

**MEDIATIZATION OR MEDIATION?
ALTERNATIVE UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE EMERGENT SPACE OF
DIGITAL STORYTELLING**

NICK COULDRY

**NICK COULDRY
GOLDSMITHS, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON**

NICK COULDRY is Professor of Media and Communications at Goldsmiths College, University of London. He is the author or editor of 7 books, including most recently *Listening Beyond the Echoes: Media, Ethics and Agency in an Uncertain World* (Paradigm Books, USA, 2006) and (with Sonia Livingstone and Tim Markham) *Media Consumption and Public Engagement: Beyond the Presumption of Attention* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

Professor Nick Couldry
Department of Media and Communications
Goldsmiths College
London SE14 6NW
0044 207 919 7636
n.couldry@gold.ac.uk

Article submitted to *New Media & Society* .

Final edit 19 December 2007 by NJ, NC and KL

xxxx words incl. notes and references + abstract xxx words

MEDIATIZATION OR MEDIATION? ALTERNATIVE UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE EMERGENT SPACE OF DIGITAL STORYTELLING

Abstract

This article reviews the social potential of digital storytelling, and in particular digital storytelling's potential to contribute to the strengthening of democracy. Through answering this question, it seeks to test out the relative strengths and weaknesses of two competing concepts for grasping the wider consequences of media for the social world: the concept of mediatization and the concept of mediation. The concept of mediatization (developed for example by Stig Hjarvard and Winfried Schulz), it is argued, is stronger at addressing aspects of media textuality, suggesting that a unitary media-based logic is at work. In spite of its apparent vagueness, the concept of mediation (developed in particular by Roger Silverstone) provides more flexibility for thinking about the open-ended and dialectical social transformations which, as with the printed book, may come in time to be articulated with the new form of digital storytelling.

Keywords

Digital storytelling; mediation; mediatization; democracy; media logic; articulation

Introduction

People who have never done so before are telling personal stories through digital forms, storing and exchanging those stories in sites and networks that would not exist without the World Wide Web and that, because of the remediation capacity of digital media, have multiple possibilities for transmission, retransmission and transformation available to them. This is the process generally called 'digital storytelling', as distinct from earlier modern forms of storytelling through photography, radio and television.¹ This shift of storytelling form, in itself, is interesting but not epoch-making. While digital storytelling has attracted attention recently for many reasons (cultural, economic, brand-led) which are not the concern of this article, one important reason is that digital storytelling represents a novel distribution of a scarce resource - the ability to represent the world around us - using a shared infrastructure. Digital storytelling occupies a distinct stage in the history of mass communication, or perhaps in the supersession of mass communication; as such, it has implications for the sustaining, or expansion, of democracy, but only under complex conditions, yet to be fully identified. This article seeks to clarify what those conditions are or, if that is still premature, at least to clarify what questions need to be answered if digital storytelling's social consequences and democratic potential are to be understood, and not merely hyped.²

Understanding digital storytelling as a broad social phenomenon involves moving beyond such storytelling's status merely as texts or processes of production/ distribution. Ever since Lazarsfeld and Merton (1969 [1948]) identified the first and most important question of 'media effects' as the 'effect' of the existence of media institutions as such, media scholars have developed answers to this classic question within a variety of methodological paradigms. In this article, I will focus on just two: the concept of 'mediation' (Martin-Barbero, 1993; Silverstone, 1999; Couldry, 2000) and the concept of 'mediatization' (Hjarvard, 2004; Mazzoleni and Schulz, 1999; Schulz, 2004). Digital storytelling, because of its complexity as narrative and social process, provides a good opportunity to clarify the respective advantages and disadvantages of these concepts in the course of developing our necessarily still speculative understanding of the social life of digital storytelling itself. By 'digital storytelling' I will mean the whole range of personal stories now being told in potentially public form using digital media resources.

