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Abstract

Many studies show that digital storytelling is a promising tool for education since it helps student understand new concepts and complex issues through its interactive, participatory and immersive techniques. As a result, using digital storytelling in peace education, which serves as an alternative for tackling important issues such as reconciliation and healing process, can be of important value for post-conflict societies. Given the limited amount of research on peace education through digital storytelling in Rwanda, this research proposal aims at analysing in which ways and to what extent digital storytelling can be used for direct and indirect peace education among Rwandan students aged between 13 and 18. In line with this purpose, seven transmedia and multimedia projects related to the Rwandan, Bosnian, Guatemalan and Cambodian genocide have been selected in order to examine the post-conflict reconciliation narratives. Additionally, these projects will be used in the workshops designed to understand students’ interaction with stories and their approach to the use of digital storytelling in peace education. The outcomes of this research will provide a guideline for the implementation of digital storytelling in peace education with the aim of facilitating post-conflict reconciliation.
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INTRODUCTION

For centuries, storytelling has always been a crucial tool used to make sense of the world. It connects us to our ancestors, creates a link between centuries, and contributes to the formation of our identities. Additionally, it has become an apparatus of meaning-making in a cultural sense rather than individual perceptions. In this regard, it has been used to understand the collective narratives and cultures as an essential factor for societies emerging from violence and conflict, and consequently appears as one of the means of reconciliation employed in such societies (Mairs, 2013). For instance, it was used within the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), which aimed to deal with South Africa’s Apartheid years, with a view to accelerating reconciliation between victims and perpetrators (Boraine, 1999).

Storytelling in post-conflict societies might vary in terms of its form, but it is mostly considered as “testimony giving” (McRoberts, 2016). In this kind of storytelling, victims and perpetrators explain their personal experiences of discomfort and pain, or their society’s suffering and survival. Storytelling can enhance the understanding of differing parties involved in the conflict. Additionally, it might help divided societies to create a common future by giving people chance to listen to each other, which can construct a potential tool for reconciliation and peace-making. However, there are many questions to ask on the way towards constructive storytelling in societies emerging from conflicts: What kind of storytelling strategies to use? Which mediums to utilize? How does storytelling affect the post-conflict healing? What kind of strategies to make use of in digital era?

The danger of having a single story which might eliminate ‘the other’ or misrepresent it in certain contexts generates a necessity to have a multi-layered story to understand the complex conflicts and facilitate reconciliation and healing in post-conflict societies. In this context, constructive storytelling should require a kind of participation, engagement, immersion and interaction for audiences to provide mutual understanding and better communication. With the evolvement of technology, storytelling has shaped its journey
from cave carvings to digital media, making it possible for storytelling to be more participatory, immersive and interactive thanks to its advanced technological tools. As Nguyen (2011) stated, “the desire for humans to tell stories has not changed since the time of the prehistoric paintings on the walls of Lascaux cave to the most recent Oscar-winning movies. What has changed is the means through which humans represent their stories, and thus, their views of life and world” (p.12). In this sense, digital storytelling can be seen as the combination of traditional storytelling and the new technology, which gives storyteller an opportunity to narrate the story with music, images, videos and other forms of digital devices.

Digital storytelling has proved to be resourceful and effective in many fields such as media, communication, education and community development. In this research, the focus will be on the use of digital storytelling in post-genocide reconciliation through the discussion of certain transmedia and multimedia projects in the framework of peace education, because digital storytelling has a capacity to explain the complexity of social issues such as genocides and wars in a more profound way by listening, explaining, and exchanging stories. It can create a real life experience through detailed and multi-sided media; as a result it establishes a strong connection between the storytellers and audience (Miller, 2004). It enables producers, journalists, teachers or everyone who would like to create a social impact in the society to make a compelling emotional connection with audiences, aim to educate, inform or inspire, communicate similarities and differences, change behaviours, or inspire people to take action.

The practice of digital storytelling can accomplish many objectives such as serving as archives of local and national history on specific conflict-related topics, peace activism in post-conflict societies with the aim of preventing further issues and education on peace and prevention of conflicts. First of all, digital storytelling functions as an archive consisting of historical events and backgrounds, thus generates a new tool to bring together the necessary knowledge to create microhistories. According to Hartley (2008), digital storytelling is a part of a “cultural process” that involves both history and local
community; however, even though digital microhistories are local community-oriented, the way of creating it and its effects can be applicable to large communities.

Secondly, digital storytelling aims at invoking a kind of outreach and activism with the hope of influencing public opinion. Since “digital storytelling represents a novel distribution of a scarce resource - the ability to represent the world around us - using a shared infrastructure” (Couldry, 2008, p.374), that “shared infrastructure” can encourage the society to take action and participate in the communication by creating a dialogue or maybe it can only induce emotion. The society can also develop further strategies or simply use the stories again to nourish activism. This kind of engagement is the core of digital storytelling, which enables storytellers to share their perspectives with the intent of having an impact on certain issues.

Lastly, digital storytelling can be used for educational purposes at every level of teaching and learning about the reasons and comprehension of conflicts, prevention of conflicts, conflict management and, reconciliation and healing processes in post-conflict societies through interactive and immersive storytelling. Utilizing digital storytelling in education, whether used inside or outside the classroom, has been visited by many scholars and researchers. Researchers such as Hibbing and Rankin-Erikson (2003) stated that multimedia is very effective for students to comprehend the new information and difficult subjects. Van Gils (2005) proposed many advantages of digital storytelling used in educational contexts such as offering more variation, personalizing the learning activities, making some subject intriguing, generating real life situations, and encouraging involvement.

Many academics have suggested that peace education can be an alternative to tackle the issues regarding conflict resolution, reconciliation and healing process (e.g. Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; Spink, 2005; Staub, 2005). When all of the advantages of digital storytelling are considered, its use for peace education in conflict areas to understand the conflicts, its reasons, consequences and the ways to prevent it or facilitate the reconciliation process
can be practical thanks to its interactive and immersive features. Furthermore, adoption of “constructive storytelling” (Senehi, 2002) and perspective-taking strategies in peace education by implementing digital storytelling into classrooms might increase mutual recognition and respect among conflicting parties.

For this project, seven web-based transmedia and multimedia projects associated with the Rwandan, Bosnian, Cambodian and Guatemalan genocide will be examined and used in the workshops designed to see how Rwandan students aged between 13 and 18 interact with the stories and how the use of this kind of projects can be useful in peace education practices. Two transmedia and two multimedia projects specific to the Rwandan genocide and post-conflict reconciliation in Rwanda will be analysed in the framework of narrative theory in order to comprehend overall understanding of national and individual healing processes in the post-genocide context of Rwanda, the projects’ characteristics, advantages and disadvantages in the reconciliation process, examine the ways they facilitate peace process as well as the premise, structure and continuation of the story, the degree of interactivity, immersion, virtuality and collaboration, the analysis of characters, media platforms and genres, target audiences and aesthetics in the projects. Qualitative comparisons between projects and with other projects related to other genocides namely Cambodian, Guatemalan and Bosnian genocide will be carried out for a comprehensive analysis. Additionally, interviews with the producers will be conducted for the further evaluation.

Centre for Conflict Management in National University of Rwanda, the organization of A Piece of Life and Never Again Rwanda will be asked for collaboration in the research project for data collection and the design of workshops with students with the aim of understanding in what ways and to what extent digital storytelling can be utilized in reconciliation through education. After in-depth narrative analysis of the projects, field notes and observations, interviews and focus groups, the researcher will develop a strategy to use digital storytelling in conflict areas to facilitate reconciliation through peace education. Given the limited amount of research on digital storytelling specific to the post-
genocide reconciliation and healing in Rwanda, the research problem can be defined as the necessity to develop digital storytelling strategies to use with the aim of promoting peace education in the country toward a better and fast reconciliation process. The outcomes of this research will be of value to the basic knowledge in the fields of conflict resolution and reconciliation through digital storytelling in peace education in Rwanda.

STATE OF THE ART

1. Literature Review

1.1. Storytelling

Storytelling as defined by Smith (1980) is simply “someone telling someone else that something happened” (p. 232). Every society, culture or group acquire their stories regarding their past, and additionally studies and reports show that those who have social or personal trauma often recover from it by telling their stories (e.g. Boraine, 1999, Furman, 2013). In such societies emerging from wars and conflicts, storytelling is encouraged for all parties to involve, engage and enhance the peacebuilding activities and reconciliation process. On the other side, disadvantages of storytelling in post-conflict societies have been discussed by many scholars as well (e.g. Mairs, 2013; Moloney, 2014). They have discussed whether storytelling in such context facilitates the reconciliation or brings back the old problems on the table.

Senehi (2002) states that “storytelling and other modes of expression may, in fact, intensify social cleavages and mistrust and perpetuate structural violence”; hence, she differentiates “destructive storytelling” from “constructive storytelling”:

Constructive storytelling is associated with positive peace; destructive storytelling is associated with its antithesis. Destructive storytelling is associated with coercive power (“power over” rather than “power with”), exclusionary practices, a lack of mutual recognition, dishonesty, and a lack of awareness. Destructive storytelling sustains mistrust and denial. Constructive storytelling is inclusive and fosters collaborative power and mutual recognition; creates opportunities for openness,
dialogue, and insight; a means to bring issues to consciousness; and a means of resistance. Such storytelling builds understanding and awareness, and fosters voice. (Senehi, 2002, p.45)

For instance, Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) made use of storytelling in order to tackle the issues of the post-conflict society in South Africa, which considerably helped victims and perpetrators manage their trauma (Boraine, 1999). Another example would be the Consultative Group on the Past, founded in Northern Ireland, which declared that storytelling is a significant element for any kind of conflict reconciliation (Report on the Consultative Group on the Past 2009, 32). In the project of the Parents Circle-Families Forum, Israelis and Palestinian who lost a relative in the conflict gathered together, and the stories they have shared between each other allowed them to “develop the capacity for empathy and moral responsibility beyond their own people by encountering “the other” via personal stories of loss and suffering” (Furman, 2013, p. 125).

Storytelling is a very powerful and inexpensive way of promoting peace if it is done constructively (Senehi, 2002). Active participation of youth in the process of creating further dialogue and the new stories needed for a peace making and peace building helps them to construct meanings and negotiate conflicts. Particularly in the context of post-genocide societies such as Rwanda’s, storytelling can help to encourage sustainable peace processes. Constructive storytelling in terms of peacebuilding and reconciliation lies in the mutual understanding and active listening and participation. And using this kind of storytelling within digital spaces can create a further reflective dialogue in which participants can immerse themselves in the conversation without any kind of temporal and geographical restrictions and in a more compelling, emotional and interactive way. Constructive digital storytelling might allow people to revive their past, illustrate their present, and reconcile for their future. It offers an innovative method for people to share their stories and learn from others within reconciliation context.
1.1.1. Digital Storytelling

There are various approaches towards digital storytelling, and indeed there is no unanimity on what digital storytelling means (Hayes & Matusov, 2005). When digital storytelling considered as a communicative practice, Salpeter (2005) defines it as “the modern expression of the ancient art of storytelling” (p.18). According to Armstrong (2003) digital storytelling is the process of combining old form of storytelling with digital media. In general digital storytelling is defined as a traditional storytelling blended with multimedia, which focuses on specific topics containing particular point of view. It might tell the personal stories, convey the historical events and information, or only give information about a precise subject. Hartley and McWilliam conceptualize digital storytelling with two categorization; “specific” and “generic” (2009, p.8). The specific one indicates the digital storytelling designed and published through Center for Digital Storytelling. The generic refers to the practice of storytelling with multimedia such as video, audio or music in order to convey stories. While the generic storytelling focuses on how digital media supports the act of narrating, the specific one uses technology due to its applicable use for creation (Hartley & McWilliam, 2009).

