital through their improved technological skills, explained by the conspicuous consumption model and the communication of cultural capital. But it also shows how self-interest and consumer culture can interfere with the Digital Storytelling process. Furthermore, this chapter adds important insight to the academic debates about 'audience' and Digital Storytelling by addressing the possible negative outcomes of Digital Storytelling, namely how the prompting of a counter discourse in local communication networks can provoke potentially hostile audiences. Finally, the chapter describes how the participants integrated new forms of media into their ongoing social interactions, such as mobile phone impression management, and analyses how participants dealt with the new mix of audiences

Digital Storytelling introduced to them in order to produce meaningful digital stories while also maintaining 'coolness' in their peer groups.

Chapter Six examines two of the final digital stories in more detail and analyses the multiple modes used by the video-makers in order to express their message while communicating simultaneously with multiple audiences. The multimodal analysis in this chapter gives insight into the complex means through which young video-makers put into practice their newly gained 'public visual voice'. It further elaborates on various strategies of integrating voices and languages of others within 'their' public voice in order to gain more space and possibilities for articulating their concerns and targeting different audiences. It also shows how the addressivity of the videos is strongly influenced by the chosen genre and language of digital stories.

In Chapter Seven, the conclusion to this study, the sub-questions presented in this chapter are answered based upon the findings of the research. This offers a means of answering the main research question, which is also answered in this chapter. Finally, some suggestions for future research are given as a means to stimulate additional research into youth Digital Storytelling and mobile media production in low-income, developing countries as a means of promoting youth engagement within larger political and social discourses.

Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework

Introduction

This chapter discusses the theoretical lens through which the qualitative study was conceptualised. Soep (2006) points out two major academic discourses around 'youth voice' and 'participatory media production', namely 'literacy' and 'voice'. Studies on literacy, such as popular literacy, media literacy or critical literacy, examine 'how and what people learn by making original media' (Soep, 2006, pp. 197-198). Studies of youth voice (Fleetwood, 2005) examine the means by which youth express themselves through youth media projects as a process of "giving voice" to young people, or helping them "find their voice", or highlighting "silenced voices" by providing teenagers with the skills and access needed to express their stories' (as cited in Soep, 2006, p. 198). As noted in the introduction, this research aims to contribute to the academic discourse around youth 'voice' and participatory media production through Digital Storytelling and shows how the notion of an 'authentic voice' can be questioned when examined in relation to Bakhtin's (1981) theories on the role of audience in multivocality. The first three sections present the definition of a youth voice, Habermas's argument about the public voice and the public sphere and important critiques of Habermas by Fraser and Fisher, and Bakhtin's discursive theory of multivocality. Following this, the fourth section further elaborates on the concept 'Digital Storytelling' as a form of participatory media production. As such, audiences of youth visual voices are discussed in more detail. Finally, Veblen's theory of conspicuous consumption (1899/1994) is discussed in order to understand the link between consumer culture and consumer goods, such as mobile phones and mobile media, as a means of acquiring social status. Conspicuous consumption is further linked to Bourdieu's theory of social and cultural capital (1986), which translates how conspicuous consumption works within a social communication system and whereby goods and/or knowledge affect both status and power.

In the following sections I use a number of terms used for persons under eighteen years of age (e.g. legal minors), such as children, teens or teenagers. When making use of direct quotes, I adopt terms from the original source: For example, whereas the 'United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child' calls persons under

eighteen 'children', others define 'children' as those under thirteen years and call thirteen to eighteen year-olds 'teens' (Ito et al., 2010). For this current study, the term 'youth(s)' is employed, since it refers to 'the general cultural category of youth, which is not clearly age demarcated but which centres on the late teenage years' (Ito et al., 2010, p. 8). This term seemed to be most suitable when talking about the participants and peers in this study, who are mainly between the ages of fifteen and eighteen. Although Ito et al. (2010) suggest that for ethnographic work researchers should make use of terms the research participants themselves use, this practice becomes difficult since 'youth do not commonly refer to themselves in age-graded categories' (Ito et al., 2010, p. 7). In these cases, Ito et al. (2010) suggest that scholars impose categories and choose themselves which term suits the research most.

Defining '(Youth) Voice'

The concept of 'voice' has many definitions, depending on the field in which it is used. In contemporary communication studies, 'voice' is often defined as the agency of individuals that can be muted by dominant forces (Watts, 2001) and is mainly understood as the 'public voice of the people' (Baker, 1999) that has emerged with Western liberal democracies. Proponents of deliberative democracies and popular sovereignty argue that every person has a free and equal voice concerning the decisions that affect their lives. Special emphasis is put on the word 'every', for youths and children, whose voice within political decision-making processes is often drowned out or dismissed by adult voices, should also have a say about issues of their concern. The 'United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child' ("Convention on the Rights of the Child Part 1, Article 13," 1988) was the first legally binding international instrument to champion youth voice, stating: 'The child shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of the child's choice'. Thus, Fletcher (2008) contextualizes that the 'youth voice' equates to

the perspectives, ideas, experiences, knowledge, and actions of young people. Youth voice doesn't mean talking loudly or shouting to be heard, and it is not about drowning out other people's voices, including adults. Youth voice is about considering the perspectives and ideas of young people,

respecting what everyone has to say, taking risks, listening, sharing, and working together (para. 2).

In recent decades 'youth voice' has become the centre of interest not only of politicians and policy makers, but also of scholars. Watts and Flanagan (2007) claim that this 'focus is due to the concerns about political disaffection in younger generations' (p. 779). Indeed, political socialisation scholars have been regularly ringing the alarm bell because of the limited interest of young citizens learning how to make use of their voice in the political decision making process (Andolina et al., 2002). These scholars fear a decline in social capital, networks, norms and trust because of decreasing levels of youth civic and political participation (Andolina, et al., 2002). In contrast, while acknowledging the decrease in youth engagement, generational replacement scholars claim that youths make use of their voice, albeit in less traditional ways, which are overlooked by political socialisation scholars (Bennett, 2003). For instance, O'Toole and Bang (n.d.) suggest that 'the new generation of citizens are simply redefining what they mean by politics, and that scientists should embrace that shift' (as cited in Bennett, 2003, para. 7). Bang (2003, as cited in Bennett, 2003) identifies a generation of 'everyday makers' who

find greater satisfaction in defining their own political paths, including: local volunteerism, consumer activism, support for issues and causes (environment, human rights), participation in various transnational protest activities, and efforts to form a global civil society by organizing world and regional social forums (Bennett, 2003, para. 7).

Contemporary examples for youth around the world making use of their voice in a less traditional, yet highly influential, way include the 'Arab Spring' (Blight, Pulham, & Torpey, 2012), the 'Occupy Wall Street' movement (Rogers, 2011) or 'Pussy Riot' in Russia (Sandford, 2012).

Of particular importance to this research is the case of youth voice in South Africa. During the struggle to end apartheid, some scholars argue that youth activism played a key role in the fight for equal rights (Ngomane & Flanagan, 2003). However others (Cherry, Jones, & Seekings, 2000) found that in spite of youth activism, for the most part there was merely the re-establishment of a traditional political society in which many leaders of youth movement organisations simply conformed to become leaders in political parties. Cherry, Jones and Seekings (2000) write that although the process of demobilisation had been welcomed because further activism could have

led to a destabilisation of the new democratic system, in fact it led to a decline in political and civic engagement, one of the cornerstones of every democracy.

Scholars attempt to explain this lasting and growing disenchantment with traditional politics by South African youth in different ways. Some claim the reason is failure of generational socialisation. According to O'Brien (1996, as cited in Reed & Hill, 2010) young South African citizens are growing up 'in the shadow of what many theorists have branded the shadow of the "lost generation"' (p. 270), having never learned to stand up for their rights in a democratic way and therefore are not able to teach younger generations how to act as citizens of a democracy. Emmett (2004) points out that although the political system was transformed in the abstract, and now affords all young South Africans similar possibilities in social advancement, the reality is that little has changed since the end of apartheid. Similarly, Desai (2002) suggests that even today many young South Africans grow up with similar socio-economic circumstances to those that prevailed under apartheid. And despite these 'new' structures, the difference between the haves and the have nots has remained strong: despite a fast-growing black elite and middle class (Bray et al., 2010), the majority of black youth still grow up in a South Africa that is 'appallingly poor [and] economic growth is insufficient to guarantee mass improvement, social inequality remains rife, and democracy itself faces major challenges' (Daniel, Southall & Lutchman, 2004, p. xix). Thus for young, black South Africans it hardly makes a difference whether they live in a post- or pre-apartheid South Africa because they still struggle socio-economically, with fewer possibilities than their white counterparts (Daniel, Southall & Lutchman, 2004).

Other research shows, however, that despite all the particular circumstances of South Africa, there are also similarities found between South African youth and international youth as a whole, namely, the tendency to activism instead of institutional politics. Sader and Muller (2004) note that South African youths are discontented with the achievements of the new democratic institutions and have the feeling of not being integrated into the new system. They also state that young South Africans want to be politically active, albeit in less formal and more issue-specific ways, such as volunteering in local NGOs, and religious or youth groups.

After this brief overview of youth voice in general and contextualised in South Africa the following section further elaborates on influential theories about civic voice coming from theorists such as Habermas, Fraser or Fisher.

Habermas' public voice within the public sphere, Fraser's subaltern counterpublics, and Fisher's narrative paradigm

The backbone of youth activism is to turn private voices of young people into public voices within the larger public discourse in order to achieve social change based on the ideas of the youth. According to Levine (2008) 'all these forms of civic engagement require the effective use of a public voice' (p. 119), which is rooted in the ideas of the German sociologist and philosopher Jürgen Habermas, best known for his theory about the public sphere and the public voice (1962/1995).

The idea of a 'public voice' is based on the European quest for a 'voice of the people' from the 18th century onwards, during which intellectuals contested the all-powerful voices of church and aristocracy, and Enlightenment theories described all humans as equal by nature with autonomous thought and reason (Baker, 1999). These ideas gave rise to Democracy as a new state form, wherein ordinary people can contribute to the rule of their own countries, and the 'public voice' of every democratic citizen has become one of the most important philosophies in Western societies and one of the pillars of every democracy (Baker, 1999). Thus, according to Habermas (1962/1995) the public sphere is an all-inclusive space where all democratic citizens, despite their social class, have equal access to and can freely and equally exert their public voice in rational political discourse with each other as peers. The aim of these deliberations is to influence each other's political thinking, reach consensus and try to influence political actions (Habermas, 1962/1995).

Central to Habermas' theory is the 'ideal speech act' within the public sphere. This is rational deliberation, free from private, state and economic interests and free of tradition, religious dogma, or social privileges, equalises all participants and provides a legitimate form of argumentation about politics and culture (Felski, 1989, as cited in Simsek, 2012, p. 23). Only then, according to Habermas (1974, as cited in Fourie, 2007), people in the public sphere act

neither as business or professional people conducting their private affairs, nor as legal consociates subject to the legal regulations of a state bureaucracy and obligated to obedience. Citizens act as a public when they deal with matters of general interest without being subject to coercion; thus with the guarantee that they may assemble and unite freely, and express and publicize their opinions freely. (p. 218)

According to the Habermasian ideal, deliberation best works with a relatively small number of people personally meeting in public places or communicating through small-scale press. As soon as more people join the public discourse, such as in a large society, 'communication media, and the ways the state permits citizens to use them, are essential to the public sphere' (Rheingold, 2008, p. 101). Habermas critiques the mass mediated public sphere and claims that 'under the economic and political pressures of late capitalism, the rational-critical debate that had been motivated by news and opinion piece becomes buried under privatized, mass-mediated forms of communication' (McLaughlin, 2004, as cited in Simsek, 2012, p. 32).

Habermas' public sphere describes a newly emerged relationship between communication and social change, which has become a normative, but also strongly contested contribution to the academic discourse around 'voice'. Post-Habermasian perspectives, such as Nancy Fraser's (1990) influential work on 'subaltern counterpublics', claim that the Habermasian notion of a public sphere 'needs to undergo some critical interrogation and reconstruction if it is to yield a category capable of theorizing the limits of actually existing democracy' (p. 57). Fraser's 'alternative, post-bourgeois conception of the public sphere' (1990, p. 58) is strongly informed by feminist theory, but it is also helpful when examining other marginalised voices within public discourse, such as youth voices. Based on alternative historical interpretations, Fraser (1990) critiques four assumptions of the Habermasian notion of the public sphere: (1) the all-inclusive and equal access to the public sphere; (2) the preference of a single public sphere over multiple publics; (3) the exclusion of issues of private concern; (4) the distinction between civil society and state. Of particular relevance for this research are the first three assumptions, which will be discussed in further detail.

According to Habermas (1962/1995), on a normative level the public sphere guarantees access to all citizens. Thompson (1995) argues that this is based on 'the idea that individuals come together in a shared locale and engage in dialogue with one another, as equal participants in a face-to-face conversation' (p. 261). Yet, Fraser (1990) observes, that instead of bracketing social inequalities within the public sphere, the exclusion of certain groups of people based on gender, class and race, was emphasized through 'discursive interaction governed by protocols of style and decorum that were themselves correlates and markers of status inequality' (p. 63). Fraser (1990) offers a number of examples, where 'social inequalities can infect

deliberation, even in the absence of any formal exclusions [...] [because] subordinate groups sometimes cannot find the right voice or words to express their thoughts, and when they do, they discover they are not heard' (p. 64).

The second point of critique is Habermas' emphasis on the singularity of one public sphere. Fraser (1990) states that if this would be the case, then 'subordinated groups would have no arenas for deliberation among themselves about their needs, objectives, and strategies [...] without the supervision of dominant groups' (p. 66). In reality, Fraser (1990) finds examples, including contemporary examples, that show how 'subordinated social groups – women, workers, peoples of colour, and gays and lesbians – have repeatedly found it advantageous to constitute alternative publics' (p. 67). These parallel public spheres created by groups that are excluded from the dominant publics are termed 'subaltern counterpublics' in which 'members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counter-discourses, which in turn permit them to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs' (Fraser, 1990, p. 67). Different counterpublics are therefore 'not only arenas for the formation of discursive opinion; [...] they are arenas for the formation and enactment of social identities' (Fraser, 1990, p. 68). This occurs when someone speaks "in one's own voice" [...] [for they are] simultaneously constructing and expressing one's cultural identity through idiom and style' (Fraser, 1990, p. 68). Thus Fraser (1990) concludes that it is impossible to have one public sphere with a 'zero degree culture, equally hospitable to any possible form of cultural expression' (p. 69).

Such counterpublics 'deliver both "internal" and "external" communication' (Hartley & Green, 2006, p. 345). In other words, members first debate their issues of concerns within and then through sustained discursive contestation, making their concerns and ideas correspond to concerns of the wider public (Fraser, 1990). Consequently, Charmaraman's (2010) argues that an ideal group voice arises from an 'ability to articulate a common goal and sense of direction and at the same time taking into account the multitude of diverse voices within its membership – an appreciation of diversity in order to be unified' (p. 208).

Fraser's (1990) third point of critique is the Habermasian assumption about 'the appropriate scope of publicity in relation to privacy' (p. 70). According to Habermas only issues of public concern have space in the public sphere, such as issues that are '1) state-related; 2) accessible to everyone; 3) of concern to everyone; and 4) pertaining to a common good or shared interest' (Fraser, 1990, p. 71). But she notes that there are 'no naturally given, a priori boundaries here. What will count as a

matter of common concern will be decided precisely through discursive contestation' (Fraser, 1990, p. 71). Instead in contemporary political discourse the labels 'private' and 'public' are easily abused to silence certain voices and to exclude certain topics from the public agenda because they are classified as private and therefore not suitable for public debate (Fraser, 1990). Furthermore, Fraser (1990) challenges the idea of excluding self-interest in order to concentrate on group-interest since 'there is no way to know in advance whether the outcome of a deliberative process will be the discovery of a common good in which conflicts of interest evaporate as merely apparent' (p. 72).

Within the public discourse in Khayelitsha, youth voice can be described as rather suppressed if not completely silenced. In general, adult-youth relationships are 'dictated rather than confrontational' (Bray et al., 2010, p. 60). '*Ukuhlonipha*' (isiXhosa for 'to respect') plays an important role in inter-generational relationships. Instead of engaging in open conversations with elders, the younger generation learns how to show respect in the form of polite speech, behaviour and non-confrontational ways of disagreeing (Dlamini, 2005, as cited in Bray et al., 2010, p. 60). In this environment the peer group (e.g. the subaltern counterpublics), plays an important role in regards to support and information exchange (Bray et al., 2010). Which leads to an adult-dominated environment in Khayelitsha that can make it difficult, if not impossible, for the voices of the counterpublic to be heard in the wider publics of the neighbourhood.

In addition to questions about Habermas's public sphere, there have been criticisms raised about Habermas's ideal speech act of communicative action that suggest that Habermas overlooks all irrational discourse that might have great impact. McGuigan (2005, as cited in Burgess, Foth & Klæbe, 2006) claims that the 'exclusion of everyday life, affect, and pleasure from our understanding of democratic participation is a serious misrecognition of some of the most powerful modes of citizen engagement' (p. 3). Moreover, when studying visual voices as forms of civic engagement Burgess, Foth and Klæbe (2006) emphasize the importance of McGuigan's (2007) critique of dominant definitions of the public sphere through the concept of a cultural public sphere:

The concept of a cultural public sphere refers to the articulation of politics, public and personal, as a contested terrain through affective – aesthetic and emotional – modes of communication. [...] The cultural public sphere provides vehicles for thought and feeling, for imagination and disputatious

argument, which are not necessarily of inherent merit but may be of consequence (p. 255).

Similarly, Levine (2008) argues that actively participating in a democracy is not only restricted to a Habermasian rational deliberation but also 'civic engagement as a broader concept that also comprises cultural production' (p. 121).

When considering modes of transmission, then, especially with respect to technologically-driven societies and cultures, Burgess (2006) argues that by means of 'remediation' (p. 206) any type and mode of communication can be transformed into 'publicly accessible culture through the use of digital tools for production and distribution' (p. 209) and thus lead to social change. Digital stories for example are described as the remediated versions of personal oral stories created for a democratic end. The idea is based on Fisher's narrative paradigm (1989), which looks beyond rational discourse and claims that human beings are 'storytelling animals by heart' (Kim & Ball-Rokeach, 2006, p. 177). Fisher claims that for human beings it comes naturally to use storytelling as a fundamental form of communication to 'express values and reasons and subsequently make decisions about actions' (Kim & Ball-Rokeach, 2006, p. 177). According to the narrative paradigm any form of day-to-day communication is a fruitful 'basis for discussions, reflections and actions in building of civic community' (Kim & Ball-Rokeach, 2006, p. 177). Wyatt et al. (2000) are convinced that every public discussion 'even among family and friends, has political consequences' (p. 88).

In contrast to Habermas, there are other critics who have proposed alternative frameworks for 'voice'. Bakhtin (1981) provides perhaps the most applicable theory to visual speech acts, and offers a means to understanding 'unique' voices and the important role of audience in multivocality. The next section therefore examines Bakhtin's theories in more detail.

Bakhtin's multi-voiced voice and speech genres

One of the most compelling alternative theories to Habermas' notion of public voice comes from the discourse theorist and semiotician Mikhail Bakhtin. In contrast to Habermas concept of communicative action, Bakhtin argues that there are in fact a number of voices, or speaking consciousnesses, represented as 'multiple and dialogic in nature, as suggested by these companion terms: multi-voiced, other-

voiced, double-voiced, and re-voiced' (Hull & Katz, 2006, p. 45). Thus any communicative action 'is not only rational, [...] it is also answerable' (Nielsen, 2002, p. 25). But through this process of answerability, responses in dialogic forms are not 'reduced to a rational act in the strictest sociological sense. An action is an answerable and potentially creative deed' (Nielsen, 2002, p. 25).

One of the core concepts of Bakhtin's work and also one of the key theories in this research is 'polyphony' or 'multivocality' (Nielsen, 2002, p. 84). The origin of the concept multivocality lies in Bakhtin's analysis of Dostoevsky's writings (Nielsen, 2002), where he detected many voices next to each other, which were not merging with the authors' voice. According to Bakhtin's notion of multi-voiced speech acts, every conversation is dialogic, and every voice is 'shaped and developed in continuous and constant interaction with others' individual utterances' (Bakhtin, 1979/1986, p. 89). This means that any speech is 'filled with dialogic overtones, and they must be taken into account in order to fully understand the style of the utterance' (Bakhtin, 1979/1986, p. 92).

Bakhtin (1979/1986) suggests that the role of 'The Other' in every single speech act is crucial, because when people speak they always draw on past experiences in dialogical work and at the same time anticipate a certain reaction of their audience, such as 'agreement, sympathy, objection [or] execution' (p. 69), which makes them speak according to these anticipated reactions. Thus voice is always 'imbued with response' (Bakhtin, 1979/1986, p. 68) and even leads to a situation where the 'listener becomes the speaker' (p. 68). Furthermore, this multivocality means that when we communicate, we do not borrow from a 'language in their neutral, dictionary form' (Bakhtin, 1979/1986, p. 87); instead, we borrow from other people's utterances, which includes also the

orientation toward a specific conceptual horizon, toward the specific world of the listener; it introduces totally elements into his discourse; it is in this way, after all, that various different points of view, conceptual horizons, systems for providing expressive accents, various social "languages" come to interact with one another. (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 282)

This leads to another popular contribution of Bakhtin (1981), termed heteroglossia. This is the process of integrating the different ideology-laden languages that come along with the different voices. Bakhtin (1981) states that 'language is heteroglot from top to bottom' (p. 291) and claims that 'the word in language is half someone

else's. It becomes one's "own" only when the speaker populates it with its own intentions, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention' (p. 294).

Through embracing others' voices and therefore their perspectives, Bakhtin (1981) claims that people mature and change (as cited in Hull, Stornaiuolo & Sahni, 2010). Hull and Katz (2006) sum up the process of making use of the voices of others for own new purposes as 'a linguistic ideological struggle to make others' words one's own – to create what Bakhtin calls an internally persuasive discourse, perhaps through the orchestration of voices from multiple discourses and social worlds' (p. 45-46). Bakhtin (1981, as cited in Hull, Stornaiuolo & Sahni, 2010) describes in his construct of 'ideological becoming' how people grow ideologically through 'a process [which] is characterized by 'struggle and dialogic interrelationship' (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 342) among discourses or patterns of thought, language, and values' (p. 336). This 'process of ideological becoming' (Hull et al., 2010, p. 337) helps us the individual to 'learn through dialogues with self and others that invite engagement with difference' (Freedman & Ball, 2004, as cited in Hull et al, 2010, p. 337).

One way of integrating the voices of others into speech acts is through 'reported or quoted speech', such as 'direct quotations, sometimes attributed and sometimes not, as well as paraphrases, and citations of speech that an actual person has said, as well as occasions when an interlocutor conjures speech that is fully imaginary – presented as if it had been said before, or might be said, by someone else' (Tannen, 1983, as cited in Soep, 2006, p. 202). 'Reported speech' is when one or more voices are reported by another voice. According to Bakhtin, 'reported speech alludes to an original utterance that is at the same time transformed [...] and can be a primary means for reconfirming authority' (Shuman, 1990, p. 170). A specific form of reported speech Bakhtin points out is 'double-voiced discourse', 'in which another person's words enter a speaker's utterance in a concealed form' (Soep, 2006, p. 202).

Of particular importance to this research are the ways in which Bakhtin's theories of multiple voices and double-voiced discourses are applied to technologically-driven media. For instance, Grace and Tobin (2002) observed that young video producers in digital storytelling workshops tend to make use of parody, which allowed them to 'momentarily acquire the power of the represented' (p. 201). Parody is a form of double-voiced speech, which contains 'both the meanings of the author and the refracted meanings of the parodied text or situation' (Grace & Tobin, 2002, p. 202), and possesses different functions, such as releasing tension or providing

oppositional views tempered by humour. Yet '[r]egardless of the outcome, parody provides space for critique and change. It may pose questions challenge assumptions, and offer new possibilities' (Grace & Tobin, 2002, p. 202). Through parodic videos, young video producers could challenge the usual roles within a classroom and were able to critique teachers and their teaching methods without running the risk of getting punished (Grace & Tobin, 2002).

Parody is, according to Bakhtin, a specific 'speech genre', an occasion, where language is used conventionally in a certain way. Thus Blommaert (2008) defines a speech genre as 'a complex of communicative-formal features that makes a particular communicative event recognisable as an instance of a type [and] guide us through the social world of communication' (p. 43). In other words, speech genres help the speaker and the audience to distinguish between particular types of speeches, such as a joke, a job interview or a love letter. Furthermore, Blommaert (2008) writes about how speakers and listeners contextualise utterances and how each context affords specific speech genres, arguing that 'The social "sphere" in which communication evolves – we would now say "context" or "domain" determines the utterance: there is a compelling link between the utterance and the "sphere" in which it occurs, in the sense that the utterance will be interpreted from within the contest in which it occurs' (p. 44). Blommaert (2008) claims that the notion of genre has broken out of its narrow definition of being solely 'an artistic concept that referred to literary forms (the novel, poetry, drama...)' (p. 44). Instead it can be used for any form of speech also visual communication; as Blommaert summarises: 'everything is genre' (p. 45).

Bakhtin's work focuses mainly on oral and written speech acts, but scholars have also applied it to visual speech acts (Grace & Tobin, 2002; Hull & Katz, 2006; Nelson & Hull, 2008; Blommaert, 2008). The acknowledgement of visual voices being multivoiced and heteroglot constructs collides with some of the core ideas of the Digital Storytelling movement, since digital stories are seen as a means of especially minority and marginalised voices obtaining and expressing their public visual voice as 'relatively autonomous citizen-producers' (Burgess, 2006, p. 208) and mostly uninfluenced by the dominant voices within the public discourse. In order to understand and to gain insight into the core ideas of Digital Storytelling, the next section contextualises and critiques this form of participatory media production.

Youth voice and Digital Storytelling

In contemporary media education, youths are neither seen as media amateurs nor as a passive audience that needs the help of adults to understand media and withstand its negative influences (Buckingham, 1998). Instead, they are treated as active media producers with new media offering them 'a new "agency" and new power' (Sefton-Green, 2006, p. 293). Sefton-Green (2006) even considered youths as 'media-producing agents' (p. 280), although Rheingold (2008) importantly clarifies that 'this population is both self-guided and in need of guidance: although a willingness to learn new media by point-and-click exploration might come naturally to today's student cohort, there's nothing innate about knowing how to apply their skills to the processes of democracy' (p. 99). Rheingold (2008) therefore emphasizes the importance of combining knowledge gained through informal learning and formal learning in participatory media production courses. This combination can help youths move 'from a private voice to a public voice [and] can help students [or anyone else] turn their self-expression into a form of public participation' (Rheingold, 2008, p. 101).

The special form of participatory media production this research aims to explore is called 'Digital Storytelling'. The term has been used 'generically to describe the uses or affordances of new media for new or innovative narrative forms' (Burgess, 2006, p. 206), such as computer game narratives or short videos combining different textual elements, including atmospheric sound, music, photos and video. For the purposes of this study, Digital Storytelling refers to the production of short videos about personal stories. This specific form of Digital Storytelling has its origins in the context of the student counter culture and free speech movement in the United States during the 1960s, where one of the first digital storytelling programmes in New York and gave inner-city youth with little or no media production experience the chance to express themselves (Goodman, 2003) through high impact, non-professional and non-commercial media created under the guidance of an experienced media producer (Burgess, 2006). This idea is reminiscent of Habermas's notion of communicative action within the public sphere, which he asserts must be free from the influence of the economy and the leading politicians. However, Bakhtin's notion of multivocality contradicts this understanding of an ideal speech act, since he describes every speech as necessarily containing other people's voices, which they then make use of for their own purpose. From this perspective, then, certain dominant ideas in politics and economy from the speech of

others can be re-used for alternative purposes; exclusion of these voices, then, is not essential.

The Digital Storytelling movement has spread over the globe since the 1990s as ‘a response to the exclusion of “ordinary” people’s stories in broadcast media [...] facilitated by the increasing accessibility of digital media to home users, with digital cameras, scanners and personal computers all becoming increasingly accessible to the domestic market’ (Hartley & McWilliam, 2009, p. 4). Lambert (2009), one of the leading figures within the Digital Storytelling movement, claims that Digital Storytelling offers ordinary people the possibility to find their own voice and experiment with turning their own voice into a public voice by circulating private stories to a wider audience. Tacchi (2009) claims that Digital Storytelling ‘empower[s] poor people to communicate their “voices” within and beyond marginalized communities’ (p. 169). Additionally, Burgess and Klæbe (2009) speak about Digital Storytelling as a form of grassroots civic engagement for people whose voice is mainly unheard in the public sphere: ‘Everyday storytelling, life narrative, and the domestic archive of biographical images are re-mediated through the production of digital stories, transforming them from one-to-one, private forms of communication and translating them into contexts where they can potentially contribute to the public culture’ (Burgess & Klæbe, 2009, p. 155).

Based on these assumptions Reed and Hill (2010) describe, in their model of the multiple impacts of digital storytelling, how developing and sharing digital stories can lead to (1) personal reflection and growth, (2) education and awareness, (3) movement building, and (4) policy advocacy. Personal reflection and growth is particularly suggestive of Bakhtin’s (1981, as cited in Hull, Stornaiuolo & Sahni, 2010) concept of ‘ideological becoming’. The brainstorming process for digital stories aims to facilitate critical engagement with other voices and therefore also with different ideological viewpoints in order to develop the storyteller’s political identity. This political standpoint should then be voiced through digital stories and distributed to wider publics.

Figure 1: Multiple Impacts of Digital Storytelling Model. Source Reed & Hill, 2010, p. 270



In order to guide people in the process of Digital Storytelling, experienced practitioners conduct workshops, since, as Rheingold (2008) claims, inexperienced media producers need guidance in order to employ their production skills to the creation of media products for democratic ends. These workshops usually take three to four full, consecutive days, and are usually divided into group brainstorming sessions, pre-production, production and post-production phases, followed by a distribution phase. Even if significant time is allocated to remediate oral stories with the help of technology, researchers argue that workshop facilitators should always remember that the origin of digital storytelling comes from oral storytelling practices within a group of people and therefore 'prioritize the "storytelling" over the "digital"' (Hartley, 2009, p. 31). Hartley (2007) further argues that '[t]he most important element of the workshops is not the training in computer use or editing but the so-called "story circle" [...] a series of dialogic games in which people draw on their own and other's embedded knowledge of stories, narrative styles, jokes and references' (p. 3-4).

Similarly, Rheingold (2008) notes that facilitators need to create an intimate and safe environment during the workshop sessions that makes participants feel comfortable to practice storytelling in front of their 'first public' (p. 99), that is, fellow participants and the facilitator. But whereas literature on Digital storytelling emphasises that the participants' voices should remain mostly uninfluenced, Bakhtin's (1979/1986) assertion of multi-vocality recognises that voice is always influenced by former experiences and audiences in speech acts. As such, it would seem that informed by Bakhtin's idea of dialogism, digital storytellers are brought into a situation in which they must engage in dialogue with and answer to at least two different groups (the facilitator and the fellow participants), who bring along different sets of knowledge, skill sets and cultural voices, while simultaneously exploring their 'own' public voice. Hartley and McWilliam (2009) seem to welcome this situation by stating that Digital Storytelling workshops offer the possibility for individuals to 'help each other to navigate complex social networks and organisational systems' (p. 15). The integration of the fellow participants' and the facilitator's voices into the personal digital stories produced for this project raises several questions about authenticity and Digital Storytelling.

Particularly the issue of the presence of an adult media professional as facilitator of the Digital Storytelling process has been raised, because the main focus of digital

stories is not supposed to be on professionalism, but rather on the creation of personal stories 'conceived, written, edited and narrated by the storyteller – apparently free from interference from media professionals' (Watkins & Russo, 2009, p. 270). However, research has shown that this goal is difficult to reach, as the institutions that offer Digital Storytelling workshops and the sociality of the workshop tend to shape the digital stories and make them 'predictable, if not uniform' (Burgess, 2006, p. 208).

The opinions of scholars on this topic are mixed. Some claim that 'teachers who give explicit instructions in techniques of shot construction and continuity editing provide greater opportunities for successfully expressive work than those who allow greater "freedom" for children to experiment' (Reid et al., 2002, as cited in Burn, 2007, p. 515). Yet others claim that authenticity is one of the main features of Digital Storytelling (Lambert, 2009), and that at any time the influence of the facilitator in particular should be kept to a minimum so that the digital storytellers are given the possibility to express themselves in their own voice. Hartley (2007) integrates these perspectives and claims that in Digital Storytelling workshops instead of an traditional knowledge transfer model it 'requires a dialogic approach to production, relying on a tactfully handled exploitation of a highly asymmetric relationship: the formal, explicit, professional, expert knowledge of the facilitator and the informal, tacit, "amateur" or "common" knowledge of the participant' (Hartley, 2007, p. 3). Other points of discussion within the Digital Storytelling movement are around the accessibility and the possible limitations of youth visual voice with the public discourse for which they are produced. Couldry (2008) questions how many of the voices remediated in digital stories are actually entering the public discourse and how many are left unheard. The concern is that it 'underlies the risk that islands of good digital storytelling practice will remain isolated, disarticulated from each other and from wider social change' (Couldry, 2008, p. 56).

These concerns feed into a discourse concerning appropriate and effective distribution channels for digital stories. Burgess and Klæbe (2009) for instance state that Digital Storytelling is only effective when storytellers work together with mass media institutions, which have large scale distribution networks in place and have experience with transferring mediated self-expression into videos containing issues of shared concern, such as public service broadcasters. Thus Burgess and Klæbe (2009) refer to television public broadcasting, whereas Watkins and Russo (2009) claim that the Internet is the good channel for distribution in order to reach a

maximum audience. Similarly, recent projects encourage the participants to make use of social media to distribute their creations.

Framing this debate through Bakhtin's concept of speech genre (1979/1986), it must not be overlooked that the various 'social spheres' of the different distribution channels can have a strong influence on shaping the digital stories. Different distribution channels, such as an online social media network (e.g. Facebook) or the local news programme, request different languages and different speech genres to which visual voices have to conform if they want to be included. This leads to a situation where the choice of genre and language through which a video-maker conveys his or her message is largely depending not only on the audiences, but also on the distribution channel.

While this part of the chapter presented the core ideas of Digital Storytelling, the following section focuses in particular on one important element of participatory media production: the role of the audience.

Youth voice, Digital Storytelling and their audiences

Just as in the case of distribution channels, the audience on the receiving end of these channels plays a crucial role in the process of producing digital stories. Echoing Bakhtin, Marwick and boyd (2010) note that, just like professional writers, young online media producers think about their audiences from the moment they decide to produce media and try to live up to the 'markers of cool' (Marwick & boyd, 2010, p. 3) they negotiate with these imagined audiences.

Marwick and boyd's (2010) findings were especially interesting for this research because the participants of this study dealt with a similar mix of audiences for their digital stories, such as online social media profile owners for their media creations. In their research, Marwick and boyd (2010) note that online social network sites 'collapse multiple audiences into single contexts' (p. 1) and force the profile owner to 'contend with groups of people they don't normally bring together' (p. 9), such as their peers and their parents. Their research showed that social network profile owners 'continually monitor and meet the expectations' (Marwick & boyd, 2010, p. 13) of the different audiences through self-censorship and balancing. In other words, profile owners aim to please the biggest audience group without offending minority

audiences and 'nightmare readers' (Marwick & boyd, 2010, p. 12), such as parents or teachers.

These findings exemplify once more how visual voices are 'directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer-word: it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction' (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 280). The young media producers in Marwick and boyd's (2010) research tackled this phenomenon by exercising 'self-censorship' through strategically concealing information, or working around this challenge completely by dividing different audiences to different profiles by creating multiple social media accounts, pseudonyms or nicknames (Marwick, 2005, as cited in Marwick & boyd, 2010, p. 9). Both strategies exemplify the pressures of the dialogic nature of visual voices and how the anticipation of an imagined audience can decide what is being said, in what ways as well as what is being left out. As Bakhtin (1981) argues, 'the orientation towards an answer is open, blatant and concrete' (p. 280); and as Marwick and boyd (2010) show, this orientation is also discernable in the visual voices themselves.