I will come later to defining the terms 'mediation' and 'mediatization'. However in choosing such broad concepts for comparison, I am already selecting from the variety of wide-range and mid-range concepts we might use to characterize digital storytelling. My purpose in choosing two wide-range concepts (mediation and mediatization) is to clarify a broader choice of emphasis in the huge variety of processes collected under the term 'digital storytelling' on linear or non-linear dynamics. My argument at its broadest is that theories of mediatization, because they look for an essentially linear transformation from 'pre-media' (before the intervention of specific media) to 'mediatized' social states, may be less useful for grasping the dynamics of digital storytelling than other approaches which I identify with the uses of the term 'mediation' mentioned earlier.³ The latter approaches emphasise the heterogeneity of the transformations to which media give rise across a complex and divided social space rather than a single 'media logic' that is simultaneously transforming the whole of social space at once. At stake here is not so much the liberatory potential of digital storytelling (although I want to clarify that, too), but the precision with which we understand media's complex social consequences. We should not expect a single unitary answer to the question of how media transform the social, since media themselves are always at least doubly articulated, as both transmission technology and representational content (Silverstone, 1994) in contexts of lived practice and situated struggle that themselves are open to multiple interpretations or indeed to being ignored. While its attentiveness to the nonlinear will be my main reason for choosing 'mediation' as a concept for grasping 'digital storytelling', I will not be claiming that mediation is always a more useful term than 'mediatization'. They are different concepts with different valences. At most I will be claiming that, in spite of its apparent vagueness, 'mediation' has a multivalence which usefully supplements accounts of the 'mediatization' of the social.

This is a theoretical article that aims to contribute to wider debates within older media theory and new media theory, not through an abstract model, but through clarifying the quite particular issues which a social process such as digital storytelling raises. The shape of this article is as follows. Taking for granted an account of the rise and current forms of digital storytelling, which others in this special issue cover in detail, I will begin by

clarifying the differences between the terms ‘mediatization’ and ‘mediation’ before in my second and third sections discussing how each would analyse digital storytelling’s social consequences. In a fourth section, I will seek to reinforce my argument for the continued importance of the term ‘mediation’ by reviewing the claims for the ‘community’ dimension of digital storytelling that cannot be assessed through the concept of mediatization alone.

Conceptual Background

My argument proceeds by contrasting two wide-range concepts for grasping the social transformations actually and potentially linked to digital storytelling. Let me acknowledge immediately some arbitrariness here at the level of pure terminology, since some writers (Altheide, 1985; Gumpert and Cathcart, 1990) have used the term ‘mediation’ to characterize precisely the transformation of societies through a linear media logic that more recently has been termed ‘mediatization’.⁴ That does not, however, affect the conceptual contrast I am making.

Mediatization

Let me start from the term ‘mediatization’ whose profile in media theory has grown considerably in recent years.

Mediatization, as developed by Friedrich Krotz, Winfried Schulz, Stig Hjarvard and others (Krotz, 2001; Hjarvard 2004; Schulz, 2004), is a useful attempt to concentrate our focus on a particular transformative logic or mechanism that is understood to do something distinctive to (that is, to ‘mediatize’) particular processes, objects and fields: a distinctive and consistent transformation that, it is suggested, can only properly be understood if seen as part of a wider transformation of social and cultural life through media operating from a single source and in a common direction, a transformation of society by media, a ‘media logic’ (Altheide and Snow, 1979). This is an important general claim, and insofar as it involves the specific claim that many cultural and social processes are now constrained to take on a form suitable for media re-presentation, it is based on transformations that are undeniable: there is, for example, no question any more of politicians doing politics without appearing in or on media, and no social campaign can operate without some media presence.