Lambert (2016), co-founder of the Center for Digital Storytelling (CDS) which is a non-profit arts and education organization which assisting people create their own digital narratives, describe the seven elements of digital storytelling (described in Table 1). Additionally, Ryan (2004) points out five properties of digital media that has an impact on its narrativity; “Reactive and interactive nature”, “multiple sensory and semiotic channels”, “networking capabilities”, “volatile signs” and “modularity” (p. 338). She describes “reactive and interactive nature” as “the ability of digital media to respond to changing conditions.” While “reactivity” indicates the responses to “changes in the environment or to nonintentional user actions”, “interactivity” describes the reaction to a “deliberate user action”. “Multiple sensory and semiotic channels” are the multimedia characteristics of digital media. Additionally, digital media can bring many people together allowing them to communicate in a multi-user system, which creates a networking opportunity. “Volatile signs” points at the dynamic nature of digital media.
which can be recreated “without having to throw away the material support”. Lastly, “modularity” refers to the possibility of using digital data autonomously (Ryan, 2004, p. 338).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of view</th>
<th>What is the premise of the story? What is the position of the author?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A dramatic question</td>
<td>What is the question that draws the audience’s attention and holds this attention throughout the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional content</td>
<td>What elements are contributing to audience’s emotional state?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gift of your voice</td>
<td>Do you personalize the story and explain the context through voice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The power of the soundtrack</td>
<td>Do you play music to generate a specific emotion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Do you use enough content to convey the story and let the audience complete the rest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td>How is the rhythm of the story arranged?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Seven Elements of Digital Storytelling  
Source: Adapted from Lambert (2006)*

When Ryan’s (2004) list (demonstrated in Table 2) is taken into consideration, it can be implied that storytelling through digital media brings many advantageous with it. One of the major areas discussed in the framework of digital storytelling is education. Most work by scholars on this field presents it with all the opportunities it generates in the classrooms (Hibbing & Rankin-Erikson, 2003; van Gils, 2005; Yang & Wu, 2012). As an educational tool, teachers can either show the previously-created digital storytelling projects or encourage students to create one in order to draw their attention and introduce new subjects. Some scholars such as Burmark (2004) have stated that combining visual materials with texts increases the comprehension of students and speeds up the learning process.
Reactive and interactive nature | Digital media’s response to dynamic settings and environments
---|---
Multiple sensory and semiotic channels | Multimedia characteristics of digital media
Networking capabilities | The ability of digital media to bring many people together in virtual environments
Volatile signs | The ability of digital media to be refreshed and rewritten
Modularity | The ability of digital media to be used autonomously in various contexts

Table 2: Five Properties of Digital Media
Source: Adapted from Ryan (2004)

According to Barrett (2006), digital storytelling combines four learning strategies for students, namely, student engagement in the course, deep and critical learning, project oriented learning and utilizing technological tools in education (demonstrated graphically in Figure 1). Additionally, introducing storytelling in social sciences improves individual's' comprehension of democracy, citizenship, cultural diversity and sways them to learn about the past (Combs & Beach, 1994). Such researchers as Dorner, Grimm and Abawi (2002) believe that audiences of digital storytelling do not merely listen to the story, but also involve into an interaction with it. Gregori-Signes (2014) takes a socio-educational perspective while analysing fifty digital stories by students regarding social issues such as war, immigration, violence and poverty. She states that creating digital stories on the social issues help students develop a critical approach and certain awareness on the topics. Addressing social problems through digital storytelling in educational environments can be effective in understanding certain aspects of issues and encouraging people to take action for social change, since “the socio-educational movement mobilises people, groups and organisations, so that they can articulate their strengths, from common goals and interests, in favour of collective welfare” (Gregori-Signes, 2014, p. 242).
Digital storytelling has been also used as a method that empowers marginalized group of people through activist narratives. The fact that personal and community stories might encourage and inform people, and move them deeply can help audiences bridge the differences that result in dividing them and treat each other with conscience and compassion. In this sense, digital storytelling has turned into a tool for altering communication ecology (Lundby, 2008) and a symbol of participation (Carpentier, 2009). Additionally, greater access to the digital devices for production and dissemination of stories allowed marginalized people to share their stories and challenge the stereotypes about themselves (Vivienne & Burgess, 2012). Since digital storytelling is mostly produced outside of the boundaries of mainstream media organizations (Couldry, 2008), it is a significant method to speak up for social issues that are not covered in the mainstream media and that contrasts with the regular context. Moreover, this kind of empowerment gives countenance to others who would like to share their stories, regain space in public and promote activism.
Lambert (2016) argues that there is a need of “conversational media”: “much of what we help people create would not easily stand alone as broadcast media, but, in the context of conversation, it can be extraordinarily powerful” (2006, p. 17). According to him, digital storytelling can offer many advantageous for better comprehension between generations, people from different ethnicities and other kind of divisions and can be used in education, activism, and professional domains (2006, p. 111) with the aim of engaging people to find out new solutions by re-evaluating and resolving complexities in the society. As Reed and Hill’s (2010) study on examining the achievements and challenges of the project by the Sonke Gender Justice Network in Eastern Cape, South Africa, which aimed at capturing the difficulties young people face in their everyday lives, shows that digital storytelling projects have potential to “offer as both a psychological outlet and a tool for community education and social activism with marginalized youth” (p. 268).

And these projects also serve as web-based digital archives which are compilation of sources, texts, videos, interviews, photographs, maps and so on. They provide people with vast amount of information on particular topics. The documents that constitute digital archives are of hypertextuality, since these documents are "composed of blocks or words (or images) linked electronically by multiple paths, chains, or trails in an open-ended, perpetually unfinished textuality described by the terms, link, node, network path" (Landow, 2006, p.2). This hypertextual dynamic allows people to go through the items freely and progress on them in non-linear way. Additionally, since the hypertextuality gives more freedom, people assume more active and flexible role in the learning process. As Christiansen states, “the accessibility of these new technologies and the use of digital storytelling workshops have supported the development of large web-based digital storytelling archives which are increasingly used within professional education to support student learning.” (p. 289). Moreover, digital storytelling projects serving as archives can be fruitful in various ways such as educating students without linear textbooks, informing people in a way that requires their participation and enhance the teaching methods of instructors.
1.1.2. Transmedia vs Multimedia Storytelling

Given this research project is focused on seven transmedia and multimedia storytelling projects, it is necessary to define the terms and differentiate between them although they are not mutually exclusive. To start with, transmedia storytelling is a notion coined by Jenkins (2003) referring to a “storyworld” consisting many stories on different media platforms by contributing to our understanding of it. As stated by Jenkins (2003):

[... ] each medium does what it does best-so that a story might be introduced in a film, expanded through television, novels, and comics, and its world might be explored and experienced through game play. Each franchise entry needs to be self-contained enough to enable autonomous consumption. That is, you don’t need to have seen the film to enjoy the game and vice-versa. (para. 10)

According to Geoffrey Long (2007) “the word ‘transmedia’ should be considered an adjective, not a noun.” (p.32). Jenkins (2007) says that “transmedia storytelling represents a process where integral elements of a fiction get dispersed systematically across multiple delivery channels for the purpose of creating a unified and coordinated entertainment experience. Ideally, each medium makes its own unique contribution to the unfolding of the story.” (para. 3)

Additionally, Scolari (2009) describes transmedia storytelling as “a particular narrative structure that expands through both different languages (verbal, iconic, etc.) and media (cinema, comics, television, video games, etc.). TS is not just an adaptation from one media to another. The story that the comics tell is not the same as that told on television or in cinema; the different media and languages participate and contribute to the construction of the transmedia narrative world” (p. 587). Then, a transmedia narrative can be defined as one big outspread story on different platforms, attracting participation of the audience. It does not consist of the same story on different platforms; rather it builds the story from a different and new perspective. In this sense, Jenkins (2009) defines “seven principles of transmedia storytelling” (described in Table 3) in order to depict what a transmedia story must achieve and in what ways it draws audiences’ attention and engage them in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spreadability vs. Drillability</th>
<th>Spreading and deepening content for different audiences to explore the extensions of story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuity vs. Multiplicity</td>
<td>Maintaining the storyworld for a long time and through alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion vs. Extractability</td>
<td>Allowing audiences to enter the story and use some aspects of it in their everyday lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldbuilding</td>
<td>Extending the story to give richer depictions, led mostly by user communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriality</td>
<td>Expanding the story through multiple media channels and engaging different audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
<td>Including various perspectives for users to experience the story in alternative ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Inspiring audiences to contribute to the storyworld with their own storytelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Seven concepts of transmedia storytelling


The research on transmedia storytelling is based on both fiction and nonfiction transmedia products. The difference of the application of transmedia storytelling in the fiction and nonfiction works is that researchers of fiction mainly focus on the internet, on the other hand researchers analysing nonfiction works try to understand the effects of “the elaboration and distribution of contents on different platforms, the professional profile of journalists and the forms of accessing contents” (Palacios, M. & Díaz Noci, 2009, p. 112). Also Jenkins (2010) state that dealing with transmedia is rather difficult since it overlaps with many fields of research that are considered different in terms of methodological approaches.
Transmedia storytelling strategies have been used in many projects to change perceptions on important social issues or encourage civic engagement and social activism. As Jenkins says “Millennials, who have been acclimating themselves with the tools of connectivity in times of play, now have at their disposal the means to harness a global community to solve such pressing issues as global warming, ethnic, racial or religious genocide, labor unrest, the inequities associated with class, and countless other modern-day assaults” (2013, para. 3). Srivastava defines transmedia activism as “the coordinated co-creation of narrative and cultural expression by various constituencies who distribute that narrative in various forms through multiple platforms, the result of which is to build an ecosystem of content and networks that engage in community-centered social” (as cited in Jenkins, 2016). As a result combining transmedia with activism and engage people to create a social positive effect can be achieved with transmedia projects, because transmedia helps activism go from a tool used to increase awareness to a tool to bring people to action.