Marwick and boyd (2010) compare their findings in the online world to similar processes in the offline world, which symbolic interactionism theorists like Goffman (1956) called 'impression management'. These scholars claim that 'identity and self are constituted through constant interactions with others [by] habitually monitor[ing] how people respond to them when presenting themselves' (Marwick & boyd, 2010, p. 10) and adjusting their self-representation accordingly. This self-monitoring process of impression management thus turns self-representation into a collaborative process (Marwick & boyd, 2010). This echoes Bakhtin's (1981) internal dialogism of voices: 'every word is directed towards an answer and cannot escape the profound influence of the answering word that it anticipates' (p. 279). Similarly, Hull and Katz (2006) explain that '[w]e enact the selves we want to become in relation with others, sometimes in concert with them, sometimes in opposition to them, but always in relation to them' (p. 47).

While the on-going impression management process (Goffman, 1956) of youth is often portrayed negatively through talk about young people being victims of peer pressure, in contrast, Ito, et al. (2010) emphasize the positive aspect of peers influencing each other and thereby creating a space for peer instructions and informal learning 'as a side effect of everyday life and social activity' (p. 21). According to Goffman (1956), impression management is an essential social skill necessary for being socialised into a society, and that it can only be learned by

experience not through formal learning. For example, young online profile owner learn by viewing and critiquing each other's online identities which 'types of presentations are socially appropriate' (boyd, 2007, p. 10) and take these unwritten rules into account when they create and maintain their online identities. Watts and Flanagan (2007) show that when exploring their political identity young people tend to 'look for a concordance between their views and those of others' (p. 781). The opinion of their peers is important to young citizens when they decide upon the political values they stand for (Watts & Flanagan, 2007).

Within the Digital Storytelling model, these findings show how fluid the public voice can be and it depends on the addressee's self knowledge, views and expression of beliefs. This is also articulated in a study by Luttrell (2010), who used photo voices as a research method, and showed that young research participants made use of the same picture for different purposes, depending on their audience: 'For example, recall that Gabriel addressed his mother as the primary audience for his picture of the church. But in conversation with his peers, he emphasised that he took the picture because this is where he goes to 'hang with the teenagers' who invite him to join their activities even though he is "only in fifth grade"' (Luttrell, 2010, p. 228). This example strongly reflects the 'relational nature of the children's meaning-making process' (Luttrell, 2010, p. 228) and demonstrates how young media producers can have simultaneously several audiences and purposes in mind when working on their media creations. But it also shows how different audiences can interpret the same visual message in many different ways. This leads to Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) notion of motivated signs. Like Bakhtin (1981), Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) claim that signs are never arbitrary; instead they are motivated by the sign-maker and possess a combination of forms and meanings. The processes of sign-making and the interpretation of signs are influenced by the cultural, social and psychological background of the speaker and the audience and the particular context in which the text is produced and interpreted.

The multiple purposes and readings of media creations lead to the following section, which speaks more in depth about two specific purposes for media production, display and distribution found in this research: conspicuous consumption and communication of cultural capital.

Veblen's conspicuous consumer and Bourdieu's social capital theory

Given that the rise of consumer culture closely links self-expression and consumerism (Posel, 2010), it is important to examine the notion of possessions as part of a social communication system since the design of the research project involved participants being given a mobile phone, which is a valuable piece of consumer electronics, to record their digital stories.

Douglas and Isherwood (1979, as cited in Richins, 1994) have claimed that 'consumers are active participants in this communication system, choosing and valuing possessions for their meaning within the cultural system' (p. 505). Thus, because of 'the inherent communicative power of possessions' (Richins, 1994, p. 505) the value of commodities derive from its meaning(s). According to Solomon (1983, as cited in Richins, 1994) products are consumed for their social and private meanings. In other words, the value of the commodity may be less about the exchange value and more about the symbolic value since social meaning or public meaning of consumption objects is the shared meaning given to them by society, and 'emerges through socialisation and participation in shared activities' (Richins, 1994, p.506). In contrast, private meanings are determined by an individual and are not known by others until told and private meaning develops over time spent with a specific commodity (Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981). A mix of public and private meaning gives commodities their value.

Richins (1994) summarized and elaborates on the most important meanings that create symbolic value for objects: (1) utilitarian value, (2) enjoyment, (3) representations of interpersonal ties and (4) identity and self-representation. The utilitarian value of an object is based on its usefulness, the enjoyment value on the pleasure it provides, interpersonal ties are represented by goods that form or symbolise social relationships, and identity and self-expression value is based on their value of differentiating one from others. Just as a commodity can have a public and a private meaning, Richins (1994) emphasizes that it can also have 'several or even all of the meaning dimensions that can influence the value' (p. 507).

In Veblen's (1899/1994) conspicuous consumption theory, the possession and showing off of luxury goods communicates wealth and belonging to an upper class, where there is a 'relationship between private property and status' (Trigg, 2001, p. 100) and where consumer behaviour is 'determined socially in relation to the

positions of individuals in the social hierarchy' (Trigg, 2001, p. 99). According to this theory, owning commodities means a gain in status for the respective owner, while not owning means simply no status. Because 'status derives from the judgements that other members of society make of an individual's position in society' (Trigg, 2001, p. 100), people begin to accumulate commodities solely for the purpose of displaying them in order to negotiate their social standing and '[i]t becomes indispensable to accumulate, to acquire property, in order to retain one's good name' (Veblen, 1899/1994, p. 18). Accordingly, the more 'wasteful' the conspicuous good is perceived to be the more status it conveys (Trigg, 2001). To keep up one's status the individual needs to regularly get new, impressive commodities, which makes conspicuous consumption unlimited and never-ending (Trigg, 2001).

For Veblen (1899/1994), conspicuous consumption is 'the most important factor in determining consumer behaviour, not just for the rich but for all classes' (Trigg, 2001, p. 101). There is also a 'trickle down' effect (Trigg, 2001, p. 102) where lower social classes try to live up to what the higher social classes exemplify and copy their consumption behaviours. Postmodern voices argue that Veblen's link between social class and consumption behaviour has disaggregated and is outdated, 'with individuals now free to project their own meanings into commodities' (Trigg, 2001, p. 104). According to McIntyre (1992, as cited in Trigg, 2001) 'consumption is now the duty of the individual: he no longer exists as a citizen or worker, but as a consumer' (p. 104) and that status is communicated more subtly (Trigg, 2001).

These theories have been examined within particular societies and cultures, with Posel (2010) exploring the 'historically constitutive relationship between the workings of race and the regulation of consumption' (p. 160) in South Africa. She states that the observed consumption behaviour of many *nouveau riche* within the black population can be explained using the theory of Veblen's leisure class, claiming that the end of apartheid 'saw South Africa's reintegration into a global economy in which conspicuous consumption is par for the course, which makes it unsurprising and unremarkable that comparable trends should emerge within the ranks of South Africa's black population' (Posel, 2010, p. 160). In her work Posel (2010) gives an overview of a history of suppression in South Africa, which did not only deny the black population political rights, but also curtailed their consumption, thus ensuring that 'each race kept to its proper place' (Posel, 2010, p. 167). In effect, the dominant white population regulated the possibilities for the black population to consume in a similar fashion to their white counterparts to the extent that 'race became inseparable

from the symbolic logics of material acquisition and deprivation, closely linked to opportunities for education and social advancement' (Posel, 2010, p. 164).

During times of apartheid, Posel (2010) argues that 'whiteness' was directly linked to 'civilized "manners", evident in a combination of factors read off a person's body, lifestyle, community and social standing' (p. 168); this led to a situation where being black was equated with 'being unworthy of certain modes and orders of consumption' (Posel, 2010, p. 168), including a proper education, in order to limit upward mobility. With the end of apartheid as well as the end of the official regulation of consumption, one of the symbols of freedom became the first African-owned mall in the townships, which sold unrestricted, unmediated consumer goods to black customers, and was officially opened by president Nelson Mandela (Posel, 2010).

Most recent developments in South African townships reported in the media seem to exemplify Posel's (2010) claims about the tendency toward conspicuous consumption within the black population in South Africa. On one news program, for instance, an uncle to a young black man stated on TV that he is happy that his nephew can purchase and display the expensive luxury goods that the apartheid regime refused him (enewschannel, 2012). There is even a term for this controversial township trend, '*izikhothane*'. The term refers to young people who engage in a commodity-based bragging battle about their possessions and who compete to display possessions that their peers do not or cannot afford; battles go as far as public displays of destruction of designer clothes or banknotes to demonstrate that they don't care and are able to buy again. These public displays are witnessed by other township youths, who admire the ones that win (enewschannel, 2012).

The theory of conspicuous consumption has further links to the concept of cultural capital, developed by Bourdieu in the 1960s. The concept is also rooted in the acquisition of status and social mobility. Cultural capital stands for 'the accumulated stock of knowledge about the products of artistic and intellectual traditions, which is learned through educational and training and – crucially for Bourdieu – also through social upbringing' (Trigg, 2001, p. 105) According to Bourdieu, status is not only communicated in an easy straightforward way through purchasing and displaying luxury goods, but rather through showing off inner goods, such as expensive education, knowledge and taste (Trigg, 2001). This leads to 'the aesthetic taste of individuals with high cultural capital [being] used to secure positions of status in the social hierarchy' (Trigg, 2001, p. 105). Taste performance and the display of cultural consumption have also conquered the online world. Research by Liu (2008) on taste

statements via online social network profiles showed that 'virtual materials of this performance are cultural signs – a user's self-described favourite books, music, movies, television interests, and so forth' and are used by profile owners to 'display their status and distinction to an audience comprised of friends, co-workers, potential love interests, and the Web public' (p. 251).

Bourdieu (1992) states that social capital is gained by increasing one's social standing: 'the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network or more or less institutionalized relationship of mutual acquaintance and recognition (as cited in Gauntlett, 2001, p. 132). But although this is seemingly a positive or natural transaction, Bourdieu emphasizes 'the cold realities of social inequality' (Gauntlett, 2001, p. 132): Social capital is closely linked to economic capital and therefore exclusionary for already marginalised groups (Gauntlett, 2001). Other scholars have noted that there are positive effects that can result from being embedded in a social network. Putnam (2001) states that 'like physical capital, social capital is far from homogeneous' (Putnam, 2001, p. 41). Putnam (2001) argues instead that there are multiple dimensions of social capital, both formal and informal, that promote different kinds of civic engagement, and these forms 'constitute networks in which there can easily develop reciprocity, and in which there can be gains' (Putnam, 2001, p. 42) and must not be overlooked.

In low-income areas such as Khayelitsha, research has shown that mobile phones give the owner/user access to various other forms of capital, especially social and symbolic capital (Skuse & Cousins, 2008). Carrying a mobile phone grants a person status, because, as a relatively expensive piece of technology, in South African township, it 'signifies wealth and translates into upward social mobility' (Bourdieu, 1984, as cited in Skuse & Cousins, 2008, p. 17) and it shows that the person may possibly be connected to influential people (Skuse & Cousins, 2008). Building and maintaining local social networks are crucial in low-income areas in order to mobilize human and economic capital in order to, for example, help build a house for the family or to protect one's home or neighbourhood (Skuse & Cousins, 2008).

Social capital within the peer network also helps young people in townships with support in times of extreme need (food or clothes) or gives them a shoulder to cry on (Bray et al., 2010). These strong ties between some individuals in the townships are often explained in terms of the African community spirit '*Ubuntu*', a traditional form of civic engagement associated with township life, which emphasizes that 'people are

people through other people. It also acknowledges both the rights and the responsibilities of every citizen in promoting individual and societal well-being' (Government Gazette, 1996, as cited in Whitehead, 2004). But often such practices are 'given a romantic gloss by those living outside of them [townships]' (Bray et al., 2010, p. 101) and should be taken with a pinch of salt, as this philosophy, at least in its traditional form, 'sits uneasily with violence and jealousy evident in neighbourhoods' (Bray et al., 2010, p. 101).

Conclusion

This chapter presented different, and often conflicting notions of 'voice'. The concept voice in this research is defined as the agency of individuals, which can be limited and often also silenced by different dominant forces. The theoretical framework of this study was presented in three main parts. Firstly, it briefly reminded of the history of the Western notion of 'public voice', which had become the normative definition in democracies all over the world. Then two important contributions to this debate were investigated: Habermas' public sphere—along with the major criticisms of Habermas's arguments: Fraser's subaltern counterpublics and Fisher's narrative paradigm—and Bakhtin's multivocality, heteroglossia, double-voicedness and speech-genre. His notion of the concept voice, mainly associated with literary criticism, was further discussed in relation to the visual voices produced in Digital Storytelling workshops, complicating and challenging the notion of an 'authentic voice' in digital stories. The last section of the chapter then speaks about the close link between self-expression and consumer culture and also about Veblen's conspicuous consumption theory with respect to the specific context of South Africa. Finally, Bourdieu's concepts of cultural capital and social capital were discussed in relation to conspicuous consumption and their function in a low-income area like Khayelitsha.

The next chapter presents the methodology used to test these theories in the qualitative component of this study.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter presents a detailed discussion of the qualitative methodology used in this study. The research took place in the low-income area Khayelitsha Township, Cape Town, South Africa and involved twenty participants from the after-school programme of the non-profit organisation Ikamva Youth. These twenty participants were already participants of the 'Media, Image and Expression Workshop' of Ikamva Youth that I took over as one of the main components of this study. During the workshop, the participants were asked to individually produce three- to five-minute digital stories with feature phones and distribute them in their peripheral peer networks in order to explore their public visual voices.

This chapter elaborates on the scientific approach to the research, principally based on the 'new sociology of childhood' perspective (James & Prout, 1997), drawing on both the action research cycle of exploration, knowledge construction and action and participatory research methods applied to data collection, such as participant observation, group discussions, informal encounters and conversations, loosely-structured, in-depth interviews (i.e. 'open' interviews) and mobile media collection for qualitative content analysis. Furthermore, insight is given into techniques used to analyse the data collected. Additionally, the chapter covers ethical considerations concerning youth research, with special attention given to the high crime rate at the research location and its influence on the research.

Overview of methodology

The premise of this research is grounded in the concept of youths as active agents, decision-makers and shapers of their social world; consequently, the choice of approach to the design and implementation of this study draws from the research of James and Prout (1997, as cited in Ito et al., 2010), who argue for a 'new sociology of youth and children' that aims to give 'voice to children and youth, who, while they have not been absent in social-science research, have often not been heard' (p. 7). Drawing from their methods, critical action research and combined multiple

qualitative research methods within an ethnographic framework were the basis for this research. This approach allowed for data collection that offered robust description and analysis of the ways the participants made use of mobile phone technology for Digital Storytelling.

In particular, action research was chosen as a key methodological approach because 'unlike traditional experimental/scientific research that looks for generalizable explanations that might be applied to all contexts, action research focuses on specific situations and localized solutions' (Stringer, 2007, p. 1). In the case of this research Ikamva Youth approached UCT with the request to investigate how best to integrate Digital Storytelling into the existing curriculum of the 'Media, Image and Expression Workshop'. In learning environments and community organisations in particular, action research offers the means to work through 'the sometimes puzzling complexity of the issues' (Stringer, 2007, p. 1) and to 'systematically investigate issues in diverse contexts and to discover effective and efficient applications of more generalized practices' (Stringer, 2007, p. 6).

The study was conducted in two phases over the course of a six-month period during which I worked in Khayelitsha and lived in Cape Town, South Africa. Whereas phase one the research concentrated mainly on participant observation, phase two applied the critical action research routine of 'reflection, planning, acting, observing' (Carson, 1990, p. 168). The first phase consisted of an initial research gathering stage during the first two months. During this period I became acquainted with the participants and the research site and collected a first round of data concerning existing media production and distribution practices. The information gathered in this phase helped working out a draft Digital Storytelling curriculum for the second phase of the research, which was conducted over the remaining four months. The second phase was kicked off by introducing feature phones to the participants and included a test run of the Digital Storytelling workshop based on the findings of phase one. During the second phase of the research the critical action research interaction spiral of the continually recycling set of 'reflection, planning, acting and observing' (Carson, 1990, p. 168) was applied in order to refine and improve the curriculum along the way based on observations and feedback of the participants. At the end of the second phase a public screening of the digital stories took place for friends and family of the participants at Ikamva Youth. Furthermore, the participants were also asked to distribute their stories within the local peer networks.

While there are a number of ways to collect data in critical action research using an ethnographic framework, the choice for this study was within a classroom context for a number of practical reasons. The primary basis for this decision was because of the high crime rate in Khayelitsha; for personal safety reasons, I was advised by experienced Ikamva Youth employees to leave the location before dusk and not to move too far away from the Ikamva Youth office. Working around these and further limitations, such as the participant's school involvement, other tutorials at Ikamva Youth, and their church duties meant that the total number of contact hours possible with the participants would be decreased, and made a fully-immersed ethnographic approach impossible. Thus, the semi-formal instructional setting of the 'Media, Image and Expression Workshop' was the main research site, with the choice of classroom ethnography being the most suitable research approach to effectively answer the research questions for this closed context.

Classroom ethnography, according to Watson-Gegeo (1997), traditionally 'emphasizes the socio-cultural nature of teaching and learning processes, incorporates participants' perspectives on their own behaviour, and offers a holistic analysis sensitive to levels of context in which interactions and classrooms are situated' (p. 135). In this study, I was not only interested in classroom life, but also in the life outside the classroom. To bridge the gap in observation, during informal conversations, homework assignments, in-depth interviews and group discussions I aimed to gain more insight into mobile media use outside the classroom.

In the 'Media, Image and Expression Workshop', the participants were asked to first concentrate on oral storytelling. According to previous research (see Chapter Two), oral storytelling helps boosting critical thinking, arguing one's point of view and understanding the power of storytelling before experimenting with enhancement of the voice through technology-driven communication (Reed & Hill, 2010). As Hartley (2009) notes, collective practice within Digital Storytelling workshops can enhance an individual's feeling of belonging to a group of likeminded people who are interested in changing the world. After the focus on oral storytelling, the workshop then proceeded to move toward technologically-driven storytelling in which the participants produced three- to five-minute long digital stories with the help of feature phones.

Within the multi-method approach of this study, in-depth, case-based qualitative content analysis was used, known as a multimodal analysis (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). Semiotic analysis is useful in order to better understand the meaning-making process during media productions, as the producers of the media texts often have

problems putting into words why they made certain choices. An extensive multimodal analysis of all ten digital stories produced during the research would be too large a data set for the scope of this research project, thus an analysis of two of the most distinctive digital stories as determined by the participants themselves were analysed to give further insight into how the participants made use of the 'mobile video' medium for Digital Storytelling.

The main research question for the study was the following:

How will young participants in a Digital Storytelling workshop in Khayelitsha, South Africa, appropriate existing mobile media production resources, practices and distribution networks to voice their concerns and ideas in public forums?

This research question is divided into the following sub-questions:

- What are the meanings and roles of existing mobile media production practices in young people's lives?
- How do young people use the affordances of their phones and visual mobile media to make their voices heard through Digital Storytelling?
- In what ways do young people make use of the different semiotic modes of mobile videos in order to communicate their concerns and ideas to their imagined audiences?

In order to answer these questions in relation to intensely personal processes of youth storytelling, this research aimed at creating a safe space for the participants during the workshop sessions, allowing them to freely express themselves, to tell their personal stories and to explore their (visual) voices also in front of an adult. Because the participants are growing up in an environment where inter-generational relationships are rather adult centred (Bray et al., 2010), the Digital Storytelling process was a new experience for the participants, as was the collaborative youth-adult relationship with the adult workshop leader. The challenge for this research was to make the participants understand that I saw them as 'experts' in mobile media production within their environment. The explicit objective was to merge their own 'out-of-school' experiences with the formal learning experiences during the workshop in order for me to gain insight into how marginalised South African youths make use of their day to day mobile media production and distribution practices for Digital Storytelling. Lessons learned within this specific context could give other Digital

Storytelling projects in similar environments a foundation for designing new projects. As a result of this research, an updated curriculum of the existing 'Media, Image and Expression Workshop' offered by Ikamva Youth based on the findings of this research will be produced.

This study aims to contribute important theoretical and practical knowledge to the existing theoretical discourses centred on youth voice and participatory media production. It does so by closely examining for the first time the complex processes taking place in the case study where marginalised youths explored their democratic visual voices within the local peer networks. The qualitative study was especially designed to investigate more sustainable approaches to the build-up of Digital Storytelling workshops in environments with limited technological resources. I did so, by primarily making use of existing local communication resources and practices.

Most of the existing research examining Digital Storytelling concentrates on group-based projects employing traditional complex video production equipment being operated by a team. This teamwork can bring along the 'danger of collapsing the individual motivations of young film-makers into claims about the motivations of the group as a whole' (Burn, 2007, p. 4), which contradicts one of the core features of Digital Storytelling: giving every individual the possibility to tell 'one's story using one's own voice' (Simsek, 2012, p. 2). In order to make solo-productions possible, this research draws from new technologies, where mobile phones act as compact mini-production units. These mobile phones were sponsored by Nokia and donated to Ikamva Youth for continued use in further 'Media, Image and Expression Workshops'. (The participants themselves referred to the phones as 'Ikamva phones', and this term will be used throughout the description and analysis of the research.) The Ikamva phones consisted of two different models, the Nokia 5530 XpressMusic and the X3, both of which came with a variety of multimedia functions. One primary difference in features exists: the XpressMusic can be used for simple video editing directly on the mobile phone, whereas the footage shot on the X3 phone needs to be edited on a computer.

The original design of the research had participants who were allocated XpressMusic phones complete their project entirely on their phones, while participants with X3 phones completed their digital stories at the Ikamva Youth computer lab. However, while preparing the editing workshop, there were several technical problems with the open source software in the computer lab and an emergency solution needed to be implemented. Consequently, the participants with X3 phones were offered the option

to edit their videos together with me on my personal computer. In spite of this solution, the editing software Final Cut Pro was too complex for the participants to operate on their own; therefore I also participated in the digital story productions as an editor, with the participants playing the role of a content editor. When the participants with XpressMusic phones realised that the participants with X3 phones had been given a wider range of video editing possibilities, they also requested my editing experience. To ensure equal treatment for the two groups, their requests were approved; but participants with XpressMusic phones were asked to use their phones to edit, with the final touches added through the computer editing programme Final Cut Pro.

The aim of this study was not to be generalisable to a wider population in a positivist sense, since being able to make more general claims can limit the possibility to take into account the specific context of the research participants (Bryman, 2008). Instead the primary goal of this study was to make use of the added value of qualitative data collection and analysis through 'contextualisation, thick description, holistic, inductive analysis [and] triangulation' (Duff, 2006, p. 73) to give the reader of this report the possibility to 'determine the generalisability of findings to their particular situation or to other situations' (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003, p. 466). According to Duff (2006) this approach also ensures internal validity of the data.

Ikamva Youth and the Digital Storytelling workshop

The non-profit youth development organisation Ikamva Youth was chosen as the research site for several reasons. Firstly, there was an ongoing cooperation between the University of Cape Town and the NGO. Secondly, working together with Ikamva Youth allowed me access to a rather closed social setting. Thirdly, Ikamva Youth already offered 'Media, Image and Expression Workshops' and computer and Internet courses, which the management allowed me to take over during the duration of this research. By leading these other courses, I had the ability to both widen and deepen the role of a participant-as-observer by being an active member of the social setting with the participants knowing the purpose of my stay (Bryman, 2008).

Ikamva Youth aims to include the young members as much in decision-making processes as possible. For example, they have an open-door policy at management team meetings to which all members and volunteers are officially invited. One point on the agenda is always reserved for their concerns and ideas. During the time of the

research, the first former member of Ikamva Youth even became part of the management team. To prepare the members of Ikamva Youth for effective participation, special leadership workshops are offered. Additionally, I observed how volunteers regularly reminded the Ikamva Youth members to stay up to date with current affairs and read the weekly free newspaper.

The workshop took place in a time period of six months from July 2010 to December 2010. Over sixty group and individual workshop sessions took place in two different venues, the Ikamva Youth computer lab and the general-purpose room of the public library next door to Ikamva Youth. First, the workshop sessions took place in the computer lab, but the physical features of the room were not ideal for group sessions and the frequent access of other people from Khayelitsha to the lab in order to use the Internet or make a copy disturbed the flow of the workshop sessions. In the general-purpose room participants generally remained undisturbed. The room had chairs and tables, which could be arranged to suit the participants' needs, a white board for writing notes and important information was utilized, and a projector from Ikamva Youth was brought in to screen videos from my laptop. Unfortunately, the acoustics in both rooms made it impossible for any of the workshop sessions to be videotaped or recorded with a sound quality of good enough quality to be used or transcribed for analysis.

Each week, I had between eight and sixteen hours of direct contact hours with the participants. Initially, more emphasis was placed on the group sessions, whereas between the end of the pre-production and the beginning of the production phase individual sessions were more useful. During the pre-production and production phases, group sessions were only used to give peer feedback on raw material, rough cuts and final digital stories. The workshops took place every week on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays. On Tuesdays and Thursdays the participants were officially scheduled for the 'Media, Image and Expression Workshop' of Ikamva Youth. Saturdays were used for individual sessions with the participants with parallel Ikamva Youth tutoring sessions or workshops.

As outlined previously, the research project and the workshop were divided into two phases. The first phase was mainly introductory in nature in order for the participants and researchers to acquaint themselves with one another and to collect data concerning the existing mobile media production and distribution practices of the participants. During the workshop sessions in this phase, the participants worked on brainstorming possible topics for their digital stories and pre-production of their

videos. In the second phase, which took four months, the participants were asked to produce and distribute the digital stories.

According to Hartley (2009), there are six stages in a Digital Storytelling workshop, such as brainstorming (which he calls story circle), script writing, the recording of voice-over, sound editing, video recording and video editing. In the context of this study I merged the first stage of group discussions around possible topics for Digital Stories with group discussions about general topics such as growing up in Khayelitsha, South African politics or mobile media production. This afforded me further insight into the experiences, fears, hopes and dreams of the participants, along with information that assisted in brainstorming possible topics for digital stories as well as in analysing the collected data. During this stage, different digital stories from all over the world were also screened in the workshop sessions in order to kick off group discussions about the topics, the way the digital stories were produced and the messages communicated in the videos (Hartley, 2009). In the second stage, the participants were asked to leave the examples behind and instead explore their own ideas for digital stories. They were asked to come up with some ideas for a personal digital story based on a topic of his or her choice and make choices about how to transfer their ideas into videos in a simple script. During this stage the participants were also introduced to conventions in film and TV productions based on Bordwell and Thompson's *Film Art* (2008). Additionally, Hartley (2009) suggests the use of structured exercises facilitated by the workshop leader in order to give the participants the possibility to practice their newly gained knowledge.

The second phase of this research commenced with participants receiving the Ikamva phones. During the time of the research the participants could continually use the phones 24-hours a day, seven days a week. After the participants became acquainted with the phones, they were asked to start with the production stage, namely record video and audio for their digital stories. In individual and group sessions the participants received weekly feedback on their material and their progress from their peers and myself. Because there was no time to show all the videos in a public screening at the end of the project, a jury was formed and included members of the Ikamva Youth management, my research supervisor and myself, and chose the most outstanding three digital stories. These were shown in a public screening which took place during an Ikamva Youth festival, where caretakers and friends of the participants could watch these digital stories. To give the participants time to display and distribute the digital stories within the peripheral peer networks,

the Ikamva phones only needed to be returned three weeks after the digital stories had been completed.

The Digital Storytelling workshop aimed to introduce the idea of a democratic visual voice to the participants and to encourage them to experiment with their 'public visual voice'. Prior to conducting the workshop, I prepared detailed lesson plans. After a few sessions, it became clear that it was more important to simply have a rough idea about the contents and emphases in a certain week for both practical and pedagogical reasons. For practical reasons, infrastructure was not always reliable: for instance, sometimes the electricity would not work, the Internet would shut off for several weeks or the participants did not bring their phones to the workshop sessions. For pedagogical reasons, a semi-structured workshop allowed and encouraged participants to explore their own voice and to find topics of their concern in order to turn these into meaningful and powerful digital stories they would be proud to show to their peers.

As with all workshops at Ikamva Youth, the Digital Storytelling workshop was held in English, which made it possible for me to communicate with participants without a translator. The participants' all shared the same mother tongue, isiXhosa, a Bantu language, but on the whole the participants spoke English to me while switching to isiXhosa when speaking with their peers. Although the group possessed a general level of English fluency as a whole, three of the twenty participants had serious problems understanding and expressing themselves in English. In these cases, informal language assistance and translations were provided by one of the Ikamva Youth volunteers, a former Ikamva member, who assisted me during the workshop sessions and the in-depth interviews.

Participant selection and participation

Ten male and ten female participants aged between fifteen to eighteen years and from a similar socio-economic background were recruited in a convenience sample from registered members of Ikamva Youth. The 10th Grade members were excited about the project and seemed to be most suitable for the research, because at the time of the project they were under less academic pressure than the older members and they had more experience with mobile media production than younger members.

The workshop started with a relatively large group of participants, with only one of the initial group of twenty participants dropping out after about four months. The other nineteen attended the workshop sessions more or less regularly and also continued to work outside the workshop sessions on their digital stories. After six months, ten participants had finished their digital story, an additional six had managed to film raw material only, while three had stopped working on the stories at the pre-production stage.

The research participants had already known each other from previous Ikamva Youth workshops and individual participants have had a history with each other. There were several relationship types between group members prior to and during the period of the research: some participants had been 'best friends forever' (Yola, f, 17) because they had grown up with each other; others attended the same school; others had met through prior Ikamva Youth events; and some of the participants were dating each other (one couple went through the process of breaking up because the girl showed interest in another participant). Given the nature of this research with its interests in the youth voice and its application and engagement with peer groups, it was helpful to work with a group of participants who already knew each other and maintained friendships on different levels to be able to observe how different social connections influenced the production, storage and exchange of mobile media creations and Digital Storytelling.

Half of the participants stated that they were previously and/or currently civically engaged. Some were volunteering at the local medical clinic; others were active in the local drama or football club. Other examples include Yola, a seventeen year-old female who joined the ANC Youth League ("ANC Youth League," 2011) the day before the research project started, and Themba, a sixteen year-old male who was active in a youth group aimed at improving the life of people in Khayelitsha from a grassroots level. Themba (m, 16) explained the role of the group:

Themba (m, 16): There was an accident with a car and children in Khayelitsha. So we wanted a place for children where they can play and where it is safe. So we went to our school councillor and talked to her about how we felt about it. And she helped us and now we have a safe playground. The community was very, very... very impressed about what we've done.

The other participants expressed their admiration towards the civic engagement of their fellow Ikamva Youth members. They thought it was 'cool' to stand up and fight

for their rights. However, not everyone was convinced that young citizens really could change something.

Meet the key informants

The following short descriptions present a brief glimpse into the life of some of the key participants of this study.

Yanga (m, 15). At fifteen years of age, Yanga was one of the youngest and the most childlike of the participants. While his friends were involved in typical teenager activities, such as romantic relationships or partying, Yanga seemed to be more interested in hanging out with his male friends, doing school work and playing mobile phone games. Most of the other participants were also taller than Yanga and treated him like 'the tiny one of the group'. He was often the centre of little playful jokes, but was nonetheless treated with respect, and that the jokes did not turn into bullying. When one of the participants was in need of a serious discussion, they would turn to Yanga. For the duration of the project, Yanga remained a silent observer and barely engaged in informal conversations with me, but he was the first one to pick a topic, the first one to present raw material and the first one to finish his digital story (described in Chapter Five and Six). He impressed everyone in the group with his work and truly gained a voice within the research group through his media creations.

Lerato (f, 17): Lerato stood out in the group with her very outspoken personality and her strong will. She enjoyed a rare closeness in her relationship with her grandmother who was open-minded and discussed teenage issues such as troubles with friends or falling in love with her. Perhaps because of this upbringing, Lerato was accustomed to speaking out her inner thoughts and welcomed the idea of expressing herself through Digital Storytelling. She also strongly believed that photos and videos by the community were needed to inform the outside world about life in the township. Her biggest dream was to become a student of CityVarsity: the school of media and creative arts in Cape Town. Within the research group Lerato was accepted and respected, but some described her as being too outspoken and too serious for their taste.

Nothemba (f, 17): At first sight, Nothemba appeared to be a shy and cautious person, but she was actually one of the opinion leaders within the group. While she remained silent during classes, I subsequently found that Nothemba worked in the background

to keep the group together and motivated till the end of the project. After one month of working with the Nokia feature phones, Nothemba's phone broke. For her that was not a reason to quit; instead she proposed to work together with Yola on a joint production and the two girls finished their digital story together.

Yola (f, 17): Yola was a silent girl who hardly spoke in class. However, she was always one of the first to appear at the workshop sessions. During the in-depth interviews she opened up to me and told me about her strict mother and how difficult it was to be a teenager when she was not even allowed to have the photo of a boy on her phone. But even when complaining about her situation, Yola was at all times very polite and friendly. She and another female participants were best friends from a very young age. The two of them were constantly sitting together, giggling and sharing the latest stories. Within the group Yola was both liked and liked to help others. For instance, when Nothemba's (f, 17) phone broke halfway through the production stage of the digital stories, Yola invited her to join her production and to work together on the digital story.

Andile (m, 17): Andile played the role of one of the 'cool dudes' in the group. He was sometimes up to no good and sometimes only interested in joking around; however, in some instances he could also be very serious. During informal conversations he talked about how much he loved his country and how sad he was about the injustice in his community. He explained that one of his favourite pictures on the wall in his room was a picture he took during a school trip to Robben Island. He enjoyed showing the photo to his friends over and over again to kick off conversations about the history of South Africa. His classmates appreciated this serious side of Andile and looked up to him as someone who would not only talk, but also was unafraid to act. Andile was not new to the process of lending his voice to civic causes. He had been involved as a volunteer for several years in different youth organisations in Khayelitsha. His greatest achievement was being part of a group of teens that had convinced their school councillor to fight in their name for a safe playground for children in an area where many young children had been involved in car accidents while playing on the streets.

Bongani (m, 17): I perceived Bongani as the 'good kid'. When the other male participants were bragging about girls or partying, he spoke about church and how important it is to him to go every Sunday. He discussed how important friendship within church is to him. He would do everything for his friends, and they for him. During the in-depth interviews he opened up more than any of the others and I could

see how much he enjoyed to be listened to. Bongani was one of the participants without a phone. His mother had promised him for over a year that she would buy him one, but was unable to provide him with one. Because he did not have a phone, Bongani also did not have many photos of himself. One of the photos that he held very dearly was a photo taken of him in a suit before a church service. In the end of the research project, Bongani gave this photo to me as a sign of friendship.

Critical action research and method of data collection

According to Carson (1990) action research is especially popular in education studies and aims to 'improve practice, improve an understanding of the practice, and improve the situation in which the practice takes place' (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, as cited in Carson, 1990, p. 169). This approach aligned with the goals of this research project, namely, to improve the existing curriculum of Ikamva Youth's 'Media, Image and Expression Workshop' by adding a Digital Storytelling workshop and to gain an understanding of the extent to which and how the participants would make use of mobile phones as production and distribution units for Digital Storytelling when offered to them.

There are, however, different forms of action research. This research employed the research methodology as formulated by Carson (1990), and based on the writings of Carr and Kemmis (1986, as cited in Carson, 1990). According to Carr and Kemmis (1986, as cited in Carson, 1990) critical action research is 'research *for* education rather than research *about* education [original emphasis]' (p. 167). Based on Habermas' critical theory in *Knowledge and Human Interests* (1972, as cited in Carson, 1990) Carr and Kemmis (1986, as cited in Carson, 1990) critique 'what they term "positivistic research" in education [...], the assumption of a single model of research based on a technical interest that views education as an object of inquiry' (p. 168). Furthermore they also reject the mainly subjective approach of interpretative research and 'argue for a superiority of a critical action research that encompasses both subjectivity and objectivity in a dialectical fashion' (p. 168). In its most effective form, Stringer (2007) argues that action research is 'phenomenological (focusing on people's actual lived experience/reality), interpretative (focusing on their interpretation of acts and activities), and hermeneutic (incorporating the meaning people make of events in their lives)' (p. 20).

According to Carson (1990) every action research has a common intention: '[...] the belief that we may develop our understandings while at the same time bringing about changes in concrete situations. Second, because action research intends to draw together research and practice, it runs counter to the present tradition, which views these as separate activities' (p. 167). In this research project the most significant changes made were halfway through the research with the introduction of a new form of media production (Digital Storytelling) and the regular access to feature phones for the participants. At the time of the research the participants were familiar with these types of phones, but they only had limited experience using them because expensive phones were more guarded by the owner and therefore less frequently exchanged by others.