It is clear the concept of mediatization starts out from the notion of replication, the spreading of media forms to spaces of contemporary life that are required to be re-presented through media forms:

As a concept mediatization denotes the processes through which core elements of a cultural or social activity (e.g. politics, religion, language) assume media form. As a consequence, the activity is to a greater or lesser degree performed through interaction with a medium, and the symbolic content and the structure of the social and cultural activities are influenced by media environments which they gradually become more dependent upon. (Hjarvard, 2007: 3)

However, the theory of mediatization insists that from this regular dependence of zones of social or cultural activity on media exposure wider consequences follow, which taken together form part of a broader media logic: ‘by the logic of the media we understand their *organizational, technological, and aesthetic* functioning, including the ways in which media *allocate material and symbolic resources* and work through *formal and informal rules*’ (Hjarvard, 2007: 3, original emphasis). Winfried Schulz (2004) in his helpful discussion of ‘mediatization’ theory, including German speaking scholars, breaks the term ‘mediatization’ down into four ‘processes’ (extension, substitution, amalgamation and accommodation) but, in doing so, confirms indirectly the linear nature of the logic that underlies theories of mediatization. How else, for example, can we understand the notion of ‘substitution’ (Schulz, 2004: 88-89) which implies that one state of affairs has become another because of the intervention of a new element (media)?

As I explain later, my reservations with the theory of ‘mediatization’ begin only when it is extended in this way to cover transformations that go far beyond the adoption of media forms or formats to the broader consequences of dependence upon media exposure. The latter will include transformations in the agents who can act in a particular field, how they can act, with what authority and capital, and so on. These latter types of transformation may require different theoretical frameworks, such as Bourdieu’s field theory (1993), if they are to make detailed sense; if so, their causal workings will not be analyzable under one single ‘logic’ of ‘mediatization’, since Bourdieu’s account of social space is always multipolar. I will come later to some other limitations of the term “mediatization”.

However, I would not want to deny the advantages of the term ‘mediatization’ for media theory. ‘Mediatization’ encourages us to look for common patterns across disparate areas. Mediatization describes the transformation of many disparate social and cultural processes into forms or formats suitable for media re-presentation. One example might be in the area of state/ religious ritual: when we see weddings or other ceremonies taking on features that make them ready for re-mediation (via digital camera) or imitating features of television versions of such events, this is an important shift and is captured by the term mediatization. Another more complex example is the mediatization of politics (Meyer, 2003; Strömback 2007). Here the argument is not just about the forms of political performance or message transmission, but about the incorporation of media-based logics and norms into political action. In the most extreme case, media, it has been argued, change the ontology of politics, changing what counts as political action because of the requirement for all effective policy to be explainable and defensible within the constraints of media formats (Meyer 2003). Prima facie, an example of this is the argument in a recent book by a retired British civil servant, Christopher Foster (Foster, 2006), that under Britain’s New Labour government, ‘Cabinet’ meetings have been profoundly changed by the media pressures that impinge on government: becoming much shorter and changing from being open deliberations about what policy should be adopted to being brief reviews of the media impact of policies already decided elsewhere.

But as this last example suggests, there is a blurring masked by the term ‘mediatization’. Are such changes to the running of government in Britain just the result of media’s

influence in the political domain? Or are they linked also to political forces, to shifts in the power that national governments have in relation to external markets and other factors (cf. Leys, 2001) which have narrowed the scope of national political action and deliberation? Surely 'media logic' and 'political logic' are not necessarily binary opposites that are simply substitutable for one other; instead they interpenetrate or cut across each other. Saskia Sassen's recent work (2006) offers an important entry-point into the spatial complexity of these interactions between media, state and economy within 'globalization'.

This reinforces the broader problem with mediatization theory already suggested: its tendency to claim that it has identified one single type of media-based logic that is superseding (completely replacing) older logics across the whole of social space. While this is useful when we are examining the media-based transformation of very specific social or institutional practices, it may in more complex cases obscure the variety of media-related pressures at work in society: for example, practical necessities which make media exposure useful, but not always essential, for particular actors; the role of media skills in the capital of particular agents as they seek in various ways to strengthen their position in a particular field; the role of media as networks whose influence does not depend on the logics embedded in media contents but on the reshaping of fields of action themselves (Benson and Neveu, 2005). These are influences too heterogeneous to be reduced to a single 'media logic', as if they all operated in one direction, at the same speed, through a parallel mechanism, and according to the same calculus of probability. Media, in other words, are more than a language (or 'logos') for transforming social or cultural contents in one particular way.