The rich storyworld of transmedia comprises many stories arriving from the interaction of people or groups, settings, subjects and events. This factor lets us use various approaches in communicating and negotiating many issues. For instance, different characters in the story can actually tell their own perceptions considering the same issue; different media platforms can be utilized to reach the target audience. Transmedia storytelling techniques have been used in many projects in order to engage people and encourage them for activism on various global issues (von Stackelberg & Jones, 2014). In this sense, transmedia storytelling is a tool for not only delivering a message but also communicating an experience to bring awareness and encourage action among people or groups in such a way that broadens and deepens the participation of people. Transmedia gets its power from the traditional means it uses such as emotions, engagement, global themes (Rutledge, 2011), and also the modern tools such as digital environment and user-generated content thanks to the digital era, making it very effective to nourish any kind of activism and enhance learning/teaching activities.
As one of the aims of this project is to see the differences between multimedia and transmedia in post-genocide reconciliation, it is essential to explain their differences. Moloney (2014) explains the differences according to their use of “media form” and “media channel”. He states that multimedia requires one story created with many forms and placed on one channel, while transmedia tells many stories building a storyworld with many forms on different channels (Moloney, 2014). Furthermore, Jenkins (2010) defines multimedia as “the integration of multiple modes of expression within a single application”, on the other hand he describes transmedia as “the dispersal of those same elements across multiple media platforms” (para. 4). He also points out the different practices of transmedia and multimedia when it comes to education:

Multimedia and Transmedia assume very different roles for spectators/consumers/readers. In a multimedia application, all the readers need to do is click a mouse and the content comes to them. In a transmedia presentation, students need to actively seek out content through a hunting and gathering process which leads them across multiple media platforms. Students have to decide whether what they find belongs to the same story and world as other elements. They have to weigh the reliability of information that emerges in different contexts. No two people will find the same content and so they end up needing to compare notes and pool knowledge with others. That’s why our skill is transmedia navigation – the capacity to seek out, evaluate, and integrate information conveyed across multiple media. (Jenkins, 2010, para. 5)

All in all, both multimedia and transmedia uses many forms such as photos, videos, texts, documentaries and so on, but while the former combines these forms on one channel, the latter places them on different channels. Another difference is the interaction and communication in a sense that while transmedia enhances the way of the audience’s interaction and communication, multimedia might limit the interaction of people in the participatory culture of media.
1.1.3. Participation, Immersion and Interactivity

Becoming a part of a group or a community generates the possibility of deeper dialogues, understanding, awareness and change. In this sense, digital media offers many advantages such as participation, immersion and interactivity among users without limitations and constraints. If these concepts function well and, complete each other in a digital project, achieving a sense of community can be viable. On the subject of participation, Jenkins states, “I object to calling it participation if the people involved have no sense of themselves as belonging to something bigger than the individual. For me, participation starts at that moment when we see ourselves as part of a group that is seeking to achieve some shared goals through collective effort” (in Allen et al, 2004, p. 1145). On the other hand, Schäfer defines participation as the ways users “contribute to or participate in using a service or a platform” (in Allen et al, 2004, p. 1142). He also adds that “it is necessary to point out the context of user activities, their agency, the role of design, and the objectives and influence of the platform providers. Then we can be more specific about the quality of participation and can develop criteria for measuring its impact.” (p.1142)

As mentioned before, Ryan (2004) describes five properties of digital media: reactivity and interactivity, multimedia capabilities, networking capabilities, volatile signs and modularity (p. 338). She points out that although digital media should be defined by emphasizing each one of them, “interactivity” is peculiar and very crucial when storytelling is concerned; because, “when interactivity is added to the text or the movie, its ability to tell stories, and the stories it can tell, are deeply affected” (Ryan, 2004, p. 339). She further develops a typology adapted from Espen Aarseth’s typology in order to categorize the user participation in digital media: internal versus external involvement and exploratory versus ontological involvement (p. 339):

In the internal mode users project themselves as members of a virtual (or fictional) world, either by identifying with an avatar or by apprehending the virtual world from a first-person perspective. In the external mode readers situate themselves outside of the virtual world. They either play the role of a god who controls the
fictional world from above, or they conceptualize their activity as navigating the database…

In the exploratory mode users are free to move around the database, but this activity does not make history, nor does it alter the plot; users have no impact on the destiny of the virtual world. In the ontological mode, by contrast, the decisions of the users send the history of the virtual world on different forking paths. These decisions are ontological in the sense that they determine which possible world, and consequently which story, will develop from the situation in which the choice presents itself. (Ryan, 2004, p.339)

In digital storytelling, the notions of participation, immersion and interactivity are complementary and they should be seen as tools which users are engaged in the story with. The rapid growth of new digital tool has made it possible for users to change from passive consumers to active contributors. Whether the participation is internal/external or exploratory/ontological, as Ryan (2004) suggested, it will allow users to immerse themselves into the virtual reality to make better use of the interactive and collaborative properties of digital world. One of the relevant subject to the aim of this project, in the framework of the keywords mentioned in this part, is interactive documentary in which “the viewers can be given the opportunity of choosing what material to see and in what order. They might also get to choose among several audio tracks.” (Miller, 2004, p. 345)

Many scholars (Gifreu-Castells 2011; Nash, 2012; Gaudenzi, 2013) have developed categorizations to define interactive documentaries. While Gifreu-Castells (2011) uses three points of view, namely the point of view of author, text and interactor, Nash (2012) categorizes interactive documentaries in terms of the narrative, categorical and collaborative properties. On the other hand, Gaudenzi (2013) adopts a more representative approach towards the current trends in the field. Her taxonomy includes conversational, hypertext, participatory and experiential mode. And according to her “the advantage of using modes of interactivities as differentiators for a taxonomy of interactive documentaries is that it allows us to see beyond the topic of the documentary, and beyond its support platform. Modes of interactivities do not look at what the documentary says but at what it does to us and to itself,” (Gaudenzi, 2013, p. 242).
For this project, participation, immersion and interactivity will be considered as perspective-taking strategies in digital storytelling. Perspective-taking is a cognitive skill to view a situation from another point-of-view (Davis, 1983), which can be beneficial for reconciliation process thanks to its possibility to increase intergroup helping (Bilewicz, 2009), reduce prejudices, stereotypes and in-group favouritism (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000) and resolving conflicts (Galinsky, Maddux, Gilin & White, 2008). As Batson and Ahmad (2009) believe that media-generated experiences can be useful because they lead us to “imagine the thoughts and feelings of a member of a stigmatized group as he or she attempts to cope (imagine-other perspective taking), we can be led to value this person’s welfare and feel empathic concern” (p. 169), thereby fostering positive behaviours and attitudes. Furthermore, storytelling in general enables people to comprehend and “imagine the real[ity] of the other” as noted by Buber (cited in Black, 2008, p.96). By using digital devices and more participatory, immersive and interactive strategies, digital storytelling might elicit a kind of perspective taking which allow people to listen to each other stories, and view themselves and (former) adversary in a more thorough and complete way than they can do in any other setting or with any other kind of media and communication tool.

1.2. Digital Storytelling for Social Change

The use of digital storytelling in social spheres for positive impact have been widely examined, analysed and discussed. There are many research in the field of education that proves digital storytelling is an efficient tool helping students (Di Blas, Paolini & Sabiescu, 2012), encouraging them to establish creative projects (Cao, Lindley, Helmes & Sellen, 2010), help them perpetuate their cultural values (Lu et al., 2011). Shen et al. (2002) explain Personal Digital Historian (PDH) project that encourage people to have conversation and reflection about their collective past by using digital archives. Furthermore, Frohlich et al. (2009) used a form of mobile digital storytelling in an Indian village to see how digital storytelling boosts the possibility of reaching information in “semi-literacy communities”.
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Although it is not very common, interactive storytelling systems have also been utilized to facilitate the post-conflict healing processes such as the MOSES project realized in Liberia (Smyth, Etherton & Best, 2010). Digital storytelling has been also discussed in terms of its application through mobile digital storytelling with the aim of sharing stories and experiences in rural areas, enabling them create awareness of their problems among people (Jones, Thom, Bainbridge & Frohlich, 2009; Bidwell, Reitmaier, Marsden & Hansen, 2010). Another example about the use of digital storytelling in social issues would be the Center for Digital Storytelling’s Silence Speaks initiative¹ that makes use of participatory media to share personal stories about the complex social topics, educate and inspire people, and promote human rights, gender equality and health in local and global frameworks.

Digital storytelling can be seen as a means to create awareness in social issues among people for two main reasons; (1) the intimacy and openness of sharing personal and community stories while contributing to meaning-making process of storytellers, (2) the use of this kind of digital stories outside of the group involved in stories to expand the discussion relating to social issues in public sphere. In this sense, digital storytelling creates a setting in which an exchange between people and groups will be facilitated through digital tools, providing a space for everyone to share their stories from their own perspectives. For a positive impact on the society regarding the social issues faced by many people, digital storytelling allows people to have a dialogue which is the core point of listening and understanding. Since the research is based on the social impact of digital storytelling on post-conflict societies, the next parts will elaborate the subject based on conflict resolution.

1.2.1. Post-conflict Healing and Reconciliation through Digital Narratives

Many agree that reconciliation refers the restoration of peaceful relationships among people, groups or nations emerging from conflicts after the conflict resolution is formally accomplished (e.g. Ackermann, 1994; Norval, 1999; Wilmer, 1998). It involves mutual

¹ https://www.storycenter.org/silence-speaks/
acceptance, shared goals and interests in the development of sustainable relationships, positive and constructive behaviours. Furthermore, reconciliation encourages and promotes the peace as a way to build relationships between societies. It also depends upon the positive emotions such as hope regarding the future to build with the past opponent (Kaufman, 2006; Staub, Pearlman, Gubin & Hagengimana, 2005). Reconciliation should be supported by the majority of the society so that it can sustain itself; otherwise it has the possibility of being in danger. That is why digital storytelling can establish a method to support reconciliation processes by reaching many people and letting them express themselves and share their stories.

As mentioned before storytelling in post-conflict contexts are mostly testimonies given by the parties involved in the conflict. In this sense, taking the aim of facilitating post-conflict reconciliation into account, many producers and designers of digital storytelling projects have started to use innovative methods for audiences to share their stories and live this experience mutually. Digital storytelling can have ability to change perceptions and behaviours between conflicting groups by providing examples of peaceful communication and cooperation. Further, improving the relationship between people or groups results in effective problem-solving techniques, as a result construct mutual trust and awareness.

In this framework, Higgins (2011) analyses the use of digital storytelling for peace-building processes in Cyprus based on the workshop including Turkish and Greek Cypriots. His findings show that “digital storytelling and community media provide opportunities to apply notions of conflict transformation within stimulating and pleasurable learning environments. Digital storytelling and community media, with direction, are able to cultivate skills of self-reflexivity, active listening, and authentic dialogue that provide a sense of empowerment and facilitate personal attachments among participants” (Higgins, 2011, p.11). Along the same line, Smyth et al. (2010) constructs MOSES, an interactive kiosk system, in Liberia for users to share video messages to support post-conflict reconciliation process. According to their study, users consider MOSES as a tool to connect to other Liberians and be listened by others in the context of
conflict resolution. There are also projects that aims at promoting reconciliation and peace in conflict areas such as Gurtong Trust - Peace and Media Project\(^2\) which is a media platform engaging South Sudanese for mutual understanding, awareness and a better future by sharing stories. Another platform is Global Video Letters\(^3\) which has projects in many countries such as India, Mexico and Afghanistan. Their mission is to advocate for human rights and social inclusion and encourage young people to use film to exchange positive and peaceful stories as an alternative to mainstream media that presents these countries only from the perspective from war and conflict.