As previously noted, this research was set up in two phases. Phase one concentrated on participant observation in order to gain better insight into and map out existing media production and distribution habits of the participants. The information gathered in this first phase became the foundation for planning and creating a draft curriculum for the Digital Storytelling workshop. This workshop was then conducted in the second phase of the research project by employing the critical action research cycle consisting of 'moments of reflection, planning, acting, observing, reflecting, replanning, etc., which take place in a spiral fashion' (Carson, 1990, p. 168). The following paragraphs provide further details about the activities in both research phases.

During phase one, I focused on understanding how the participants made use of mobile media production, display and distribution in order to express themselves, in addition to ascertaining how they might be encouraged to engage in civic communication through mobile media. Participants spent approximately eight to fourteen hours per week with me in workshops (field notes), group discussions (field notes), informal conversations (field notes) and in-depth interviews (video recording); during this time, I tried to identify and understand the participants' existing 'mobile visual voices'. Additionally, participants started brainstorming potential topics for digital stories in group discussions that I facilitated (field notes).

Of particular interest to the research was the presence of a kind of 'spell' that the mobile phones had on the participants. In field notes, there was a consistent observation that before, during and after the workshop sessions the participants were constantly busy with their phones. While the Ikamva Youth policy was to switch off phones during the workshop sessions, in the context of this research it did not make

sense to ban the phones completely from the Digital Storytelling workshop. Being bound to classroom observations for the ethnographic research, the fact that the participants were inseparable from their mobile phones offered many possibilities for me to observe their mobile phone behaviour in the relatively small amount of contact hours I had with them.

After unveiling local peer communication networks and mapping out mobile media production resources and practices in phase one, based on the critical action research routine I *reflected* on the gathered data and worked out and *planned* for the second phase of the research a draft Digital Storytelling Workshop curriculum. This second phase of this research then explored how the participants integrated the idea of Digital Storytelling into their ongoing mobile media production. In the beginning of this second research phase, the participants and I interacted between six to ten hours together in weekly group sessions (field notes). From the second month onwards engagement between the participants and myself took place in individual sessions (field notes), where I spent approximately one to two hours with each participant. At this stage, this was possible because only ten of the participants were working seriously on their digital stories. During the pre-production phase simple scripts and storyboards were produced. These documents were not formally analysed for this research, but provided a good source of background information in order to gain deeper understanding during the multimodal analysis of the final videos (discussed further below). During the production phase, raw footage for the digital stories of the participants was collected on a weekly basis, and field notes were made from the group feedback sessions on the raw material, rough cuts and final digital stories. However, the raw material was not analysed exhaustively as this would have gone beyond the scope of this research. Nevertheless, it offered further insight for the multimodal analysis of two of the digital stories.

At the end of the second phase of this research, there was a public screening. Unfortunately, because of the noisy venue and because the comments of the audience were mainly in isiXhosa, this made it impossible for me to produce field notes or a recording and thus could not be included in the data. After the screening the participants were given three more weeks for the distribution of the videos, and a final round of in-depth interviews (video recorded) took place. And Ikamva Youth received the curriculum for follow up Digital Storytelling workshops.

In the following sections the methods used during the two phases are discussed in more detail.

Participant observation

For this research the overt participant observation method (Bryman, 2008) was chosen. Participants were fully informed about the reason for my presence and gave permission (in the case of minors, their legal guardians gave permission) for conducting the research. As a participant-as-observer (Gold, 1958; as cited in Bryman, 2008) I took on the role of the workshop facilitator and therefore immersed myself into the social setting that I studied. This ethnographic method allowed me to get to know the key actors in this setting and to experience the Digital Storytelling workshop together with the participants according to Bryman (2008): 'a participant observer / ethnographer immerses him- or herself in a group for an extended period of time, observing behaviour, listening to what is said in conversations both between others and with the fieldworker, and asking questions' (p. 402).

Ethnographic methodology such as participant observation often 'has been based on a rejection of "positivism", broadly conceived as the view that social research should adopt scientific method, that this method is exemplified in the work of modern physicists, and that it consists of rigorous testing of hypotheses by means of data that take the form of quantitative measures' (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994, p. 251). Ethnographers have pointed out that the positivist notion of research fails 'to capture the true nature of human social behavior' (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994, p. 251); indeed, positivist research prefers artificial settings, such as experiments or surveys, which rely on what participants themselves record, over real settings, where the observer notes down what people actually do (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994). Without rejecting the advantages of quantitative methods, in the case of this research project, participant observation in a real setting would allow for extensive contact with participants in their natural social environment, allowing me to map out links between behavior and context (Bryman, 2008). Making this decision was facilitated by the participants already being members of Ikamva Youth and therefore being used to the regular introduction of new technology and new media production and distribution knowledge in the 'Media, Image and Expression Workshop'. When I entered the setting I could take on the role of a workshop facilitator in a similar fashion as other volunteers before me and I could introduce the Nokia feature phones as new technology in a way that already has been known to the participants.

Choosing the method participant observation brought the advantage of being able to observe the participants in their natural environment; however I also ran the risk of creating an observer effect (Bryman, 2008). This means that the participants could alter their behavior because they are aware of being part of a research project. In this case, technical problems became advantageous in that it was not possible to videotape the workshop sessions, which will be further discussed below. Since I was only able to take field notes, this made the workshop appear more like any other workshop at Ikamva Youth and allowed the participants to forget that they were being observed. Another risk identified by Bryman (2008) is called 'going native' (p. 412), or the 'prolonged immersion of ethnographers in the lives of the people they study, coupled with the commitment to seeing the social world through their eyes, lie behind the risk and actually of going native' (Bryman, 2008, p. 412). In the case of this study the cultural and age differences between the participants and me were significant, and that the amount of time we spent together was too short to put me in a position of losing sight of my role as researcher.

Originally I aimed to use video for data collection by taping some of the crucial classroom interactions for later analysis in addition to field notes. According to Bryman (2008) there are opposing opinions about video recording as a means of data collection in ethnography instead of or in addition to taking detailed field notes. While video has been celebrated as a more precise way of 'note taking', these recordings may create problems at a later stage, because one can easily get lost in the vast amount of video transcriptions (Bryman, 2008). In this study technical limitations hindered the videotaping of crucial classroom interactions. The acoustic in the workshop room made it impossible to record audio of a quality acceptable for transcription with the recording equipment available. Only the audio of two individual sessions with participants were successfully recorded and transcribed and incorporated into the analysis. In order to work around this limitation as much as possible, for the remaining sessions I took mental notes and written notes (Lofland & Lofland, 1995, as cited in Bryman, 2008) in the field journal and later wrote full field notes (Lofland & Lofland, 1995, as cited in Bryman, 2008) every evening after returning from the research site. Literature warns that 'wandering around with a notebook and a pencil in hand and scribbling notes down on a continuous basis runs the risk of making people self-conscious' (Bryman, 2008, p. 417). This issue was moderated by making notes when the participants were engaged in discussions with each other, in small video production assignments or before and after the workshop sessions. On occasion, the fellow MA student who conducted the in-depth interviews

observed the workshop sessions and made notes for me so that my note taking would not interfere with the discussion. The additional researcher was consulted beforehand with the important points that would be focused on during the discussion. After the sessions, his notes were added to my notes from the workshop. In total, 82 pages of word-processed field notes were used for analysis.

Group discussions and other workshop interactions

Group discussions were mainly used to brainstorm possible topics for the digital stories, give peer feedback on video material and to clarify and elaborate on certain areas of interest to this research, such as youth civic engagement and the daily life of youth in Khayelitsha or the meaning(s) of mobile phones as a tool to record and distribute mobile media. The group discussions cannot officially be called 'focus groups', but they borrowed from the procedures of this method: Group discussions were employed in order to examine 'the ways in which people in conjunction with one another construe the general topics in which the researcher is interested' (Bryman, 2008, p. 475). According to Bryman (2008) the advantage of focus groups is that people are not approached as individuals, but as a group, and 'the focus group approach offers the opportunity of allowing people to probe each other's reasons for holding a certain view' (p. 475). In group sessions, the most important issues of a group concerning a certain topic can be explored, which is important in qualitative research as 'the viewpoints of the people being studied are an important point of departure' (p. 475).

As will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five, this approach at first proved problematic as participants were not used to discussing certain topics with each other with an adult in the room. Consequently, they mainly addressed me directly with their answers rather than engaging with one another in a dialogue. Perhaps because of this, group discussions mainly turned into group interviews. Since certain members were not contributing as much as others in the group discussions, I was careful to make sure also that silent participants got a say. Bryman (2008) highlights this also as an important point in focus groups, where the moderator should allow the conversations of the groups to flow freely, but interfere as soon as some of the voices within the group are constantly overheard or silenced.

Workshop sessions were not limited to discussions. On a regular basis photography or filming assignments were given to participants in order to gain further insight into

the participants meaning-making processes when producing mobile media. These assignments took place either during the workshop sessions or as a homework assignment to be finished prior to the next session. These assignments offered the possibility to see how the participants made use of their phones' media production features outside the workshop and to prompt further discussions between participants. Every assignment was screened during group sessions and discussed in order to find out more about the meaning-making process of the peer audience. When discussing these projects in the workshops, I asked guided questions to elicit relevant responses for the data collection, such as 'What do you think the producer wanted to say?' or 'What does that mean to you?' Pink (2001, as cited in Bryman, 2008) calls this approach a 'reflexive approach', which is 'frequently collaborative, in the sense that research participants may be involved in decisions about [...] how they [photos] should be interpreted' (p. 426). Pink (2001, as cited in Bryman, 2008) emphasizes the importance of the researcher being open-minded in terms of how the participants' age, their upbringing, their environment or even the fact that they are participants in a research project might influence the meaning-making processes when producing media as 'homework'.

Informal conversations and in-depth interviews

While informal conversations with the participants took place spontaneously on a regular basis, semi-structured in-depth interviews were scheduled twice during this project, once at the beginning of the research and once at the end. Each interview took about one hour and contained open-ended questions, which aimed to engage in an unrestricted conversation with the participants concerning their mobile media production, display and distribution practices. According to Bryman (2008) in-depth interviews can help to clarify complex questions, to ask detailed questions, to clear ambiguities and to gather in-depth information about personal feelings. On the downside, in-depth interviews can be very time-consuming, for which reason Bryman (2008) suggests researchers should make use of semi-structured interviews rather than unstructured interviews. If the researcher already has a fairly clear focus about what issues need to be addressed, semi-structured interviews take less time and they allow for more than one researcher to conduct the interviews (Bryman, 2008).

In the context of this study, the interviews were for the most part led by myself; on some occasions because of time pressure, my research supervisor and a fellow MSc

student from University of Cape Town assisted me. The participants knew the additional interviewers as my research supervisor regularly visited the research site and interacted with the participants in the Ikamva Youth programme. My fellow MSc student had a research project running at the public library next door and therefore also asked the participants to participate in his study. In order to avoid misunderstanding about the focus of the questions, which can easily happen when several people conduct the interviews (Bryman, 2008), I made a list of questions for all the interviewers and held meetings before the sessions in order to go through all the questions and clear all ambiguities. One of the advantages is that during interviews the participants are not influenced by others (Bryman, 2008). Private space at Ikamva Youth was scarce, but it was possible to arrange for the interviews a private setting with only the interviewer and the participants in the room. On two occasions an informal translator, an Ikamva Youth volunteer, assisted, because of the participant's difficulty in expressing themselves clearly in English. In total, forty-four hours of in-depth interviews were videotaped and transcribed in total. Any information gathered during informal conversations was noted in my fieldwork notebook and added to the field notes every evening. This procedure is described in more detail in the following section.

Video diaries

Drawing from the methodology used by Ito and Okabe (2005), the initial plan for this study was to make use of diaries, in order to gain insight into the daily mobile phone usage patterns of the participants (such as mobile phone and media sharing, mobile media production and other mobile phone features) outside the workshop environment. Ito & Okabe (2005) suggest asking the participants to keep 'communication logs' (p. 258), in which they note down all activities including the phone, such as calling, texting, taking pictures or going onto the Internet. The participants should also add further details, such as the time of usage, the context and with whom they were communicating with in what ways (Ito & Okabe, 2005). I followed this method for about one month, but after four weeks of weekly diary collection, a joint decision was made to drop this method because it seemed to be inappropriate within this specific research setting for several reasons. Firstly, pens and paper were rare in Khayelitsha, which tempted the participants to use the pens and notebooks provided for schoolwork and other purposes outside of this research. Secondly, the participants who filled in the diaries frequently did so just one day

before they were asked to hand it in. They reported that they forgot to regularly write down their experiences and also that they had merely copied from each other when they did not know what to write down.

The digital stories

The participants were asked to individually create personal digital stories with the Ikamva phones. They could freely choose the topic, the genre and the semiotic modes to bring their messages across. The only requests from me were to produce a three to five minute video that contained some moving images and discussed personal topics of concern. The decision about whether they would appear in the video themselves or show other people was their decision. The goal communicated to the participants was that they should engage critically with their environment or detect areas they would like to see improved and then create a digital story that would bring their concerns and ideas across to their peer audience. In the end, nine digital stories were finalised. Eight of the nine were individual productions, and one digital story was a co-production because the Ikamva phone of one of the participants (Nothemba, f, 17) broke during the production phase and another participant (Yola, f, 17) offered to work together on one digital story as they were focusing on similar topics.

Table 1: Final topics and messages of completed digital stories

| Name | Final topic |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Unam | Title: 'The danger of alcohol' Message: "You can drink a bit, but don't drink too much, it destroys your life." |
| Zodwa | Title: 'Crime' Message: Go to school instead of doing crime. |
| Lindelwa | Title: 'Dancing' Message: Don't listen to others. Follow your dream. |
| Sibongile | Title: 'What happens if teenagers drink too much alcohol?' Message: Don't drink, because horrible things happen to you. |
| Lerato | Title: 'Fears of teenagers' Message: We have all the same fears, so help and don't kill each other. |
| Yanga | Title: 'Crime' Message: Stop doing crime, start working for your money. |
| Nomonde | Title: 'The danger of alcohol for teenagers' Message: I am afraid that my friends die when they drink too much. |
| Yola and Nothemba ² | Title: 'Friendship' Message: We tell you what to do to be a good friend. |
| Yolena | Title: 'Education' Message: Go to school, become independent. |

While all of the digital stories would have been very interesting to analyse, this would have been too much for the scope of this dissertation. In order to determine the most appropriate digital stories to present in detail in this research, during the production and distribution phases it was observed which videos were the most significant according to the participants and their peers. From these observations, it became clear that Yanga's (m, 15) video 'Crime' and Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba's (f, 17) video 'Friendship' were the most significant. 'Crime', played an important role during the production phase within the group feedback sessions. Yanga (m, 15) was the first one to bring raw material into the workshop sessions. His work impressed many of the other participants, to the extent that they started copying his ideas. 'Friendship' was the only video that applied another genre: whereas the other videos were shot as citizen journalism-like reports or documentaries, Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) decided to create a more parodic digital story.

² After Nothemba's phone broke Yola invited her to join her production.

Data analysis

During the analysis phase of this research I first made use of ‘topic coding’ (Morse & Richards, 2002, p. 117) and then moved on to a more ‘analytical coding’ (Morse & Richards, 2002, p. 119). Topic coding is suggested by Morse and Richards (2002) as a suitable coding method especially in the first stage of analysis in order to create categories that emerge from the in qualitative research often vast amount of data. Because the data in this research was of a manageable quantity I refrained from using software such as Nvivo. Instead topic coding was performed by copying and pasting observations and quotes from the field notes and transcripts in Word documents into Excel sheets with rows for every participant and columns for every identified topic, such as ‘mobile phone and privacy’ or ‘mobile media and ownership’. Taking into account the multifaceted nature of qualitative data (Morse & Richards, 2002), some interview answers or situations described in the field notes were assigned to two or more columns. This process of analytical coding helped to find more general themes and clear patterns in the data, which could be directly linked for comparison to theories and concepts presented in the theoretical framework for this study.

Table 2: Example spread sheet for coding in-depth interviews

| Name | Is a phone private or public? | Why? | Privacy – hiding mobile media |
|----------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Andile | Public | Besides the messages I don't have anything to hide. | My friends have porn on their pictures and they hide them or have passwords on them, I don't even want to have them. |
| Bongani | Public | Actually it is a private device, but you constantly run the risk that someone picks up your phone and looks through it. Not good. You cannot do anything. | It is good. |
| Mandla | Public | If you take someone's phone you have to give them your phone as well, that is law. | I do it, so they can do it as well. But sometimes the challenge is on and you really want to see what they hide. Everyone is after that picture or message or song. |

Multimodal analysis

In addition to the collection of field notes and in-depth interviews, this research relies on a detailed examination of two digital stories, 'Crime' by Yanga (m, 15) and 'Friendship' by Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) as a means of clearly identifying and understanding the participants' ability to use mobile visual media and the expression of their own voice and their engagement with the different audiences. These two stories were chosen for the multimodal analysis because they received the most acclaim from the participants. For instance, throughout the workshop sessions the participants admired and copied Yanga's (m, 15) work. However, in the end, after receiving feedback from their intended audience, Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba's (f, 17) digital story seemed to be favoured by the participants. This shift made especially the two stories stick out and especially interesting for further investigation.

The preferred methodology for analysing the data collected is called multimodal analysis. 'Multimodal analysis' is an innovative analysis technique to investigate 'representation, communication and interaction which looks beyond language to investigate the multitude of ways we communicate: through images, sound and music to gestures, body posture and the use of space' (Jewitt, 2011). In contrast to other analysis techniques, such as for instance qualitative content analysis, which puts an emphasis on 'allowing categories to emerge out of data and on recognizing the significance for understanding meaning in the context in which an item being analysed appeared' (Bryman, 2008, p. 276), multimodal analysis takes a semiotic stance, which is 'an approach to the analysis of symbols in everyday life and as such can be employed in relation not only to sources but also to all kinds of other data because of its commitment to treating phenomena as texts' (Bryman, 2008, p. 531). With the rapid growth of new media and the Internet, the seemingly endless production and circulation of multimodal visual communication has created a great need for a 'better understanding of how images, gesture, gaze and other modal forms are used within particular situations [...] as part of broader cultural and social work' (Jewitt, 2011, p. 4). The digital stories are multimodal texts, because they use several modes, such as language, music, pictures and so on. Jewitt (2011) states that multimodal communication is not a new phenomenon; on the contrary, 'people have always used image and non-verbal forms to communicate' (p. 1).

In order to better understand and analyse the process of the production of multimodal texts, Kress and van Leeuwen (2001) identified four strata of meaning-making when composing texts: (1) discourse; (2) design; (3) production; and (4) distribution. These strata do not necessarily happen in succession; rather, they overlap. For instance, when designing a text the producer must already consider the distribution channel in order to produce an appropriate text. The first stratum, 'discourse', refers to the process of picking from the various existing discourses available to the producer in order to communicate his or her message in a new text, and are defined as "socially constructed knowledge' (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001, p. 4). In the second stratum, 'design', the producer 'plan[s] and shape[s] discourses within a certain communication event' (Cronje, 2010, p. 130) and chooses semiotic resources appropriate and available in 'the context of a given communication situation' (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2001, p. 5). The third stratum, 'production', refers to the 'organisation of expression, the physical articulation of the semiotic event, or the actual material production of the semiotic artefact' (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2001, p. 6). Finally, the fourth stratum, 'distribution', 'semiotically means, in the first place, acknowledging that the technologies may be used in the service of preservation and transmission as well as in the service of transforming what is recorded or transmitted, of creating new representations and interactions, rather than extending the reach of existing ones' (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2001, p. 93). For the purposes of this research study, the first three strata played a prominent role, whereas the distribution stratum was not relevant because there was no widescale distribution planned in. However, beyond the scope of this research project, six months after finishing the videos, some of the digital stories were published by Ikamva Youth in order to showcase work produced by Ikamva Youth members.

During the production stage in particular, creators of multimodal texts assign meaning to the modes used in their text. Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) social semiotic multimodal analysis, which is adopted for this research, studies the ways in which producers use semiotic resources in order to produce media texts. As with every semiotic approach, Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) key interest is the nature of meaning of texts, such as websites, paintings, videos or objects. Given the importance of visual texts, Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) developed a conceptual framework for the reading and analysis of multimodal texts in order to explore 'how the context of communication and the sign-maker shaped signs and meaning' (Jewitt, 2011, p. 29). 'Sign-makers [...] "have" a meaning, the signified, which they wish to express, and then express it through the semiotic mode(s) that make(s)

available the subjectively felt, most plausible, most apt form, as the signifier' (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 8). But there are also limits to this freedom. Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) discuss the 'conventions and constraints, which are socially imposed on our making of signs' (p. 12). As people are immersed in a culture, they get to know these 'culturally produced semiotic resources of our societies' (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 12) and how to work with these 'constant limitations of conformity on sign-making' (p. 12). Within these constraints, the sign-makers try to make themselves understandable in the best form possible by picking the 'most apt and plausible representational mode (e.g. drawing, Lego blocks, painting, speech)' (p. 7) as well as the 'forms of expressions which they believe to be maximally transparent to other participants' (p. 13).

In order to apply the theoretical concept of multimodal analysis in the current research, the video data from the two videos 'Crime' from Yanga (m, 15) and 'Friendship' from Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) was examined through the transcription scheme first developed by Hull & Nelson (2005). This transcription process 'invents a way to graphically depict the words, pictures, and so forth that are copresented in the piece at any given moment' (p. 12). As part of this process, Hull & Nelson's (2005) method of parallel time-coded presentation was adapted for this study in which the final digital story was translated back into a form of storyboard as shown in Table 3:

Table 3: Excerpt of transcription from the digital story 'Crime'

| TC | Visual Frame (due to confidentially concerns pictures not included) | Visual Image | Kinesic Action | Soundtrack | Metafunctional interpretation (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006) |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| 10:00:26 – 10:00:30 | | <p>Phase 1: Introduction to topic:</p> <p>Storytelling technique: B-Roll,</p> <p>Shot size: Long shot, eye-level of boy that is running away, no one looks into the camera. Producer stands still – handheld - steady shot.</p> <p>Location: street in front of informal housing in Khayelitsha</p> <p>Represented Participants: Four nameless male protagonists, two boys (white shirt/green shirt, both older than the producer and the other protagonists) are the attackers, two boys (blue/white shirt/yellow shirt) are the victims (both younger than the other protagonists, same age as producer) All are in casual clothes</p> | <p>Fade from Black</p> <p>Re-enacted scene with friends: Two older boys (white and green shirt) bring younger boy (yellow shirt) down to the ground and hit him. Other younger boy (blue/white shirt) escapes and runs away.</p> <p>Fade to black</p> | <p>MUSIC: (see above) Instrumental</p> <p>Atmosphere sound (kids playing, wind sound)</p> | <p>Angle Eye level (equality, no power difference)</p> <p>Attitude Frontal (Attached)</p> <p>Contact Offer</p> <p>Social Distance Public distance (remain strangers)</p> <p>Other observations: Aggressors are taller and older than producer; victims are same size as producer. One victim runs away instead of helping. Bystanders ignore what is happening. All are in casual clothes = happens in spare time. The aggressors don't have any special attributes = 'it could be anyone that attacks you' (see Neo later in Rap)</p> <p>All are boys.</p> |

Furthermore, transcription and analysis were also conducted using a 'cluster oriented micro transcription approach [which] makes use of notational elements namely timing, visual frame, visual image, kinesic action, soundtrack and metafunctional interpretation of phases and sub-phases, plotted in a table format' (Cronje, 2010, p. 125). Thus, in the transcription scheme with the previously-identified components, column one is used for integration and cross-referencing. Column two is a still image of every second of the video that 'serves as referential image to ensure that other information corresponds with the actual visual image' (Cronje, 2010, p. 125-126). Column three describes in detail the video still in order to 'analyse relevant semiotic modalities' (Cronje, 2010, p. 126). Column four contains notations on kinesic action, which 'deals with all kinds of movement within the camera frame, either concerning the actors, props or other elements in view' (Cronje, 2010, p. 126). Column five records diegetic and non-diegetic sound. The sixth column offers space for interactional meanings of the text (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). In this research the

social relation between the audiences and the represented participants established through the several modes used in the digital stories is of particular interest, therefore this analysis concentrated on the interpersonal metafunction and paid less attention to the other metafunctions identified by Kress and van Leeuwen (2006).

Ethical considerations

Since the majority of the participants were minors, it was necessary to first inform their caretakers of the aim and purpose of the research and to make sure participants understood their rights in relation to the project and provided informed consent. In an introduction session the participants and caretakers were briefed on the research project and provided with an information sheet and consent form in English and isiXhosa that clearly stated and explained the reasons, aims, schedule and methods of this study and the rights of the youths participating. To make sure that all participants and caretakers exactly understood what the research was about during the introduction session, which was held in English, an Ikamva Youth staff member translated the information given into isiXhosa and gave answers to questions. One of the important points of the information session was to make clear to the participants that there were no negative implications for anyone who did not want to participate, for those who may want to leave during the course of the project, or who were not allowed to participate by their caretakers. As noted previously in this chapter, one participant made use of the offer to withdraw during the research project. However, even after withdrawing from the study, he still occasionally joined the group sessions and allowed me to make use of all previously collected data about him (up to the moment of his withdrawal) to be used for analysis.

In all material collected for research purposes and other documents created (such as field notes, transcripts and mobile media) the anonymity of participants was protected and the personal information they revealed has been treated with the strictest confidentiality. Names and identifying references have been changed throughout. Because all the participants act themselves in their digital stories, I further refrained from including any visual stills of the videos in connection with this dissertation in order to maintain confidentiality. However, maintaining this confidentiality shows that there is a certain conflict inherent in this sort of project. Precisely because these videos are produced to become part of the public dialogue, it seems counter-intuitive to sustain confidentiality. For instance, six months after this

research Ikamva Youth asked to showcase some of the videos publicly; some of the participants consented and their digital stories went online. Yet at the outset of this project I made clear to the participants that their anonymity would be maintained, thus for the readers of this report, I provide detailed written descriptions of some of the digital stories and raw material when appropriate.

For all material collected by the participants for the production of the digital stories or any other media productions during the workshops, the participants were asked to hand in signed quit claims by any person photographed or filmed. Participants were informed about media and privacy rights and were made aware of the harm they could cause through cyber-bullying and 'flaming' (insulting communication between Internet users, provoked by one or more people in order to show someone up). To prevent the possibility of such events, I reserved the right to interfere at any point in time during the production of the digital stories if participants actively or passively overlooked the violation of personality rights; furthermore, intervention occurred when participants overlooked the importance of anonymity in the digital stories as well as material shot but not used. For the case of difficult ethical or other issues arising from the production or publication of videos, an editorial committee was formed consisting of two staff members from Ikamva Youth, the research supervisor, a participant representative and me. By the end of the research project, signatures of permission by all actors and protagonists were handed in for all digital stories.

Another issue paramount to this research was the safety of the participants when providing them with expensive feature phones. Considering the high crime rate in Khayelitsha, Ikamva Youth and I were concerned that the phones might increase the danger of an attack or robbery of participants. Both Ikamva Youth and I attempted to prevent this from happening by repeatedly reminding the participants in workshops about the value of these Ikamva phones and the danger this implies for them carrying them around with them. Fortunately there were no incidents during the time of the research.

Benefits for the participants

For the duration of the research, the participants were allowed to use the Ikamva phones as their private phones. To avoid any confusion or disappointment at the end of the workshop and research project, it was clearly explained that the Ikamva phones did not belong to the participants and that they were the property of Ikamva

Youth; furthermore, it was stressed that they must be returned to Ikamva Youth after the six month workshop/research period. In order to a dependency situation or conflict of interest between researcher and participants, I emphasized that the phones belong to Ikamva Youth and not to me. Additionally, to avoid young people only joining the study in order to receive a fancy feature phone, it was decided that only the Ikamva Youth members who regularly attended the workshop before I announced that phones would be provided could choose to participate in the research project.

As incentives, the participants received airtime as a thank you for participating in in-depth interviews. To minimize the influence this non-monetary incentive might have on the answers given during the interviews, the airtime was distributed only after the interviews were finished. During the second round of interviews, candy was provided to the participants during the interviews without mentioning the airtime that would be provided to them upon completion of the second interview round.

For full disclosure, my affiliation with the University of Cape Town (UCT) did offer several opportunities for participants. For example, my research supervisor made it possible for the participants in this study to join a two-week intensive media production summer course at UCT together with regular University students that included transport, food and beverages. In this summer course the participants were given the possibility for the first time to experiment with professional video production equipment and work together and exchange experiences with other students. In addition, some of the participants were able to participate as a paid peer researchers in a follow-up research project at Ikamva Youth. They were recruited because of their experience with research interview techniques and filming with mobile phone cameras.

Limitations of the study

One of the major limitations of this research project lies in the limited amount of time that I had with the participants due to the research site constraints. Although it would have been beneficial for this study to be able to spend time with the participants outside Ikamva Youth, safety concerns made this impossible. My data shows that classroom ethnography could only give a limited insight into the exiting mobile media production practices of the participants and that a more comprehensive experience of the participants' daily lives could have enriched my understanding of their digital

stories and the ways in which they give voice to their own experiences and their engagement with their peers and community.

In spite of this limitation, contact hours with the participants were extended during the study through regular informal chats via the popular South African instant messaging service Mxit. This service helped to enlarge daily contact outside the workshop sessions with eight of the participants in particular: Siyabulele (m, 16), Yanga (m, 15), Lerato (f, 17), Neo (m, 17), Nothemba (f, 17), Lindelwa (f, 16), Zodwa (f, 16), and Unam (m, 16). In fact, given the mobile media provided to participants, Mxit chats turned out to be the most reliable way of communicating with them to make appointments, to ask questions about the video productions or just to have a social chat.

A second means of adding additional contact hours was the opportunity for me to extend the length of stay in Cape Town and at Ikamva Youth. After the completion of this project, I became an assistant on another project in the same area for an additional six-month period. Participants from this current study became peer researchers as described above in this chapter. Thus during this additional six-month period, data and findings from this current research could be further discussed with the participants. Consequently, additional questions could be asked if necessary. In total, although the bulk of the research for this project was conducted in a six-month period, a total of one year of involvement with the participants was achieved.

Interestingly, another limitation of this study actually resulted from the need to include the sponsored Nokia phones in the research. At the time of the research only a few of the participants and their peers had regular access to such 'exotic' mobile phone technology. Therefore the technology and applications on the phones introduced into the peer group of the participants on one hand highlighted certain behaviour, but on the other hand also might have distorted the outcome. Without the introduction of the Nokia phones the participants and their peers would have perhaps acted and reacted differently when engaging in Digital Storytelling. However, in the fast-changing world of mobile phone technology, including companies' desire to make high-tech phones more financially accessible, change could also be seen in low-income areas like Khayelitsha shortly after the research project concluded: At the end of this study, more of the participants and their peers had regular access to similar feature phones outside the workshop, which made the Nokia phones used for the workshop already seem 'less exotic'. Thus the phones were equally useful for a sustainable Digital Storytelling experience for the participants. By working with the Nokia feature phones

in the workshop, they were prepared for making use of the next generation of phones accessible to them also without Ikamva Youth for Digital Storytelling.

A further constraint was my inability to speak isiXhosa. Frequently, unless I was directly engaged with participants, they immediately fell back into their mother tongue isiXhosa. With prior exposure and fluency in isiXhosa, it is likely the case that I could have gathered more and better insight into participants' mobile media practices if private conversations could have been understood. Similarly, the nature of the researcher-as-outsider also created different limitations. I had no prior insight into the specific context of participants' upbringing in this environment in spite of reading literature about their historical and cultural circumstances. In order to overcome this, I talked to friends and acquaintances who came from similar backgrounds to get as much information from as many perspectives as possible in order to compensate for a lack of personal experience.

Yet in spite of these limitations, I believe that this study still offers findings of value in understanding 'youth voice' and participatory media production in this context.

Conclusion

This chapter has elaborated on the methodology applied to this research project. The specific design of the Digital Storytelling workshop was described in detail, as well as the methods of data collection and analysis used in this project. In particular, the approach of this research to multimodality has been discussed. Furthermore, ethical considerations in youth research in relation to this specific study were discussed and elaborated on, as well as the benefits for the participants when completing this research project. The chapter concluded with an examination of the limitations of this research. In the following two chapters, the data collected during the two phases of the study will be presented and described and analysed using the multimodal analysis technique.

Chapter Four: Understanding Existing Media Practices And Local Communication Networks

Introduction to the first phase of the research

As noted in the previous chapter, the first three months of this study were used as an orientation phase to explore and map out the existing media production resources, practices and communication networks of the participants and to ascertain how they might be encouraged to engage in civic communication through mobile media. In this first phase of the research, the participants and I spent approximately eight to fourteen hours per week together. While getting acquainted, we explored their 'mobile visual voices' in workshops, group discussions, informal conversations and in-depth interviews.

The findings of this first phase of the research examined existing theory about mobile phone usage and mobile media with data about marginalised youth in the low-income area of Khayelitsha, South Africa. This data also laid the foundation for the second phase of the research, the digital storytelling workshop. The first phase of the research served as the basis for workshop syllabus preparation, devising teaching methods and understanding the available distribution channels. This chapter further presents the ongoing offline mobile media distribution practices since many participants did not have many previous online activities. Following the distribution of the Ikamva phones, it elaborates on the ways that participants and their peers made use of their mobile phones and their mobile media in order to gain more voice within their peer group. Using the conspicuous consumption model (Veblen, 1899/1994) and social capital theory (Bourdieu, 1986) as presented in Chapter Two, this chapter contextualises the strategies youth in Khayelitsha employed in order to gain status as well as a strong voice within the peer group.

It is more than just a phone, it is a status symbol

An analogy can be drawn between the behavioural characteristics of 'youths with phones' in the context of Khayelitsha with those of Veblen's (1899/1994) 'leisure class', the 'nouveau rich'. Like the leisure class, youths in Khayelitsha consumed

luxury goods not necessarily based on their utilitarian value, but on their identity and expression value to differentiate themselves from others. The display of a mobile phone was a public statement about one's (family's) wealth and social status. This section will therefore describe and analyse the role of participants' phones as status symbols in the first phase of the research.

Even prior to the participants receiving their Ikamva phones, from the first day at Ikamva Youth I observed that the youths seemed under the spell of mobile phones. Students went to great lengths to have their phones with them as much as possible. Because phones are not permitted at schools, some of the participants made quite long detours via their homes in order to have their phones with them at Ikamva Youth. For some it was so important to have their phone with them at all times that they even ran the risk of getting fined at school. In order to retrieve a phone, which had been confiscated by a teacher, one student had to pay R50 (about 5 Euros). One of the participants, Linda (f, 15), 'lost' her phone when showing her latest music to a friend at the schoolyard, and it her took four weeks to save up enough money to retrieve her phone.

It became clear that it was less about having the phone with them for the sake of using the phones' features than it was about being seen with their phone. Participants neither had the most advanced phone models with many features nor the money to buy airtime in order to use the phones for calling, texting or surfing the Internet. Rather, carrying one's 'own' phone could signify a better family background or an important role in an in-group:

Siyabulele (m, 16): You have a phone, it means you are from rich family. It means status.

Lerato (f, 17): You are in the out-group when you don't have a phone. Because you don't know what we are talking about. Who can call you?! No one. Who can you talk to? No one.

These findings are in accordance with the observations of Walton & Pallitt (2012). They found youths from a similar socioeconomic background making use of feature phones and downloadable games as 'micro-commodities', which were 'converted to gain "bragging rights" with peers' (Walton & Pallitt, 2012, p. 355). Additionally, phase one of the research confirms Posel's (2010) argument about the black population in South Africa having a strong need for conspicuous consumption after being freed

from the consumption regulations of the apartheid regime, and that consumer behaviour could be explained by the black South African population often making a 'conjunction of liberation with wealth and what it can buy' (p. 157). It seems that from the ways in which the participants saw and used their mobile phones, this consumer behaviour is not only present within the generation that experienced apartheid, but also within the younger generations.

Yet most of the young people cannot afford such luxury commodities. They must make choices when engaging in conspicuous consumption. The participants reported that some peers spend all their money on expensive phones, leaving them no money to buy airtime in order to actually make use of all the features the expensive phones would offer. Sometimes the choices made have an even stronger impact:

Yolena (f, 16): Some of us [who] have these phones, they want to show off, want to be popular, but honestly they have no food back home.