The problem is not that mediatization theorists do not recognize the breadth of these changes; they certainly do, and this is largely what grounds their claim for the broad implications of the term. The problem is that the concept of 'mediatization' itself may not be suitable to contain the heterogeneity of the transformations in question. There are two ways in which this argument might be made more fully. One would be by considering in detail how the basic insights of mediatization theory can be developed within a version of Bourdieu's field theory (cf. Couldry, 2003b), but suggesting that the complex dynamics of the interrelations between media and other fields are not best captured by 'mediatization, in so far as it suggests a single logic of transformation (there is no problem of course if we use 'mediatization' merely as a catch-all term to cover any and all changes in social and cultural life consequent upon media institutions' operations). This line of argument would, however, take me some way from the specific issues raised by digital storytelling.

The other way of arguing for the limits of the term 'mediatization' which I will pursue here is by exploring the virtues of the complementary approach to media's social consequences that following other writers I gather under the term 'mediation'. Do media (and specifically digital storytelling, to which I come in detail later) have social consequences which have not been – and could not readily be – captured by the theory of mediatization, and which are better encompassed by the concept of 'mediation'.

Mediation

In introducing the term ‘mediation’, I need first to say a little about the term ‘media’. The term ‘media’, in English at least, is so taken-for-granted that there seems to be nothing more to say about it. But it is a basic point of media research that the term ‘media’, and notoriously the phrase ‘the media’, result from a reification. Indeed, media processes involve a huge complexity of inputs (what are media?) and outputs (what difference do media make, socially, culturally?), which require us to find another term to differentiate the levels within and patterns across this complexity.

According to a number of scholars, that term is ‘mediation’.⁵ ‘Mediation’ as a term has a long history and multiple uses: it has for a very long time been used in education and psychology to refer to the intervening role that the process of communication plays in the making of meaning. In general sociology, the term ‘mediation’ is used for any process of intermediation (such as money or transport). My concern here is however with the term’s specific uses in media research. Within media research, the term ‘mediation’ can be used to refer simply to the act of transmitting something through the media, but here I have in mind a more substantive definition of the term which has received more attention in media research since the early 1990s. One crude definition of ‘mediation’ – in this substantive sense - is: the overall effect of media institutions existing in contemporary societies, the overall difference media make by being there in our social world. This addresses Lazarsfeld and Merton’s (1948) first question of ‘media effects’, but it only gestures in the right direction without helping us differentiate any of mediation’s components; indeed it gets us no further definitionally than the catch-all use of the term ‘mediatization’ I rejected a moment ago. A more useful approach is via John B. Thompson’s term ‘mediatization’ (1995) – as it happens, he avoids the term ‘mediation’, because of its broader usage in sociology (see above). Thompson notes that:

By virtue of a series of technical innovations associated with printing and, subsequently, with the electrical codification of information, symbolic forms were produced, reproduced and circulated on a scale that was unprecedented. Patterns of communication and interaction began to change in profound and irreversible ways. These changes, which comprise what can loosely be called the ‘mediatization of culture’, had a clear institutional basis: namely, the development of media organisations, which first appeared in the second half of the fifteenth century and have expanded their activities ever since.(1995: 46, added emphasis)

This is helpful because it turns the general question of media institutions’ consequences into a series of specific questions about media’s role in the transformation of action in specific sites, on specific scales and in specific locales.