1.2.2. Peace Education through Digital Storytelling

According to many (e.g. Abu-Nimer, 2004; Bekerman & McGlynn, 2007; Spink, 2005) peace education is considerably an important way to endorse peace and reconciliation. As stated by Bar-Tal and Rosen (2009), schools can have an important role in promoting reconciliation due to some reasons:

First, education in schools is sure to reach a whole segment of a society (i.e., the young generation) because schools are compulsory and all children and adolescents are required to attend them. Second, schools are often the only social institution that can formally, intentionally, and extensively achieve the mission of peace education as they have the authority, the legitimacy, the resources, the methods, and the conditions to carry it out. Third, schooling takes place during children’s formative years, and the young generation, which still is in the process of acquiring a psychological repertoire, is least affected by the dominating ethos and is more open to new ideas and information. Finally, the young generation is required to learn the messages and information transmitted in schools and often treats them as truthful, and, therefore, it is possible to ensure that students at least will be exposed to them. (p. 560)

Regarding post-conflict context, reconciliation takes time and the future generations are the ones who will be in charge of many institutions; as a result the schools should not be counted as consisting of one agent, but as a long-term means for peaceful relationships and

\(^2\) http://www.gurtong.net/
\(^3\) http://globalvideoletters.org/
prevention of further conflicts; because, as Staub (2002) notes, peace education implements crucial elements into education such as emotions and knowledge towards understanding of the causes and consequences of conflict and violence and finding peaceful ways of conflict resolution and devaluation of other groups and individuals.

In this framework, digital storytelling can become a powerful tool in the process of peace and reconciliation due to its successful implementation in curriculum as noted before. Many scholars and researchers (e.g. Hibbing & Rankin-Erikson, 2003; van Gils, 2005; Yang & Wu, 2012) states that digital storytelling generates many opportunities for students’ learning and helps them comprehend the complex topics better. Combining peace education with digital storytelling might allow students to develop consciousness of conflicts, its consequences, needless violence, peaceful methods and conflict resolution for interpersonal and intergroup conflicts, which in the long-term can elicit positive and constructive results for wider social contexts.

1.3. Rwandan Genocide

The Rwandan genocide is one of the cruellest periods in recent history, killing approximately 75 percent of Tutsis along with many moderate Hutus (Mann, 2005, p. 430). A vast number of people were killed in a very short time with the civilian population as well as the government, media, churches and military taking part in it. Some research on the causes of the genocide has suggested that it was organized, planned and ordered by the authorities in political spheres (Des Forges, 1999; Prunier, 1997). Furthermore, in many documents the Rwandan genocide is classified as a conflict based on ethnic hatred; however, some scholar such as Fujii (2011) and Straus (2013) suggested that the Rwandan genocide was caused by the politicization of ethnicity.

The role of radio in Rwanda genocide is very well documented by many academics (e.g. Kirschke, 1996; Li, 2004; Thompson, 2007). Before the genocide, there were two national radio stations in Rwanda namely RTLM and Radio Rwanda. RTLM (Radio Télévision Libre des Milles Collines) was launched in 1993 and worked as a propaganda tool against
Tutsis through jokes and comments (Paluck, 2009). Radio Rwanda had been making propaganda against Tutsis as well, but RTLM broadcasted “the most extreme and inflammatory messages” (Yanagizawa-Drott, 2014, p. 1953). According to Yanagizawa-Drott (2014), even though there were alternative print media, low literacy level elicited the limitation of circulating and reading newspapers. After the genocide radio was used as a tool for reconciliation as well, since it was the most important and popular form of media which is listened by many people in Rwanda (Hendy, 2013).

After the genocide, national courts, foreign courts, the International Criminal Tribunal of Rwanda and a national military tribunal have been established to tackle the crimes during the genocide (Sosnov, 2007). However, they have not succeeded in clearing up the problems the genocide brought to the society. Later, Gacaca has been developed, but it has also failed in revealing the truth and handling the problems associated with the genocide (Sosnov, 2007).

Years after the genocide, Rwanda is still trying to construct a peaceful environment through an ongoing reconciliation process. Reconciliation can take a long time, but it requires more than asking what should be done with the perpetrators. Alternative ways for society to recover from the trauma should be discussed and encouraged. One of the methods implemented after the genocide in Rwanda is storytelling. Many storytelling projects have succeeded at preparing a place for mutual understanding and reconciliation, because the power of narrative enables people to consider difficult problems and stimulate empathy. Another way to fight against and tackle the problems relating to the post-conflict context is peace education, which has the potential to facilitate the reconciliation process and peace-making in the society.

1.3.1. Reconciliation Process and Storytelling in Post-genocide Rwanda

After the genocide ended, the ‘Gacaca Courts’ were set up, which allowed hearings held at villages of Rwanda every week in order to give an opportunity to victims, perpetrators and their communities to share their stories about what they experienced during the genocide.
A gacaca historically meant “a community-based informal arbitration convened by the parties to a civil dispute; its legitimacy was founded upon the willing participation of the parties and the community” (Le Mon, 2007, p. 16). The hope was that the courts would be helpful for the country to recover from the consequences of the genocide and promote reconciliation (Mukherjee, 2011); however, they led people to become more divided as innocent and guilty because the Gacaca Courts were using a retributive approach and pseudo-legal conflict resolution mechanisms instead of restorative strategies (Le Mon, 2017). Additionally, many scholars such as Clark (2010) and Reyntjens (2011) believe that there are many problematic sides to reconciliation and national unity in Rwanda because of the government’s approach, lack of freedom of speech and violation of human rights.

On the other hand, some media productions have been designed in such a way that puts an emphasis on the cultural processes which aims at examining the genocide in details and help both victims and perpetrators toward reconciliation. For instance, the significant role of the radio during the genocide led many people to think that it can also be used for reconciliation and healing process in post-genocide Rwanda. A number of peacebuilding projects by media have been initiated. 10 years after the genocide, the NGO Radio La Benevolencia broadcasted a radio soap called “Musekeweya” (New Dawn) whose aim was to accelerate reconciliation by using an entertainment-education strategy (Singhal, Cody, Rogers & Sabido, 2003) based on a fictional story of a conflict between two groups through psychological approaches (Staub, 2008). The radio soap’s impact on listeners has been examined by Paluck (2009) and she found out that it “affected listener’s perceptions of and behaviours toward some of the most critical issues for Rwanda’s post conflict society, such as intermarriage, open dissent, trust, and talking about personal trauma” (p. 3).

Another radio, Radio Agatashya, was an independent regional radio for Rwandan refugees broadcasting “anything that would provoke hatred or panic and it aimed to valorise and develop all information to assist national reconciliation, the reconstruction of the country,
peace, and respect for human rights. It aired programmes about nutrition, sanitation, medical information, the search for disappeared peoples and the reunification of separated families” (Curtis, 2000, p.156). Further, Castagno noted that according to a sociologist’s evaluation Rwandan refugees thought Radio Agatashya was the most confidential source for them (as cited in Curtis, 2000).

1.3.2. Peace Education in Post-genocide Rwanda

Freedman et al. notes that after the genocide the education system and the infrastructures were destroyed and also many teachers were killed during the genocide or imprisoned after the genocide due to alleged participation in it (as cited in Hilker, 2010, p.8). When the genocide was over, the education system has faced many challenges as stated by Weinstein, Freedman and Hughson (2007):

Many of these traumatized children exhibit emotional symptoms that are manifest in the classroom. The return of Rwandans from the diaspora, many of whom are English-speakers, have introduced a second official language into the schools. Children are expected to learn and be proficient in English as well as French while their home language remains Kinyarwanda. Finally, the genocide was so massive in its scale that a large number of educated professionals including teachers and school administrators were lost. All of these experiences coupled with the psychological and social aftermath of ethnic cleansing, rape and trauma undoubtedly affect the educational system in a profoundly negative manner. (p.56)

Another important element that caused a drawback on the education system was the “genocide ideology” that was criminalized in 2008 (Waldorf, 2009). According to Waldorf (2009), even though the aim of the law punishing “genocide ideology” is to promote unity and reconciliation, it can generate negative outcomes in the education context because of political manipulation. The fact that the government uses the law for its own interests led a fear among people, preventing them to express themselves freely. Taking this context into account, Hilker (2010) gives an example of a project launched by UCB in which “teachers who participated… were increasingly reluctant to discuss anything related to ethnicity, let alone encourage debate on the topic amongst pupils in their classrooms…” (p.14)
Waldorf (2009) believes that reconciliation process is indeed very restricted. The fact that many Rwandans, both Tutsis and Rwandans feel the limited boundaries of speaking up about the difficulties they experienced in the past might lead to the development of injustice. Therefore, peace education plays a key role for promoting reconciliation by “allowing students to explore multiple historical understandings of the past and engage in productive discussions about ethnic identity formation” (Hilker, 2010, p.15). Although there have been many attempts to implement peace education into Rwandan schools, the objectives have not been accomplished fully (Obura, 2003). And since the education system is based on teacher-centered didactic lesson (Freedman, Weinstein, Murphy & Longman, 2008), there is no interaction between students to create a mutual understanding and openly discuss the topics relating to the past, which will prevent the reconciliation process from advancing further.

1.4. Theoretical framework

This project will be based on the educational and social potential of digital storytelling, especially digital storytelling’s possible contribution to the peace education in post-conflict societies; as a result it will be explained in the framework of digital storytelling as mediation and mediatization by Couldry (2008) and peace education models developed by Bar-Tal and Rosen (2009), and the overall discussion will be supported by the concepts of reconciliation, constructivist learning theory, constructive storytelling and perspective taking. Couldry (2008) makes a distinction between “mediation” and “mediatization”, by criticizing the definition of mediatization by some scholars such as Hjarvard who considers it as linear and choosing mediation instead. He points out that the shifts taken place in digital storytelling cannot be analysed pursuant to the concept of mediatization and its linear logic. Consequently, he defines mediation as “the overall effect of media institutions existing in contemporary societies, the overall difference media make by being there in our social world” (Couldry, 2008, p. 379). He suggests that mediation
of an area of culture or social life is always at least two-way: ‘media’ work, and must work, not merely by transmitting discrete textual units for discrete moments of reception, but through a process of environmental transformation which, in turn, transforms the conditions under which any future media can be produced and understood. In other words, ‘mediation’ is a non-linear process. (Couldry, 2008, p. 380)

According to Couldry (2008), “understanding digital storytelling as a broad social phenomenon involves moving beyond such storytelling’s status merely as texts or processes of production or distribution.” (p. 374). As a result, he offers three main approaches regarding digital storytelling as mediation: (1) the analysis of the relation between the production of digital storytelling and certain practices and interpretation styles; (2) the ways of circulation and recirculation of digital storytelling products among various sites and people; (3) the impacts of digital storytelling as a practice in the long run for certain people, places and social and cultural contexts (p. 383). He further adds more questions based on Wuthnow’s argument which claims that the significance of the book cannot be explained without considering some environmental and institutional spaces as well as “action sequences” (as cited in Couldry, 2008, p. 384):

- What patterns, if any, are emerging in the institutional settings in which digital storytelling is now taking place? Who is included in them and who is not?
- What types of resources and agents are drawn upon typically in creating and sustaining effective sites of digital storytelling, and how in detail are effective contexts for the production and reception of digital stories created? (Equally, what factors typically undermine those sites and contexts?)
- Are any new circuits for the distribution of digital stories and social knowledge developing through, and in relation to, digital storytelling sites? What wider profile and status do those circuits have?
- What broader links, if any, are being made between the field of digital storytelling and other fields of practice – education, civic activism, mainstream media production, popular culture generally and politics? (Couldry, 2008, p. 385)

All in all, digital storytelling should not only be considered in the framework of its use of style or forms but also the social and cultural background, locations, broader contexts and the circumstances in which digital stories are delivered, used or referred should be
analysed and examined. This leads us to the theory of peace education which in this research will be the basis of reconciliation through digital storytelling in post-genocide contexts. But first of all, the concept of reconciliation should be defined within the scope of a post-genocide society. According to Staub (2006) reconciliation means that all parties involved in the conflict “come to see the humanity of one another, accept each other, and see the possibility of a constructive relationship” (p.868). It requires mutual recognition and acceptance, attempts to create a common future and move beyond the past conflict. From a psychological perspective, it defines an informal process in which the members of the society form new and positive beliefs about each other, their society and the relationship with the former adversary (Bar-Tal, 2000). In this sense, many scholars (e.g. Abu-Nimer, 2004; Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; Bekerman & McGlynn, 2007) believe that peace education is a promising method to promote reconciliation in post-conflict societies.