Drawing further on the analogy between Veblen's (1899/1994) 'leisure class' and 'youths with phones' in Khayelitsha research phase one showed that both populations not only sought to differentiate themselves as a group from other groups in society, but also as individuals from each other. The 'leisure class' for example differentiated between having 'old' or 'new money', whereby people with 'old money' were more valued than the nouveau rich (Veblen, 1899/1994); within the in-group 'youths with phones' I could detect three main factors that had influence on the internal hierarchy: (1) the exchange value of the phone; (2) the youths' relation to the phone; and (3) the relation to the phone owner.

The ranking according to the exchange value of the phone worked in a very straightforward way: expensive goods equate to a higher status. As one participant explained:

Mandla (m, 18): The more expensive the phone, the more you are worth.

The most valued phones within the peer group were feature or smart phones with a touch screen. Firstly, these phones in most cases were too expensive for any of the participants' and their friends' families to afford. Secondly, buying a phone with a touch screen was perceived as a very risky move because they are hard to repair when they break (there are no touch-screen mobile repair shops in Khayelitsha) and because of the expense associated with repair (it must be sent to the manufacturer). The alternative would be throwing them away and buying a new one. Thus

possessing a touch screen phone showed that the possessor had enough money to run that risk. As a perceived 'wasteful' consumption, this gives the phone possessor a higher status than other phone possessors and is another indicator for conspicuous consumption. Veblen (1899/1994) describes that the more 'wasteful' a purchase seems to be, the more the acquired commodity enhances the social status of the owner.

The second factor that determined the status in relation to a phone was the youths' relation to the phone. Not all of the research participants were phone possessors at the time of phase one of this study. Four (male) participants did not have regular access to a phone during the period of the research project: Andile (m, 17), Bongani (m, 17) and Themba (m, 16) had never had a phone, while Lunga's (m, 15) phone got stolen about eight months before the research started and he did not have a new one. The other sixteen were phone possessors, but the quality of their phones differed. Three of the participants, Lerato (f, 17), Mandla (m, 18) and Yolena (f, 16) had the ultrabasic phone (Nokia 1600), which had been designed for developing countries and only allowed calling and texting. The other thirteen participants had feature phones with additional features, such as a camera, while some also had access to the Internet. In Khayelitsha an important difference has to be made between 'possessing' a phone and 'owning' a phone. In research into shared use of mobile phones in rural Uganda Burrell (2010) describes five roles people can take on in relation to a mobile phone: (1) purchaser; (2) owner; (3) possessor; (4) operator; and/or (5) user of the phone.

In the context of this research the participants liked to say that they 'own' the phones they had regular access to. But borrowing Burrell's (2010) terminology they were rather (3) possessors and their caretakers were the (1) purchaser and (2) owner of the phones. When caretakers passed on the phone to a younger family member, they retained the 'authority to decide who is permitted to use it, where it is to be kept, and how others may interact with the phone' (Burrell, 2010, p. 235). The participants took on the role of a (3) possessor, 'who carries or houses the artefact, but with the understanding that it can be recalled or given out to another at the discretion of the owner' (Burrell, 2010, p. 235). Both were at times (4) operators and (5) users.

A third factor showed that influenced the social standing of the participants as soon they received the 'Ikamva phones': the relation to the owner of an expensive phone. While all the participants received phones with the same exchange value and all stood in the same relationship to the phones, some managed to climb higher up the

hierarchy than others by lying about the actual owner of the phone. Lerato (f, 17) explained that for their friends it made a difference if a family member or Ikamva Youth owned the phone:

Lerato (f, 17): Yes, we are very much more popular now. But still, they are not our own phones. We have a sponsor. If they would be our own, like our mom's or so, then we would be even more popular.

Andile (m, 17) and Lunga (m, 15) seemed to have anticipated this reaction and made use of the fact that outside of Ikamva Youth, they had no connection to the fellow participants because they went to different schools and had different circles of friends. So they told a different story about the whereabouts of the phones than the other research participants.

Andile (m, 17): When they ask me: Yuuu, where do you have the phone from? I was lying and said my mom bought it for me. Feels like we have money back home.

This highlights the importance of not only having regular access to any expensive phone to gain status and therefore also a stronger voice within the peer group, but also that participants' peers also took into account the relationship between the possessor and the owner. The closer this relationship, the higher the possessor climbed up the ladder of popularity. For example Andile (m, 17) managed over a period of four months to keep up this lie, which brought him lots of status within his group of friends:

Andile (m, 17): They come up to you and talk to you, because you have the phone. I have another girlfriend now.

Likewise, understanding the strong impact the access to expensive micro-commodities can have on the social life of youth in Khayelitsha explained the enormous excitement of the participants when they were offered to work with two of the most popular phones in their peer group during the workshop: the Nokia X3, a feature phone with a keyboard and the Nokia 5530 Xpress Music, a feature phone with a touch screen. Participants repeatedly discussed their rise in social status:

Zukiswa (f, 17): This means everything to me. I never had a fancy phone like this. It makes me feel special.

Siyabulele (m, 16): Wow. I have a more expensive phone than my dad!

Sibongile (f, 17): Many more want to be my friend now, because they want to close to me now because of the phone.

Yolena (f, 16): Before my friends do not call me. Now they are again, 'Yonela, Yonela'!

The conspicuous consumption of mobile phones helped the participants raise their status and gain voice within the peer network. In particular, the participants who had no phone before reported that they finally could participate in the public discourse. Once they possessed the Ikamva phones, they had regular access to the latest news, gossip or other teenage-relevant information circulating via the South African mobile phone instant messenger Mxit and they could also actively participate at any time they wanted. Previously, most participants said they could hardly participate because they relied on the limited time their friends and family members offered them to use their phones. And since most of the 'important' chatting happened at night when they were lying in bed, none of the youths without phones had a chance to enter the discourse. Additionally, the participants reported that having a phone did not only give them a voice on Mxit, but also in one-on-one conversations. Lerato (f, 17) explained that it is 'boring' to talk to peers without phones because they were not aware of what was going on and would have to bring them up to speed.

Based on the conspicuous consumption of mobile phones by youths in Khayelitsha, I anticipated that participants' newly gained social capital would have a positive effect on the second phase of the research and draw attention to the digital stories. Furthermore I also foresaw that the participants could make use of the connectedness to the information flow, which they explicitly mentioned and insert their public visual voices in order to kick off civic communication with their peers. This exemplifies Bourdieu's (1986) claim that social capital leads to agency; and in the context of this study, this phenomenon was welcomed.

The public phone and its little privacies

One of the primary goals of phase one of this study was to further explore this public accessibility of mobile phone content in order to see if the phones in this way could serve as a distribution channel for the digital stories. This section therefore discusses the public-private character of mobile phones (Walton et al., 2012) in Khayelitsha.

At Ikamva Youth, it was accepted that as soon as phones were either on a table or sticking out of the backpack of one of the participants, anyone could pick up that phone and flip through the content. This even occurred with my phone: During the second workshop session my phone was on the desk next to me while transferring files from one of the participant's phones onto my computer. One of the participants stood next to me, picked up my phone and started flipping through the content. My first reaction was to take the phone away from the participant since I was not used to sharing my private information with others in this way. Yet I learned that whether the phone possessor liked it or not, their mobile phones were treated like public devices to which others had almost unlimited access:

Bongani (m, 17): Yes, actually it is a private device, but you constantly run the risk that someone picks up your phone and looks through it. You cannot do anything, because they think you hide something if you take the phone from them.

During the first phase of the research, three main situations in which the phones of the participants turned into public devices were detected: (1) known and unknown peers were 'paging' through phones with the phone possessor close by; (2) unknown audiences were 'paging' through the phone after phone sharing; and (3) older family members were using the phone as control device.

Firstly, in private and semi-private spaces such as Ikamva Youth, their schools, their churches or their homes the participants openly displayed their phones in order to show off with a micro-commodity. But they did not only display the phones, they also granted access to known and unknown people who wanted to use the phones or flip through the content. However, outside of these places the participants were very protective over their phones since, according to the participants, mobile phones were target number one for criminals in Khayelitsha.

Secondly, there was a high degree of phone sharing between peers and family members. Sharing mobile phones with other people is a common practice in low-income areas in different parts of the world (Kreutzer, 2009; Steenson & Donner, 2009; Burrell, 2010). All the research participants reported that they share their mobile phones regularly with friends, classmates and family members. The reasons given for sharing their phones varied; for example youths without phones borrow phones from their peers or other family members in order to make calls, send texts, take a picture or to surf the Internet (Walton et al., 2012).

Phone possessors may also swap their phones with other phone possessors because the phone of the other person has more or better features than their own phone or the other one owns the latest games or music. However, sharing and collaborative use is not necessarily 'a mechanism for coping with scarcity' (Burrell, 2010, p. 237), but rather because 'phone sharing arrangements [also] generate social ties' (Burrell, 2010, p. 237). For example Lindelwa (f, 16) explained that she and her best friend Zodwa (f, 16) regularly swap their phones for the duration of a weekend or even for a complete holiday. Exchanging phones for such a long time shows a high level of trust between the two phone possessors. In general all participants explained that the length of time operators/users are allowed to borrow a phone depends on the amount of trust the phone possessor has in the operator/user. Classmates and acquaintances are only allowed to have the phone for a few moments to a few hours, mostly with the phone possessor close by. Close friends and family members could have the phone for up to several days.

In the phone sharing process, youths without phones were tolerated; they were allowed to borrow phones even if they had nothing to offer in return. Phones were treated in a similar fashion to other scarce goods shared by the youths in Khayelitsha, such as lunch, clothes or fashion accessories. The phone-sharing community did not mind when youths without phones did not participate in the phone-sharing process, but phone possessors who refused to share their phone with others were immediately excluded from the circle since they were seen as being selfish. The participants reported that this peer pressure made most of the young people comply with the sharing rules, whether they initially wanted to or not. Reasons against sharing named by the participants were that they completely lost control over who had access to their phone. As soon as they passed on their phones, they no longer had control over who else has access to the phone content. But they had to participate in the phone sharing practices to avoid being classed as outsiders, which would have had strong influence on other aspects of their lives because others would not share other goods with them any longer.

A third reason for mobile phones becoming public devices was because of caretakers who regularly checked the phones of younger family members. As discussed in the previous section, caretakers remained the phone owners (Burrell, 2010) and therefore had the right to gain access to the phone at any time. Some of the participants' caretakers made use of this right and regularly checked the phones of their children to check if there was 'inappropriate media' (such as American songs

with strong language, boy- or girlfriend photos or perhaps even explicit pictures of their children). Only six of the participants had caretakers that would grant their children their phone as their private space. Nothemba (f, 17) is one of them:

Nothemba (f, 17): It is my private space [away from] my parents. And my mom understands that. But I know my friends don't have this privacy.

The rest of the participants reported that their caretakers use their phones as a control device.

Zukiswa (f, 17): My mom checks my phone once a week. I don't like it. But if I would say no, they would ask me what I hide that I don't want her to look.

These dynamics in which youths' mobile phones were not an exclusively private possession and could therefore become a source for intergenerational conflict is not limited to poorer socioeconomic environments such as Khayelitsha; it can also be found in wealthier contexts (Lenhart et al., 2010).

The regular access of known and unknown audiences to the mobile phone and its content was at some times inconvenient for the participants and their peers and they expressed that they wished they had more privacy on their phones. But it also constituted a lively local communication network, which helped them to gain a public visual voice as will be discussed further below. During the first phase of this research it became evident that such a local communication network could form a perfect replacement of online distribution channels, which are usually used for digital stories. Thus the next section addresses the various meanings mobile media has for its producers, owners and audiences and the implications these meanings have on the behaviour of individual players within the local communication network.

Mobile media, creative freedom and conspicuous consumption

Chalfen (1987) describes in his early work about amateur photography in the 'Kodak culture' that the parents, especially mothers, have control over the family photo camera and the photos made with them, even over photos that show the younger family members or photos that were made by them. However, more recent research has shown that more and more young media producers get a say over how they are represented in photos and about what happens with the photos in which they are portrayed (Tinkler, 2008). The following section examines how youth in Khayelitsha

found ways to enjoy a similar creative freedom through mobile phone cameras and photo albums, even though their caretakers tried to curtail this freedom by regularly raiding the phones. Furthermore, this section addresses the importance of mobile media, such as songs, photos and video, in relation to content, creativity and mobile media as a means of enhancing social capital.

The participants rated the photo function on phones as a particularly important feature, in spite of limited access to the photo function since they tend to be more expensive, and therefore very rare in the households of the participants, as well as being strongly protected by older family members because they were afraid the younger family members could break the expensive device. For example, Themba (m, 16) does not have a phone nor do any of his immediate family members; but his uncle, who was living in the same house as Themba (m, 16) owned a photo camera and would (rarely) allow Themba (m, 16) to make use of it:

Themba (m, 16): He thinks I can break it. So he doesn't want me to use it all the time. If I use the camera he will be close to me all the time and watches what I'm doing with his camera.

Themba (m, 16) perceived such precautions behaviour by adult camera owners as a strong limitation on his creativity. He described experimenting with the camera of his uncle as 'no fun' because he felt he was being watched all the time.

Thus, although Themba's uncle's mobile camera allowed higher quality shots than the photos taken with his friend's phones, he preferred to borrow those of his friend. For Themba (m, 16), the freedom to explore his own creativity was more important to him than the quality of the pictures:

Themba (m, 16): It means like I can do things on my own, like taking pictures the way I want.

Additionally, taking pictures with a friend's phone gave Themba (m, 16) the feeling of ownership over these photos, unlike those he took with his uncle's camera. He reported that he has no idea what his uncle does with the photos, if he keeps them, shows them to other people or just simply deletes them. This feeling of powerlessness of youth concerning media creations has been only recently resolved with the availability of cheaper cameras, according to Tinkler (2008).

In Khayelitsha, the photo function of mobile phones gives youths a tool by which they can explore their creativity, and it offers them a feeling of ownership and control over the media creations, even if they do not have their own phone (see also 'The ideal audience and the nightmare readers of "mobile media profiles"' below, which further elaborates on the limitations to this freedom and how the participants and their peers manage to work around them). As Themba (m, 16) explained, unlike the photos on his uncle's mobile phone, the photos he took with his friend's phone and stored there he perceives as his own photos that he could dispose of if he so wishes. For these situations, Themba (m, 16) and his friends made special agreements concerning the storage of the photos:

Themba (m, 16): They give me a month or so. Then I am going to print my photos from his phone. If we agreed the phones... ah... that I take the photos off the phone that one day, then I have to do that, otherwise they can delete them.

Themba (m, 16) has access to his photos when he borrows the phone from his friends; he can edit his photos, show them to his other friends or delete them if he wants to. Zodwa (f, 16) explained that it is a rule that if someone has media stored on another's phone, the phone possessor is not allowed to delete or edit these files because they belong to the other person. Instead, the phone possessor must make an agreement with the media owner about how long they can store their files on your phone. During this time the phone possessor is not allowed to delete the files.

Thus ownership of any mobile media was in general highly respected by the participants' friends. Whoever created or received a mobile media file was seen as the official owner of that file, irrespective of the owner of the phone, SIM or memory card the file is stored on. The participants illustrated that mobile media is the only 'thing' they really own. Most of the material goods they 'owned' their caretakers paid for and mostly they had to share these with others, such as, for instance, their clothes or schoolbooks. Mobile media was not paid for by any adult, therefore the participants perceived them as their own:

Yolena (f, 16): The phone...my mom bought it. But the photos and the music [are] mine.

Likewise, owning various media files plays an important role in the conspicuous consumption of youths in Khayelitsha. In addition to the phone itself, participants and

their peers appropriated mobile media as conspicuous goods in order to enhance their status even more or to make up for the missing economic value of their phones. Similar to the economic value of the phone, the public value which the peer group assigned to individual media files brought status and agency to the respective owners. This phenomenon can be understood as a symbolic value commodity, as Martin (2008) observed in online gaming communities: Immaterial goods turn into highly priced status symbols, and although these virtual goods have no use-value, 'the symbolic-value of an object comes into play and works to value commodities within their social context' (Martin, 2008, p. 5). In the online world, this symbolic value determines both the exchange value of the immaterial goods and the status of the respective owner (Martin, 2008).

In the offline world in Khayelitsha, the symbolic value of mobile media determines the status of the respective owner, as few peers can pay for mobile media. Only a few participants occasionally spent money to buy airtime in order to download new mobile media through mobile Internet. The majority of the youths relied on friendly favours from their peers, which the participants called 'dealers'. The 'dealers' were highly courted by the youths because they were the only ones from whom they could get new mobile media. This dependency relationship gave dealers a strong standing within the peer group and also a strong voice, which others attempted to utilise. The closer the relationship to a 'dealer', the greater the possibility of gaining new media files as well as the enhancement of one's own status. Lunga (m, 15) proudly explained his excellent connections to a 'dealer', making him one of the first in his peer group to have new files and therefore second in line for being courted by peers. Within the group of participants a 'dealer' could be identified: Nothemba (f, 17) said that most of the participants got their files from Unam (m, 16), who explained that he saved up all his lunch money to occasionally go online with his phone and download the latest media files.

The biggest difference between the online world 'dealers' of virtual goods (Martin, 2008) and the offline mobile media 'dealers' in Khayelitsha was that the latter did not aim to constantly 'sell' goods; instead they were more interested in the opposite, keeping the latest mobile media files for themselves as long as possible, which makes the name 'dealer' for youths that have access to new files a rather misleading one. But in the context of Khayelitsha, selling mobile media would not have made sense because of the lack of money within the peer group, and so the files did not have any concrete exchange value. Instead, 'dealers' wanted to make use of the

symbolic value of the media in order to enhance their status. Some dealers, the participants reported, even put passwords on the media files to make it impossible for anyone to steal the file off the phone or SIMcard. According to Nothemba (f, 17), a file is 'worthless' as soon as someone else has it, because then it becomes widely available. Files perceived as 'valuable' were those with a high representation of interpersonal ties and identity and self-expression (Richins, 1994). Consequently, Jhally (1987, as cited in Martin, 2008, p. 8) explains that 'everything [has] to do with meaning, and especially meaning that producers are able to position in terms of status, belonging, and individuality'.

While the most popular and rare files were the latest music files and music videos of the favourite artists of the peer group, 'homemade' mobile media could turn into status symbols. One of the most prominent examples within the peer group of the participants was the 'representations of interpersonal ties' (Richins, 1994), such as portrait photos of popular peers. The symbolic meaning of these photos represents a close friendship or a love relationship (Barthes, 1981, as cited in Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2011). Participants explained that best friends or lovers give each other their portrait photos to display on their phones. However, they had to be posed beauty shots, which implied, according to the participants, that the person on the photo tried to look as beautiful as possible for the intended recipient of the photo. The most highly regarded photos showed a popular person and the phone possessor together in one picture. The participants stated that the status of the picture owner raises gradually with the status of the person portrayed on the picture. These kinds of photos were so important to the participants and their peers that some even stole photos from others' phones and claimed they received them as a sign of friendship or relationship.

In addition to homemade photos, participants explained that pictures of celebrities, such as famous singers or actors, were highly valued in the peer group. Although the participants could not articulate a clear answer to why these photos were so highly valued (they gave answers like, 'I don't know, they are just cool' or 'I really like the singers or actors on the photos'), it may be that this is similar to 'taste statements' (Liu, 2008, p. 252) given by online social media profiles and communicate their status and distinction through 'cultural signs' (Liu, 2008, p. 253). Studies show that online profile owners make use of 'the new emphasis on taste and cultural consumption free[ing] identity from some of its traditional socioeconomic limitations' (Grodin & Lindlof, 1996; as cited in Liu, 2008, p. 252). Participants in this research

thus seemed to make use of mobile media files to publicly declare their taste. One particularly interesting variation on this theme is that some participants also had photos of actual luxury goods, such as expensive cars or logos of expensive brands like Gucci or Versace:

Neo (m, 17): It show[s] that you know that there is something like Gucci. You show that you are 'in'. [...] You have to update it all the time. Have to have all the time the newest things. Otherwise you are out.

Even if this appears to be a mediated form of conspicuous consumption, it also suggests that the participants also attempt to show their knowledge of the latest goods as a type of cultural capital, suggesting that Bourdieu's (1986) knowledge-based social capital theory can extend to knowledge about popular culture.

Thus while in the realm of the conspicuous consumer good mobile phone youth without a phone were excluded, in the world of 'status symbol mobile media' they could participate. Some of the participants without phones possessed memory cards or SIM cards on which they could store media files. As soon as they got hold of a phone, they were able to show these files. Others had their files stored on their friends' phones, although the latter was a bit more complex and difficult undertaking when using mobile media as status symbols. Since the phone possessor could earn status through another's files, they could claim these particular media files for their own. Although youths without phones can theoretically participate in consumer culture and the communication of cultural capital, they are strongly disadvantaged.

Mobile media and impression management

Fraser (1990) argues that a public voice is always also a public expression of identity; this is also the case with public visual voices according to Rosenfeld Halverson (2010). The identity presentation of participants in this study was similar to that which other researchers have found with social networking site (SNS) profile owners (Marwick & boyd, 2010). These studies show that owners found a way to write themselves into being in the online world through texts, photos or weblink, and phase one of this research demonstrated that participants made use of the public nature of their phones to communicate their desired identity through a careful selection of mobile media on their phones. Just as social network site users were aware of their audience and learnt how to deal with their peers and their parents

simultaneously having access to the same profile (Marwick & boyd, 2010), so too were participants in this study aware of the challenging mix of audiences of their mobile phones.

In general, the participants and their peers placed content on their 'mobile phone profile' so that their peers would see it. According to participants, mobile media reveals a great deal about the identity and taste preferences of the owner:

Sibongile (f, 17): I look at the pictures of someone's phone and I know what kind of person that person is.

Bongani (m, 17): The phone is all about style and image. When you choose photos on your phone, you choose what you want the others to see about you. You choose your style.

Andile (m, 17): You must look good on your photos. If you don't look good, you have to delete them.

Yolena (f, 16): I select the photos on my phone for other people. Everyone does that.

Marwick and boyd (2010) explained the behaviour of social network site (SNS) profile owners modelling, expressing and maintaining their desired identity in the online world in terms of Goffman's (1956) impression management theory. As noted in Chapter Two, Goffman (1956) argued that people present a frontstage, and researchers (Marwick & boyd, 2010) have applied this argument to online identity creation, in which a profile owner conveys their intended impression to the imagined audience through the careful selection of content displayed on the three key features of social network sites: friends lists, public commentary features and text, video, audio or photos. The research participants of this project made use of the wallpaper, the photo/video albums and the contact list of their phones in a very similar way.

The wallpaper of the phones had a similar function to SNS profile pictures; it was the first impression of participants to their mobile phone audience. These wallpaper pictures were the most carefully selected and most regularly updated. Most of the participants had the latest 'cool' picture of themselves, of any other impressive happening in their lives or their friends on their wallpaper. Additionally, the photo album of the mobile phone also serves as a commentary function for friends, similar to SNS commentary features, such as the Facebook 'wall'. Participants sent pictures

with written words embedded in the picture to each other, which they called 'photo cards' (Walton et al., 2012), and stored these in their photo albums or displayed them on the wallpaper. The pictures contained messages such as 'I love you', 'Cool galz [girls]' or 'Best friends'. Some of these pictures were created with the editing function on their phones, while others were generated on a computer or downloaded from the Internet.

Similarly to the way social network site users used photos of their favourite holiday trip or their best friends to create their online self (Marwick & boyd, 2010), participants made use of their mobile photo album to show their audience who they are or want to be. For example male participants often had many pictures of girls on their phones.

Mandla (m, 18): I am proud of all the girls' pics on my phone. Hey. But I would not put a photo of my real love on it. That is only for showing off. You show that you are a playboy.

Andile (m, 17): Sometimes I place the photo of my girlfriend on the wallpaper. To show her that she is special. But then I cannot flirt with others any more [laughs].

Female participants described that they had complete photo shoot sessions in one of their homes to update their mobile phone profiles.

Lindelwa (f, 16): We do photo sessions with friends in my house. They bring clothes and we make many pictures from us. Beautiful ones.

These examples affirm prior research by Boerdam and Martinius (1980; as cited in Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2011), who claim that 'people give a "performance" when they allow themselves to be photographed, in the sense that they make allowance for a public that will ultimately see the photograph' (p. 8). While the participants were busy producing 'mobile phone profile' worthy mobile media and displaying these strategically on their phones, they did not only have to take into account their peers as an imagined audience. The following section elaborates further on the mix of commonly distinct audiences of mobile media and in what ways youth in Khayelitsha deals with this 'audience problem'.

The ideal audience and the nightmare readers of 'mobile media profiles'

The participants explained that mobile media gives them the freedom to express themselves in a way their caretakers would never allow them to do in the 'real' world. Through mobile media the participants found a way to communicate their desired identity to their peers, without their caretakers' rules limiting them. However, this freedom did not come easily. Similar to SNS profile owners, the participants had to find ways to maintain two parallel and distinct profiles on their phones: a 'cool' one for the peers and a 'decent' one for the caretakers.

Participants therefore seemed highly aware of the mix of wanted, unwanted, known and unknown audiences who could view young people's media content. According to Marwick and boyd (2010), SNS profile owners can limit access to their pages through privacy settings, but they never know who sits next to the person they have officially allowed access to their profiles. The participants of this research had a similar experience when they give their phones away for a longer time, as they would lose immediate control over their device and over who has access to the phone's content. Additionally, the audience of SNSs is typically a mix of otherwise distinct audiences, such as parents and peers, with peers classified as 'the ideal reader' of SNS profile owners, and parents as 'the nightmare reader' (Marwick & boyd, 2010). However, both audiences have access to the same platform and have to be taken into account when building and communicating an online identity. In this research, participants talk about a similar challenge with both phones and mobile media because their peers and caretakers have similar access to their phone:

Neo (m, 17): My family are taking my phone and look at the pictures. I don't like that. No. If you have a picture of a girl, your girlfriend, then you get thousand of questions. Not good.

Zodwa (f, 16): When I do something wrong my mom goes through my phone. She openly checks my phone all the time and then asks me 'who is this?' and "who is that?' So I really cannot have any photo of any boy on my phone.

Zukise (f, 17) explained that for most participants passwords on the phone, folders or photos were out of question, because their caretakers would perceive this as keeping a secret from them, which was not tolerated and could lead to severe punishments

without the parents even knowing what the participants tried to hide with the passwords.

Research (Marwick & boyd, 2010) has shown that SNS profile owners tackled privacy issues through privacy settings and/or they build up 'mirror networks' especially for their parents with content they would approve. The participants of this research found a similar solution: They managed to come up with a hidden folder structure only accessible by their peers for any 'questionable' mobile media. The participants elaborated that most of their caretakers were not mobile phone literate enough to find these folders, which allowed them to create a double identity on one phone, one for their caretakers and one for their peers. In the infrequent cases where the phone user's caretaker was aware of the hidden folder system, the participants came up with a backup solution by having safety copies of 'questionable' mobile media on each other's phones. For example, I found soft-pornographic videos on the phone of a female research participant. She explained that her male friend regularly backs up his 'funny videos' on her phone, because her parents were not aware of the hidden folders on her phone and the videos were safe. The participants explained that knowing that there is a backup file on a friend's phone they could quickly delete questionable files in case their caretakers spontaneously asked for the phone back to make a call or to check upon the phone user.

To keep the phone profile updated, the participant regularly produced new media files, but they also exchanged some with their peers through Bluetooth, an open wireless connection between mobile phones for exchanging files over short distances at no charge. This cheap and fast way of exchanging media files has been observed previously with another group of young people in Khayelitsha (Kreutzer, 2009). For the participants of this research, who had hardly any access to computers or Internet, the Bluetooth function opened the possibility to create a collocated media network for mobile media exchange (Walton et al., 2012). As soon as the participants bumped into another phone user, they checked out each other's phone content and started sending files from one phone to the other via Bluetooth. Some of the participants were standing in the middle of rooms or hallways at Ikamva Youth, three phones in their hands, busy sending files from one phone to the other.

Conclusion

This first phase of research attempted to unveil pre-existing media production and distribution practices of youths in Khayelitsha, which could then be used in the second phase of the research for civic communication through digital storytelling. This chapter examined the ways participants and their peers make use of the public accessibility of their mobile media. They created and maintained 'mobile phone profiles', in a similar fashion to that described by Marwick and boyd (2010) in their work about online social network profiles and the strategic display of media in order to express identity and negotiate status. In addition, it identified participants' ongoing impression management process on their mobile phones, and showed that the participants and their peers also engaged in conspicuous consumption, making use of the economic value of the phones and the within their peer group negotiated social value of mobile media files in order to express wealth and status. But the Khayelitsha 'leisure class' (Veblen, 1899/1994) also goes one step further and communicates status through the display of cultural capital. It was found that this status was directly transferred into agency within the peer group and the respective youths turned into an opinion leader.

Furthermore, this phase showed that participants had a significant amount of experience in mobile media production as well as two possible distribution networks for Digital Storytelling: Firstly, a lively peer phone exchange network which turns mobile phones into public devices and gives regular exposure to mobile media to known and unknown audiences; and secondly, a Bluetooth exchange network for mobile media. It also showed that the participants and their peers created a (mostly) adult-free mobile media production and display zone by maintaining parallel 'mobile phone profiles' on their phones. This mirror network allowed them to communicate a 'cool' image to the peers, while they also created a self-censored image of themselves for their caretakers.

All things considered, I anticipated that the local offline social networks could be used as screening platforms and distribution channels for the digital stories produced during the second phase of the research. Thereby I took into account that the limited memory space available on their peers' phones might pose an obstacle concerning sharing the digital stories. Furthermore, I expected that the participants made use of their enhanced social capital, which they gained through the exchange value of the Ikamva phones, for prompting civic communication within their peer group. And

lastly, I anticipated the digital stories to be shaped through the peer-review of the on-going impression management process in order to fit the needs of the intended audience. In the following chapter I further elaborate on how the participants made use of their increased social capital, their peripheral social networks and the knowledge acquired in the Digital Storytelling class for Digital Storytelling.

Chapter Five: Exploring 'Public Voices' Through Digital Storytelling

Introduction to the second phase of the research

After mapping out existing mobile media production and distribution practices, this chapter analyses the ways in which the participants introduced Digital Storytelling into these on-going processes. It investigates the challenges involved when marginalized young people for the first time experiment with their public visual voice within and outside the safe and contained workshop environment. This chapter therefore describes and analyses the major themes found in the workshop sessions and in-depth interviews, and gives insight into the perceptions of young video-makers and their audiences of 'public voice'. The analysis of the observations and interviews is further contextualized within the theoretical framework (Chapter Two) in order to both understand and offer additional insight into existing theory and research with respect to multi-vocality, impression management, conspicuous consumption and the communication of cultural capital.

As described in Chapter Four, the first phase of this research was focused on understanding local youth communication networks and existing media production resources and practices. During the second phase of the study, I aimed to foster the participants' critical consciousness and to guide them in examining their lives as well as the lives of their peers in order to identify unjust social conditions. I encouraged the video-makers to identify topics of personal concern, to turn their message into a personal digital story, to display it to their peers on the 'mobile phone profiles' and distribute it within their Bluetooth network in order to foster collective action aimed at changing personal or community issues (Ginwright & James, 2002). According to the pedagogy of Digital Storytelling, this process should concentrate on the stories the participants want to tell with the workshop leader solely supporting the participants in detecting issues of personal concern and remediating these into digital stories.

‘Powerful technology’ versus ‘powerful digital story’

As described in Chapter Four, the social status of the participants within their peer group was enhanced when they received the feature phones. I anticipated that this new standing within the peer group might help draw their peers’ attention to what was going on in the digital storytelling workshop and eventually to the digital stories. But whereas other scholars have argued that ‘the universal attraction of young people to digital communication [...motivated] engagement with chosen issues’ (Bennett, 2003, p. 9), the findings of this research show a far different outcome. While there was the appearance of an engagement with the chosen issues, there was also the competing allure of the luxury good (e.g. the Ikamva phones) and the status it brought in combination with the knowledge of how to operate it, creating a conflict between a powerful digital story and the powerful technology.

As noted above, Bennett (2003) argues that digital communication fosters engagement with social issues; and at the start of the project, this did seem to be the case. The participants were eager about the possibility of engaging in the public discourse in Khayelitsha and voicing their concerns and ideas from the point of view of young people through digital stories. When introducing the concept Digital Storytelling to them in one of the first workshop sessions, the participants voiced their excitement about experimenting with their public video voice:

Sibongile (f, 17): It means a lot to me. I never made a video that could be something that people may even really look at.

Nomonde (f, 16): I make a video from Khayelitsha and tell others what is going on. I will be the Khayelitsha insider.

However, after the initial phase of excitement about digital storytelling, it became clear that the participants began to take an increasing interest in the phones and their technology (among participants, peers and caretakers), a distraction from the actual purpose and content of the videos. For example, while it appeared as though they were enjoying the production skill sessions of the workshop, during the times when there was less concentration on the ‘digital’ and more on the ‘story’ part of Digital Storytelling the participants seemed to lose their enthusiasm. Although they were present during these sessions, they did not participate enthusiastically. Instead of identifying issues they feel deeply about and critically engaging with these during oral storytelling exercises or when preparing their digital stories, they began treating

me like a teacher: The participants were constantly busy with pleasing me with their 'homework' in a way, which I never observed when sitting in any of their other workshop sessions. There, the participants seemed to be more relaxed, but when participants came late to the Digital Storytelling workshop or did not bring any material to the feedback sessions as agreed, they were clearly nervous. Some of them promised to do their 'homework' or to 'deliver in time' the next time. Even though I continuously repeated that this was not school and that it was not obliged to participate, they continued to treat the workshop as if it was a school subject. Some of the participants even asked me when showing their first raw material if they did their homework sufficiently or if I want them to redo their work. When one of the participants did not show up to the workshop for two weeks, two of the participants asked if that meant that he had to give back the phone because he was not participating.

All of these instances suggested that the participants may not have been coming regularly to the workshop primarily to create digital stories in order to kick off civic communication, but because they wanted to secure their right to keep the Ikamva phones. At the end of the project, Nothemba (f, 17) confirmed that the participants had several purposes in mind when producing the digital stories:

Nothemba (f, 17): In the beginning we only wanted the phones. That's why we came to the project. And we did it for you, Silke. You know... We did not want to let you down. But then it was fun. We really liked the project.

Another purpose for working on their digital stories could be identified, namely, the technological knowledge as a means of status amplification. The participants and their peers appropriated the first raw material and rough cuts as a means of demonstrating their newly gained exclusive mobile media production knowledge to their peers in order to move higher in the hierarchy within their peer groups. The participants revealed that most of their friends found the idea of doing 'political videos' rather boring and ignored the content of the digital stories the participants were working on. But they were very enthusiastic about the new mobile media production possibilities the Ikamva phones offered. They wanted to view the first material shot and edited by the participants in order to check out the new 'videolising' and editing tricks the participants learnt:

Yolena (f, 16): My friends don't know how video works. They don't have camera. Only me. And I videolise them and also edit photos and make it a video with music and they are 'Aaaahhh. Yolena, you are so clever'.

Lerato (f, 17) {in a proud voice}: We are the new wave of videolising kids in Khayelitsha.

When peers liked what they saw, they asked the participants to teach them, which turned into a source of pride and increased status for the participants.

Similarly, the adult audience of the production phase of the digital stories also seemed to be more interested in the mobile phones and the mobile media production process than in the actual stories the participants were working on. Participants reported that their caretakers were proud that they had been selected to participate in the workshop, had been trusted with such an expensive device and had been able to learn technological skills. In many instances, caretakers encouraged the participants to show off their *Ikamva* phones and their new video-making and editing skills to other family members and even neighbours. Similar to the findings reported in Chapter Four, the caretakers usually were not interested in the material participants produced with mobile media for the digital storytelling workshop; rather their main purpose at looking at participants' mobile media was to detect inappropriate content stored on their phones. This suggests that caretakers made use of the possibility to communicate status to their own peers through their child's privileged position and exclusive knowledge. The caretakers' responses further exemplify Posel's (2010) claim that within black communities in South Africa, the older generations (which were deprived of consumer culture and education during apartheid) felt under pressure to catch up on communicating status through conspicuous consumption and cultural capital, especially through their children. In relation to youth voice within youth-adult relationships, this behaviour suggests the ease with which youth voice is overlooked in Khayelitsha.