There is, it might seem, a risk that ‘mediation’ is used so broadly that it is simply a substitute for the ‘media saturation’ about which many writers within and outside media research have written, most notably Baudrillard (1983). But while the idea of ‘media saturation’ does capture the media density of some contemporary social environments, it does not capture the multi-directionality of how media may be transforming society. This

is where I turn to Roger Silverstone's definition of 'mediation', the approach for which I want to reserve my main use of that term. Here is Silverstone:

Mediation, in the sense in which I am using the term, describes the fundamentally, but unevenly, dialectical process in which institutionalised media of communication (the press, broadcast radio and television, and increasingly the world wide web), are involved in the general circulation of symbols in social life. (Silverstone 2002: 762, added emphasis)

Silverstone explains the nature of this dialectic in a later essay, when he comments that mediation requires us to understand how processes of communication change the social and cultural environments that support them as well as the relationships that individuals and institutions have to that environment and to each other (Silverstone, 2005: see also Madianou, 2005). This helpfully brings out how any process of mediation (or perhaps 'mediatization') 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. 'Mediation' in other words is a nonlinear process.

Can we build on Silverstone's insight into the dialectics of mediation, and so reinforce the contrast with the purely linear logic of 'mediatization'? Arguably Silverstone's term 'dialectic' is too friendly to capture all aspects of mediation's nonlinearity. It disarms us from noticing certain asymmetric interrelations between actors in the media process, and even the impossibility of certain actors or outputs influencing other actors or outputs. Rather than seeing mediation as a dialectic or implied conversation, it may be more productive, I suggest, to see mediation as capturing a variety of dynamics within media flows. By 'media flows', I mean flows of production, flows of circulation, flows of interpretation or reception, and flows of recirculation as interpretations flow back into production or flow outwards into general social and cultural life. We need not assume any 'dialectic' between particular types of flow, still less does it assume any stable circuit of causality; we must allow not only for nonlinearity but for discontinuity and asymmetry. More specifically, this adjustment allows us to emphasise two possibilities only hinted at in Silverstone's definition of mediation: first, that what we might call 'the space of media' is structured in important ways, durably and partly beyond the intervention of particular agents; and second that, because of that structuring, certain interactions, or 'dialectics' - between particular sites or agents - are closed off, isolating some pockets of mediation from the wider flow. This point will be important later. The media sphere is extraordinarily concentrated in crucial respects; indeed the very term 'the media' is the result of a long historical construction that legitimates particular concentrations of symbolic resources in institutional centres (Couldry, 2000, 2003a). With this qualification to Silverstone's notion of dialectic, however, 'mediation' remains an important term for grasping how media shape the social world which, as we shall see, usefully supplements the theory of mediatization.

Martin-Barbero's concept of 'mediation' (Martin-Barbero, 1993) broadens it still further by considering over the longer-term how the embedding of media technologies has consequences within the broad development of national cultures (Scannell and Cardiff's classic research on the social history of the BBC addresses similar territory but without emphasizing the term 'mediation': Scannell and Cardiff, 1991). This historical dimension will be drawn upon later, but what I will not consider further is Martin-Barbero's interest in how particular narrative contents – particular addresses to the nation – have cultural consequences: that would take me too far afield.

It is time now to consider how these different approaches to understanding the broader social consequences of media – mediation and mediatization – might contribute distinctively to grasping the potentials, and limits, of new media and specifically digital storytelling.

Digital Storytelling as Mediatization

Any account of digital storytelling's long term consequences in terms of mediatization must start from the claim that there are certain consistent patterns and logics within narrative in a digital form. In principle this is difficult, since the main feature of a converged media environment is that narrative in any original format (from spoken story to elaborate hypertextual commentary to photographic essay) can be widely circulated through a single 'digital' site. But let me simplify the argument by limiting 'digital storytelling' to those online personal narrative formats that have recently become prevalent: whether multimedia formats such as MySpace and Facebook, textual forms such as blogs, the various story forms prevalent on more specialist digital storytelling sites, or the many sites where images and videos, including material captured on personal mobile devices, can be collected for wider circulation (such as YouTube). Is there a common logic to these formats, a distinctive 'media logic', that is consistently channeling narrative in one particular direction?