Bar-Tal and Rosen (2009) defines two approaches regarding peace education: the school approach and the societal approach. In the school approach, the focus is placed on the activities for peace carried out in schools, while the societal approach looks to the integration of people in the society for reconciliation. They also propose two models of peace education namely indirect and direct peace education (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). Indirect peace education does not precisely explain the conflict; rather, it revolves around the general themes regarding peace-making and reconciliation by avoiding direct clashes and references to the conflict. Further, Bar-Tal and Rosen (2009) offers five of them in order to discuss the properties of these values in terms of peace education (described in Table 4). On the other hand, direct peace education addresses the conflict by confronting the parties involved in the conflict. However, for this kind of education method, societal, political and educational conditions should be appropriate (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). The authors discuss five different themes of direct education system as well (described in Table 5).
Indirect Model of Peace Education

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Thinking</td>
<td>Considering alternatives to analyse information and to have accurate information in order to assess the complexities and judge the essence of the conflict regarding these complexities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Promoting mutual recognition and acceptance, avoiding negative stereotypes and prejudices, reducing the perceived fear or anger of the other side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Empathy</td>
<td>Comprehending another’s feelings, emotions, perceptions and aspects, seeing other group’s members as human individual with goals, needs and concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>Becoming conscious about the human rights, reinforcing the respect for fundamental rights, raising awareness for the recognition of other group’s human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Recognizing the importance of collaborative work for negotiation and solutions, becoming aware of the constructive methods to peace processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Five themes of indirect peace education

Source: Adapted from Bar-Tal & Rosen (2009)

Bar-Tal and Rosen (2009) believe that indirect and direct models of peace education can be applied to any kind of conflict regardless of the characteristics of the conflict since these models include general concepts needed for reconciliation. However, implementing peace education and the methods for conducting it might vary according to the circumstances under which the society is experiencing the post-conflict situation. In this context, digital storytelling can be used in an efficient, adaptable, easy and cheap way by facilitating a constructivist approach for peace education. In constructivist learning theory, teacher is not the single source for learning; rather, learning is “complex and fundamentally non-linear in nature” (Fosnot & Perry, n.d., “Constructivism” section, para.1).
### Direct Model of Peace Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict and peace</td>
<td>Teaching the aspects of the conflict, the explanations of violence and wars, and the essence of the peace process, the ways of conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace process</td>
<td>Teaching the definition of peace, the obstacles to peace, the peace agreements signed in the conflict context, the analysis of reconciliation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the rival</td>
<td>Teaching the process of legitimizing, equalizing, differentiating the parties and the personalization of the rival to understand them as human beings with objectives, needs and virtues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of the conflict</td>
<td>Teaching the unbiased history of the conflict, its causes and consequences, deconstruction of collective narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New affect and emotions</td>
<td>Teaching the collective hope and trust, mutual recognition while reducing the collective prejudices, fears and hatred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Five themes of direct peace education*

*Source: Adapted from Bar-Tal & Rosen (2009)*

Unlike behaviourist approach to learning, constructivist theory does not consider learning as a passive process of gaining knowledge (Jonassen, 1999). Constructivism in peace education requires interactive and authentic learning strategies in order to create a dynamic and multicultural context for students to develop relevant knowledge and attitudes about peace and harmony (Pandey, 2007). According to Pandey (2007), for education to be effective in promoting reconciliation and negotiating conflict, following principles of constructivism should be taken into consideration:

- Posing problems of emerging relevance to students.
- Structuring learning around primary concepts.
Seeking and valuing students’ points of view.
Adapting curriculum to address students’ suppositions.

Adopting constructivist approach in peace education through digital storytelling might serve as a powerful tool for promoting reconciliation and peaceful coexistence, and also for students in post-conflict environments to build new concepts and meanings on what they already know about conflict and peace, how people around them address these notions. Additionally, the use of digital storytelling allows students to discover different perspectives and representations and participate and immerse more in the debate and further dialogue. The reason why these theories have been selected lies in the two concepts that are related to the overall discussion and the theories discussed above: perspective-taking and constructive storytelling. In the post-conflict societies, destructive storytelling hinders reconciliation efforts, as a result using constructive storytelling with perspective-taking strategies is a considerably important task in peace education.

As mentioned in the literature review, constructive storytelling is related to peace process, mutual understanding and recognition, while destructive storytelling implies the opposite (Senehi, 2002). Since all parties involved in the conflict mostly resist engaging with each other’s perceptions (Cikara, Bruneau & Saxe, 2011), the use of digital storytelling in schools regarding peace education can help transforming such destructive stories into constructive stories with the help of its perspective-taking strategies such as participation, immersion and interactivity. According to Galinsky, Ku and Wang (2005), perspective-taking is “the process of imagining the world from another’s vantage point or imagining oneself in another’s shoes” (p. 110); in this sense, the ability of digital storytelling to allow people to participate in creation and course of the story, immerse into the lives of characters and the community and interact with them. As a result, using constructive digital storytelling in peace education might help students understand the complex topics, think critically, raise their awareness, create empathy and so on, which shows that it has a potential to increase perspective-taking and also avoid or eliminate destructive storytelling.
PROBLEM STATEMENT

1. Research Problem

As illustrated throughout the literature review and theoretical framework, digital storytelling is a promising means for peace education and social change. However, the research on the digital storytelling in the context of peace education and reconciliation in post-conflict societies is not extensive. Taking into account the limited amount of research on digital storytelling specific to the post-genocide reconciliation and healing in Rwanda, the research problem can be defined as;

- The necessity for examining the storytelling strategies used by transmedia and multimedia projects tackling the issue of post-genocide
- The necessity for investigating the approach of producers of such projects to the use of digital storytelling to tell stories of post-genocide reconciliation and to be utilized as a tool in peace education
- The necessity for researching the approach of Rwandan students regarding the use of digital storytelling as an innovative peace education tools
- The necessity for exploring in what ways and to what extent digital storytelling can be encouraging for students to take action for reconciliation and national unity
- The necessity for developing digital storytelling strategies to use with the aim of promoting peace education in post-genocide countries towards reconciliation process.

2. Research Objectives

This project aims at contributing to the use of digital storytelling in peace education. Firstly, multimedia and transmedia projects related to genocides and reconciliation processes will be examined with the aim of understanding how they transmit values associated with peace, reconciliation, conflict resolution, mutual recognition and respect. After analysing the projects, the producers will be interviewed in order to acquire deeper understanding of the production process and their approach to the use of digital storytelling in peace education. Later, the workshops will be performed with students by using the projects and, interviews and focus groups will be carried out to evaluate the student’s approach toward using digital storytelling. Taking into consideration the gathered knowledge regarding in what ways and to what extent digital storytelling is helpful and what kind of storytelling strategies are favourable and applicable, the researcher will develop a strategy for using digital storytelling in direct and indirect peace education. Therefore, proposed objectives are:

Objective 1: Analyse the storytelling strategies used by the multimedia and transmedia projects about genocides and reconciliation process in order to tell the complex stories and challenge audiences to experience and interact with the stories
Objective 2: Analyse and compare the projects related to the Rwandan Genocide and the other genocides, namely Bosnian, Cambodian and Guatemalan for the differences and similarities
Objective 3: Identify the approach and the strategy of the producers of the projects toward creating digital storytelling about genocides and its use in peace education
Objective 4: Identify Rwandan students’ approach and needs for using digital storytelling projects to create a dialogue and discuss the issues related to reconciliation and peace processes

Objective 5: Develop a guideline of strategies for the use of digital storytelling in direct and peace education while discussing the themes proposed by each theory

Objective 6: Identify areas, fields and institutions for the guideline to be utilized in terms of facilitating reconciliation process in conflict areas through peace education

3. Research Questions

Based on the literature review and theoretical framework, and the limited amount of research on the use of digital storytelling in peace education, especially in Rwandan context, the research questions that guide this study are as follows;

RQ1: How is digital storytelling in the projects used to enhance the understanding of the genocide and promote reconciliation in the conflict areas?

RQ2: What kinds of strategies are made use of in the projects with the aim of increasing the involvement and participation of audiences?

RQ3: What is the difference between the projects related to the Rwandan genocide and other genocides in terms of narration?

RQ4: What is the approach of producers toward the use of digital storytelling for social change, and in this case reconciliation process and peace education?

RQ5: What is the personal experience for those who attend the workshops of peace education through digital storytelling? What is the approach and needs of students toward using digital storytelling for peace education?

RQ6: Do the projects allow students to discuss further issues associated with genocide and reconciliation process? What are the advantageous, disadvantageous and challenges to use digital storytelling for peace education?
4. Research Limitations

Although Rwanda has three official languages namely Kinyarwanda, French and English, the Rwandan government’s new language policy aims at discarding French and installing English as the official education language (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010). However, As Hilker (2010) notes “French and English are the language of the elites and that there are overlaps between language and ethnic identity, with most English speakers being Tutsi returnees from Uganda and most French speakers being Hutu and Tutsi who grew up in Rwanda or Tutsi returnees from DR Congo and Burundi.” (p.12). Even though, for this project Centre for Conflict Management in University of Rwanda will be asked for collaboration and the school’s official education language is English, there might be still some obstacles while collecting data regarding the genocide and the reconciliation process due to language restrictions. Additionally, acquiring permission from the Rwanda government is a demanding process:

Conducting fieldwork in Rwanda is a daunting prospect for several reasons, most notably the current political climate in the country and the extensive (and expensive) bureaucratic processes that must be navigated in order to acquire formal permission for the proposed research. Researchers whose projects touch upon sensitive issues such as the 1994 genocide or the evaluation of government development and reconciliation initiatives should expect to encounter difficulties when dealing with Rwanda-based gatekeepers. (Jessee, 2012, p. 271)

Another drawback for this research project would be the concerns that Rwandans have regarding speaking about the genocide itself and the reconciliation process in their country due to the law criminalizing “genocide ideology”. Because of the vague definition of “genocide ideology” and the misinterpretations of the law in terms of what is considered criminal under the laws (Amnesty International, 2010), Rwandans might hesitate to talk about the past and be reluctant to discuss the issues related to the reconciliation process. As a result it can become a disadvantage for focus groups in this research to be conducted since it is based on personal experiences and ideas, and an open discussion about the current situation in Rwanda.
METHODOLOGY

For this project, seven transmedia and multimedia projects related to Rwandan, Bosnian, Cambodian and Guatemalan genocide will be analysed. Since the project aims at defining the storytelling strategies in post-genocide societies, the selection of genocides from different countries and different continents will grant a wider perspective of storytelling practices in various contexts. Another reason for choosing projects from different genocides is to develop both direct and indirect peace education methods while referring to other genocides in the context of the themes of peace education such as discussing human rights and conflict resolution in general. In consideration of this aim, qualitative research methods will be conducted in order to understand the use of digital storytelling in peace education. The reason why qualitative approach is chosen for this research is that it can provide rich contextual and narrative explanations of social and human experiences (Creswell, 1998).