Chapter Four described how the research participants and their peers already made use of mobile media for taste statements and as a communication tool for cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) to their peers before the workshop. The second phase of this project further amplified how swiftly this was integrated into this production process as objectified cultural capital, especially in the first raw material and rough cuts of the digital stories. Bourdieu (1986) claims that status is not only communicated through the display of any expensive goods (e.g. through mobile

phones), but also suggests that status is communicated through the display of exclusive knowledge commonly associated with higher social classes and, like Veblen (1899/1994), the luxury objects associated with this knowledge (e.g. works of art or instruments). And while theories on social capital and cultural goods were coined before information technologies entered regular households, the concepts are flexible enough to transfer them into information technologies and the 'skills and knowledge which have accompanied the "information revolution"' (Emmison & Frow, 1998, p. 42). Bourdieu (1986, as cited in Emmison & Frow, 1998) states that cultural goods can be acquired through economic capital, but 'what constitutes the precondition for specific appropriation, namely, the possession of the means of "consuming"' (p. 42) is literally priceless because it cannot be easily transferred. The findings of this research suggest that the participants made use of both conspicuous consumption and knowledge-based social capital: they gained status through the Ikamva phones as a conspicuous consumer good, but also through the video clips produced for the digital stories as objectified cultural capital.

Bourdieu's (1979, as cited in Blunden, 2004) theory further claims that people possessing social, cultural and/or economic capital not only gain social status, but also agency by being enabled to 'resist domination in social relationships' (Blunden, 2004, para. 7). However, this research showed that even though the participants had social and cultural capital, they seemed not to be inclined to use their newly gained agency in order to prompt civic communication with their peers. Instead, it seemed the participants were occupied with enjoying the newly gained status and by maintaining their elevated position by acquiring more skills in media production and upgrading their digital stories with more and more effects with which they could impress their peers. This affirms Bourdieu's (1986) claim that there is an unceasing effort that must be exerted in order to maintain one's social capital. Putnam (2000) argues that such behaviour, driven by self-interest, undermines the potential of social capital for social change. As this research shows, self-interest over participation in the democratic process through civic engagement also has a significant effect on the core idea of digital storytelling: producing video voices in order to activate social capital for voicing marginalised members of the community. However, it is important to note that the students were not necessarily abandoning or rejecting the democratic purpose of their digital stories; rather, the civic engagement was passively superseded by the allure of technology.

Arguably, the reported disinterest of their peer audiences in the content of the digital stories followed by the subsequent focus by participants on the immediacy of the increase in their status through cultural goods and social capital seems to have been promoted by this disinterest. Levine (2008) suggests that an attentive audience is one of the main motivating factors for young media producers to create a meaningful digital story for democratic ends and that the 'best quality' audience can be found within the group of friends of the producer itself. The findings of this research show, that peer instructions and informal learning have a strong impact on the process of Digital Storytelling, but that a friendship relationship between producer and audience alone is not enough to turn the peer group into an attentive, engaged audience or the producer into a digital storyteller with an intrinsic motivation to produce videos for civic communication.

Instead the findings demonstrate how self-interest and consumer culture can interfere with the process of Digital Storytelling and that the mere production of digital stories and the active participation in a Digital Storytelling workshop does not automatically mean that private voices are automatically turned into public ones. In the context of this study the temporary possession of the Ikamva phones and the participation in the Digital Storytelling workshop offered all the participants the requirements for producing public video voices, but it showed that social capital via the conspicuous consumption model through possession of technology and the communication of a consumer-related cultural capital was also a driving force. Participants who did not have a phone prior to the workshop in particular reported that the Ikamva phone helped them to drastically enlarge their social network and boost their social standing.

Nevertheless, the findings in this research are consistent with Bakhtin's (1981) theory of dialogism, and exemplify the 'relational nature of meaning-making processes' (Luttrell, 2010, p. 228) when producing media creations. Participants do have several purposes in mind and are aware of multiple audiences when producing the stories, such as the workshop leader, other participants in the workshop and their peer group outside of the workshop. Chapter Six will shed further light on this aspect through multimodal analysis of the digital stories, exploring how the participants made use of multimodal texts in order to deal with multiple (imagined) audiences and multiple intentions.

Difficult topics and hostile audiences

Borrowing from Bakhtin's (1981) theory of dialogism, this section examines data that suggests that although participants have a good deal of experience with addressing distinct audiences when creating mobile media, because of their lack of experience in creating video voices for the public discourse they overlooked the possible reactions of new audiences in their immediate environment that could react hostilely towards controversial content. The local collocated distribution network (Walton et al., 2012) may make it easy for people who disagreed with statements in the digital stories to find the source of the videos and to interact with the participant producer, family members and the people appearing in the video. Particularly if young media makers want to address controversial topics in the local community this study shows that certain forms interaction might offer both more or less safe distribution channels for hostile audiences.

Two of the most eager participants generated ideas for digital stories that could not be made because of potential danger they presented to themselves and the people depicted in their videos. One participant for example presented his first raw material relatively early in the process in which he had secretly filmed his peers doing drugs and planned to use this footage in his digital story about drugs and peer pressure. However, he had not considered the consequences this could have if the peers depicted in his video saw themselves in the final digital story. He lived in an area that was well known for young people abusing and dealing in drugs. The first test shooting the participant brought with him to the workshop session showed young people secretly smoking crack in a dark shack, casually laughing into the camera. The raw material looked like a home movie filmed for private use rather than for wider distribution. Although there was hardly any light on the shooting location, the interior of the room and the faces of the people in the video were easily recognisable. This secretly filmed raw material could have got him into trouble, therefore I told the participant to tell no one about the existence of the material and to delete it immediately.

Another participant wanted to make a digital story about homophobia against lesbians in Khayelitsha. In South Africa over the past ten years, there have been 31 reported cases of lesbians being gang-raped, stoned or stabbed because of their sexual orientation (Fihlani, 2011). In addition, there are cases of 'corrective' rape and killings where men brutally force sexual intercourse upon lesbians to 'cure' them from

the 'disease' of homosexuality. During the time of this research, a twenty-three year-old woman was the victim of this homophobia, and was stabbed in an area close to where some of the participants stayed (Fihlani, 2011). The female participant that wanted to pursue this digital story was particularly passionate about it because even gossip about a woman being gay could make her a possible target for 'corrective' rape. Because most of the participant's female friends were even too afraid to talk about this topic with each other, she attempted to break the silence with a digital story. Even though her caretaker had given consent and some of her friends had agreed to talk on camera, I doubted that everyone involved was fully aware of the impact a digital story like this could have. I feared that neither I, nor Ikamva Youth, nor the University of Cape Town could protect the people involved if she went ahead with the planned story. Therefore we connected the participant with a professional lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender organisation that had more experience in dealing with such sensitive topics in Khayelitsha.

These two proposed digital stories suggest the possible hazards of Digital Storytelling in certain contexts. It shows that it is of utmost importance to not only teach the possible positive outcomes of digital stories but also to make the participants aware of the possibility of harm that could result if the videos were seen by hostile audiences. And while the workshop design is to empower young media makers to be active agents in changing their world, it does not mean that others in their environment accord them the same status. Nor does the workshop design guarantee that the environment is safe for the digital storytellers to engage in a counter discourse in a Fraserian or Bakhtinian sense. In fact, this research indicates that the 'safe and contained environment' (Simsek, 2012, p. 69) of a Digital Storytelling workshop might even give some participants an unrealistic feeling of safety when talking openly about their concerns and their ideas depicted in digital stories, especially when these counter discourses are introduced into the local communication network. These findings are very different to other reports that describe workshop participants feeling confident to openly talk about and produce digital stories about controversial issues of their concern (Mendoza, Renard & Goodman, 2008). In the context of Khayelitsha, this would not have been possible.

An additional concern is that the Digital Storytelling format may give participants false hope about being able to speak freely about everything to anyone. As these examples showed, despite the fact that their projects were restricted because of safety concerns of the workshop leader, being silenced in the very beginning of the

process seemed to be perceived as a major setback and a strong demotivating factor for the participants. Both had a hard time motivating themselves to come up with another topic; and in the end only one of the two finished a digital story. Instead of being proud of the final product, the participant was still disappointed at not being able to talk about the topic initially chosen.

Looking at these two silenced visual voices through Fraser's theory (1990), the two participants aimed at creating a local counter discourse. While the mainstream discourse dominated by the authorities in South Africa is against drug abuse and homophobia (South Africa is the only African country that legalised gay marriage), within local communities the majority of the people might have opposing opinions on these topics. The dominant discourse in Khayelitsha, like in the majority of other African countries, is that there is a strong disapproval of homosexuality (Gibson & Gouws, 2003). While on the national level the participant's digital story would have affirmed the dominant discourse as set by authorities, on the local level, it would have constituted a counter discourse. In the case of the digital story speaking against drug abuse it becomes more complex. While the top-down vocality is clear against drug abuse, and is the same message that local communities try to convey, in the localized neighbourhood of the participant, drug use by certain populations may be determined by a different social capital arrangement, where deviance rather than non-deviance determines one's status. Thus, while the anti-drug discourse is reflective of a dominant discourse in mainstream society and even on the local level, within the micro-community there is ambivalence toward this discourse. The producer of the digital story therefore ran the risk coming under fire from the people who possessed strong social capital in the neighbourhood, namely drug users and dealers, in spite of the larger community's anti-drug stance.

This observed phenomena ties in with one of the main questions Bakhtin asked in relation to voice: 'How do we speak when someone can answer?' (Nielsen, 2002). According to Bakhtin's construct of addressability (as cited in Nielsen, 2002), voice is constantly shaped by the reaction we anticipate from the addressee. In a one-on-one conversation for example, the speaker has the possibility to continuously adapt the speech act according to reactions. But when remediating oral storytelling into digital stories, the video producer has to make decisions about how to speak while merely anticipating how the imagined audiences will react. Once a decision is made and the digital story is produced and distributed, this decision cannot be reversed. In case of a possible hostile audience, Bakhtin's notion of answerability is important: The

anticipation of the possible reaction of opponents can, in a worst-case scenario, be a life-saver. Significantly, this research reveals that Digital Storytelling literature is ambivalent towards the concept of the hostile voice and the challenges for workshop leaders to integrate the idea of audience reaction.

The next section further discusses addressability in the process of Digital Storytelling, but from the aspect of audience appeal versus authenticity. According to Digital Storytelling literature, the video-maker should attempt to make the digital story appealing to a large audience, while remaining true to his or her own opinions and feelings despite external pressures. In this debate the role of the facilitator has been discussed, as the creative freedom of unprofessional video-makers should stay particularly uninterrupted by media professionals (Watkins & Russo, 2009). Approaching this debate from a dialogic perspective, the following section shows how visual video voices are always produced in relation to their audiences and how the 'first public' (Rheingold, 2008) of a digital storytelling workshop can distract from addressing the intended audience to such an extent that the video-makers feel uncomfortable presenting the final creations to the intended audience.

'We know what you want to hear'

The Digital Storytelling workshop audience acts as the first public, which the participants should make use of in order to test run their public voice in a safe environment before entering the public discourse outside the workshop (Rheingold, 2008). The following section shows how the first public as the main dialogic partner in the Digital Storytelling process influences the nature of the final video creations. These findings confirm research done by Burgess (2006), which showed that digital stories produced within a workshop environment tend to be rather uniform, shaped by the sociality of the workshop, thus indicating that there is a divide between the workshop goals and the digital stories produced. This section will offer possible reasons for this within the context of this study through addressivity and speech genres (Bakhtin, 1979/1986) as well as the impression management process (Goffman, 1956) with particular focus on the push and pull from workshop leader and peers.

One of the advantages of mobile media production detected in the first phase of the research was the hard-earned independence of the participants from adult supervision when producing media creations. However, this research asked the

participants to produce mobile media under the guidance of an adult, which constituted a cultural clash. While I aimed at creating a youth-centred and -led environment in the workshop sessions in order to create an 'arena for deliberation among themselves about their needs, objectives, and strategies' (Fraser, 1990, p. 66), the participants, just as when they interacted with any adult, tried to show me respect by silently listening and answering when asked a question in a polite and non-confrontational manner (Bray et al., 2010). They explained:

Lerato (f, 17): Our teachers don't care what we think. They are talking all the time. We must listen, not talk.

Yolena (f, 16): Yuuu! Talking with my mother about my private things. No... that does not work. She is too strict. She don't want to hear my opinion.

Andile (m, 17): No, Silke. I have friends, you know, best friends to talk. Not my mother. No, I would not like to talk with my mother about these things.

While Mendoza, Renard and Goodman (2008) report that young participants with similar backgrounds to the participants in this study welcomed the possibility of being able to discuss topics of interest with their peers and the workshop leader, the participants in this study struggled with how to negotiate the group discussions and the new youth-adult relationship within a classroom-like situation. Instead of freely deliberating with each other, they behaved as if they were at school in a classroom, waiting for me to start and lead the discussions like a teacher. Often, they only answered when asked something directly. Only on some rare occasions did the participants break from expected classroom behaviour, with two or three participants briefly engaged in mini-debates with each other. In general, larger-group discussions remained rare and did not last long. Either one of the speakers suddenly stopped talking, seemingly 'remembering' that was an adult in the 'classroom' or the debating participants were shushed by other participants, nodding into my direction as if it would have been impolite to have this kind of private arguments in front of an adult. *Lerato* (f, 17) was the only participant who regularly kicked off mini-discussions during the workshops. But as she explained during the in-depth interview, she was still careful when talking in front of an adult about her personal life. She told me that young people in Khayelitsha know by experience how far they can go with certain adults and when it is better to keep silent.

This confusion about collaborative adult-youth relationships and student-led and centred discussions might also explain another difficulty the participants faced during the oral storytelling exercise. For instance, after one of the rare mini-group discussions, Nothemba (f, 17) approached me and said that she and some others from the group were wondering why I was interested in their private conversations. She told me that I could be stricter with them, like their other teachers, and that this would make it also easier for them. She said that they were confused about when to talk and when not, especially because 'you came from so far to teach us something and now we are talking all the time'. This inability to differentiate between a top-down model and a horizontal model suggests that instead of approaching issues of social concern from a personal point of view, which is paramount for creating later on powerful digital stories (Levine, 2008), the participants repeated adult concerns about the dangers to youth. When confronting the participants with this possible repetition, Lerato confirmed my feeling:

Lerato (f, 17): Yes, We ... we just know what you would like to hear. So we say it.

These findings are in complete opposition to previous findings by workshop leaders of Digital Storytelling, who report that especially younger participants were 'at ease with the use of personal and emotive themes' (Burgess, 2006, p. 209) during group discussions. Rheingold (2008) only observed that participants struggled with relating their personal concerns and ideas to a greater topic of social concern in order to make their digital stories interesting for a wider audience. However, Luttrell (2010) did find similar outcomes to the present research when working with children using photovoice as a research tool, wherein participants continually associated the researchers 'with dominant educational values' (p. 227) and behaved in a way they were used to at school.

This phenomenon seems most similar to Bakhtin's (1981) notion of dialogism, which states that every speech act is based on experiences in previous speech acts and the anticipation of responses of the counterparts. Especially young participants, who are used to a lifelong of non-confrontational communications with adults at school and at home (Bray et al., 2010), seem to stick to the 'speech genre', that they learnt was appropriate in this situation. One might predict that young video makers could have an easier time experimenting with their voice with a workshop leader closer to their age; however, given the 'highly asymmetric relationship [between] the formal, explicit, professional expert knowledge of the facilitator and the informal, tacit,

“amateur” or “common” knowledge of the participant’ (Hartley, 2007, p. 3), this may make the participants perceive the ‘professional’ in the room as a teacher despite his or her closeness in age.

Additionally, the group discussions and one-on-ones with the participants concerning issues of their concern gave insight into how the participants made use of dominant voices in their lives when expressing themselves. This ties right into the on-going debate around ‘authenticity’ and Digital Storytelling. Digital Storytelling literature states that it is important to preserve the authenticity of the visual voices as much as possible in the process of guiding them through the production process (Lambert, 2009). Approaching this issue from a Bakhtinian perspective, multivoiced and heteroglot visual voices can be unique and ‘personally meaningful’ (Hull & Katz, 2006). It is less about excluding voices from one’s own voice than about the unique arrangement of multiple voices and languages in order to express the desired message, which makes digital stories authentic. However, this research exemplified that the critical engagement with other voices and their ideologies for ‘ideological becoming’ (Bakhtin, 1981, as cited in Hull, Stornaiuolo & Sahni, 2010) and in order to give birth to ‘one’s own’ voice is not a straightforward and natural process especially for marginalized voices, which are taught to repeat dominant voices within the public discourse without challenging the status quo.

Parallel impression management process and ‘markers of cool’

According to Fraser (1990), subaltern counterpublics do not only offer space for deliberation, but also for ‘the formation and enactment of social identities’ (p. 68). Likewise, civic communication must allow the individual to ‘construct and express [...] one’s cultural identity through idiom and style’ (p. 68). Public discourse, according to Fraser (1990), is not uniform; instead everyone must be able to speak with ‘one’s own voice’ (p. 69). In this research, participants were so focused on the feedback from the first public that they seemed to have overlooked the actual intended audience of the digital stories, their peers outside the workshop. As described at length in Chapter Four, the participants and their peers were used to appropriating mobile media for communicating identity and status to each other. Within this ongoing impression management process the participants and their peers were previously reviewing each others ‘mobile media profiles’, negotiating ‘markers of cool’ (Marwick & boyd, 2010, p. 3) for mobile media and determining what kind of mobile media was socially acceptable within their peer group.

Because of the nature of the workshop and the participants' local environment, they were the first ones within their peer group to experiment with the new form of mobile media and therefore also had no other point of reference within the 'mobile phone portfolios' of their peers about what kind of digital story could be perceived as being 'cool'. The production of the digital stories mainly happened within the isolated context of the workshop environment without any non-workshop peer review. Yanga (m, 15) was the first one to shoot raw material and receive feedback from the first public. His raw material constituted out of two re-enacted scenes of a phone robbery with four of his friends starring in it. When the other participants saw the videos, they screamed, laughed out loud and pointed at the actors they knew from school or their neighbourhood. Yanga sat in the first row with a serious face, staring at the projection. When the first wave of excitement had calmed down, participants were asked for their feedback. Although I expected negative comments based on their reactions, the participants stated unanimously that they loved what they saw. They said Yanga's work looked great and professional, like clips they see on TV. Yanga explained that he wanted his video look like the programmes he watches on TV and that he watched a lot of programmes before he shot his first video in order to get inspired.

Yanga's production within the workshop environment and for the first public therefore became the marker for the 'new cool' for the other participants' digital stories. After this first screening almost all of the raw material and rough cuts of the other participants seemed to be inspired by TV productions. At this point it must be mentioned that based on my background in TV production, I introduced the participants to common storytelling techniques used in TV productions, such as interviews, clips or voice-overs. The participants' first attempts to create a digital story could be heavily influenced by the 'forms' they were offered (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 13) and which they also recognised when watching TV. Like speakers of a foreign language, the participants may have chosen 'the nearest, most plausible form they know for the expression what they have in mind' (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 13). However, this also is a clear example of a parallel impression management process and the 'marker of cool' for digital stories at the very moment the others in the workshop approved the style as being 'cool'. Some participants even named Yanga's raw material and rough cuts as a point of reference when asked about how they would like their digital stories to look:

Unam (m, 16): I got great ideas from Yanga's video. Liked it a lot. The pictures, the scenes. Wow. Looks like on TV. Everyone likes it. Great. I will also do it this way!

Yola (f, 17): I like the way Yanga is talking in the beginning of his video, I want to do that now as well.

After the first screening, during the workshop sessions several participants asked Yanga (m, 15) directly for help with their own creations to reach a similar effect in their videos as the ones they saw in his digital story.

Even though participants seemed to be confident about their digital stories within the workshop environment, they told me that they do not feel comfortable sharing the final digital stories with their peers outside the workshop through the peripheral social networks as I had anticipated. They showed the final videos only to their best friends in order to receive more feedback before allowing others to watch the digital stories or even handing over the actual video files to others. The newly gained privacy gained with the Ikamva phone helped them keep the video files from unwanted audience. I anticipated that by the producer known and unknown group of audiences might have access to the digital stories based on the public character phones have in Khayelitsha (see Chapter Four). But the participants turned out to be more protective over the Ikamva phones than over their own phones, mainly because their caretakers constantly reminded them that in case of loss or breakage they could not repay the cost of the phone:

Lerato (f, 17): I allow actually no one to touch it. Perhaps sometimes for a tiny moment. But I am all the time with them. I am just afraid they break it. It is not my phone. [...] Even my mom is not allowed to use it too much and she reminds me all the time not to break it.

Nomonde (f, 16): I share it with no one. Because it is not my phone. And hardly anyone of them know how to use a touch screen.

The participants told their peers that because it was not their family's phone they had to be extra careful so that no one could steal or break the Ikamva phone. And therefore they were not able to pass it on as much as they did their 'own' phones. However most of the participants told me that it was also 'a good excuse' to not have to participate in the ongoing phone sharing practices (see Chapter Four). With the help of this excuse the participants could better control who had access to the phone

and who not and enjoy the new privacy of their phones. Thus for audiences outside the workshop they displayed their regular profile content, such as photos and music files, in order to communicate and negotiate their identity and digital stories on this 'mobile phone portfolio' were handled with care. Moreover, in the later stages of the production process, more and more of the participants started hiding their rough cuts from their peers. In the end some even deliberately excluded the finalized digital stories from this portfolio by storing them in different folders than the other mobile media.

In the context of this study, then, participants maintained two parallel impression management processes. Within the workshop the participants together with their fellow participants started up a parallel impression management process with new 'markers of cool' for mobile videos independent from the input of the digital stories' intended audience. In contrast to the presentation of their digital stories to their first public, what they revealed to their non-workshop peer groups varied significantly. While in the beginning of the second phase of research the participants still reported that they proudly showed the raw material and the first rough cuts to their peers in order to command their admiration for their newly gained media production skills. But as noted previously in Chapter Four, because of the familiarity of participants and their peer group with mobile media (and their unfamiliarity with expressing their marginalised voices and participating in civic discourse), peer audiences outside the workshop only concentrated on the technological aspect of the media creations participants had produced. The actual purpose and content of the digital stories, namely the visual voice and engagement in the democratic process, were therefore excluded from the usual peer review process.

Concerning the careful handling of the final digital stories strongly suggests that the peer-approval of the workshop audience was not sufficient enough to give the participants enough confidence to proudly display their digital stories also outside the workshop session. Furthermore it is an indicator for the participants having overlooked during the production process anticipating how the intended audience might react to the digital stories. This complex process of addressing different audiences given the existence of (at the least) dual, opposing pressures: (1) to conform to the expectations of the workshop leader, and (2) the need to appear 'cool' in social networks of peers. This research indicates a tension that eventually blocked the dissemination of the digital stories, suggesting that within the contained environment of a workshop environment the participants can learn the basics of

Digital Storytelling, but for negotiating what kind of self-expression and self-representation within digital stories is socially acceptable the feedback of the intended audience is needed but may not always be sought after because of insecurities.

When reflecting upon their final digital stories it became apparent to the participants that they might have overlooked that they actually know what kind of videos their peers like to watch. Unam (m, 16) mentioned that when producing the video he was so focused on filming and editing, that he overlooked the preferences of his friends:

Unam (m, 16) I would make it different this time, something funny with a message. The others would like that as well. I think that is the trick.

Yola (f, 17): They don't want Ikamva videos. They want funny videos.

Nothemba (f, 17): If you make a funny video. Others want to have your video. People are always looking for something funny. Or Rap videos. They are also wanted.

Instead, nine of the final ten digital stories were serious citizen journalism-like reports. Nothemba (f, 17) and Yola (f, 17) were the only ones that seemed to remember that their intended audience usually responds to parodic videos. They intentionally wrapped up their message about how to be a perfect best friend by being funny. During the reflection phase they stated that they felt that their friends would like their video more and would be more receptive to the message they wanted to send:

Yola (f, 17) It is important to make it funny, then people enjoy watching it and they receive the message. And don't get bored.

Other media literacy projects state that humorous and parodic treatments are a common strategy resorted to by young and inexperienced media producers who use humour and irony to manage the embarrassment of self-exposure and the difficulty of measuring up to broadcast media production values (Grace and Tobin, 2002). In the context of this study this likely would have been a better option, because as the participants explained during the final project group session, private videos were in general dreaded in the mobile phone impression management process. Videos about themselves, their friends and their family were perceived as more private than similar

kinds of photos, partly because of the sometimes transgressive uses of video, but also because of the difficulties in controlling impressions in this semiotic mode:

Nomonde (f, 16): A video has always something funny. Sometimes that makes you laugh. If others laugh about you, then it is not cool.

Zukiswa (f, 17): On photos your style is easier to control, on videos harder. There you might look funny.

Neo (m, 17) We are afraid that others find our videos funny. We are always afraid. Because when if it is just a little bit funny, they will find it.

These comments indicate that participants are aware of the distinction between being intentionally funny for one's audience, which can be controlled by impression management, and losing control of their self-presentation by seeming foolish or 'uncool'.

In the following chapter I will further elaborate on the way the videos by Yanga (m, 15) and by Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) dealt with these external pressures of addressing several audiences simultaneously.

Conclusion

This chapter investigated the ways young video-makers make use of their public visual voices in a collocated social network when using pre-existing resources for the production and distribution of digital stories. The core idea of Digital Storytelling workshops is to give marginalised groups the tools and the knowledge in order to enter public discourse and represent their concerns and ideas for social change in their own voice. The findings of this research do demonstrate how the knowledge gained in such a workshop and the access to an upgraded version of existing media production technology can be helpful in order to gain more social and cultural capital, but they also show that the participants, their peers and their caretakers found different purposes for the digital stories and how gaining social capital via the conspicuous consumption model and the communication of cultural capital through the mobile technology was one of the main motivations for the participants to engage in Digital Storytelling.

In addition, the findings add an important contribution to the academic discourse concerning 'audience' and Digital Storytelling. While literature focuses on the positive impact audience can have or on the negative impact if audience is missing, the findings in this research highlight the possibility of reaching hostile audiences with digital stories, which may in peripheral distribution have negative consequences. Just because the workshop environment offers participants the platform to experiment with their public voice does not mean that the outside environment is also ready for the counter discourses on sensitive topics offered by otherwise marginalised voices. Furthermore, the examples of two participants whose voices were silenced out of safety reasons show how demotivating this experience can be and how the 'safe' environment of a Digital Storytelling workshop can give marginalised voices a false hope to be able to freely engage in the public discourse. This research indicates that integration of Bakhtin's concepts of addressivity and the idea of audience answerability more prominently in Digital Storytelling workshops is of particular importance.

Finally, this chapter identified the complex processes of addressing a mix of different known audiences with different needs given the existence of several pressures, such as the urge to produce videos that are rated as 'cool' by peers, the necessity to conform to adult norms and the desire to please the workshop leader with the creation of digital stories for a democratic end. It further showed how these tensions activated by these three overlapping audiences can contribute to cautious behaviour concerning the screening of the digital stories. It indicated that while the participants of this research were proud of their digital stories, they nevertheless refrained from distributing them within the peripheral social networks out of fear they could negatively interfere with the impression management process on their 'mobile phone profile'. Consequently, this demonstrated the strong impact audiences have on the formation of a 'public voice', which defined from a dialogic perspective might be less 'authentic' and 'personal', but must be seen as a relational construct, negotiated and co-constructed with and between its audiences.

Chapter Six: Multiple voices, multiple modes and multiple audiences – A multimodal analysis

Introduction to multimodal analysis

Chapter Four and Five analysed the mobile media production and distribution practices of the digital storytellers and identified the ways they integrated digital storytelling within their ongoing processes of impression management, conspicuous consumption and communication of cultural capital. This chapter shifts focus to the digital stories themselves and examines the ways in which the participants made use of multiple voices and multiple semiotic modes in order to address multiple audiences. I employ Bakhtin's (1981) notion of voice and apply it to a multimodal analysis (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006) of two digital stories, the first entitled 'Crime' by Yanga (m, 15), and the second entitled 'Friendship' by Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17). The two stories were chosen for analysis because they received special attention and acclaim from the participants ('Crime') and their broader peer group ('Friendship').

The strongest point of difference between the two digital stories is the genres they employ. Whereas Yanga made use of a journalistic genre and produced a video in citizen journalist mode (Goode, 2009), Yola and Nothemba made use of a parodic genre and produced a digital story drawing on personal, friendship-based interactions. The choice of these genres and the distinctive language employed seemed to influence the audience's reactions. Thus, Yanga's digital story was well-received within the workshop environment, while he reported that his peer audience outside the workshop found the video boring. Yola's and Nothemba's video was not singled out for special attention by the workshop audience, but outside the workshop, their peers enjoyed watching it, mainly because it made them laugh.

In the following section, a short overview of the content of the videos is given, then it considers how the three video-makers made use of multiple semiotic modes in video in order to communicate their message to the different audiences they addressed. An exhaustive multimodal analysis of the two digital stories would exceed the scope of this study; for this reason, analysis will focus on particular sequences that are salient in relation to multivocality, dialogism and heteroglossia. Applying Bakhtin's (1981)

dialogic framework in the analysis showed that both videos made use of multivocality and heteroglossia in order to best articulate their messages while addressing various discrete and overlapping audiences in their environment.

The digital stories

Yanga's digital story is entitled 'Crime' (5 minutes, 9 seconds). He summed up the persuasive intentions of his story as follows: 'Doing crime is wrong. You must withstand and fight crime, then we all will have a better life'. Yanga's video is structured much like a journalistic report, in that he makes use of reported speech in the form of (1) *Vox Pops* (Chandler, 2012), (2) a reporter stand-up, (3) a narrative voice-over; and (4) two re-enacted crime scenes (these two scenes are split up into parts and edited in between the other elements so that eventually the complete stories of the scenes are told).

Yanga's digital story begins with the written title 'Crime' introducing the topic and a mix of short statements by peers about what crime means to them, along with the most violent parts of the re-enacted crime scenes: a phone robbery and a street fight. Then Yanga introduces himself as the director of the video in a reporter stand-up, explaining why he chose this topic and what the digital story is about. Following his self-introduction, Yanga gives the floor once more to his peers, letting them talk in more depth about what they are afraid of in relation to crime in their neighbourhood. Seemingly out of nowhere, one of them begins comparing living in Khayelitsha with living in the suburbs and comes to the conclusion that life is better in the township. Next, Yanga once more talks about himself, showing where he comes from and where he lives. He cuts back to the phone robbery scene and tells the story of the re-enacted scene from the beginning: A boy walks down the street playing with his phone when two older boys attack him, stealing the phone from him and dancing victoriously as the boy runs away. In the voice-over overlaying this scene, Yanga takes a clear stance by stating 'Crime is very wrong' and that he does not 'encourage people to do crime'. After this scene Yanga adds another *Vox Pop* of a peer talking about how his life is affected by crime.

Following this, Yanga changes the tone of his story: He shifts focus from a (mostly) negative description of life in Khayelitsha through the content of *Vox Pops*, his voice-over and the violent crime scene to drawing a more nuanced picture of his home by describing alternative life styles in Khayelitsha. The young people who have been

portrayed as helpless victims of the mugging now become young people who can stand up for themselves and have a life decision to make: In the first life decision, the young victim of the phone robbery scene is coming back with friends and attacks the two older boys, winning the phone back; in the second life decision, a voice-over tells the audience to 'Stop doing crime', followed by scenes showing alternatives to criminal activities, such as playing games, reading the bible or doing sports. Yanga then includes the voice of another peer performing a freestyle hip-hop song. The song is split up into three parts and between each, other parts of the re-enacted crime scenes visualize what the hip-hop lyrics were about, namely, (1) that it is one's own choice to either join criminal gangs or to fight them; (2) that no one can be trusted on the streets of Khayelitsha because everyone could be a criminal; and (3) that it is painful to live in a place where 'people try to kill me for no reason'.

The video continues with a voice-over explaining that his deepest wish is peace and freedom for all people in South Africa. He illustrates this with religious imagery, such as a shot of his church, still pictures of a dove and two hands holding each other. He cuts back to the street fight scene, showing the people being attacked and restraining themselves from hitting back, thus remaining on the 'good side'. His voice-over for this sequence is particularly emotional: 'I am scared. I don't want to be killed. I am still too young. I have dreams and I want my dreams to become true'. His final title reads 'The End', however, he includes an additional three 'bloopers' scenes after the final title, with Yanga trying to conduct an interview but every time something funny happens and they have to laugh.

Yola and Nothemba's digital story is entitled 'Friendship' (8 minutes, 3 seconds), and they use it to discuss their ideal form of friendship (what they termed 'a manual for the perfect friendship'), with the aim of accurately reflecting their friends' point of view rather than persuading them to behave differently. Yola and Nothemba also introduced their topic with a written title: 'Friendship means everything'. The title is superimposed on the scene of girlfriends walking down the street, chatting and laughing with one another. This digital story does not feature any narration. Instead Rihanna's song 'Te amo' ('I love you') is overlaid throughout the film, beginning with the first scene of the girls walking down the street. Following this, Yola and Nothemba introduce themselves in two separate video clips where they sit relaxed on a couch, addressing the camera directly while talking about what friendship means to them. A title follows, stating: 'a film by Yola & Nothemba'. After the title, the two video-makers let their peers speak about what they associate with a perfect

friendship. After the last interview, the following sections are similarly structured: They place a title stating 'Friendship is...' and then insert various definitions of friendship followed by a re-enacted clip that visualises the statement made.

The next title states 'Friendship is... sharing', with a re-enacted scene of two female peers standing in the middle of a room, sharing a single bottle of soda with each other while smiling into the camera. After, 'Friendship is... being there for each other' is visualised through a re-enacted scene in which two male peers have a 'friend's talk' about having sex with a girl, about whether and how to use a condom and what to do if the girl becomes pregnant. Following this is 'Friendship is... sharing secrets', after which Yola and Nothemba cut to a scene showing two male peers whispering into each other's ear and giggling about what they tell each other in secret. Finally, a title sequence begins 'Friendship is... looking out for each other' and shows two male peers badmouthing one of their friends because he has bad body odour, when another male peer enters the scene and rebukes the two, telling them to go and help the friend out instead of talking about him behind his back. The final scene is entitled 'Friendship is... loving each other' and shows the two video-makers hugging one other in front of the camera. This scene blends into the final title with the words: 'We should love, care and share for each other. We should appreciate our friends. And embrace our friendship while we can. To those who have a lovely friendship: Keep on making sure that it stays good for ever'. Similarly to Yanga, Yola and Nothemba end their digital story with a blooper. They return to the hugging scene, and the camera stays on even when the two fall out of their acting role and walk towards the camera, with Yola saying to the person behind the mobile phone camera: 'Are you waiting for us to say stop?'

Below, the two digital stories will be discussed in more detail, and examined using the multimodal analysis technique described in more detail in the methodology chapter (Chapter Three). This analysis will further elaborate on various aspects of Bakhtin's multivocality, heteroglossia and dialogism and demonstrate the complexity of youth visual voices.

'Crime' by Yanga: Constructing a journalistic persona in a multi-voiced narrative

Yanga's digital story begins by introducing the topic with a written title 'Crime' in white letters on a black background. A mix of non-diegetic and diegetic sound fades

in. This analysis focuses on the visual images but it is important to note that during all the clips Yanga juxtaposes atmospheric sounds of kids playing and laughing in the distance along with a local song in isiXhosa, 'Owethu mena' (DJ Fisherman featuring Big Nuz and Professor). The clips from the song are mostly instrumental with the lyrics only included in a few scenes. However, by choosing this song Yanga makes a strong reference to the ideology behind the local music genre called 'Kwaito'. This genre asserts a pride in a 'kasi' or township culture and identities, and suggests a 'street-smart' knowledge of township life 'walking the walk, talking the talk and most importantly, being proud of these things' ("South African History Online," n.d., para. 4). The language used by 'Kwaito' artists is 'Isicamtho, South African township slang' ("South African History Online," n.d., para. 3). While the genre celebrates township life and is inspired by famous artists such as Brenda Fassie, the music genre also suggests gangsterism by making use of *isicamtho* or language derived from *tsotsitaal*, which is commonly associated with township gangsters ("South African History Online," n.d.). Integrating the musical and verbal languages of *Kwaito* and its complex associated ideologies (Bakhtin, 1979/1986) suggests Yanga's contradictory feelings towards the circumstances in Khayelitsha, similarly to another sequence where he inserts his friend's positive remark about township life.