Some important features of online narrative forms immediately spring to mind, important that is by contrast with oral storytelling. These features stem in various ways from the oversaturation of the online information environment: first, a pressure to mix text with other materials (sound, video, still image) and more generally to make a visual presentation out of narrative, over and above its textual content; second, a pressure to limit the length of narrative, whether to take account of the limits of people's attention when reading text online, or to limit the file size of videos or sound tracks; third, a pressure towards standardization because of the sheer volume of material online and people's limited tolerance for formats, layouts or sequences whose intent they have difficulty interpreting; fourth, a pressure to take account of the possibility that any narrative when posted online may have unintended and undesired audiences. We are, I suggest, at too early a stage in the development of digital storytelling to be sure which of these pressures will prove most salient and stable, or whether other unexpected pressures will overtake them in importance. But that there will be some patterns is unquestionable; whatever patterns become standard will be consequential in so far as having an online narrative presence itself becomes expected of well-functioning citizens. That people are

already making such an assumption emerges from recent press reports that employers are searching blogs and social networking sites for personal information that might be relevant to judging job applicants' suitability.

However this last case also brings out the complexity of the transformations under way. If digital storytellers assume their public narratives will be an archive that can be used against them in years to come, they may adjust what stories they tell online. Indeed the evidence of David Brake's recent work (Brake, 2007) on MySpace users is that young people are already making similar adjustments of content, not merely style, for more immediate reasons, to avoid giving compromising information to people at school or in their local area who may be hostile or dangerous to them. This is an important finding, since it brings out precisely the complexity of causal influences at work here. It is not simply that young people already have in fixed form identifiable stories of themselves they want to tell, and that the digital format imposes certain constraints on those particular stories, producing an adjustment we can register as an effect of 'mediatization'. Instead young people are holding back personal material that might in theory have gone into their MySpace or Facebook site. This problematizes any idea that social networking sites represent simply the mediatization (and publicization) of formerly private self-narratives although journalists (for example the editorial in the *Financial Times*, 6-7 July 2007) have drawn precisely this conclusion. On the contrary we might argue young people, by holding back personal narratives from such sites, are protecting an older private/public boundary rather than tolerating a shift in that boundary because of the significant social pressures to have an online presence.

We start to see here how the transformations under way around digital storytelling cannot be contained within a single logic of mediatization, since involved also are logics of use and social expectation that are evolving alongside digital narrative forms: we are closer here to the dialectic which Silverstone saw as at the heart of the mediation concept.

Digital Storytelling as Mediation

If, as I earlier suggested, we can understand mediation as the resultant of flows of production, circulation, interpretation and recirculation, then there would seem to be three main angles from which we might approach 'digital storytelling' as mediation:

1. by studying how digital storytelling's contexts and processes of production are becoming associated with certain practices and styles of interpretation (stabilities in the *immediate and direct context* of storytelling);
2. by studying how the outputs of digital storytelling practices are themselves circulated and recirculated between various sites, and exchanged between various practitioners, audience members and institutions (stabilities in the *wider flows* of digital stories and the resulting personal and institutional linkages, flows which the possibility of digital storytelling while on the move, using mobile phones and other mobile digital devices, complicate considerably);

3. by studying the *long-term consequences* of digital storytelling as a practice for particular types of people in particular types of location, and its consequences for wider social and cultural formations, even for democracy itself.

Needless to say, these are areas where extended empirical work must be done, and as already explained this article will remain at the theoretical level. The third perspective in particular ('long-term consequences') involves considering the wider interactions, if any, between particular storytelling practices and general media culture. When a practice such as digital storytelling challenges media's normal concentration of symbolic resources so markedly, analysing the consequences for wider society and culture is precisely difficult, but it cannot be ignored because of the possibility that digital storytelling is part of a wider democratization, a reshaping of the hierarchies of voice and agency, which characterize mediated democracies. The resulting issues, while they encompass issues of media form (and therefore mediatization), go much wider and can therefore only be captured, I will argue, by the dialectical term 'mediation'.