First of all, narrative analysis as well as the analytical method adapted from Gambarato’s (2013) method (described in Table 6) will be used to analyse the transmedia and multimedia storytelling projects based on text, images, videos, webdocs and characters in order to understand how digital storytelling is utilized to enhance the understanding of genocide and promote reconciliation. Their similarities and differences on narration will be discussed and the storytelling strategies will be identified to see how these projects increase the engagement and participation. According to Bamberg (2012) narrative presents “a portal into two realms: (a) the realm of experience, where speakers lay out how they as individuals experience certain events and confer their subjective meaning onto these experiences; and (b) the realm of narrative means (or devices) that are put to use to make (this) sense” (Bamberg, 2012, p. 77). He also states that while the former refers to the “research with narrative”, the latter to the “research on narrative” (p. 78). Ryan’s (2007) understanding of narrative is also relevant for this research. She notes that “…narrative is about problem solving; narrative is about conflict; narrative is about interpersonal relations; narrative is about human experience; and narrative is about the temporality of existence” (Ryan, 2007, p. 24). Then narrative analysis sees the individual
within their social contexts as giving meanings to objects in their surroundings, and therefore it is interpretive and subjective.

When the narrative strategies of selected transmedia and multimedia projects are analysed, semi-structured interviews will be carried out with the producers of the projects selected with the intent of finding out more detailed knowledge about the production of the projects. Since “interviewing people provides insight into their world; their opinions, thoughts and feelings” (Hove & Anda, 2005, p.1), interviews with the producers will give the researcher relevant information about their strategy of storytelling and their approach to the use of digital storytelling in peace education. The interviews will be conducted individually and online through Skype. The main themes of the interview will include questions about pre-production, production and post-production of the project and their ideas on digital storytelling for promoting peace and reconciliation (see Appendix A).

After the analysis of the projects and the semi-structured interviews with producers, field research will be conducted in Rwanda. Workshops, individual interviews and focus groups with students will be arranged in order to identify their approach and needs for using digital storytelling in peace education as well as to discover to what extent the selected projects foster further dialogue and discussion of such issues as reconciliation and mutual understanding. Workshops will be arranged in small groups of 6-8 students. During the workshops, students will be exposed to the transmedia and multimedia projects selected, which in total last seven weeks (see Appendix B for Workshop guide). Every week, a different project will be chosen randomly to show the students. In the first half of the workshop, students will discover the project themselves and the researcher will observe their interaction with the design and the storytelling strategies.

Observations and field notes will also be gathered throughout the field research in Rwanda. As Adler and Adler (1994) notes, observations are “the fundamental base of all research methods” (p. 389). During the workshops in classroom, notes will be taken on
how students interact with the story and with group members. These field notes are, as described by Bogdan and Biklen (2007), “the written account of what the researcher, hears, sees, experiences, and thinks in the course of collecting and reflecting on the data in a qualitative study” (p.119). The observations will be focused on the workshops in order to see the activities and engagement of the students with digital storytelling projects. The researcher’s role will be “peripheral membership” (Adler & Adler, 1994) which allows researcher to “maintain a balance between being an insider and an outsider, between participation and observation” (Spradley, 1980, p. 60). By this method, the researcher partly involves in activities with the insiders, however does not participate in the core activities (Adler & Adler, 1994).

After each workshop both individual interviews and focus groups will be conducted. Why both individual and group interviews have been selected is because while individual interviews will be based on personal stories, focus group interviews will aim at discovering the group dynamics and different perspectives. During the individual interviews, students will be asked to discuss such themes as education in Rwanda, their ideas on the project and its design, and general ideas on digital storytelling (see Appendix C). At the end of each workshop, the researcher will also carry out focus groups which will be formed as groups of 6-8 students in order to see the interaction and the dialogue between students based on digital storytelling and reconciliation process in their country. Focus groups will include questions related to the projects, digital storytelling and education (see Appendix D). Both individual interviews and focus group discussions will grant the researcher the opportunity to observe non-verbal indicators and gestures, especially the subject in question is associated with sensitive topics (Gorden, 1975), in this case genocide and reconciliation in Rwanda.
Research Instruments | Research Subjects | Research Questions
--- | --- | ---
Narrative Analysis | The multimedia and transmedia projects related to post-genocide reconciliation | RQ1: How is digital storytelling in the projects used to enhance the understanding of the genocide and promote reconciliation in the conflict areas?  
RQ2: What kinds of strategies are made use of in the projects with the aim of increasing the involvement and participation of audiences?  
RQ3: What is the difference between the projects related to the Rwandan genocide and other genocides in terms of narration?
Semi-structured Interviews | The producers of the selected projects | RQ4: What is the approach of producers toward the use of digital storytelling for social change, and in this case reconciliation process and peace education?
Workshops, Semi-structured Interviews, Focus Groups, Field Notes and Observations | 25-30 Students in total (Workshops and focus groups will be formed as groups of 6-8 students) | RQ5: What is the personal experience for those who attend the workshops of peace education through digital storytelling?  
What is the approach and needs of students toward using digital storytelling for peace education?  
RQ6: Do the projects allow students to discuss further issues associated with genocide and reconciliation process? What are the advantageous, disadvantageous and challenges to use digital storytelling for peace education?

*Table 5: Overview of Research Instruments*

Since the research includes sensitive topics and students under the age of 18, the participants and their parents/guardians will have access to relevant information regarding the study prior to the consent which will be taken through a written parent/guardian
consent form (See Appendix E). They will be informed about the research in general, procedures, and time table. They will also confirm that they voluntarily participate in the project; however they will have a right to withdraw from the research or refuse to participate at any point during the process. As mentioned before, because of the government’s pressure on individuals about discussing the genocide, people might be unwilling to talk about it openly. Therefore, the participants will be notified that the research records will be kept confidential and only accessed by the researcher and that their identity will be disclosed and anonymously published.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical Method for Digital Storytelling</th>
<th>Relevant questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Premise and Purpose:</strong></td>
<td>-What is the subject of the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-What is the project’s importance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Is it fictional, non-fictional or both?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-What is the aim of the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This part states what the story is about.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not only describing the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regarding how, where and to whom, but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also defining the purpose of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characters:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This part of the study defines the</td>
<td>-Who are the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characters and explains how the</td>
<td>characters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience will engage with the story.</td>
<td>-Is the audience a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>character as well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-What is the aim of the characters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Who are the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>primary and secondary characters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extensions:</strong></td>
<td>-Are there extensions in the project? How many?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital storytelling might be</td>
<td>-Are they adaptations or expansion of the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experienced in multiple media. The</td>
<td>-Do the extensions add something to the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relation between each media and their</td>
<td>-Do the extensions maintain the same characters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integration is significant for the story.</td>
<td>-Do they provide in-depth analysis of the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Do the extensions bring on new questions and discussions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Media platforms and genres: | -Which media platforms are used in the project?  
-What are the functions of these platforms?  
-Which devices are utilized to discover the story?  
-How these platforms and devices contribute to the story?  
-Which genres are made use of?  
-What are the functions of these genres?  
-What are the problems specific to these platforms and genres? |
| Audience: | -Who is the target audience?  
-Which devices are targeted for which group of people?  
-Are there any other projects like this? |
| Engagement: | - Do the audiences experience the story as a first person or a second person, or a third person?  
-What is the role of the audience?  
-What are the mechanisms of interaction and participation?  
-Is there a possibility of immersion into the story?  
-Does the project offer an element to the audience for them to take and incorporate into their lives? |
| Structure: | -Is the project reactive or pro-active?  
-What is the structure of the project?  
-What are the major units?  
-Does each extension serve as an independent element?  
-What are the possible endpoints?  
-How is the map of the storyworld? |
| Aesthetics: | -What kind of visuals is used?  
-Is there a specific design?  
-What is the role of the audio in the project?  
-What is the role of the images in the project?  
-How does the structure affect the design? |

Table 6: Analytical Approach towards Transmedia and Multimedia projects  
Source: Adapted from Gambarato (2013)
1. Research population and site

The workshops, interviews and focus groups will be carried out with the Rwandan students aged between 13 and 18, because secondary school education in Rwanda is divided into two: lower secondary education is between the ages of 13 and 15, while upper secondary education starts at the age of 16 and ends at the age of 18 (Education Policy and Data Center, 2014). This age group has been selected since the objective of this research is to examine the interaction of students in secondary school period with the digital storytelling projects for the purpose of developing a strategy for implementing digital storytelling into peace education in Rwandan context. During the field research, Centre for Conflict Management⁴ in University of Rwanda, Never Again Rwanda⁵ and A Piece of Life⁶ will be asked for collaboration throughout the workshop process and for arranging a workshop space, necessary equipment and relevant contacts.

1. Love Radio – Episodes of Love and Hate⁷

Love Radio is a transmedia project by Anoek Steketee and Eefje Blankevoort, which is based on three main pillars - all interconnected - that tell stories which take place in Rwanda and try to reproduce the post-genocide reality of the country; the interactive web documentary consisting of two interactive parts, tap stories for smartphones and an exhibition in Foam, Exhibition Museum Amsterdam. It is based on reviving the popular radio soap ‘Musekeweya’ broadcasted in 2004 and comparing it to the reality.

2. 20 Years after the Genocide: Portraits from a Changing Rwanda⁸

This project is a transmedia project produced by Giordano Cossu, which includes a web documentary, a documentary film and a photo exhibition. It tells the story of the

---

⁴ Centre for Conflict Management is a research centre in University of Rwanda financially supported by UNDP, which conducts research and provides training and community services in the field of genocide, its causes and consequences, prevention and post-conflict reconciliation. http://www.ccm.ur.ac.rw/
⁵ Never Again Rwanda is an NGO aiming at promoting mutual understanding and conflict resolution among youth, especially through education. http://www.neveragainrwanda.org/
⁶ A Piece of Life is a Nonprofit organization that provides workshops for youth with the aim of encouraging critical thinking through innovative peacebuilding especially the use of media. https://apeaceoflife.com/
⁷ http://www.loveradio-rwanda.org
⁸ http://www.rwanda20ansapres.net/en/
Rwandans who are struggling to rebuild their lives after the genocide and also explains the reconciliation process and inner conflicts of people who experienced the genocide.