Yanga's video includes several peers, and uses another common journalistic convention, that of the *Vox Pop*. Including this television-style 'voice of the people' is commonly used to give 'a flavour of "what ordinary people think" about some issue' (Chandler, 2012, p. para. 88). This marks the genre as journalistic while the use of multiple perspectives suggests that the overall voice is that of the 'objective' journalist. This sequence has 'reporter' Yanga first edit two clips sequentially, where one male and one female peer discuss what crime means to them and what they fear, followed by another interview in which a third peer voice abruptly shifts the topic away from crime, instead focusing on the positive aspects about living in Khayelitsha:

Living in Khayelitsha is good, because you are around a lot of people. If you live in the suburbs you don't have people around you if you need something. But if you live in Khayelitsha you can go to your neighbour and get what you need. But in the suburbs you don't get it because there are big yards. You cannot just walk to your neighbour. In Khayelitsha you can. That's why it is better to live in Khayelitsha.

Similarly to *Kwaito* music, this perspective asserts a positive view on life in Khayelitsha, valuing the neighbourliness and mutual support that are traditionally

associated with philosophies such as *ubuntu*. Although this interview and perspective is not carefully integrated into the overall persuasive argument of the digital story, it was nonetheless extremely important to Yanga to include it. During a feedback session, Yanga and I had a long discussion concerning this interview, in which I wanted to know why he wanted to put this clip in his digital story since it seemingly detracts rather than adds to his argument by disrupting the flow of his message that crime is bad. Yanga could not give me a reason for his decision, but he insisted on having the interview in the video:

Yanga: Because it belongs there, Silke. I want it there.

Through an informal translator, I attempted to approach the topic again, but I did not get any further with him. It is certainly possible that this break in the flow of Yanga's story could be explained as an attempt to present a more nuanced picture of life and home in Khayelitsha. This may perhaps also exemplify how township youths grow up with 'a combination of pride, frustrations, hope and fatalism' (Bray et al., 2010, p. 324). This double-voicing then is another way to appeal to the intended audience of this digital story, his peers, who might grow up with a similar torn feeling towards their home.

Also interesting is that Yanga placed the positive sound bite in his video without any further comment before or after it. He did not verbally react to it, neither agreed with his friend's statement nor distanced himself from it. Cinematically, he treated this peer similarly to the other interviewees, which further contributed to the sense of a journalistic 'objectivity' where all of the interviewees are placed into the same relationship with the audience, putting them on an equal footing within the discourse of the digital story. The status given to the perspectives of peers is apparent if we consider the interpersonal metafunction, the visual resources for the representation of the interaction and 'a particular social relation between the producer, the viewer and the object presented' (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 42). All interviewees are filmed from a low and oblique angle (the producer is rather short), which unintentionally gives the speakers greater power (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006) and boosts the authority of their voices. The framing (close up) of the interviews suggests the feeling of a close personal relationship between the audience and the represented participants, thereby building audience identification with the rather emotional stories the participants tell about their experiences of crime in Khayelitsha. And finally, all of the interviewees are placed in the centre of the frame, but they do not look into the camera directly, what Kress & van Leeuwen (2006) term 'offer'

pictures, where the represented participant does not look directly at the camera, but is 'offered' to the viewer. This establishes a further sense of journalistic objectivity in that these speakers do not appeal to the viewer or engage with them through a direct visual address.

The use of 'offer' shots for the interviews is particularly interesting in relation to the standard convention in journalistic genres, known as demand pictures in which the represented participant looks directly into the camera, implying 'communicative power' (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 121). Not everyone in front of a television camera is entitled to look and speak directly into the camera in order to address the audience directly: This right is reserved for news reporters, newsreaders or other television show hosts. Within this digital story, only Yanga and his best friend Neo (m, 17) look directly into the camera. The fact that these two are singled out in this way suggests that it might be important to look in more detail at Yanga's own self-portrayal within his video, and the special treatment he affords to Neo (m, 17) in comparison to all the other represented participants.

Whenever Yanga himself appears in the picture through either photos or video clips, he is depicted in a demand picture, directly talking to his audience and building a sense of connection to them. Furthermore the direct gaze into the camera suggests that he maintains authority over 'his story', even though he offers other voices the opportunity to address us through the digital story. His authoritative stance is also apparent in his use of spoken language. While Yanga includes a number of peer voices in his video, he is ultimately the gatekeeper: Only voices that suited his overall persuasive intent made it into the final video. For example, when working together on the structure of his video, Yanga was very picky with the interviews he edited into the video. He did not randomly pick an interview and placed the complete answer of the interviewee into his digital story; instead he cut out pieces that he thought fit best in his overall message, which he also mentioned several times during interviews. Also, when working with me to give the video a finishing touch with Final Cut Pro, Yanga asked me if I could cut out certain words from various sentences from the interviewees that he did not want to have in the video since he could not do it himself accurately or precisely with the editing software on his phone. It was clear that he was picking parts of the answers that suited his message as gatekeeper best. Similarly, for his own self-presentation Yanga tried to maintain a professional, authoritative journalistic identity and to communicate this through several semiotic modes in his digital story. For instance, at the beginning of the video he introduces

himself formally as the director of the digital story with his full name appearing in a title frame superimposing white letters on a black background, a convention reminiscent of professionally produced documentaries which are often aired on South African television (such as 'Third Degree').

Throughout the video Yanga employs a 'social language' rather than a personal one, which 'is though still colloquial, already [...] introduc[ing] a hint of formality' (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 129). Firstly, he uses a reporter stand-up, a storytelling technique that is normally associated with news reporters or foreign correspondents, in order to introduce his audience(s) to what his 'video' is about. However, the materiality of the reporter stand-up and the social relationship suggested by the chosen frame size work against his overt intention. Yanga films himself in an extreme close up (he holds the phone in front of himself), signifying a very intimate relationship between audience and the represented participant (and in this case, implied author). This encourages identification and may also suggest that the opinion of the implied author can be trusted (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006) but it does reduce the usual distance associated with a journalistic persona. In the background, kitchen tools hanging on the wall give away the private shooting location. Through this heteroglossic coexistence of intimacy and distance, Yanga assumes a journalistic persona while making do with available resources (cellphone camera, kitchen space, etc.). He announces the purpose of his digital story, while drawing on discursive resources that an outsider might by using 'othering' strategies, such as talking about his digital story depicting 'the people from Khayelitsha'. His persona as a reporter is thus distanced from the events of the narrative.

Through his self-presentation, Yanga distances himself from the other represented participants and youths in Khayelitsha in general. For instance he shows photos of himself and the home where he lives with his parents. Although modest by suburban South African and Western standards, it is one of the best forms of accommodation available in Khayelitsha, a brick house in a better-situated area of the township. His dress in the photos and the locations in which the pictures are taken thus do not immediately signify poverty or, in South African terms, 'ekasi' or stereotypical township life. He is wearing his best 'Sunday clothes' and poses for instance on one of Cape Town's beaches. In contrast, the other represented participants in his digital story wear regular clothes such as school uniforms or jeans and T-shirt and are shown at school, in poorer housing or in neighbourhoods with unpaved streets. In his introduction he also does not state explicitly that he lives in Khayelitsha, instead he

says: "I live in South Africa, Cape Town." By introducing Cape Town as situated in South Africa, he may be implying his awareness of an unknown, possibly foreign audience. Notably, in this introduction he foregrounds his national identity, rather than his identity as a township resident.

Although this form of self-representation might exemplify once more the transgressive use of mobile media in order to communicate status, it can also show that Yanga attempted to distance himself from those aspects of Khayelitsha that could come across negatively for a much wider (international) audience than his intended peer audience. While in the first half of the digital story he discusses the negative sides of life in Khayelitsha, he prefers to make use of the voices of his peers to describe the status quo and uses his voice as a narrator. He shifts persona to represent himself as a youth from Khayelitsha when, halfway through the story, he begins discussing alternatives to crime. Then he states that 'crime is very wrong' and that he does not 'encourage people to do crime' because people who steal from hard-working people do wrong and they end up in jail. Even as he introduces his personal opinion, he still uses social language (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006).

Only Yanga's best friend Neo (m, 17) is also granted the privilege to talk directly into the camera and therefore to address the audience directly. Neo (m, 17) performs a freestyle hip-hop song, which within the context of apartheid South Africa had a special meaning in relation to youth voice: 'during South Africa's transition to democracy, [...] [the] use of hip-hop as a tool for raising the critical consciousness of their audiences played a significant role in ensuring that the country's disenfranchised youth found ways of accessing the public sphere' (Haupt, 2008, p. 184). And in post-apartheid South Africa, Haupt (2008) notes that hip-hop is 'a significant vehicle through which subjects are able to position themselves as citizens' (p. 183). Yanga makes use of this civic language of the subaltern counterpublics of South African Youth in order to push the core message of his video into the public discourse.

Neo (m, 17) is framed in the centre of the picture, and occasionally points directly to the camera, appearing to draw from the style of popular hip-hop music videos. The pointing and the direct gaze into the camera makes the hip-hop clip a clear demand picture and gives the represented participant an authoritative voice (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006), possibly depicting him as a role model (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). The materiality of the scene contradicts a potentially transgressive meaning since Neo (m, 17) is in his school-uniform and performs in the middle of the

workshop room at the NGO, which resembles a classroom. His performance comes across as slightly insecure or self-conscious, given the smile in his face. The lyrics however, communicate a powerful message. Neo (m, 17) tells the audience that they themselves need to make a choice and decide whether they want to join criminal gangs or to fight them. In this video, Yanga split up the hip-hop scene in three parts, each part having an independently powerful message followed by re-enacted scenes visualizing Neo's (m, 17) verbal message. After the first message about making a choice, Yanga shows how two young people (male and female) fight a third person that behaves aggressively towards them. In part two, the hip-hop song states that no one can be trusted on the streets of Khayelitsha because everyone could be a criminal, with its corresponding clip showing the aggressive young men from the first clip suddenly attacking the other young people. The final part of the song speaks about how it is painful to live in a place in which there are 'people trying to kill me for no reason', followed by a scene where a young man is brutally attacked by older boys in order to steal his mobile phone.

The three re-enacted scenes cut in between the three hip-hop messages tell two different storylines and are very important to the overall message, given the way they are spliced throughout the digital story. In one scene, a young boy is robbed of his mobile phone, and then returns with his friends and fights back. In the other, a young man manhandles another male youth, while a young woman tries to protect the victim who was robbed in the first scene. Yanga split up these two scenes into small sub-scenes, telling the two stories chronologically and stretching the interrupted and slightly disjointed narrative throughout the digital story. The style of these scenes is reminiscent of the genre of 'amateur footage' or citizen journalism, such as 'eyewitness footage from cell phones, reporting of stories originally broken by citizens, it also resembles "citizen journalism" initiatives, where ordinary people publish their own video on the web, or even guest reporter slots in which citizens front and participate in packaging an item for a television or radio newscast' (Goode, 2009, p. 1288). The sense of disengagement of being an uninvolved bystander is given through the social relation between media producer/viewer and the represented participants. All the scenes are filmed from a public distance (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 124), which establishes an extremely distant or non-existent social relationship between the viewer and the represented participants. Furthermore, the pictures are all offer pictures, which further emphasize the sense of journalistic objectivity, conveying the feeling of watching the scenes without being involved in the action, or even noticed by the represented participants.

As elaborated above in more detail, Yanga aims throughout the digital story to communicate a professional identity. However, this identity keeps slipping, especially towards the end of the video. Yanga shows the final clip of the phone robbery scene and explains in a very emotional voice-over that he wishes all thugs would leave Khayelitsha and peace could come instead for all South Africans through unity. At this stage, Yanga's persona shifts dramatically from that of the objective and uninvolved journalist towards a person concerned with and intimately affected by the issues. When he shows the scene of one man attacking the other innocent two people who struggle not to fight back, his voice-over reveals his personal emotional plea to his audience: 'I am scared. I don't want to be killed. I am still too young. I have dreams and I want my dreams to become true'.

A title 'The end' indicates the end of the digital story and the end of the role-play. After the title, Yanga adds some bloopers as a surprise after the title in which Yanga and the represented participants fall back into their usual informal behaviour. The three bloopers are in the youth's native language and are not subtitled in English, putting the peer audience on a more intimate footing, one that is common between friends, through both the close personal distance suggested by the frame size (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006) and the use of isiXhosa. The pictures show first two interviewees laughing in the middle of a sentence so that Yanga had to stop filming, as well as another scene in which another person in the background takes over the interview, which Yanga does not seem to find amusing. The interviewee and the person behind the camera who asked the questions start making fun of Yanga. In the final shot all three are laughing.

In sum, Yanga's video invited many different voices into his digital story through reported speech, but also through the usage of different languages. The multivocal and heteroglot digital story included popular South African youth activism languages as well as the language of media professionals. In particular, the latter does not sit well with the core idea of digital storytelling, namely that the videos should be mainly free from the influence of media professionals (Watkins & Russo, 2009). By employing the language of objective journalism and multiple voices in combination with various other semiotic distancing measures discussed above, Yanga was able to distance himself from the negative depiction of his home in his video, while allowing others to talk about this side of Khayelitsha.

Whereas Yanga made use of multivocality and heteroglossia to appear formal and to distance himself from the represented as well as the local audiences from

Khayelitsha, Yola and Nothemba adopted a different strategy. They employed multivocality through parody as well as personal and intimate language (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006), which is what Bakhtin (1979/1986) termed double-voicedness, the carnivalesque space, where 'everything goes' and the speaker can push the boundaries by critiquing dominant (mainly adult) norms and morality more than usual without getting into trouble (Grace & Tobin, 2002). According to Fraser (1990), classifying certain topics as 'public' or 'private' is a strong mechanism to exclude certain voices and subjects from the public discourse. By using parody, Yola and Nothemba found a way to address topics, such as sex, that are of importance for youth but which are normally silenced by adults in public discourse in Khayelitsha, who classify such topics as 'private' and 'indecent'. The following section, then, explores how gossiping and sex-talk can turn into civic communication.

'Friendship' by Yola and Nothemba: Exploring intimacy and humour

The digital story by Yola and Nothemba begins with a title 'Friendship means everything' in semi-transparent typeface overlaying a scene showing four female friends walking down the street, loudly chatting and laughing with each other. The camera operator walks backwards and the four girls follow, not looking into the camera, but at one another. The typeface (Braggadocio) in a screaming green colour immediately introduces a playful tone, markedly different to that of Yanga's opening sequence. The friends laugh and jump around, which maintains the irreverent and light-hearted tone. The diegetic and non-diegetic sound is designed to maintain this tone, notably the laughter of the girls and Rihanna's song 'Te amo'. While the chorus sings about love, the verses are rather sad and were edited out by the video-makers so that only music sequences without lyrics and the chorus were included. Thus the digital storytellers appropriated the singer's voice to suit their intentions. Additionally, the popularity of Rihanna within the peer group could attract viewers to their digital story since Rihanna is seen as a role model for many of the participants and their friends, having grown up under similar socio-economic circumstances but through hard work becoming extremely successful (Itv1, 2012). In particular, Rihanna serves as an example of those who are able to overcome Bourdieu's negative conception of social capital given her previous marginalized voice, much like what many of the participants also desire.

Alongside non-diegetic sound, diegetic sound plays a significant role in Yola and Nothemba's video when addressing several audiences. As in Yanga's digital story, Yola and Nothemba also gave several of their peers a stage to voice their ideas about friendship, albeit in a more relaxed setting. The two video-makers appeared themselves in the beginning of the video, discussing about their ideas about perfect friendship. Because the video has such a strong stylistic resemblance to an amateur YouTube production rather than a citizen journalism report, the *Vox Pops* and the introduction of the two video-makers appear less 'formal' than in Yanga's piece. This informality can be attributed to the fact that all the peers in this digital story are filmed at a close personal distance, which implies close friendship and suggests that the audience should identify with the opinion of the represented participant (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). Furthermore all of the peers address the camera directly, and talk intimately straight into the camera, placing the audience in the role of a close friend being entrusted. Only one adult is depicted and is shot at far social distance, making an obvious visual contrast between the close-ups of peers and the distancing of adults. While all the young people speak in personal or even intimate language, a 'kind of personal language, spoken perhaps only by the members of [...] a group of school friends (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 129), the adult takes on an authoritative voice and language, which makes him resemble a teacher lecturing a class. In contrast, the peers come across as friends inviting the viewer for a chat.

Yola and Nothemba introduce themselves in two separate clips sitting looking relaxed on a couch in front of a plain white wall. They smile into the camera when talking about their ideas about friendship. These two clips in no way evoke the feeling of listening to news reporters or other TV hosts, even though the picture is framed in a breast pocket shot size, which is usually the kind of shot distance used when presenting experts on television (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). Moreover, the materiality and the set up of the picture possess an amateur look and feel. When the two implied authors discuss what friendship means to them, their first names fade in on the sides of the pictures, repeating the informal font and green colour of the title. The style is strongly reminiscent of an amateur video edited with Windows Moviemaker.

When watching the digital story 'Friendship', the multivocality (with the exception of the adult represented participant) and the home video styling of the media creation suggests a feeling of being allowed into a circle of friends as well as a playful and light-hearted introduction to their social norms concerning friendship. Similarly,

through a framing that implies a close personal relationship using an eye-level shot, the viewer feels included, perhaps assuming the role of a third girlfriend in the 'girl talk', or as the title states: 'Friendship is laughing together'. One of the interviews included, however, also shows that too much intimacy and informality can easily lead to the exclusion of many viewers, because it becomes difficult to follow the conversation between the two interviewees: Two female friends were interviewed together in one frame, taking turns talking, debating about whether friendship is not only about serious talks, but also about just having fun with each other, yet they start making less and less sense as they increasingly shift into discourse that relies heavily on the two interviewees closely knowing each other. To a viewer who does not share the same close circle of friends, the language became too intimate, which limits the possible attentive audience to a very small group of people.

Yola and Nothemba mostly make use of a mix of personal and social language (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). Furthermore, they speak in their mother tongue isiXhosa. Although Nothemba started her introduction in English, half way through she switched to isiXhosa. It is striking that the two are much more fluent when speaking in their first language, even though the majority of the young people in this digital story chose to speak in English. This is once more an indicator for audience awareness, this time not of the video-makers but of the represented participants. They made use of the public display of these digital stories to communicate their cultural capital, namely being able to express oneself in a foreign language. This point was highlighted through a scene in one of the participants' raw footage, where the interviewees refused to speak in isiXhosa even though the video maker asked them several times to switch to isiXhosa because the interviewees had a difficult time of expressing themselves fully in English. A similar phenomenon could be observed in 'Friendship', where some of the represented participants found it more important to show off exclusive knowledge to their community rather than using the intended audiences' mother tongue in order to express themselves fully.

In particular, the sequence 'Friendship is being there for each other' allows us to better understand how the two video-makers made use of multivocality and double-voicedness in scenes that resemble short scenes cut out of a theatre play. They are filmed in one steady shot, with no camera movement and no cuts. The 'Friendship is being there for each other' scene shows two male friends discussing sex, and in particular, whether and how they should use a condom and what to do if the girl becomes pregnant:

Figure 2: Transcript 'You must feel the juice'

Male, right: 'It is important that we use condoms.'

Male, left: 'No, it is not important.'

Male, right: 'Why is it not important?'

Male, left: 'Skin to skin. You must feel the juice.'

Male, right: 'No, if you don't use a condom you get diseases. Or the girl you are having sex with is getting pregnant when she is still young.'

Male, left: 'Well, they can use their injection.'

Male, right: 'You are not thinking about that in that moment.'

Male, left: 'There is no problem. There is abortion.'

Male, right: 'Abortion is wrong.'

Male, left: 'Why?'

Male, right: 'It is not right to kill the child, it has also a right to live.'

Male, left: 'Well, then we just raise the child.'

Male, right: 'What do you want to raise it with?'

Male, left: 'With the grant money.'

The two young men are framed in a medium shot, which suggests a close personal distance between the represented participants and the viewer. Furthermore, the scene was shot at eye level with the represented participants indicating an equal power relationship between the audience and the two young men. And the frontal shot conveys an 'involving' perspective (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006), in which the viewer is invited to identify him or herself with them. Like the girl talk scene, the frame is set up in a way that suggests that the viewer is the third 'friend' in the scene. As an offer picture, the scene allows the viewer to silently observe the two represented participants discussing in front of him or her. However, during the first two sentences the represented participants sometimes look directly into the camera, as if to have confirmation from the person behind the camera that they were doing the right thing and it was okay to speak about this topic. These bashful smiles directly into the camera disrupt the feeling of an equal relationship between the represented participants and the viewer established through the angle of the shot. It appears as though the participants do not feel confident about talking openly in front of the viewer because they could be judged on what they were about to say. This indicates an awareness that they are about to engage in a conversation they would usually not have in front of an adult, while also knowing that the video may be seen by an adult audience. Similarly, the materiality (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006) of the frame does

not necessarily show that the participants are alone in the room having an intimate conversation. The viewer can only see a yellow wall behind the two represented participants and the part of a closed blue door on the right side of the picture. The closed door might indicate that they are in a contained room, but it does not say anything about whether they are alone or not. The semiotic mode of sound, however, strengthens the perception of them being by themselves: The room 'sounds' like it is empty and hollow with the boys' voices echoing, and there are no other audible sounds other than the ones produced by the two represented participants during the scene.

The social meanings (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2006) communicated through the two characters are promiscuity and ignorance versus morality and maturity. The male on the left hand side (hereafter: Male, left) reflects a rather careless attitude, while the male on the right hand side (hereafter: Male, right) provides a more mature or responsible clarifying voice. Male, right makes use of several authoritative voices of their caretakers, teachers or pastors in order to make his point, such 'it is important to use condoms' or 'Abortion is wrong'. While he repeats these adult messages in a serious tone of voice, the Male, left answers with uninformed comments of young people, which he parodically exaggerates with slang or explicit language. When watching the video, the group of digital storytellers found his part hilarious, especially the reference to the 'grant money'. They stated that when watching this video during a group feedback session that only 'stupid people' think that the small financial support from the government for parents would be a justification for not using contraceptives.

This scene is particularly important in that it reveals the intended audience of the digital story and the different kinds of voice available to male and female teens. Both video-makers told me several times that they could never talk in public about these kind of topics, and particularly not with their parents. Yola (f, 17) explicitly mentioned several times that her mother was very strict and did not even allow her to mention the word boyfriend at home. With this background knowledge it was particularly surprising to see a scene in their video that used such explicit and graphic language. This scene exemplifies how multi-modality and double-voicedness can help youths gain voice in an adult-dominated environment.

At the same time, we should also explore the fact that this scene only includes the perspectives of male participants, particularly on gender-specific experiences such as the feeling of sex with a condom and not the female experience of pregnancy or

abortion. On the one hand, the silence of the two digital storytellers on the topic might suggest that the story is not the 'own voice' of the two female video-makers but rather shows how a peer voices can help to perpetuate dominant patriarchal discourse, especially since the scene ends with the grant money comment, without a final comment from the male arguing against the ignorance of such a statement. On the other hand, the inclusion of the young man's suggestions about using grant money to support a child and his glib suggestion that the problem of an unwanted pregnancy can simply be solved through abortion may also be an (unspoken) critique by the female video-makers of the lack of empathy and short-sighted selfishness of the masculine perspectives introduced or parodied in this sequence.

This scene in particular exemplifies how multi-modality and double-voicedness can help youths touch upon sensitive topics in public without running the risk of punishment for not complying with adult norms, namely not talking openly about sexuality and particularly not using explicit language. This sequence confirms Grace and Tobin's (2002) findings of 'students pushing the boundaries and transgressing the norms of everyday life in school' (p. 196) through the production of parodic videos. It is of course not out of the ordinary that youth are 'fascinated with things that adults consider to be rude, uncouth, or gross' (Grace and Tobin, 2002, p. 196), but usually they express their fascination within an intimate circle and not in public. The findings in the multimodal analysis of the analysed sequence in Yola and Nothemba's digital story exemplifies Grace and Tobin's (2002) argument that 'video production opens up a space where students can play with the boundaries of language and ideology and enjoy transgressive collective pleasures' (p. 196).

This scene became especially interesting because prior to the production phase of the digital stories, the participants started opening up about the topics they wanted to really talk about with their peers through their digital stories in individual sessions. But the problem was that these teenage topics, such as 'the first time' 'the first kiss' or 'love sickness', were not approved of by their caretakers. As Fraser (1990) notes, certain topics are labelled 'private' by those in positions of authority in order to silence young people particularly in the public discourse. In the case of the video 'Friendship', the two young video-makers managed to talk in public about 'private' topics, even with their caretakers as a possible audience. And multi-vocal and double-voiced speech even allowed them to talk about these topics in the language of their peer group, which according to Fraser (1990) is paramount when deliberating in a subaltern counterpublic.

Conclusion

Yanga's digital story used a genre commonly associated with citizen journalism and gave his peers a platform to voice their opinions on the topic of crime. Analysis of the video suggests that he subordinated his peers' voices to his own voice, with the exception of one friend, who provides a counter argument to Yanga's main argument within the digital story. Further analysis shows, however, that Yanga does not engage with this counter argument in a dialogue. Instead, Yanga appears to have used his peer's voice to show that there are also other sides to the topic, but he does not articulate this directly, perhaps in order to avoid weakening his own argument. Similarly, he made use of a local music genre, which has transgressive connotations and which stands for both pride in township culture and also the tensions, dangers, threat, excitement and perhaps masculine appeal of gangsterism. In contrast, Yola's and Nothemba's video is particularly interesting in that they use multivocality and double-voiced speech in order to address sensitive topics in both their own and their peer audience's voices while treading carefully in order to engage indirectly with the gender differences associated with sexuality in township youth culture, and to avoid being punished by the strict adult audience in Khayelitsha.

Thus rather than a simple process of accessing an authentic communal voice, the young digital storytellers tried various strategies to integrate the voices of others within their digital stories. These strategies gave the video-makers more space and possibilities to voice their concerns and target their intended audience than if they had only used a kind of univocal public voice advocated by Habermas (1962/1995). Analysis of their stories suggests that the choice of genre and language strongly influenced the perceived addressivity of the video. This ties in with Fraser's (1990) claim that it is of paramount importance for counterpublics to be able to use their accustomed idiom and style in their deliberations.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

In this case study, twenty young South Africans from Khayelitsha, Cape Town, South Africa were offered the opportunity to participate in a Digital Storytelling workshop using mobile phones as Digital Storytelling production units and peripheral social networks as distribution channels. The aim of this study was to gain insight into existing mobile media production and distribution practices and how these can be used for youth to express their marginalized voices in the public discourse through Digital Storytelling (Lambert, 2009). Thus the main research question for this study was the following:

How will young participants in a Digital Storytelling workshop in Khayelitsha, South Africa, appropriate existing mobile media production resources, practices and distribution networks to voice their concerns and ideas in public forums?

In order to answer the main research question, the following sub-questions were formulated:

- What are the meanings and roles of existing mobile media production practices in young people's lives?
- How do young people use the affordances of their phones and visual mobile media to make their voices heard through Digital Storytelling?
- In what ways do young people make use of the different semiotic modes of mobile videos in order to communicate their concerns and ideas to their imagined audiences?

In this final chapter, the subquestions and main research question shall be answered based on the findings of this research. Additionally, suggestions for future research are proposed in order to expand research in this important field of youth engagement through mobile media.

What are the meanings and roles of existing mobile media production practices in young people's lives?

Over a period of six months the project unveiled a world where access to digital communicative resources and online networks in particular are scarce, and where

mobile media production, display and sharing practices are distinctive and the visual speech acts are dialogic (Bakhtin, 1981) in nature. The findings of the first phase of this study showed that youths in Khayelitsha were heavily involved in mobile phone photography and mobile media distribution within their peripheral social networks. It showed that the participants have significant experience with mobile media production, which, in spite of adult monitoring, was robust. Two different local distribution channels useful for Digital Storytelling could be detected. Firstly, distribution through the mobile media exchange network via Bluetooth and through the participants' appropriation of their phones into 'mobile phone profiles'. Secondly, youths appropriate their mobile phones to create 'mobile phone profiles' similar to youth on online social network sites (Marwick & boyd, 2010). Through the careful selection and strategic display of mobile media they communicate status, identities and cultural capital. Mobile media profiles had to please at least two commonly distinct audiences. For the intended audience, their peers, they created and maintained a 'cool' image of themselves, while the strict norms of their caretakers, who constituted the 'nightmare' audience, necessitated the creation of a mirror image in conformity with adult norms (Marwick & boyd, 2010).

Furthermore, it was found that the participants and their peers were engaging in conspicuous consumption (Veblen, 1899/1994), using the economic value of their phones in order to communicate status to their peers and to gain social capital (Bourdieu, 1986) and voice in their peer group. And they also negotiated the social value of mobile media within their peer group, and treated them as 'symbolic value commodities' (Martin, 2008). These commodities also helped 'youths without phones' in social status negotiation and voice within their peer group through the display of conspicuous goods and cultural capital. These on-going complex processes of impression management, conspicuous consumption and taste statements were found to have a strong impact on the content of mobile media produced, displayed and distributed.

After phase one of the research, I expected the local social networks to be a good alternative to online distribution of digital stories. Similarly, I anticipated that the participants would make use of their enhanced social capital received through the project's Nokia feature phones in order to draw their peers' attention to the goals and aims of the Digital Storytelling workshop and to kick off wider civic communication through their digital stories. And finally, I trusted that the digital stories introduced into the ongoing impression management processes would be like other mobile media,

that is, shaped in a collaborative process with the intended audience, their peers, and not merely with the audience within the contained environment of the Digital Storytelling workshop.

How do young people use the affordances of their phones and visual mobile media to make their voices heard through Digital Storytelling?

Despite the predicted results formulated at the end of the first phase of the research, outcomes during phase two of this research differed markedly from the predicted outcomes. Results showed that while a Digital Storytelling workshop introduces new elements into the on-going visual communication processes, such as a new meaning of media creations, new audiences with new needs, new 'spheres' with 'new speech genres' and a new youth-adult relationship in media production, the participants and their audiences were overwhelmed by these new elements intruding in their on-going processes on their 'mobile phone profiles' and found different ways of dealing with them.

Digital Storytelling lives from critically engaging with dominant voices in the public discourse and making use of one's public voice by openly engaging in dialogue with them based on one's own opinions, both during the workshop environment and later in digital form. This research showed that this was not an easy task for the participants. Firstly, they had to get used to an adult, typically a nightmare reader, deliberately interfering in their 'cool' image profiles from their mobile media production. Secondly they were new to the expectations of a collaborative youth-adult relationship. The participants had a particularly difficult time critically engaging with topics of their concern; most of the time they politely repeated the dominant voices in the public discourse, which is expected from them in the adult-centred environment of Khayelitsha.

Analysis showed that at the beginning of phase two of this research, outside the workshop participants swiftly integrated the projects' fancy feature phones as well as the raw material and first rough cuts produced for their digital stories into familiar processes. They engaged in conspicuous consumption by showing off the Ikamva phones to their peers and began appropriating the video clips into objectified cultural capital in order to communicate status to their peers through their newly gained exclusive 'videolising' and video editing knowledge. But instead of using the accumulated social capital for introducing Digital Storytelling to their peers and prompting civic communication, the participants were busy enjoying their new social

standing and put much energy into maintaining their social capital by showing off further 'videolising' tricks acquired as phase two progressed. This demonstrates that self-interest and consumer culture can interfere with the process of Digital Storytelling. Nevertheless, this was not an outright rejection of the main goal of the Digital Storytelling workshop, but it shows that these youth prioritised technological knowledge over civic engagement.

While proudly showing off the unfinished digital stories in the beginning of the project, the participants reported that towards the end of the project they felt increasingly uncomfortable showing their (almost) final digital stories to their peers outside the workshop in particular. It was proposed that this was a result of the unfamiliarity of the participants and their peers with the production of mobile media content specifically for entering the civic discourse. In contrast to the anticipated outcome, namely, that their peers would play a role in shaping the content of the digital stories within the mobile phone impression management process, the participants' peer audience classified the new content as 'boring' and mainly concentrated on giving feedback only on the aspect with which they were familiar: technology.

The participants worked around this lack of interest in the content of the intended audience by creating a parallel impression management process together with the fellow participants and the workshop leader especially for Digital Storytelling. In the isolated environment of the workshop new 'markers of cool' (Marwick and boyd, 2010) for mobile video were negotiated, whereby most of the participants mainly concentrated on the workshop audience, seemingly overlooking the needs of the intended peer audience outside the workshop. Only at the very end of the project did participants realize this confusion and thus treated the final versions of their digital stories cautiously when asked to insert them into their 'mobile phone profile': They preferred to keep their digital stories private in case of disapproval from peers outside the workshop, which could have a negative impact on their carefully constructed image via their 'mobile phone profiles'. While on the one hand videos could be used to distinguish oneself from others by showing off the latest technology and production skills, on the other hand the participants preferred to keep their videos private and off their 'mobile media profiles' because of the often transgressive use of videos and difficulties of achieving and controlling the desired self-representation in this semiotic mode.

This situation exemplifies the strong impact audiences have on media production and therefore confirms Burgess's (2006) findings that the sociality of the workshop

environment might lead to uniform and predictable digital stories. It shows that a public visual voice might be less 'authentic' and 'personal', but should be more seen as a relational or dialogic construct, negotiated and co-constructed with its audiences. In general this research indicated that within the Digital Storytelling workshop environment the participants can learn the basics about using their public visual voices for civic communication. But for the negotiating which kind of self-expression and representation the final audience accepts in order to being heard, participants need constructive feedback not only from the workshop audience but also from the final audience.

Another positive effect of introducing concepts of audience awareness in Digital Storytelling was identified in this study: In a peripheral communication network it can be life-saving to anticipate the reaction of potentially hostile audiences when producing digital stories that constitute counter-discourses within the local environment. It showed that the safe and contained environment of a Digital Storytelling workshop can easily give marginalised voices a false hope that they are able to freely engage in the public discourse since participation in the workshop does not necessarily guarantee that the people outside the workshop are ready for a strong youth voice. Therefore, this study highlights the importance of integrating Bakhtin's concept of addressivity and the idea of audience reaction, strongly into the curriculum of Digital Storytelling workshops in order to avoid disappointment of participants when they are forced to be silenced because of safety concerns within the process of exploring their public voice for the first time.

In what ways do young people make use of the different semiotic modes of mobile videos in order to communicate their concerns and ideas to their imagined audiences?

The multimodal analysis of the two most salient digital stories during this project: 'crime' by Yanga (m, 15) and 'friendship' by Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) highlighted the complexity of the process of turning one's private voice into a public one when facing such a complicated mix of audiences. It showed that participants employed a number of strategies to incorporate different voices and languages into their 'own' digital stories, which helped them to gain more space for self-expression in an adult dominated public sphere, such as Khayelitsha. Multi-vocal, heteroglot and double-voiced digital stories created a playground for the participants where they could experiment with 'private' topics in 'inappropriate' ways in public, without being held accountable by adults for the content of the mobile media, who generally raid

the phones of the participants in order to find (and have participants delete) inappropriate content. Furthermore, it demonstrated that participants not only made use of their videos for self-expression, but also that they incorporated views by their peers in the digital stories. Aware that their peers in the local network were the intended audience of the digital stories, the represented participants made use of certain knowledge and showed off their cultural capital by insisting on speaking in English instead of in their mother tongue, isiXhosa. Furthermore, it became clear that the genre and language chosen for the two videos had a strong influence on the perceived addressivity of the digital stories.

How will young participants in a Digital Storytelling workshop in Khayelitsha, South Africa, appropriate existing mobile media production resources, practices and distribution networks to voice their concerns and ideas in public forums?

In sum, especially in low-income areas where mobile phones are available to youths, Digital Storytelling with existing resources and within local distribution networks can be a strong tool to help marginalised youths gain sustainable experience in adopting public voices. However, it also shows that the conversion of private voices into public ones is not a straightforward process for youth when the opportunity to do so is offered to them, and that this process does not take place automatically. Instead it is very important for the initiator of Digital Storytelling projects to first carefully study the local meaning of technology in order to determine the extent to which mobile phones are not only a technological device for calling, texting and producing mobile media for youths, but also a tool for conspicuous consumption, impression management and the communication of cultural capital in order to gain status and voice within their group. The findings in this research suggest that a public voice is not something monolithic and pre-existing, but that instead it is found or constructed as a result of being heard or having something to say, and that, in a strongly visual society, to some extent it is also dependent on how the speaker is 'seen' or perceived by an audience. The participants' struggles to communicate their concerns to an audience of peers suggests that this sense of being heard or being noticed is developed through interaction with others, through the recognition of genres, languages and discourses, and that these processes are always situated in specific contexts of communication.