3. **Love for My Enemies**

“Love for My Enemies” is a multimedia project by filmmaker Lukas Augustin and reporter Niklas Schenck, which consists of videos, texts and pictures telling the story of a Hutu man asking forgiveness from his childhood Tutsi friend for his involvement in his mutilation during the genocide and the things he went through after the genocide.

4. **Rwanda 20 Years Later**

This project is a multimedia project by Kari Costanza, consisting of many parts such as introduction to the Rwandan genocide and its historical background, recovery process after the genocide and the current reconciliation process in the country. It allows readers to enter into stories through videos, music, pictures and interviews.

5. **Granito: Every Memory Matters**

“Granito: Every Memory Matters” is a transmedia project by Skylight Pictures aiming at recovering the Guatemalan collective memory through the story collection related to the genocide against indigenous people. The project target the Guatemalan youth who do not know much about the genocide, hence it tries to create a dialogue between them and elder people. By providing an intergenerational exchange through videos, texts, photographs and letters, the project hopes to construct a common historical narrative regarding the past and the future.

6. **Scars of Cambodia**

It is a transmedia project comprising of a documentary, photography book, audio slideshow and an exhibition telling the Khmer Rouge Regime’s history through a Cambodian fisherman’s eyes, which sheds light on the history of the country during the...
genocide causing psychological and physical traumas. The project was carried out by Emilie Arfeul and Alexandre Lieber.

7. Why Srebrenica had to fall¹³

“Why Srebrenica had to fall” is a multimedia project about the Srebrenica genocide in 1995. It consists of six consecutive parts with videos, official documents and texts, and interviews in order to pose important questions about the genocide. The project is realized by Argos and VPRO Digitaal and the director of the documentary is Stefan Heifdendael.

2. Sampling strategies and size

In consideration of the research objectives explained before, this study uses “purposive sampling” for the selection of the multimedia and transmedia projects to be analysed and the research subjects – students aged between 13 and 18- to be interviewed, carried out workshops and focus groups with. Additionally, the students will be chosen with the collaboration of A Piece of Life organization in Rwanda which conducts workshops in rural areas. As Devers and Frankel states, “purposive sampling strategies are designed to enhance understandings of selected individuals or groups’ experience(s) or for developing theories and concepts.” Thus, purposive sampling is appropriate for the aim of this project. The sample size for the research has been determined as 25 to 30 students; however, in the case of not gaining data saturation, more students will be asked to participate in the research. Since in qualitative research, a large sample size might hamper the case-oriented and deep analysis (Sandelowski, 1995), it is believed that the size of the sample selected for this study will allow the researcher to reach data saturation.

3. Data collection methods

The data collection process will consist of interviews with the producers of the selected projects, workshops with the students, interviews and focus groups with the students after the workshop, field notes and observations. The workshops will be carried out as groups

¹³ https://srebrenica-int.vpro.nl/
of approximately 8 students in order to allow the researcher to observe their interaction in a detailed way. In addition to this, focus groups will contain approximately 8 students, because as Krueger and Casey (2000) state focus groups should be large enough to provide various perspectives and opinions, and it should be small enough to give an opportunity to everyone to share their experiences.

4. Data analysis procedures

Data collection and analysis will take place simultaneously through NVivo which is a qualitative data analysis software. NVivo provides all necessary tools for the analysis of qualitative data. It allows researchers to review data, make notes, create the codes, categorise them. It also shows the relations between the collected data and the coding scheme. Additionally it “allows for open coding, axial coding (making links between codes), hyperlinks to nontextual data such as audio clips or photographs, coding according to demographic information, and the exploring of ideas visually with a modeler” (Bringer, Johnson & Brackenridge, 2006, p. 248). It can also attach internal annotations and external files in order to refer to a specific context that is relevant to the research and the document (Bringer, Johnson & Brackenridge, 2006).

Although the researcher does not have training for NVivo, she will attend online training courses\footnote{http://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-training} organized by QSR International and she will also be supported by MEDIUM\footnote{https://www.upf.edu/recercaupf/es/grups/gr-medium.html} Research Group in Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain throughout the research and NVivo analysis. This training will be beneficial for both the research and the data analysis process. During the research period, while the data is implemented into NVivo, the researcher will use the coding and start interpreting the data through conversation analysis, non-verbal communication cues, content and thematic analysis of interviews and focus groups. In vivo coding as a method of open coding will be firstly used to condense the data, and then this information will be connected through axial coding methods. Memos and jottings will be added to capture the reflections, ideas and thoughts of the

\footnotetext[14]{http://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-training}
\footnotetext[15]{https://www.upf.edu/recercaupf/es/grups/gr-medium.html}
researcher. Preliminary guidelines for semi-structured interviews, workshops and focus groups are included in Appendix A, Appendix B, Appendix C and Appendix D; however, these guidelines will be rearranged throughout the research process according to the course of the research and the analysis of the multimedia and transmedia projects.

5. Anticipated ethical issues and risks

As mentioned before, in Rwanda it is illegal to talk about ethnicities and even ask participants what their ethnicity is neither in a résumé nor in a personal conversation. This might create a problem, since the workshops are expected to be balanced and representative sample with all ethnicities with the aim of creating a diverse dialogue. However, as Paluck (2009a) notes, “person's birthplace, movement during the genocide and afterward (e.g., which refugee camps they stayed in), current address, and their personal recollections of the participant” allows researchers to understand the ethnic group of participants. Additionally, the multimedia and transmedia projects related to the Rwandan genocide talk about Hutus and Tutsis as two different ethnicities hence differentiates between them, which might create some ethical problems in terms of the government’s policies. As it is explained in the ‘Research Limitations’ part, there are some restrictions and risks toward the research and the participants regarding the freedom of speech and the law criminalizing ‘genocide ideology’ in Rwanda.

The vague definition of ‘genocide ideology’ in the laws of Rwanda might create possible risks for participants as well as the researcher. Although every interview and focus group discussion will be kept strictly confidential, parents of the students might not be willing to sign the consent forum because of the possible risks of accusations. Another risk is the difficulty of getting permission from the Rwandan government for the research. As Jessee (2012) states, bureaucratic process for the permission is long and demanding. Moreover, this research project can be emotionally overwhelming for the researcher since the interviews and focus groups might involve sensitive topics and personal stories. However, these risks can be eliminated to a certain point (see Table 7 for possible solutions) through
some research, discussions with people who are working in this field and governmental institutions in Rwanda such as National Commission for the Fight against Genocide16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Ethical Issues and Risks</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risks emerging from the law criminalizing “genocide ideology”</td>
<td>-Some organizations, governmental institutions will be consulted about the selected projects and the overall field research before starting the research. -It will be clarified that the ethnic differences of the past will not be discussed in the workshops; these parts will only be used as a historical value. -The relevant information about the project and the research will be given to parents prior to the workshop and they will be ensured that nothing illegal will take place throughout the research and the research will be conducted with the utmost sensibility toward children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The government might not approve some projects claiming that some parts of the projects discuss the ethnic differences of the past -Parents might not sign the consent forum because of the concerns related to the law and genocide ideology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks emerging from bureaucratic process for permission</td>
<td>-Since the process might take weeks, the application period will be started accordingly. -Organizations such as Centre for Conflict Management in Rwanda University, Never Again Rwanda and A Piece of Life will be asked for collaboration. In case they do not accept, other organizations will be contacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-It is a long process in which Rwanda's National Ethics Committee and Ministry of Education should be asked for permission. -The Committee and the Ministry of Education asks for a Rwandan-based research partner to give permission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks emerging from emotional safety</td>
<td>-As soon as it is noticed that one of the participants is affected psychologically, he will be withdrawn from the research. -The researcher will have someone, a family member or a friend, to talk and share emotional feelings without violating the confidentiality of participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The children who will involve in the project might be affected psychologically from the content of the projects -The researcher might be affected psychologically from the sensitive topic and stories during the interviews and focus groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Possible solutions to the risks of the project

16 http://cnlg.gov.rw/home/?L=0
6. **Significance of the study**

Given the limited amount of research on peace education through digital storytelling, particularly in the context of Rwanda, the outcomes of this research will be of value to the basic knowledge in the fields of digital storytelling for the use of peace education, conflict resolution and reconciliation. This study is also expected to have the following benefits:

- Broadly, it will make a contribution to the existing literature concerning digital storytelling for educational use. It will also illustrate the use of digital storytelling for social change.
- Generally, it will make a contribution to the extension of literature on using digital storytelling into direct and indirect peace education, both in formal and social education. It will also focus on the advantageous, disadvantageous and challenges of implementing digital storytelling into peace education.
- Specifically, it will make a contribution to the Rwandan society which continues to suffer from the consequences of the genocide. Additionally, one of the objectives of this study is to develop a strategy to be used by producers who target conflicts and reconciliation processes in their works, teachers, educational institutions, national and international organizations and NGOs, therefore indirectly helping societies in post-conflict period.
# PRELIMINARY PHD DISSERTATION STRUCTURE

PhD Dissertation structure is provided in Table 8; however, the revisions and changes are expected to be made throughout the course of the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter No</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The Context and Theoretical</td>
<td>2.1 Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>2.1.1 Digital Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.1 Digital Storytelling in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.2 Digital Storytelling for Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2 Transmedia and Multimedia Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2.1 Transmedia Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2.2 Multimedia Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Post-conflict and Peace</td>
<td>2.2.1 Conflict Resolution and Digital Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narratives</td>
<td>2.2.2 Post-conflict Healing and Reconciliation through Digital Narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3 Peace Education and Digital Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Rwandan Genocide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.1 Power, War and Media in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2.3.2 Justice and Narration in Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3 Storytelling as a Constructive Peace Process in Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.4 Peace Education in Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Key Concepts and Terms</td>
<td>3.1 Digital Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Transmedia vs Multimedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Interactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Problem Statement</td>
<td>4.1 Research Problem</td>
<td>3.6 Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Research Objectives</td>
<td>3.7 Peace Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Research Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Research Limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Design and Methodology</td>
<td>5.1 Overall approach and rationale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Site and population selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Analysis of the Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.1 Love Radio – Episodes of Love and Hate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.2 20 Years after the Genocide: Portraits from a Changing Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.3 Love for My Enemies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.4 Rwanda 20 Years Later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.5 Granito: Every Memory Matters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.6 Scars of Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.7 Why Srebrenica had to fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.1 Interviews with the producers of the projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.2 Observation of workshops with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.3 Individual interviews with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.4 Focus group with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Results</td>
<td>6.1 The use of digital storytelling in the projects related to genocides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 The strategies of transmedia and multimedia storytelling in the projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 The approach of producers and students toward transmedia and multimedia learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4 The advantageous, disadvantageous and challenges of using digital storytelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5 The use of digital storytelling to promote the direct and indirect peace education themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Discussion</td>
<td>7.1 Implementing digital storytelling in direct and indirect peace education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Advantageous, benefits, disadvantageous and challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Digital Storytelling Strategies for Peace Education in Post-conflict Societies</td>
<td>8.1 Guideline of strategies for the use of digital storytelling in direct and peace education while discussing the themes proposed by each theory 8.2 Areas, fields and institutions for the guideline to be utilized in terms of facilitating reconciliation process in conflict areas through peace education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8: Preliminary PhD Dissertation Structure*
### CALENDAR AND TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Preparing the final version of PhD research proposal based on the feedbacks from the defence session
- Sending the proposal to the potential supervisors
- Identifying potential funding schemes and research assistantships
- Collaboration with the Centre for Conflict Management in University of Rwanda
- Further literature review and data collection
- Analysis of the projects selected for the study
- Semi-structured interviews with the producers of the projects
- Analysis of the interviews
- Workshop design
- Focus group design
- Semi-structured interview design
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with A Piece of Life and Never Again Rwanda for the workshops, focus groups and interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input data into NVivo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of field notes and observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of workshops, focus groups and interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of the results with supervisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and Conclusion Chapters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of guidelines for strategy of creating and using digital storytelling in peace education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and Proof-reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final version of PhD dissertation and presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A. Preliminary Semi-structured Interview with Producers