Suggestions for future research

One single Master's research project is very restricted in what it can accomplish in the limited amount of time given. Therefore in my final section of this thesis I would like to set out new interesting research questions, which emerged from this study in order to encourage further research into the issues raised in this thesis.

For instance a follow up study on the participants of this research in their twenties could offer interesting insight whether the project motivated them to become more involved in local and national public discourses about politics and society. Furthermore, it could be insightful to obtain a similar study but in a different part of the developing world to target the specific audiences there, or to conduct a comparative study between a developing country and a developed country (such as Europe, the U.S., etc.) to compare how young people in disparate environments use mobile media production to engage multiple voices and multiple audiences. And finally, a study that integrates Bakhtinian notions about discourse, multivocality, and audience in the curriculum of a Digital Storytelling workshop in order to see whether the digital stories become less 'uniform' (Burgess, 2006) and more diverse and whether the participants engage with audiences and mobile media production in more diverse ways.

Works cited

ANC Youth League. (2011). Retrieved June 12, 2012, from ANC Youth League:
<http://www.ancyl.org.za/>

Andolina, M. W., Jenkins, K., Keeter, S., & Zukin, C. (2002). Searching for the Meaning of Youth Civic Engagement: Notes from the Field. *Journal of Applied Developmental Science*, 6 (4), 189-195.

Atkinson, P. & Hammersley, M. (1994). Ethnography and participant observation. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 248 – 261). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Baker, B. (1999). What Is Voice? Issues of Identity and Representation in the Framing of Reviews. *Review of Educational Research*, 69 (4), 365-383.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1979/1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Eds. C. Emerson, & M. Holquist. Trans. V. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Ed. M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Ball-Rockeach, S. J., Kim, Y.-C., & Matei, S. (2001). Storytelling Neighborhood Paths to Belonging in Diverse Urban Environments. *Communication Research*, 28 (4), 392-428.

Bennett, W. L. (2003). *Civic Learning in Changing Democracies* (No. 4). (Working Paper). Retrieved May 23, 2011: from
http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCYQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdepts.washington.edu%2Fccce%2Fassets%2Fdocuments%2Fbennet_civic_learning_in_changing_democracies.pdf&ei=FYpCUL21B4fA0QWGzIGoDw&usg=AFQjCNH5oQC2wkK8AGw-dDUcDh55L6nlwA

Blight, G., Pulham, S., & Torpey, P. (2012, January 05). Arab spring: an interactive timeline of Middle East protests. *The Guardian*. Retrieved July 07, 2012, from
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/interactive/2011/mar/22/middle-east-protest-interactive-timeline>

Blommaert, J. (2008). *Grassroot Literacy: Writing, Identity and Voice in Central Africa*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Blunden, A. (2004). Bourdieu on Status, Class and Culture. Retrieved June 06, 2012, from <http://home.mira.net/~andy/works/bourdieu-review.htm>

Bordwell, D., & Thompson, K. (2008). *Film Art: An Introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York, Greenwood Press.

boyd, d. (2007). Why Youth (Heart) Social Network Sites: The Role of Networked Publics in Teenage Social Life. In D. Buckingham (Ed.), *MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Learning: Youth, Identity, and Digital Media* (pp. 1-26). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bray, R., Gooskens, I., Kahn, L., Moses, S., & Seekings, J. (2010). *Growing up in the new South Africa Childhood and Adolescence in Post-Apartheid Cape Town*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buckingham, D. (1998). Media education in the UK: moving beyond protectionism. *Journal of Communication*, 48 (1), 33–43.

Buckingham, D. (2003). *media education: literacy, learning and contemporary culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Burgess, J. (2006). Hearing Ordinary Voices: Cultural Studies, Vernacular Creativity and Digital Storytelling. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Culture*, 20 (2), 201-212.

Burgess, J., & Klaebe, H. (2009). Digital Storytelling as Participatory Public History in Australia. In J. Hartley, & K. McWilliam (Eds.), *Story Circle: Digital Storytelling Around the World* (pp. 155-165). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Burgess, J., Foth, M., & Klaebe, H. (2006). Everyday Creativity as Civic Engagement: A Cultural Citizenship View of New Media. *Proceedings Communications Policy & Research Forum*. Sydney.

Burn, A. (2003). 'Two Tongues Occupy My Mouth': Poetry, Performance and the Moving Image. *English in Education*, 37 (3), 42-51.

- Burn, A. (2007). The place of digital video in the curriculum. In R. Andrews, & C. Haythornthwaite (Eds.), *Sage handbook of e-learning research* (pp. 504-523). London: Sage.
- Burrell, J. (2010). Evaluating Shared Access: Social equality and the circulation of mobile phones in rural Uganda. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 15, 230-250.
- Carson, T. (1990). What Kind of Knowing is Critical Action Research?. In D. H. Tripp (Ed.), *Theory Into Practice* (pp. 167-173).
- Chalfen, R. (1987). *Snapshot versions of life*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.
- Chan, C. (2006). Youth Voice? Whose Voice? Young People and Youth Media Practice in Hong Kong. *McGill Journal of Education*, 41 (3), 215-225.
- Chandler, D. (2007). Cinema and Movies. Retrieved January 18, 2012 from <http://allal-cinemagoer.blogspot.nl/2007/09/mise-en-scene-and-grammer-in-cinema.html>
- Charmaraman, L. (2010). The Importance of Audience and Agency for Representation: A Case Study of an Urban Youth Media Community. In H. B. Johnson (Ed.), *Children and Youth Speak for Themselves* (pp. 205 - 231). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Cherry, J., Jones, K., & Seekings, J. (2000). Democratization and Politics in South African Townships. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24 (4), 889-905.
- Convention on the Rights of the Child Part 1, Article 13. (1988). Retrieved March 23, 2011, from www2.ohchr.org/english/law/crc.htm
- Couldry, N. (2008). Digital storytelling, media research and democracy: conceptual choices and alternative futures. In K. Lundby (Ed.), *Digital Storytelling, Mediatized Stories* (pp. 41-60). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Cronje, F. (2010). *Border crossings: How students negotiate cultural borders during digital video production*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Cape Town, Cape Town.

- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Rochberg-Halton, E. (1981). *The meaning of things: Domestic symbols and the self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daniel, J., Southall, R., & Lutchman, J. (2004). *State of the Nation: South Africa 2004 - 2005*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Desai, A. (2002). *We Are the Poors: Community Struggles in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Duff, P. A. (2006). Beyond generalizability. In M. Chalhoub-Deville, C. A. Chapelle, & P. Duff (Eds.), *Inference and Generalizability in Applied Linguistics: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 65-97). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Emmett, T. (2000). Beyond community participation? Alternative routes to civil engagement and development in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 17 (4), 501-518.
- Emmett, T. (2004). South African Youth and Civic Engagement. *Youth Development Journal*, 32-41.
- Emmison, M., & Frow, J. (1998). Information technology as cultural capital. *Australian Universities' Review*, 41 (1), 41-45.
- enewschannel. (2012, May 24). *3rd Degree / Izikhotane - Part 1* [Video File]. Retrieved July 08, 2012, from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IWecV_Ecfl4&feature=related
- Fair Share. Responses of the city of Cape Town to HIV/AIDS. (2005). Retrieved July, 21, 2011, from: http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.fairshare.uwc.ac.za%2Fresearch%2FCCT%2520RESPONSES%2520HIV_AIDS%2520IN%2520KHAYELITSHA_final.pdf%2Fat_download%2Ffile&ei=mphCUNDTGaHN0QW4woGIBw&usg=AFQjCNFKIu5mHMn8Mgbo9eXPfllEH4vTzg
- Fihlani, P. (2011, June 30). South Africa's lesbians fear 'corrective rape'. *BBC News Africa*. Retrieved July 13, 2012, from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-13908662>

Fleetwood, N. R. (2005). Authenticating practices: Producing realness, performing youth. In S. Maira, & E. Soep (Eds.), *Youthscapes: The popular, the national, the global* (pp. 155-172). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fletcher, A. (2008). The FreeChild Project. Retrieved July 12, 2012, from <http://www.freechild.org/youthvoice.htm>

Fourie, P. J. (2007). Mass Communication Theory. In P. J. Fourie (Ed.), *Media Studies: Volume 1 Institutions, Theories and Issues* (pp. 210-261). Landsdowne: Juta Education.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actual Existing Democracy. *Social Text*, 25 (26), 56-80.

Gall, M., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction (7th ed.)*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Gauntlett, D. (2001). *Making is Connecting: The social meaning of creativity, from DIY and knitting to YouTube and Web 2.0*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gibson, L. J., & Gouws, A. (2003). *Overcoming Intolerance in South Africa: Experiments in Democratic Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ginwright, S., & James, T. (2002). From assets to agents of change: Social justice, organizing, and youth development. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 96, 27–46.

Goffman, E. (1956). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.

Goode, L. (2009). Social news, citizen journalism and democracy. *New Media & Society*, 11 (8), 1287-1305.

Goodman, S. (2003). *Teaching Youth Media: A critical guide to literacy, video production and social change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Grace, D. J., & Tobin, J. (2002). Pleasure, creativity, and the carnivalesque in children's video production. In L. Bresler, & C. M. Thompson (Eds.), *The Arts of Children's Lives: Context, Culture and Curriculum* (pp. 195-214). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Habermas, J. (1962/1995). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Hartley, J. (2007). The Problems of Expertise and Scalability in Self-Made Media: Lessons from Digital Storytelling in Australia. *Proceedings 57th Annual International Communication Association (ICA) Conference*. San Francisco, USA.
- Hartley, J. (2009). *The Uses of Digital Literacy. Creative Economy + Innovation Culture*. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.
- Hartley, J. (2009). TV Stories: From Representation to Productivity. In J. Hartley, & K. McWilliam (Eds.), *Story Circle: Digital Storytelling Movement Around the World* (pp. 16-36). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hartley, J., & Green, J. (2006). The public sphere on the beach. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 341-362.
- Hartley, J., & McWilliam, K. (2009). Computational Power Meets Human Contact. In J. Hartley, & K. McWilliam (Eds.), *Digital Storytelling Around the World* (pp. 3-15). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Haupt, A. (2008). *Stealing Empire: P2P, intellectual property and hip-hop subversion*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Hull, G. A., & Katz, M.-L. (2006). Crafting an Agentive Self: Case Studies of Digital Storytelling. *Research in the teaching of English*, 41 (1), 43-81.
- Hull, G. A., & Nelson, M. E. (2005). Locating the Semiotic Power of Multimodality. *Written Communication*, 22 (2), 1-38.
- Hull, G., Stornaiuolo, A., & Sahni, U. (2010). Cultural citizenship and cosmopolitan practice: Global youth communicate online. *English Education*, 42 (4), 331-367.
- Ikamva Youth. (2010). Media, Image and Expression. Retrieved November, 03, 2012 from: <http://ikamvayouth.org/programmes/media-image-and-expression>
- Ito, M., & Okabe, D. (2005). Technosocial Situations: Emergent Structurings of Mobile Email Use. In M. Ito, D. Okabe, & M. Matsuda (Eds.), *Personal, Portable, Pedestrian: Mobile Phones in Japanese Life* (pp. 257-277). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Ito, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., boyd, d., Cody, R., Herr-Stephenson, B., Horst H. A., Lange, P. G., Mahendran, D., Martinez, K., Pascoe, C.J., Perkel, D., Robinson, L., Sims, C., Tripp, L. (2010). *Hanging Out, Messing Around, and Geeking Out*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Itv1. (2012). Rihanna Interview with Kate Garraway [Video File]. Retrieved June 13, 2012 from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TL7HroVAOtl&playnext=1&list=PLEB832CF72E7CD119&feature=results_main

James, A., & Prout, A. (1997). *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood*. London: Falmer Press.

Jewitt, C. (2011). Different approaches to multimodality. In C. Jewitt (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis* (pp. 28-39). London: Routledge.

Kim, Y.-C., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2006). Civic Engagement From a Communication Infrastructure Perspective. *Communication Theory*, 16, 173-197.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal Discourse. The Modes and Media of contemporary communication*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading Images - The Grammar of Visual Design*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Kreutzer, T. (2009). Generation mobile: online and digital media usage on mobile phones among low-income urban youth in South Africa. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology*, 5 (5), 43-57.

Lambert, J. (2009). *Digital Storytelling: Capturing Lives, Creating Community*. Berkeley: Digital Diner Press.

Lenhart, A., Ling, R., Campbell, S., & Purcell, K. (2010). *Teens and Mobile Phones. Text messaging explodes as teens embrace it as the centerpiece of their communication strategies with friends*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.

Levine, P. (2008). A Public Voice for Youth: The Audience Problem in Digital Media and Civic Education. In W. Bennett (Ed.), *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth* (pp. 119-138). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Liu, H. (2008). Social Network profiles as Taste Performances. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 151-175.

Luttrell, W. (2010). 'A camera is a big responsibility': a lens for analysing children's visual voices. *Visual Studies*, 25 (3), 224-237.

Martin, J. (2008). Consuming Code: Use-Value, Exchange Value, and the Role of Virtual Goods in Second Life. *Journal of Virtual Worlds Research*, 1-21.

Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d. (2010). I Tweet Honestly, I Tweet Passionately: Twitter Users, Context Collapse, and the Imagined Audience. *New Media & Society*, 1-20.

McGuigan, J. (2007). The cultural public sphere. In P. Lang (Ed.), *Spheres of Influence: Intellectual and Cultural Publics From Shakespeare to Habermas* (pp. 252-264). Bern: European Academic Publishers.

Mendelson, A. L., & Papacharissi, Z. (2011). Look at us: Collective Narcissism in College Student Facebook Photo Galleries. In Z. Papacharissi (Ed.), *The Networked Self: Identity, Community and Culture on Social Network Sites* (pp. 251-274). New York: Routledge.

Mendoza, C., Renard, R., & Goodman, S. (2008). Drop it to the Youth: Community-Based Youth Video as a Tool for Building Democratic Dialogue in South Africa. In N. Pecora, E. Osei-Hwere, & U. Carlsson (Eds.), *African media, African children* (pp. 149-163). Goeteborg: Nordicom.

Morse, J. M., & Richards, L. (2002). *Readme First for a User's Guide to Qualitative Methods*. London: Sage.

Nelson, M. E., & Hull, G. A. (2008). Self-presentation through multimedia: A Bakhtinian perspective on digital storytelling. In K. Lundby (Ed.), *Digital Storytelling, Mediatized Stories: Self-representations in New Media* (pp. 41-60). New York: Peter Lang.

Ngomane, T., & Flanagan, C. (2003). The Road to Democracy in South Africa. *Peace Review*, 15 (3), 267-271.

Nielsen, G. M. (2002). *The Norms of Answerability: Social Theory between Bakhtin and Habermas*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Posel, D. (2010). Races to consume: revisiting South Africa's history of race, consumption and the struggle for freedom. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33 (2), 157-175.
- Putnam, R. (2001). Social Capital: Measurement and Consequences. *ISUMA-Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 2 (1), 41-51.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.
- 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), 267-279.
- Rheingold, H. (2008). Using Participatory Media and Public Voice to Encourage Civic Engagement. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.), *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth* (pp. 97-118). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Richins, M. L. (1994). Valuing Things: The Public and Private Meanings of Possessions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (3), 504-521.
- Rogers, S. (2011, December 18). Occupy protests mapped around the world. *The Guardian*. Retrieved July 07, 2012, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/occupy-wall-street>
- Rosenfeld Halverson, E. (2010). Film as identity exploration: A multimodal analysis of youth-produced films. *Teachers College Record*, 112 (9), 2352-2378.
- Sader, F., & Muller, M. (2004). Young People's Voices. *Youth Development Journal*, 5-8.
- Sandford, D. (2012, August 12). Will Pussy Riot criticism affect Putin? *BBC NEWS Europe*. Retrieved August 25, 2012, from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-19303187>
- Sefton-Green, J. (2006). Chapter 8 Youth, Technology, and Media Cultures. *Review of Research in Education*, 30 (1), 279-306.
- Shuman, A. (1990). Appropriated Personal Experiences: The Case of Abortion Junk Mail. In C. Thomson (Ed.), *Critical Studies: Mikhail Bakhtin and the Epistemology of Discourse* (pp. 165-187). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- Simsek, B. (2012). *Using digital storytelling as a change agent for women's participation in the Turkish public sphere*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane.
- Skuse, A., & Cousins, T. (2008). Getting connected: the social dynamics of urban telecommunications access and use in Khayelitsha, Cape Town. *New Media & Society*, 10 (9), 9-26.
- Soep, E. (2006). Beyond literacy and voice in youth media production. *McGill Journal of Education*, 41 (3), 197-214.
- South African History Online. (n.d.). Retrieved August 12, 2012 from <http://www.sahistory.org.za/performing-arts/kwaito>
- Statistics South Africa. Population statistics. (2010). Retrieved September 09, 2011, from <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/populationstats.asp>
- Steenson, M., & Donner, J. (2009). Beyond the personal and private: Modes of mobile phone sharing in urban India. In S. W. Campbell, & R. Ling (Eds.), *The Reconstruction of Space and Time: Mobile Communication Practices* (pp. 231-250). Piscataway: Transaction Books.
- Stringer, E. T. (2007). *Action Research*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Tacchi, J. A. (2009). Finding a voice: Digital storytelling as participatory development in Southeast Asia. In J. Hartley, & K. McWilliam (Eds.), *Story Circle: Digital Storytelling Around the World* (pp. 167-175). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- The Population Register Update: Khayelitsha 2005. (2005). Retrieved March 12, 2011, from http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCUQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.westerncape.gov.za%2Fother%2F2007%2F10%2Fkprufinal_2005_october_2007_publish_date.pdf&ei=IUNBUOuUPInb0QWpq4GICw&usg=AFQjCNEZolxgs6oDFo5esp07Cz3pr9sAng&cad=rja
- Thompson, J. B. (1995). *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Tinkler, P. (2008). A fragmented picture: reflections on the photographic practices of young people. *Visual Studies*, 255-266.

Trigg, A. B. (2001). Veblen, Bourdieu, and Conspicuous Consumption. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 1, 99-115.

Veblen, T. (1899/1994). *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. New York: Dover Publications.

Walton, M. (2010). Mobile literacies & South African teens: Leisure reading, writing, and Mxit chatting for teens in Langa and Gugulethu. *Research report prepared for the Shuttleworth Foundation, Durbanville*.

Walton, M., & Pallitt, N. (2012). 'Grand Theft South Africa': games, literacy and inequality in consumer childhoods. *Language and Education*, 26 (4), 347-361.

Walton, M., Marsden, G., Hassreiter, S., & Allen, S. (September, 2012). *Degrees of Sharing: Proximate Media Sharing and Messaging by Young People in Khayelitsha*. Unpublished paper presented at ACM SIGCHI's International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services (MobileHCI). San Francisco.

Watkins, J., & Russo, A. (2009). Beyond Individual Expression: Working with Cultural Institutions. In J. Hartley, & K. McWilliam (Eds.), *Story Circle: Digital Storytelling Around the World* (pp. 269-278). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (1997). Classroom Ethnography. In N. H. Hornberger, & D. Corson (Eds.), *Research methods in language and education* (pp. 135-145). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Watts, E. K. (2001). "Voice" and "voicelessness" in rhetorical studies. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 87 (2), 179-196.

Watts, R. J., & Flanagan, C. (2007). Pushing the Envelope on Youth Civic Engagement: A developmental and liberation psychology perspective. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35 (6), 779-792.

Whitehead, J. (2004). Do the values and living logics I express in my educational relationships carry the hope of Ubuntu for the future of humanity? Retrieved March 12, 2011, from <http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/BERA/bera04/jwbera04d.htm>

Wu, Q. (2009). Commercialization and Digital Storytelling in China. In J. Hartley, & K. McWilliam (Eds.), *Story Circle: Digital Storytelling Around the World* (pp. 230-244). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wyatt, R. O., Katz, E., & Kim, J. (2000). Bridging the Spheres: Political and Personal Conversation in Public and Private Spheres. *Journal of Communication*, 50, 71-92.

Youth. (2012). Retrieved July 13, 2012, from <http://outyouth.org/programs/educational-programs/insideout-digital-storytelling-project/>

University of Cape Town

Appendix A

Transcript 'Crime' by Yanga (m, 15)

| TC | Visual Image (Due to confidentiality reasons the pictures are excluded) | Kinesic Action | Soundtrack | Metafunctional interpretation / Phases and Subphases |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| 10:00:00 – 10:00:04 | <p>Phase 1: Introduction to topic: <i>Yanga (m, 15) introduces a topic with the written title 'Crime'. Thereafter two of his peers, explain in short statements (Vox Pops style) convey what crime means to them. In between the interviews, Yanga (m, 15) depicts re-enacted scenes of young people who are being robbed and fighting with each other.</i></p> <p>Title – English, music (no lyrics) Text: Written by producer: 'Crime'</p> | <p>Fade from Black</p> <p>Title (white letters on black background)</p> <p>Fade to Black</p> | <p>MUSIC: Always the same song used: Artist: Big Nuz ft fisherman and the name of the song: Owethu Local Kwaito music in South Africa In this part: Instrumental</p> | <p>Title centred</p> |
| 10:00:04 – 10:00:12 | <p>Phase 1: Introduction to topic: Shot size: Close up, low angle (attention: producer is small), centred, steady handheld shot. Location: Inside (at school) in front of a yellow wall, alone Represented Participant: nameless female in school uniform (same age as Producer)</p> | <p>Fade from Black</p> <p>Female was asked to look into the camera (see raw material) but instead looks around in the room Very serious facial expression. Fade to black</p> | <p>MUSIC: (see above) Interview English: 'Crime means destruction of moral values. It makes me to live in fear through the [pause] security of police endorsement.'</p> | <p>Angle (Power) In general: low angle - because the producer is very short, which leads to most of the video shot from a low-angle perspective. He always filmed from a standing position, never stepped on anything or kneeled down to change the angle. Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' Involved, but also oblique, female turns head</p> <p>Contact Does not look into the camera – Offer picture (face is directed to</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>camera, but eyes wonder around)</p> <p>Social distance Intimate distance (audio issue – had to go close to interviewee to get feasible sound recordings)</p> <p>Other Observations: No interviewee has a name or an identity. No personal life story about them. They remain nameless, like people in Vox-Pops. 'It makes me to live in fear' = very personal. Facial expression is very emotional. But does not look into the camera = detachment. 'Through the security of police enforcement' – she stops and thinks before she says that – may be a language problem? Conceptual patterns: school uniform / location school = one of us. Placed her in the centre – important information, but could also be because beginners tend to center object</p> |
| <p>10:00:12 – 10:00:19</p> | <p>Phase 1: Introduction to topic: Storytelling technique: B-Roll Cinematography: medium shot, low angle (producer is short), no one looks into the camera. Producer - handheld, camera follows the action. Oblique angle Location: neighbourhood of producer = brick houses in Khayelitsha / on the street Represented Participants: nameless three RPs (all same age, older than producer): 2 males (white and green shirt), 1 female Female is in school uniform, Males are in casual clothes</p> | <p>Fade from Black</p> <p>Re-enacted scene with friends: Male (white shirt) attacks male (green shirt) by kicking him on the stomach. Female attempts to shield the male (green shirt), while they both walking backwards. Male (white shirt) stationary and waits to see what happens. Male (green shirt) points at male (white shirt), screams something (not audible). Female tries to hold male (green shirt) back. Male (white shirt) runs towards male (green shirt), depicting threatening gestures. Male (green shirt) and female run away.</p> | <p>MUSIC: (see above) Instrumental</p> <p>atmosphere sound (kids playing, wind sound)</p> | <p>Angle Low angle Attitude Oblique angle – 'them' – not our world. Viewed from sidelines (not involved) Contact No one looks into the camera = offer picture Social distance Medium shot – far personal relationship (the way youth observes violence. Especially how small people, like the producer, see the world in Khayelitsha) Other observations: Aggressors are older/taller than</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | Fade to black | | producer. Boys are fighting; the girl tries to go in between, tries to help, but fails. Reality version <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Girl and victim belong to each other, both are afraid – both are close to each other – aggressor is alone - Girl is the same size as both guys, but cannot help (classical roles) B-roll with nameless actors. Nowhere written that it is re-enacted. |
| 10:00:19 – 10:00:26 | Phase 1: Introduction to topic: Storytelling technique: Interview Shot size: close up, low angle (producer is short), centred Location: in front of brick wall, at school Represented Participant: nameless male in school uniform (same age as producer) | Fade from black Steady shot. Serious facial expression. Fade to black | MUSIC: (see above) Instrumental Interview English: 'Crime to me means to take something that does not belong to you. And make some money out of it.' | Angle Low Angle Attitude Frontal (Attached) Contact Demand / Offer, More offer!!! Social Distance Intimate distance Other observations: Feels like he means the audience by 'you' when he says 'does not belong to you'. But does not look into lens Emphasized through low angle. Makes message stronger. Don't do it! Like a parent / child Small audience = familiar to this perspective, tall audience not – one of us is speaking down on us. School uniform = one of us |
| 10:00:26 – 10:00:30 | Phase 1: Introduction to topic: Storytelling technique: B-Roll, Shot size: Long shot, eye-level of boy that is running away, no one looks into the camera. Producer stands still – handheld - steady shot. Location: street in front of informal housing in Khayelitsha | Fade from Black Re-enacted scene with friends: Two older males (white and green shirt) bring younger male (yellow shirt) down to the ground and hit him. | MUSIC: (see above) Instrumental atmosphere sound (kids playing, wind sound) | Angle Eye level (equality, no power difference) Attitude Frontal (Attached) Contact Offer |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | <p>Represented Participants: Four nameless male protagonists, two males (white shirt/green shirt, both older than the producer and the other protagonists) are the attackers, two males (blue/white shirt/yellow shirt) are the victims (both younger than the other protagonists, same age as producer) All are in casual clothes</p> | <p>Other younger male (blue/white shirt) escapes and runs away.</p> <p>Fade to black</p> | | <p>Social Distance Public distance (remain strangers) Other observations: Aggressors are taller and older than producer; victims are same size as producer. One victim runs away instead of helping. Bystanders ignore what is happening. All are in casual clothes = happens in spare time. The aggressors don't have any special attributes = 'it could be anyone that attacks you' (see Neo later hip-hop) All are the same race – no race difference. All are boys.</p> |
| 10:00:30 – 10:00:33 | <p>Transition 1 – Introduction to me and my video: <i>Yanga (m, 15) introduces himself in a written form as the director of the digital story with his full name, followed by a photo of himself. Then he added a stand-in (filmed by himself, holding his camera in front of him), explaining what his 'video' is about; that he will be explaining what crime means to him and his peers and how it is affecting them.</i></p> <p>Storytelling technique: Title – English</p> <p>Text: Written by producer: 'name of producer' – first name and surname Shot size: Text is centred</p> | <p>Fade from Black</p> <p>Title (white on black) - centred</p> <p>Fade to Black</p> | <p>MUSIC: (see above) Instrumental</p> <p>Lyrics: 'He is a big boy'</p> | <p>Shows his full name.</p> |
| 10:00:33 – 10:00:36 | <p>Transition 1 – Introduction to me and my video:</p> <p>Storytelling technique: Photo Shot size: Long shot, person is centred, looks into the camera. Location: in front of a brick house in Khayelitsha Represented Participant: producer in 'Sunday church clothes'</p> | <p>Fade from Black</p> <p>Photo</p> <p>Fade to Black</p> | <p>MUSIC: (see above) Instrumental</p> | <p>Angle Almost eye level (equality, no power difference) – a little bit high angle Attitude Frontal (Attached) Contact Demand Social Distance Public distance (remain strangers)</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>Other observations: Total shot = very distant (also in his interviews, he was very professional with his questions / distant) Clothes – Sunday church clothes = smart clothes and 'cool' posture.</p> |
| 10:00:36 – 10:00:48 | <p>Transition 1 – Introduction to me and my video: Storytelling technique: Reporter stand-up of producer – English Shot size: Close up, eye-level, centred, looks directly into the camera, he holds camera/phone himself Location: Kitchen of his parent's house, he is alone Represented Participant: Producer</p> | <p>Fade from black</p> <p>Stand up neutral/serious facial expression</p> <p>Fade to black</p> | <p>Stand-up:</p> <p>'This small video shows what crime means and how does it happen. I will try to interview different people so that I can hear what crime means to them and how does it affect them as the people of Khayelitsha.'</p> | <p>Angle Eye level (equality, no power difference) Attitude Frontal (Attached) Contact Demand Social Distance Intimate distance (attention – filmed himself – holding camera = no other framing possible) Other observations: 'Interview different people' / 'how does it affect them as the people of Khayelitsha' = distant to them. Audience = not from Khayelitsha – but close up = you belong to me. Mixes up roles: Outsider (reporter) / insider (Yanga from Khayelitsha.) Wanted to be alone when in front of the camera, because he dislikes to talk in front of people. With the camera, he has no problem, he said.</p> |
| 10:00:48 – 10:01:10 | <p>Phase 2 – THEIR life with crime: <i>Here Yanga (m, 15) shows three interviews of his peers. One male and one female peer are talking about what crime means to them and what they fear. The third interviewee suddenly talks about the positive aspects of Khayelitsha compared to living in the suburbs, and that it is good residing in Khayelitsha.</i> Storytelling technique: Interview – isiXhosa Shot size: close up, low angle (producer is short), centred / positioned slightly at the left side, handheld -steady shot</p> | <p>Fade from black</p> <p>Interview Male was asked to look into the camera (raw material), instead he looks around, and only occasionally he looks directly at the camera. Neutral/serious facial expression.</p> <p>Fade to black</p> | <p>Interview isiXhosa:</p> <p>Subtitles by producer: 'According to my point of view. Being born in Khayelitsha or not does not make a difference because there are still some people that discriminate against you despite that we are all black people. And there are thugs.'</p> | <p>Angle Low level Attitude Oblique Contact Offer/demand (more offer) Social Distance Personal distance Other observations: Identity: We are all black, but we are different – discrimination going on</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>Location: in front of a brick wall at school, they are alone</p> <p>Represented Participants: nameless male in school uniform (same age as producer)</p> | | | <p>amongst 'us'. Corresponds to the fighting pictures – all are black, but fighting. Talks like he has accepted the status quo in Khayelitsha (shrugging shoulders).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Talking to an outsider, explaining how it is in Khayelitsha. - But also residents from Khayelitsha could relate to it – 'yes I think the same' |
| 10:01:10 – 10:01:25 | <p>Phase 2 – THEIR life with crime:</p> <p>Storytelling technique: Interview – English</p> <p>Shot size: Close up, low angle (producer is small), centred, Steady shot (handheld).</p> <p>Location: Inside (at school) in front of a yellow wall, alone</p> <p>Represented participant: Second time: nameless girl in school uniform (same age as protagonist)</p> | <p>Fade from black</p> <p>Interview: Female was asked to look into the camera instead she looks around in the room. Very serious facial expression.</p> <p>Fade to black</p> | <p>Interview - English</p> <p>Nameless female: 'For example if I go to school, I go to school fearing thugs, because thugs are all around Khayelitsha. Thugs rob people's possessions; they expect people to give them money when you walk on the streets.'</p> | <p>Angle Low angle</p> <p>Attitude Oblique</p> <p>Contact Offer/demand (more offer)</p> <p>Social Distance Intimate distance</p> <p>Other observations: Talks to outside audience. Talking about how bad it is. Explaining to an outsider what it is like to be in Khayelitsha. Talking about 'people', not about 'us'.</p> |
| 10:01:25 – 10:02:05 | <p>Phase 2 – THEIR life with crime:</p> <p>Storytelling technique: Interview - isiXhosa</p> <p>Shot size: Close up, low angle (producer is short), centred, Steady shot (handheld).</p> <p>Location: in front of a brick wall at school, they are alone</p> <p>Represented Participant: nameless male protagonist in school uniform (same age)</p> | <p>Fade from black</p> <p>Interview: Male was asked to look into the camera, instead keeps on looking around. Only occasionally he looks into the camera. Little smile on his face.</p> <p>Fade to black</p> | <p>Interview isiXhosa: Subtitles: English (translated by producer: 'Living in Khayelitsha is good, because you are around a lot of people. If you live in the suburbs you don't have people around you if you need something. But if you live in Khayelitsha you can go to your neighbour and get what you need. But in the suburbs you don't get it because there are big yards. You cannot just walk to your</p> | <p>Angle Low angle</p> <p>Attitude Oblique (detached)</p> <p>Contact Offer/demand (More offer, only a few demand pics in between)</p> <p>Social Distance Close personal</p> <p>Other observations: Not as bad... There are also positive aspects of living here. Like Yanga said in interview = I like</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | neighbour. In Khayelitsha you can. That's why it is better to live in Khayelitsha.' | the community!!! Boy smiles. |
| 10:02:05 – 10:02:08 | Storytelling technique: Photo Shot size: Long shot, person is centred, looks into the camera, almost eye level (bit low angle) Location: Inside a house in Khayelitsha Represented Participant: producer in 'Sunday' church clothes | Fade from Black Photo Fade to black | music see above instrumental voice over producer – English 'My name is [first name] and surname' | Angle Almost eye level (bit low angle) Attitude frontal (attached) Contact demand Social Distance Public distance (remain strangers) Other observations: Sunday church clothes! |
| 10:02:08 – 10:02:11 | Transition 2 – ME...: <i>In this part Yanga (m, 15) gives more detailed information about himself, he shows photos of himself and his parent's house, and in a voice-over he tells the audience once more his full name, then his age and explains where he lives.</i> Storytelling technique: Photo Shot size: Long shot, person is centred, looks into the camera. Almost eye level (a bit high angle) Location: at the beach in front of rich neighbourhood Represented Participant: producer in 'Sunday clothes' | fade from Black Photo Fade to black | music see above instrumental voice over producer – English 'I am 15 years old.' | Angle Almost eye level (bit high angle) Attitude frontal (attached) Contact demand Social Distance Public distance (remain strangers) Other observations: Shows himself in cool location. Cool clothes |
| 10:02:11 – 10:02:13 | Transition 2 – ME...: Storytelling technique: Photo (same picture like in the beginning) Shot size: Long shot, person is centred, looks into the camera, eye level Location: in front of a brick house in Khayelitsha Represented Participant: producer in 'Sunday church clothes' | fade from Black Photo Fade to black | music see above instrumental voice over producer – English 'I am living in South Africa, Cape Town.' | Angle Eye level Attitude frontal (attached) Contact demand Social Distance Public distance (remain strangers) |
| 10:02:13 – 10:02:16 | Transition 2 – ME...: Storytelling technique: Photo Shot size: Long shot Location: house of protagonist's parents in Khayelitsha (brick house – clean surrounding) | fade from Black Photo Fade to black | music see above instrumental voice over producer – English 'And this is where I live. To me | Angle Eye level Attitude oblique (detached) Contact no Social Distance |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | Represented Participant: none | | crime is very wrong...' | Public distance Other observations: House = brick house. Car in front. Depicts Status. |
| 10:02:16 – 10:02:55 | <p>Phase 3 - ...and MY life with crime: <i>Over a re-enacted clip where a young boy walks down the street of Khayelitsha playing openly with his phone when two older boys sitting at the roadside signalling him to approach them, Yanga's (m, 15) voice over lays out how he thinks about crime. Yanga (m, 15) takes a clear stance by saying that he thinks 'crime is very wrong' and that he does not 'encourage people to do crime' because people that steal from hard working people do wrong and they end up in jail.</i></p> <p>Storytelling technique: B-Roll</p> <p>Shot size: Long shot, eye-level with older males (white and green shirt) which are the attackers, low-angle for the ones that are standing (younger males, same age as producer). No one looks into the camera. Producer stands still, handheld follows the action with the camera/phone.</p> <p>Location: street in front of informal housing in Khayelitsha</p> <p>Represented Participants: Four nameless male protagonists, Two males (white shirt/green shirt, both older than the producer and the other protagonists) are the attackers, two males (blue/white shirt/yellow shirt) are the victims (both younger than the other protagonists, same age as producer) All are in casual clothes</p> | <p>Fade from Black Re-enacted scene with friends Young male (yellow shirt) walks with his cell phone in his hand down the street...</p> <p>...passing by the two older males (white and green shirt), sitting in front of shack</p> <p>They beck the younger male (yellow shirt) to them.</p> | <p>music see above instrumental</p> <p>voice over producer – English '...because taking something you didn't work for is a bad luck...</p> <p>music see above instrumental</p> <p>voice over producer – English</p> | <p>Angle Low angle Attitude Oblique (detached) Contact Offer Social Distance Far social distance</p> <p>Angle Low angle (young male) Eye level (older males) Attitude Frontal (older males) Oblique (younger male) Contact Offer Social Distance Public distance</p> <p>Angle Low angle (young male) Eye level (older males) Attitude Frontal (older males) Oblique (younger male) Contact Offer Social Distance Public distance</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>The young male (yellow shirt) walks towards them, the three of them are talking.</p> <p>Older male (white shirt) stands up and the three of them keep on talking. Another young male (blue/white shirt) passes by the group...</p> <p>...when he has almost passed by, the older male (white shirt) beckons him to the group.</p> <p>As soon as the young male (blue/white shirt) arrives at the group of three, the two older males (white and green shirt) attack the younger male (yellow shirt).</p> | <p>'...That person has tried by all means to have those things. So I don't encourage people participate in crime. Crime does not take you anywhere. And living by stealing can lead to jail.'</p> <p>Music (lyrics) isiXhosa and In English: 'Fish, fish, fish...' when the male (white shirt) beckons younger male (blue/white) shirt closer to the group</p> | <p>Angle Low angle (young male) Eye level (older males) Attitude Frontal (older males) Oblique (younger male) Contact Offer Social Distance Public distance</p> <p>Angle Low angle (young males and one older male) Eye level (one older male) Attitude Frontal (older males) Oblique (younger male) Contact Offer Social Distance Public distance</p> <p>Angle Angle Low angle (young males and one older male) Eye level (one older male) Attitude Frontal (older males) Oblique (younger male) Contact Offer Social Distance Public distance</p> <p>Angle Low angle (young males and one older male) Eye level (one older male)</p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | Attitude Frontal (older males) Oblique (younger male) Contact Offer Social Distance Public distance |
| | Transition 3 – This is how we see crime: <i>The voice over from phase 3 stops when the two older boys suddenly attack the younger boy and by forcefully take his phone. After the young boy runs away defeated, the two gangsters show their victory by dancing. Then Yanga (m, 15) added once more an interview with a peer narrating a personal story about how his life is affected by crime.</i> | While the two older males (white and green shirt) are kicking the young male (yellow shirt), the other young male (blue/white shirt) runs away. The two older males (white and green shirt) keep on beating the younger male (yellow shirt). People passing by ignore them. The older males (white and green shirt) take away the cell phone of | Music (lyrics) isiXhosa and In English: 'Leave it! Leave it! I put them all in a fish tank. All right!' (when the older males beats up younger male) | Angle Low angle (all, but victim – eye level) Attitude Oblique (older males – but from behind & younger male – victim – from front) Oblique (younger male running away) Contact Offer Social Distance Public distance Angle Low angle (older males) Eye level (younger male) Attitude Oblique (older males – but from behind & younger male – victim – from front) Contact Offer Social Distance Public distance Angle Low angle |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>the younger male (yellow shirt) and let him run away. The younger male (yellow shirt) runs away.</p> <p>Older males (white and green shirt) give each other a hand slap and the male (white shirt) starts dancing</p> | | <p>Attitude Oblique Contact Offer Social Distance Far social distance</p> <p>Angle Low angle Attitude Oblique When dancing - frontal Contact Offer Social Distance Far social distance</p> |
| 10:02:55 – 10:03:15 | <p>Transition 3 – This is how we see crime: Storytelling technique: Interview – English Shot size: close up, low angle (producer is short), centred, handheld - Steady shot. Location: in front of a brick wall, at school Represented Participant: Second time: nameless male in school uniform (same age as producer)</p> | <p>L-cut</p> <p>Interview Neutral/serious facial expression.</p> | <p>Interview nameless male: English 'All I can say about crime. It affects me badly, because hey... the equipment of my school is being stolen by thieves. And as a learner I'm deprived, because I lack the experience of computers. Because the computers have been stolen from my school.'</p> | <p>Angle Low angle Attitude Frontal, turns into oblique position Contact Offer Social Distance Close personal</p> |
| 10:03:15 – 10:03:33 | <p>Phase 4 – WE fight back: <i>Then Yanga (m, 15) changes the tone of the digital story. He shows the young victim coming back with his friends, fighting the two older boys and acquires the phone back. After the two older boys are defeated, they start attacking each other. He uses these pictures of revenge to tell the audience to 'stop doing crime'</i> Storytelling technique: B-Roll Shot size: Long shot, low-angle for all now – because all are standing (producer is short). No one looks into the camera.</p> | <p>Three older males (white, green and striped shirt) are standing together, conversing. The two young male (blue/white and yellow shirt) come back and bring a third young male (white shirt) with them. The three young males attack the two older ones (white and green shirt)...</p> | <p>Music (lyrics) isiXhosa In English: 'Leave it! Leave it! I put them all in a fish tank. Al right!'</p> | <p>Angle Low angle Attitude First older males frontal, Then all oblique Contact Offer Social Distance Public distance</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | <p>Producer stands still, follows the action with the camera/phone.</p> <p>Location: street in front of the informal housing in Khayelitsha</p> <p>Represented participants:</p> <p>Six nameless male protagonists, three older males (two are the attackers from the scene before – white and green shirt, third male is new, same age as white and green shirt, his shirt has black stripes), three younger males (two are the victims from the scene before – blue/white and yellow shirt, third is new, same age as blue/white and yellow shirt, his shirt is white). All are in casual clothes</p> | | | |
| | See above | <p>... The third one (striped shirt) stands there, looks at what is happening and walks away. The younger men acquire the phone back and run away. The two older males (white and green shirt) start attacking each other and start fighting.</p> | <p>Music</p> <p>Instrumental</p> <p>Voice-Over Producer</p> <p>'I would like to tell all the criminals to stop stealing other people's belongings and to try to work for themselves, so that they can earn an honest living at the end of the day.'</p> | <p>Angle</p> <p>Low angle</p> <p>Attitude</p> <p>oblique</p> <p>Contact</p> <p>Offer</p> <p>Social Distance</p> <p>Public distance</p> <p>When younger one's are gone: far social distance</p> |
| | See above | <p>The two older males are beating each other up</p> | <p>Music</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Instrumental</p> <p>Voice-Over Producer</p> <p>English 'There are other ways of keeping you busy except participating in crime.'</p> | <p>Angle</p> <p>Low angle (aggressor)</p> <p>Eye level (victim)</p> <p>Attitude</p> <p>oblique</p> <p>Contact</p> <p>Offer</p> <p>Social Distance</p> <p>Far social distance</p> |
| <p>10:03:33 – 10:03:43</p> | <p>Transition 4 – Alternatives to crime:</p> <p><i>Here Yanga (m, 15) offers in clips and voice over alternatives to criminal activities, such as playing games, reading the bible or doing sports.</i></p> <p>Storytelling technique:</p> <p>B-Roll</p> <p>Shot size: Three shots: (one) close up, (two) medium shot, (three) long shot</p> <p>Location: three shots: game hall in Khayelitsha, home/in living room of the producer, football field in Khayelitsha</p> | <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Someone is playing a game (2) A nameless young male is reading the bible (3) A group of people are playing football | <p>Music</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Instrumental</p> <p>Voice-Over Producer</p> <p>English 'You can play games as me. Read the bible or get involved in sports.'</p> | <p>Angle</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) low angle (2) eye level (3) eye level <p>Attitude</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) frontal (2) oblique (3) oblique <p>Contact</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) demand (POV) |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>Represented Participants: (One) None, (Two) nameless young male, (Three) group of nameless people playing football.</p> | | | <p>(2) offer (3) offer Social Distance (1) intimate distance (POV) (2) far personal distance (3) public distance</p> |
| 10:03:43 – 10:03:47 | <p>Phase 5 – It is your choice: <i>In this phase Yanga (m, 15) shows his best friend addressing the audience directly with a freestyle hip-hop song. Yanga (m, 15) cuts the hip-hop song into three sub-phases, containing out of one part of the rap song and a clip that seems to visualise what the friend was singing about. In sub-phase one the friend is singing about how it is everyone's own choice to either join criminal gangs or to fight them followed by a clip showing how two young people (male and female) fight a third person, who behaves in an aggressive way towards them. In sub-phase two the hip-hop song states that no one can be trusted on the streets of Khayelitsha, because everyone could be a criminal. The following clip shows how the aggressive young men from the first clip in this phase suddenly attack the young people. The rap in sub-phase three talks about how it is painful to live in a place where 'people trying to kill me for no reason' followed by again a part from the phone robbery scene from the beginning.</i></p> <p>Storytelling technique: Hip-hop – English Shot size: close up / medium shot, looks directly into the camera, steady shot Location: in a room at Ikamva (after school programme) Represented Participant: nameless male in casual clothes</p> | <p>Hip-hop Neutral/serious facial expression.</p> <p>Gesture: lifts fist when says '...do what is right for your community.'</p> | <p>Hip-hop 'It is your choice to make it. You can join or end up being yourself and do what is correct for your community.'</p> | <p>Angle Low angle Attitude frontal Contact demand Social Distance Close social distance</p> |
| 10:03:47 – 10:03:55 | <p>Phase 5 – It is your choice:</p> <p>Storytelling technique: B-Roll Shot size: medium shot, low angle (producer is small), no one looks into the camera, producer stays at one spot, follows the action with camera Location: neighbourhood of producer = a brick houses in Khayelitsha / on the street Protagonists: Three nameless protagonists (all same age, older than producer): two males (white and green shirt), one</p> | <p>The group that was fighting in an earlier scene starts talking amongst each other. The male (white shirt) walks towards the female and the male (green shirt), talking to them, wild gestures (but calmer than when he was fighting). Female still has her arm around male (green shirt), ready to protect him. Female and male (green shirt) walk backwards while male (white shirts) walks</p> | <p>Music See above Instrumental</p> | <p>Angle Low angle Attitude Oblique Contact offer Social Distance Far social distance</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | female. Female is in school uniform Males are in casual clothes | towards them. Then they stop, the three of them start talking. | | |
| 10:03:55 – 10:04:02 | Phase 5 – It is your choice: Storytelling technique: Hip-hop – English Shot size: close up / medium shot, looks directly into camera, steady shot Location: in a room at Ikamva (after school programme) Represented Participant: male in casual clothes | Rap neutral facial expression Gesture: pointing at audience when says ‘...don’t trust people.’ | RAP ‘Don’t trust people smiling at you at the streets, because, like you, see a guy smiling, don’t know if he wanna shoot you or not. If he has a gun in his hand.’ | Angle Low angle Attitude frontal Contact demand Social Distance (close social) |
| 10:04:02 – 10:04:08 | Phase 5 – It is your choice: Storytelling technique: B-Roll Shot size: medium shot, low angle (producer is short), no one looks into the camera. Producer stands still, camera follows the action. Location: neighbourhood of producer = a brick houses in Khayelitsha / on the street Represented Participants: Three nameless protagonists (all same age, older than producer): two males (white and green shirt), one female Female is in school uniform Males are in casual clothes | Re-enacted scene with friends: Male (white shirt) attacks male (green shirt) - kicks him with the foot. Female tries to cover male (green shirt), while they are both walking backwards. Male (white shirt) stands still and waits what happens. Male (green shirt) points at male (white shirt), screaming something. Female tries to hold male (white shirt) back. Male (white shirt) runs towards male (green shirt) and wants to kick him again. Male (white shirt) runs backwards, female tries to pull him away. Male (white shirt) slips. Male (green shirt) and female holding hands, running away. | Music See above Instrumental | Angle Low angle Attitude Oblique Contact offer Social Distance Far social distance |
| 10:04:08 – 10:04:16 | Phase 5 – It is your choice: Storytelling technique: RAP – English Shot size: close up / medium shot, looks directly into camera, steady shot Location: in a room at Ikamva (after school programme) Represented Participant: nameless male in casual clothes | Rap neutral facial expression with a bit of a smile (due to a mistake in a cut out scene before) | Rap ‘ My heart aches. My heart beats fast. Because I am getting in the rust. People try to kill me for no reason. And now my (not understandable) is taken. What shall I say?’ | Angle Low angle Attitude frontal Contact demand Social Distance Close social distance |
| 10:04:16 – 10:04:20 | Phase 5 – It is your choice: Storytelling technique: B-Roll Shot size: Long shot, eye-level with the one that are sitting, | Re-enacted scene: Now the former attackers and the victims are sitting/standing together, talking. All of a sudden the older | Music See above Instrumental | Angle Low angle Eye level (the one’s that are sitting) Attitude |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | <p>low-angle for the one that is standing (producer is short). No one looks into the camera. Producer stands still, follows the action with the camera/phone.</p> <p>Location: street in front of informal housing in Khayelitsha</p> <p>Represented Participants: nameless four male protagonists, 2 older males are the attackers from the scene before (white shirt and green shirt), the younger males are the former victims (b/w shirt and yellow shirt)</p> | <p>males (white and green shirt) stand up and attack younger male (yellow shirt). Younger male (blue/white shirt) tries to help younger male (yellow shirt). All start fighting with each other.</p> | <p>Voice over Producer - English 'I wish all thugs to move here'</p> | <p>oblique Contact offer Social Distance Public distance</p> |
| <p>10:04:20 – 10:04:28</p> | <p>Transition 5 – South Africa Unite: <i>The clip of the phone robbery from phase five goes on and turns into a ramp for Yanga's (m, 15) voice over talking about how he wishes that all thugs would leave Khayelitsha. Then he shows a clip of his church and still pictures of a dove and two hands holding each other whilst stating that he wishes that there could be peace for all South Africans through unity.</i></p> <p>Storytelling technique: B-Roll and photos (self-made and downloaded from Internet)</p> <p>Shot size: 3 shots: (1) medium shot, (2) close up, (3) close up</p> <p>Location: (1) at church, (2) downloaded picture from the Internet, (3) inside (self-made picture)</p> <p>Represented Participants: (1) people at church (filmed at Sunday church), (2) none, (3) two hands (young protagonists)</p> | <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) People at church singing (documented shot) (2) Peace flag with pigeon (downloaded from the internet) (3) Two hands holding each other (hand shake – self-made picture) | <p>Music See above Instrumental</p> <p>Voice over Producer - English 'To that all South Africans may have piece and unite.'</p> | <p>Angle (1) low angle (2) eye level (3) high angle Attitude (1) oblique (2) frontal (3) oblique Contact (1) offer (2) demand (3) offer Social Distance (1) intimate distance (2) intimate distance (3) intimate distance</p> |
| <p>10:04:28 – 10:04:42</p> | <p>Phase 6 – I am scared: <i>In this phase Yanga (m, 15) emphasizes once more how important the topic is for him personally. He shows the two young people once more, struggling to staying on the 'good side' while stating in the voice over: 'I am scared. I don't want to be killed. I am still too young. I have dreams and I want my dreams to become true.'</i></p> <p>Storytelling technique: B-Roll</p> <p>Shot size: medium shot, low angle (producer is short), no one looks into the camera, producer stays at one spot, follows the action with camera.</p> <p>Location: Neighbourhood of producer = A brick houses in Khayelitsha / on the street</p> <p>Represented Participants: Three nameless protagonists (all same age, older than producer): two males (white and green</p> | <p>Re-enacted scene with friends: Female tries to hold male (green shirt) back, but he pushes her away. Male (white shirt) and (green) start fighting. But male (green shirt) reconsiders and stops fighting and goes with female, who ducked away when the two males started fighting.</p> | <p>Music See above Instrumental</p> <p>Voice over Producer - English 'I am scared. I don't want to be killed. I am still too young. I have dreams and I want to make my dreams come true. I haven't been robbed yet, but I get so see how bad it is it to be robbed for something you worked hard for.'</p> | <p>Angle Low angle Attitude oblique Contact offer Social Distance Far personal distance</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------|---|---|
| | shirt), one female | | | |
| 10:04:42 – 10:04:46 | <p>Transition 6 – The End? A title 'The end' indicates the end of the digital story, but Yanga (m, 15) adds some bloopers as a surprise after the title.</p> <p>Storytelling technique: Title – English, no sound</p> <p>Text: Written by producer: 'The End'</p> <p>Shot size: Centred</p> | | No sound | |
| 10:04:46 – 10:04:53 | <p>Phase 7 – Funny outro: The last three clips of the digital story are three funny bloopers from the shooting, all irrelevant to the topic.</p> <p>Storytelling technique: Bloopers - Interview - isiXhosa</p> <p>Shot size: Close up, low angle (producer is short), steady shot, smiling then laughing</p> <p>Location: in front of a brick wall at school, they are alone</p> | Bloopers | <p>Spoken word: isiXhosa Subtitles: no subtitles Producer: 'Molo' Male interviewee: 'My name is [first name] [surname]' starts laughing. Turns away from camera. 'You see this one...' They are laughing at each other – no obvious reason for laughing</p> | <p>Angle Low angle Attitude frontal Contact offer Social Distance Close personal distance</p> |
| 10:04:46 – 10:05:06 | <p>SCENE 29</p> <p>Storytelling technique: Bloopers - Interview -isi Xhosa</p> <p>Text: Shot size: Close up interviewee – camera tilts down when producer is getting angry Location: in front of a brick wall at school Represented participants: nameless male protagonist in school uniform</p> | Bloopers | <p>Spoken word: isiXhosa Subtitles: no subtitles Person in the background / male: 'How are you doing, my uncle' Interviewee: 'I am grand, and you?' Producer: 'No man, what is wrong with you, Chris???' All are laughing</p> | <p>Angle Low angle Attitude frontal Contact offer Social Distance Close personal distance</p> |

Transcript 'Friendship' by Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17)

| TC | Visual Image | Kinesic Action | Soundtrack | Metafunctional interpretation / Phases and Subphases |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 10:00:00 – 10:00:06 | <p>Phase 1 - Introduction to topic: Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) introduce their topic with the written title 'Friendship means everything' placed in between a scene that shows their friends walking down the street, conversing and laughing with each other. Medium shot, eye level, frontal/oblique Casual clothes Location: Outside, near to Ikamva Represented Participants: Four girls (all research participants)</p> | <p>Re-enacted scene: Four females walk down the street (proximate to Ikamva), laughing amongst each other.</p> | <p>MUSIC: Always the same song used: Instrumental version of <i>Te amo</i>, Rihanna Atmosphere Sound: Females laughter and screaming</p> | <p>Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Oblique – 'them' / detached Contact Don't look into the camera – offer picture Social distance Far personal distance</p> |
| 10:00:06 – 10:00:10 | <p>Phase 1 - Introduction to topic: Scene goes on – title fades in</p> | <p>Scene goes on</p> | <p>Title: Friendship (title of digital story) MUSIC: Instrumental version of <i>Te amo</i>, Rihanna. Atmosphere Sound: Female laughter and screaming</p> | <p>Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Oblique – 'them' / detached Contact Don't look into the camera – offer picture Social distance Far personal distance</p> |
| 10:00:10 – 10:00:13 | <p>Phase 1 - Introduction to topic: Scene goes on – title fades out</p> | <p>Scene goes on</p> | <p>MUSIC: <i>Te amo</i> with Lyrics (Te amo, Te amo, Te amo) Atmosphere Sound: Female laughter and screaming</p> | <p>Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Oblique – 'them' / detached Contact Don't look into the camera – offer picture Social distance Far personal distance</p> |
| 10:00:13 – | <p>Phase 1 - Introduction to topic</p> | <p>Fades to title (dissolve)</p> | <p>Title: Friendship means everything</p> | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 10:00:18 | | | MUSIC: <i>Te amo with lyrics</i> , Rihanna (She says to me. She says to me) Atmosphere Sound: Female laughter and screaming | |
| 10:00:18 – 10:01:07 | Phase 2: Introduction to us and what friendship means to us: <i>Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) introduce themselves in two separate stand-ups. First Yola (f, 17) introduces herself and conveys a comment about what friendships mean to her. Then Nothemba (f, 17) does the same. Both are seated on a couch, directly looking into the lens. Yola speaks in isiXhosa (English subtitles provided). Nothemba (f, 17) Spoke in isiXhosa and English (English subtitles provided). Both utilizing a lower third showing their first name.</i> Medium shot, eye level, frontal Casual clothes Location: Inside Represented Participants: One of the producers | Fade from title Stand-in Seated on the couch (stationary) – looking directly towards the camera – friendly face Fade to green | Stand up isiXhosa (subtitles by producers) 'My name is Yonela.' <i>(Written TITLE: Yonela (in green left upper corner)</i> 'And that is what friendship means to me: two people that are friends. When someone has a problem or I have a problem. I would go and share it with my friend, so that my friend can advice me on a certain problem that I have. Sometimes friends are there for you when you need to go somewhere far, they would ask me to accompany them. That's what friendship means to me. Friendship means a lot of things to me. Because if you have friends, there is nothing you don't have. | Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Contact demand Social distance Far personal distance |
| 10:01:07 – 10:01:37 | Phase 2: Introduction to us and what friendship means to us: Medium shot, eye level, frontal Casual clothes Location: Inside Represented Participants: One of the producers | Fade from green Stand-in Seated on the couch (stationary) – looking directly towards camera – friendly face | Stand-up English 'To me friendship means for us to love one another. To share things...' <i>Written title: NOMASOMI (in green left upper corner)</i> '...to care for each other. To be honest with each other. And to have fun with each other.' Completes the last couple of sentences in isiXhosa. Translation (subtitles by producer) 'In friendship you need to trust each other. You know that you can open up to your friend and | Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Contact demand Social distance Far personal distance |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| | | | know that they will not share it with anyone else. It is between the two of us. I know it won't be spoken of anywhere else because you trust each other. I think that is what friendship is to me. ' | |
| 10:01:37 – 10:01:47 | Transition 2 – This is our message: <i>Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) insert a title stating: 'a film by Yola & Nothemba'.</i> | Hard cut to title | Title: A film by Yonela & Nomasomi MUSIC: Te amo with lyrics: (Te amo, Te amo, She says to me. | |
| 10:01:47 – 10:02:25 | Phase 3 – What friendship means to our friends: <i>Three Interviews with their friends are lined up. The first two are alone in the frame. The last interview is a double interview with two friends in the picture. All of them convey what friendship means to them. Two of the interviewees conversed in English, the last two in isiXhosa.</i> Medium shot, eye level (slightly low angle), frontal Casual clothes Location: Inside (library) Represented Participants: Male (without name) – age of producers | Interview Leaning back – averring a nonchalant demeanor. Fashionable glasses. Talks in a nonchalantly fashion. | Interview English 'Friends mean life. Friends mean... Friends mean... um... positive relationship. Friends mean... mean... um... friends mean... um.... Almost everything! 'Cause if ever you can't talk to your parents, you can't talk to your teacher, you can't talk to your like your neighbours, you can, you can have someone which is your friend you can talk to. You got a boyfriend. You got a girlfriend. Those people are friends. See... that's why... that's why friends... um., friend... friend is life. Friends... friend is everything to me. | Angle (Power) Eye level (little bit low angle) Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Contact demand Social distance Close personal distance |
| 10:02:25 – 10:03:12 | Phase 3 – What friendship means to our friends: Medium shot, eye level (slightly low angle), frontal Casual clothes Location: Inside Represented Participants: | Interview – looks straight into the camera – no special movements | Interview English 'There might be a friendship between you and your colleagues, you and your schoolmates, you and your teachers. You and | Angle (Power) Eye level (little bit low angle) Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Contact demand |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | Male (nameless) – older than producers (employee of library) | | maybe your choir friends. And in the computer as well. But there is one thing you need to understand. There is this thing called friendship. There are such things as honesty, such thing as trust, such thing as being there for each other. There is a saying, you know that says: <i>When days are tough, friends are few</i> . We tend to forget how special it is, when we have friends. We tend to forget when someone is down, what are we to them. How significant are we to them. Because when our friends are down, we need to 'pick' them up. And say: I am your friend. | Social distance Far personal distance |
| 10:03:12 – 10:03:24 | Phase 3 – What friendship means to our friends: Medium shot, eye level, frontal Casual clothes Location: Inside (library) Represented Participants: Two females (nameless) – Two fellow participants | While one is talking, the other one looks into the camera. First the right hand side is talking, and then the left side interrupts her and starts talking. | Interview: isiXhosa (one on the right hand side talking) Under titles by producer: 'To be there or here when she has a problem and vice versa. And to be able to tell her my problems and for her to tell me hers too.' | Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Contact demand Social distance Close personal distance |
| 10:03:24 – 10:04:14 | Phase 3 – What friendship means to our friends: Medium shot, eye level, frontal Casual clothes Location: Inside (library) Represented Participants: Two females (nameless) – Two fellow participants | While left-hand side one is talking, the one on the right is mostly looking at her and listening. In the end – last picture, the right one nods in agreement with what the left one has said. When the left one is giving examples, she overtly is talking about the two of them as friends. | Interview isiXhosa (left hand one) – subtitles by producers: 'Friendship is not only about problems, because maybe she has a problem and I have a problem, too. But sometimes we just need to chill together and do things that we both love. That's why they say friends... Because sometimes you have something in common that you agree upon. Maybe we both like the same subjects at school and therefore we can help each other. And you | Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Contact demand Social distance Close personal distance |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>are also able to have fun and talk about crazy things, like this kid, this one that is always... Oh! (giggle) yes!!!... And then... (giggle) Okay, yuuuuuuuuuu. You don't like a friend because they are always serious. – Now you are talking about... (laughter) You like them because you joke around and you can't do that with other people. –But not with everyone, there are some people, you know who... (giggle). But hey, so, your friend understands you. That's what friendship means to me.'</p> <p>Right sided girl: nodding in agreement – both giggling (2nd version, reedited – 2nd take)</p> | |
| 10:04:14 – 10:04:18 | <p>Transition 3 – Friendship is...: <i>They show a title stating: Friendship is laughing together.</i></p> | | <p>Music: Te amo with lyrics: Te amo, te amo... Written text: Friendship is...</p> | |
| 10:04:18 – 10:04:20 | <p>Transition 3 – Friendship is...:</p> | | <p>Music: Te amo with lyrics: 'She says to me...' Written text: ...laughing together</p> | |
| 10:04:20 – 10:04:34 | <p>Phase 4 – Friendship is laughing together: <i>Again they cut back to the scene of the girls walking down the street chatting and laughing which each other.</i></p> <p>See beginning! Medium shot, eye level, frontal/oblique Casual clothes Location: Outside, near to Ikamva Represented Participants:</p> | <p>Re-enacted scene: Four females walk down the street (close to Ikamva), laughing with each other.</p> | <p>MUSIC: Te amo with lyrics: 'Then we danced underneath the candelabra, she takes the lead. That's when I saw it in her eyes...' Atmosphere Sound: Female laughter and screaming</p> | <p>Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Oblique – 'them' / detached Contact Don't look into the camera – offer picture Social distance Far personal distance</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | Four girls (all research participants) | | | |
| 10:04:34 – 10:04:38 | Transition 4 – Friendship is...: <i>They show a title stating: Friendship is sharing.</i> | | Music Te amo with lyrics: Then she said 'te amo.' Title: 'Friendship is... ...sharing.' | |
| 10:04:38 – 10:04:48 | Phase 5 – Friendship is sharing: <i>They show a re-enacted scene of two female friends sharing one bottle of a fizzy drink with each other smiling into the camera.</i> Almost long shot, eye level, frontal Casual clothes Location: Inside Represented Participants: Two girls (both research participants) | Re-enacted scene: The two girls stand with their backs against the wall. The right girl offers the left girl her drink (sharing). They both overtly demonstrate to the viewer of the video what sharing is done. | Music Te amo with Lyrics: 'Then she put her hand around my waist' | Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Contact Mainly demand picture (both look into the camera, only when passing on the fizzy drink, looking at each other) Social distance Far personal distance |
| 10:04:48 – 10:04:54 | Transition 5 – Friendship is...: <i>They show a title stating: Friendship is being there for each other.</i> | | Music Te amo with Lyrics: '...without asking why. I said 'te amo" Written text Friendship is... ...being there for each other. | |
| 10:04:54 – 10:05:43 | Phase 6 – Friendship is being there for each other: <i>In a re-enacted scene two male friends have a 'friendship talk' concerning having sex with a girl, if and how to use a condom and what to do if the girl falls pregnant.</i> Medium shot, lower angle, frontal Casual clothes (left), school uniform (right) Location: Inside (In front of Ikamva toilet) Represented Participants: Two boys (same age as producers) | Re-enacted scene Two 'best friends' secretly talking about sex. They are in a silent corner of Ikamva talking to each other. Is filmed like there is nobody else there, but the two of them – but they both once in a while (in particular the beginning) look at the person behind the camera (confirmation look) | Conversation isiXhosa (English subtitles by producers) Right: 'It is important that we use condoms.' Left: 'No, it is not important' R: 'Why is it not important?' Left: 'Skin to skin. You must feel the juice.' Right: 'No, if you don't use a condom you get diseases. Or the girl you are having sex with is | Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Contact Mainly offer picture (mostly looking at each other, occasionally looking into the camera – confirmation look in particular in the beginning when they converse about such a private topic like sex.) Social distance |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>getting pregnant when she is still young.'</p> <p>Left: 'Well, they can use their injection.'</p> <p>Right: 'You are not thinking about that in that moment.'</p> <p>Left: 'There is no problem. There is abortion.'</p> <p>Right: 'Abortion is wrong.'</p> <p>Left: 'Why?'</p> <p>Right: 'It is not right to kill the child; it has also a right to live.'</p> <p>Left: 'Well, then we just raise the child.'</p> <p>Right: 'What do you want to raise it with?'</p> <p>Left: 'With the grant money.'</p> | Close personal distance |
| 10:05:43 – 10:05:48 | <p>Transition 6 – Friendship is...: <i>They show a title stating: Friendship is sharing secrets.</i></p> | | <p>Music Te amo with Lyrics: 'Don't I mean 'I love you'?'</p> <p>Written text Friendship is... ...sharing secrets.</p> | |
| 10:05:48 – 10:06:03 | <p>Phase 7 – Friendship is sharing secrets: <i>In a re-enacted scene two male friends whisper into each other's ear and giggle about what they whisper about.</i> <i>Medium shot, lower angle, frontal</i> School uniform Location: Inside (in a office adjacent to the library) Represented Participants: Two boys (same age as producers)</p> | <p>Two boys are whispering into each others ears. Then the left one starts laughing and looks into the camera. (He seems uncomfortable about what the other one whispered). Then the right one pulls the left one again closer and keeps on whispering into his ear.</p> | <p>Music Te amo with Lyrics: 'Think it means 'I love you' Don't it mean 'I love you'?' Listen we can dance, but you gotta watch your hands Watch me all night, I'm moving to the light because I understand</p> | <p>Angle (Power) Lower angle Attitude Frontal angle – 'us' / Involved Contact Mainly offer picture (only once does the left boy look into the camera – he seems embarrassed about what the other one whispered.) Social distance Far personal distance</p> |
| 10:06:03 – 10:06:06 | <p>Transition 7 – Friendship is...: <i>They show a title stating: Friendship is looking out for each other.</i></p> | | <p>Music: Te amo with Lyrics: 'That we all need love and I'm not afraid.'</p> <p>Written text Friendship is... ...looking out for each other.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| <p>10:06:06 – 10:06:36</p> | <p>Phase 8 – Friendship is looking out for each other: <i>In a re-enacted scene two male friends badmouth a friend of theirs. Then another male friend joins the scene and tells them that it is wrong talking like this about a friend and that they better go to the friend and talk openly about the issue they have with him.</i> Medium shot, eye level, frontal Left: casual clothes, Right: School uniform Location: Inside (office adjacent to library) Represented Participants: Two boys (same age as producers) – same as in ‘sex-talk’</p> | <p>Re-enacted scene: Two boys stand together and badmouth another one. First they talk loud and openly, but then they start whispering and laughing.</p> | <p>Conversation: isiXhosa English Subtitles (producer) [badmouthing] Translated by (Nomonde) Right: ‘xxx doesn’t wash at all. He does not match well with water.’ Left: ‘Me too, I’ve noticed it for a while.’ R: ‘Yho, my friend, when he is lifting up his arm. Yho!!!’ L: ‘When you smell it, it is strangling you.’ R: ‘Yhooooo!’ L: ‘It is almost as if you have been put against the wall. And his feet have dead skin. And I look at it and I am like, this is a problem.’ R: ‘His clothes are even dirty.’ L: ‘His clothes are torn and I don’t even know what to say to him. Ah... he needs to wash!’</p> | <p>Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – ‘us’ / Involved Contact Offer picture Social distance Far personal distance</p> |
| <p>10:06:36 – 10:07:22</p> | <p>Phase 8 – Friendship is looking out for each other: Medium shot, eye level, frontal Left: casual clothes Right: School uniform Middle: casual clothes Location: Inside (office adjacent to library) Represented Participants: Three boys (same age as producers) – same as in ‘sex-talk’ and the new boy</p> | <p>While the two boys are badmouthing the other one, a third boy joins in and talks to them.</p> | <p>Conversation: Subtitles by producer New boy: ‘Yho guys, what are you guys talking about? Why are you talking about the other guy like this?’ Left boy: ‘He smells.’ New boy: ‘Yes, I know he smells. But why are you talking like this on the streets? Why don’t you go and advice him?’ Left boy: wants to say something New boy: ‘Wait, wait, wait. You guys are fed up, but what does friendship mean? We support each other in friendship.’</p> | <p>Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Frontal angle – ‘us’ / Involved Contact Offer picture Social distance Far personal distance</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>Left: 'But not a stinking one.'</p> <p>New boy: 'Yes, but he will be advised by you, then he will stop stinking.'</p> <p>Left: 'Yes, yes, we want to call him...'</p> <p>New boy: 'How do you know that you don't stink?'</p> <p>Left: 'No, no, no you can smell me.'</p> <p>New boy: 'No, you don't stink. But advice your friend that he should not stink.'</p> <p>Left: To the right boy: 'Okay, stop stinking.'</p> <p>New boy: 'Yho! He does not stink.'</p> <p>Left: laughing</p> <p>New boy: 'We are talking about the one that stinks. That one that you were talking about. The one you made fun of. Do the correct thing, and advise him.'</p> <p>Left: 'Okay, yes, we will tell him.'</p> | |
| 10:07:22 – 10:07:27 | <p>Phase 9 – Friendship is loving each other: <i>Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) hug each other in front of the camera.</i></p> | | <p>Music: Te amo with Lyrics: 'Te amo means I love you.'</p> <p>Written text: Friendship is... ...loving each other.'</p> | |
| 10:07:27 – 10:07:31 | <p>Phase 9 – Friendship is loving each other: <i>Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) hug each other in front of the camera.</i> Almost long shot, eye level, Oblique Both relaxed clothes Location: Inside (in office adjacent to the library) Represented Participants: Two producers</p> | Both are hugging each other | <p>Music: Te amo with Lyrics: 'Don't it mean: I love you?'</p> | <p>Angle (Power) Eye level Attitude Oblique Contact Offer picture Social distance Far personal distance / almost far social distance</p> |
| 10:07:31 – 10:07:57 | <p>Transition 9 – Friendship is...: <i>They show a title stating: We should love, care and share for each other. We should appreciate our friends. And</i></p> | | <p>Music: Te amo with Lyrics:</p> | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | <i>embrace our friendship while we can. To those who have a lovely friendship: Keep on making sure that it stays good for ever.</i> | | <p>'Think it means 'I love you' I love you Te amo, te amo Don't it mean I love you?'</p> <p>Written text</p> <p>'We should love, care and share for each other. We should appreciate our friends. And embrace our friendship while we can. To those who have a lovely friendship. Keep on making sure that it stays good for ever.'</p> | |
| 10:07:57 – 10:08:03 | <p>Phase 10 – Funny ending (Bloopers):</p> <p><i>Yola (f, 17) and Nothemba (f, 17) still hugging each other in front of the camera. Then falling out of their role and walking towards the camera and Yola (f, 17) says in isiXhosa (English subtitles provided): 'Are you waiting for us to say stop?'</i></p> <p>Almost long shot, eye level, Oblique Both casual clothes</p> <p>Location: Inside</p> | <p>Blooper</p> <p>The two producers hug (end of this scene), they 'fall out of their role' and walk towards the camera operator. Yonela closes the lens with her hand.</p> <p>END</p> | <p>Conversation:</p> <p>isiXhosa (subtitle by producer)</p> <p>'Are you waiting for me to say stop?'</p> | <p>Angle (Power) Eye level</p> <p>Attitude Oblique – turns into frontal as soon as Yonela walks towards the camera</p> <p>Contact Offer picture – turns in demand picture</p> <p>Social distance</p> |