Following is the preliminary semi-structured interview guide that will be conducted with the producers of the projects selected for this project. It should be noted that the themes and questions might vary according to the projects’ content, storytelling strategies and design. After analysing the each project, the researcher will elaborate the themes and the relevant questions. The interviews will be carried out individually and online through Skype.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Relevant Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pre-Production process of the project       | - What was the reason behind being involved in this project?  
- How did you come up with the idea of using this particular subject with a specific storytelling strategy?  
- What was the aim of your project? |
| Production process of the project           | - How was the designing process for different platforms/genres/media?  
- Why have you chosen multimedia/transmedia instead of using a linear strategy?  
- Why have you chosen webdoc/images/music/videos/photobook/exhibition? |
| Post-production process of the project      | - Do you expect Rwandans/Bosnians/Cambodians/Guatemalans to interact with the project?  
- How does your project enhance the audience’s participation, immersion and interactivity?  
- How do you think your project will have an impact on society?  
- How does your project encourage people to have a further dialogue and collaboration? |
| Ideas on digital storytelling for social and educational use | - What do you think about the use of digital storytelling for social change?  
- What do you think about the use of digital storytelling for peace education?  
- How do you see the future of transmedia-multimedia storytelling in peace education? |
Appendix B. Preliminary Workshop Guide

Following is the preliminary workshop guide to be carried out with students for 7 weeks. Every week one digital storytelling project will be selected and discussed. Some themes related to direct and indirect peace education will be assigned to a week depending on the project. Students will be given some time to discover the project on their own and in the meantime the researcher will observe their interaction with the design and storytelling strategy. Afterwards, the researcher will guide them as a group to see how they relate the project to themes and how they create further dialogue. During the workshop, the researcher will not be actively involved in the workshop; rather, she will observe and take some notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Project1. Granito: Every Memory Matters**  
**Themes:** Ethno-empathy, conflict resolution | **Day 1** |
| Workshop Group 1 Focus group |
| **Day 2** |
| Workshop Group 2 Focus group |
| **Day 3** |
| Workshop Group 3 Focus group |
| **Day 4** |
| Individual interviews |
| **Day 5** |
| Individual interviews |
| **Day 6** |
| Input data into NVivo |
| **Day 7** |
| Coding and analysing |
| **Project2. Scars of Cambodia**  
**Themes:** Reflective thinking, tolerance | **Day 8** |
<p>| Workshop Group 1 Focus group |
| <strong>Day 9</strong> |
| Workshop Group 2 Focus group |
| <strong>Day 10</strong> |
| Workshop Group 3 Focus group |
| <strong>Day 11</strong> |
| Individual interviews |
| <strong>Day 12</strong> |
| Individual interviews |
| <strong>Day 13</strong> |
| Input data into NVivo |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Coding and analysing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Workshop Group 1 Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Workshop Group 2 Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Workshop Group 3 Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Individual interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Individual interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Input data into NVivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Coding and analysing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Workshop Group 1 Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Workshop Group 2 Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Workshop Group 3 Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Individual interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Individual interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Input data into NVivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Coding and analysing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Workshop Group 1 Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Workshop Group 2 Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Workshop Group 3 Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Individual interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Individual interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Input data into NVivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Coding and analysing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Workshop Group 1 Focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project3. Why Srebrenica had to fall**  
*Themes: Human rights*

**Project4. Rwanda 20 Years Later**  
*Themes: History of the conflict*

**Project5. 20 Years after the Genocide: Portraits from a Changing Rwanda**  
*Themes: Conflict and peace*

**Project6. Love for My Enemies**
| Themes: Presentation of the rival, new affect and emotions | Day 37 | Workshop Group 2  
Focus group |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Day 38 | Workshop Group 3  
Focus group |
| Day 39 | Individual interviews |
| Day 40 | Individual interviews |
| Day 41 | Input data into NVivo |
| Day 42 | Coding and analysing |

| Project7. *Love Radio – Episodes of Love and Hate*  
**Themes:** Peace process | Day 43 | Workshop Group 1  
Focus group |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Day 44 | Workshop Group 2  
Focus group |
| Day 45 | Workshop Group 3  
Focus group |
| Day 46 | Individual interviews |
| Day 47 | Individual interviews |
| Day 48 | Input data into NVivo |
| Day 49 | Coding and analysing |
Appendix C. Preliminary Semi-structured Interview with Students

Following is the preliminary semi-structured interview guide that will be conducted with the students. It should be noted that the themes and questions might vary according to the projects’ content, storytelling strategies and design. After analysing the each project, the researcher will elaborate the themes and the relevant questions. The interviews will be carried out individually after the presentation of each project in workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Relevant Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Education in Rwanda**  
*(This part will be carried out only during the first week)* | -How do you describe the education system in Rwanda?  
-Do you have any class aimed at teaching the Rwandan genocide, its causes and consequences, before and aftermath?  
-Do you have classes regarding genocides, peace process, human rights, and conflict resolution and so on?  
-Do teachers create activities to foster discussions, participation or interaction?  
-Do you use any kind of digital storytelling activities such as images, videos, documentaries in classrooms? |
| **The Project’s content**  
*(this part will be refined after the analysis of each project)* | For the projects related to the Bosnian, Cambodian and Guatemalan genocide;  
-Did you know anything about this specific genocide? Explain.  
-Has this project fostered any ideas or thought related to your country’s past? Explain.  
-Has it elicited any questions in your mind associated with peace and reconciliation? Explain.  
-How can you relate this genocide to the Rwandan genocide? |
| For the projects related to the Rwandan genocide;  
- Have you learned something new or unfamiliar to you while reading or watching the materials on the website? Explain.  
- Has this project elicited any questions in your mind associated with peace and reconciliation process in your country?  
- Do you know some people who had experiences similar to the characters in the project? Explain.  
- What would you do if you were in the place of the character?  
- Has this project made you question the current social situation of your country and government policies about the reconciliation process? |
|---|
| **The Project’s design**  
*(This part will be refined after the analysis of each project)*  
- How do you like the design of the website?  
- Was it easy or hard to follow?  
- What do you think about the interface of the project?  
- What do you think about the visuals, colours and audio used in the project?  
- Have these visuals, colours and audio evoked any emotions? |
| **General ideas on Digital storytelling**  
*(This part will be carried out only during the last week)*  
- Do you think using digital storytelling projects in your classrooms would attract your and your friends’ attention?  
- Did you enjoy discussing such subjects as peace and conflict, the genocide’s causes and consequences, reconciliation processes by using digital storytelling projects?  
- Would you want your teachers to use these web-based projects in classrooms?  
- Do reading and watching the stories of these people encourage you? In what ways? How? |
Appendix D. Focus Group

Focus groups will be conducted after students examined and discovered each project. It will be designed to see the student’s interaction with each other and how the project creates a further dialogue among them regarding the genocide, peace and reconciliation process. It should be noted that focus groups will be refined after the analysis of the projects and rearranged for each project according to the content, design and the narrative of the project. Additionally, the questions will be also related to the theme(s) of each week.

Questions

1. What do you think about the project?
2. What do you think about the visuals and audio used in the project? (here some slides will be shown with the pictures and the audios extracted from the website)
3. What do you think about the design of the website? (here some slides will be shown with the interface and other design features of the website)
4. Have you already known the information given on the website?
5. Have you learned any information new and unfamiliar to you?
6. Do you know someone who lived similar experiences to the character?
7. Has the project elicited any kind of emotion in you? What emotions?
8. Have you imagined yourself in the character’s position?
9. Supposed you are in the place of this character, what would you do?
10. After reading and watching the materials on the website, have you questioned or thought about the current reconciliation process in your country? Please explain further.
11. Do you use this kind of projects in your classroom? How? In what context?
12. What do you think about using this kind of web-based digital storytelling projects in classrooms? Would you enjoy it?
13. Does seeing these stories encourage you to do something for your society? What would you like to do?
Appendix E. Consent Form

Parent/Guardian Consent for Their Child to Participate in a Research Study

Title of Study: Negotiating Conflict through Digital Storytelling: Reconciliation Process and Peace Education in Post-genocide Rwanda

Researcher: Tugce Ataci
Dept: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Department of Communication
Phone: +34 617609703

Please read the following part carefully.

- You are being asked to consent your child’s involvement in a research study on the use of digital storytelling in peace education in post-genocide Rwanda
- The purpose of the study is to understand in what ways and to what extent digital storytelling can be used in peace education and what are the students’ expectations, needs and approach.
- Ultimately, this research will be a PhD dissertation in Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Spain.
- If you agree for your child to be involved in this research, he/she will be asked to do the following things: workshops, interviews and focus groups.
- There are no expected physical risks that your child will be exposed to throughout the course of this research. However, there might be emotional and sensitive scenes in the web documentaries selected for this project.
- The benefits of participation are that your child will gain information about the genocides such as Bosnia, Cambodia and Guatemala and you will have a chance to see the similarities and differences, causes and consequences of each. He/she will also widen your
perspective about the concept of reconciliation processes, peace education and digital storytelling.

- All of the information about your child identity will be kept anonymous. Research records will be kept in an electronic format which will be locked with a password. The researcher will record the interviews, workshops and focus groups with a voice recorder or a video camera, which will be used only by her and only for educational purposes.

- You or your child may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time during the project.

**I hereby confirm that:** (please tick the boxes)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I have read and understood the information about the project, as provided below.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I understand that my child’s participation is voluntary and he/she can withdraw from the study at any time without being penalised.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I voluntarily agree to my child’s participation in the project.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I understand that regarding confidentiality, my child’s identity will be kept anonymous.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I agree to the workshops/ interviews /focus groups being audio or video recorded</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I understand that the data collected for this research will be used in publications.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Select only one of the following:

I would like my child’s name and what he/she has said during the workshops /interviews /focus groups to be used in research reports, publications or any other research outputs.

I do not want my child’s name to be revealed and used in this project.

8. I agree to sign this parent/guardian consent form.

**Child’s Name:**

________________________   ___________________________   __________________________
Name of Parent/Guardian   Signature   Date

________________________   ___________________________   __________________________
Name of Researcher   Signature   Date