We can learn a lot here from the work of the American sociologist Robert Wuthnow on the social and ideological consequences of the book (Wuthnow, 1989). Wuthnow in *Communities of Discourse* analyses the factors that contributed to major ideological shifts such as the Reformation and the birth of modern democratic politics. He sees the medium of the book and the new information networks it made possible as essential to these long-term changes. But what makes Wuthnow's account so interesting is that his argument does not stop there – if it did, it would be an old-style technological determinism. Wuthnow argues that we cannot understand the impact of the book, over the longer-term, unless we look at a number of contingent factors, some environmental, some institutional and some at the level of what he calls 'action sequences' (1989: 7). Factors Wuthnow isolates include, first, the development of settings for communication other than the book (such as the church, the school, the political party), second, the many interlocking social and political processes that created new contexts for cultural production more generally, and, third, the ways in which new circuits for the distribution of ideas, such as the journal, emerged over time and then became gradually institutionalised in certain ways.

Wuthnow's rich historical account clearly invites us to think not only about the detailed processes necessary for the book to be stabilized in cultural life in a certain way, but also about the unevennesses (to use Silverstone's term again) of any such process. We might add another factor, implicit in Wuthnow's account: the emerging processes of hierarchisation that developed through the above changes. Think of the literary public sphere for example, and the social exclusions on which it was famously based, the 18th century coffee-house versus the market-square (Calhoun, 1992; Stallybrass and White, 1986). Wuthnow asks us to think systematically about the types of space in which particular symbolic practices (in his case, the regular practices of reading and discussing printed materials in pamphlet, newspaper or book form; in ours, the practice of exchanging digital stories) become under particular historical circumstances embedded more widely in individual routines and the organisation of everyday life.

Wuthnow's emphasis on institutional spaces (such as the church or school) far beyond the immediate moments of media production, circulation or reception, is inspiring for research on digital storytelling; first, for drawing our research into the wider territory of education and government; and second, for its emphasis on space, more precisely on the complex historical conditions under which new social spaces emerge that ground new routines. We could approach the same question from a different disciplinary angle by drawing on the geographer Henri Lefebvre's concept of 'social space'. As Lefebvre puts it provocatively:

The social relations of production have a social existence to the extent to which they have a spatial existence; they project themselves into a space, becoming inscribed there, and in the process producing that space itself. (Lefebvre, 1990: 129)

If Lefebvre is right and all social and cultural change involves transformations of 'social space' in this sense (think of the normalization of television as a domestic medium through its embedding in the space of the home), then any successful embedding of digital storytelling in the everyday life of mediated democracies will involve a similar spatial transformation, with resulting spatial asymmetries too.

Translating Wuthnow's argument to the early 21st century context of digital storytelling, we can ask a series of questions about 'mediation' beyond those asked above:

4. 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 isn't?
5. What types of resources and agents are typically drawn upon in creating and then 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?)
6. 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?
7. 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 finally politics?

We can focus these questions a little more sharply. Wuthnow explains his larger argument as one about how ideas work: they do not work by floating freely, but instead they need to 'become embedded in concrete communities of discourse' (1987: 552). There is a striking intersection here with Etienne Wenger's (1998) concept of 'communities of practice'. Wenger uses the term 'community', he says, as 'a way of talking about the social configurations in which our enterprises are defined as worth pursuing and our participation is recognizable as competence' (1998: 5, added emphasis). For Wenger, 'communities of practice are the prime context in which we can work out common sense through mutual engagement' (1998: 47): put another way, Wenger is concerned with the social production of value and authority, and these must be crucial to

the broader processes of ‘mediation’ in which digital storytelling will come, if it does, to matter.

It is these points – the building of community through the construction of value and the giving of recognition (cf Honneth, 2007) – on which I want to focus in the next section, since they are crucial to digital storytelling’s claims to reenergize community and possibly even democracy. This discussion will take us further into the territory of mediation and away from the territory, independently important though it is, of mediatization.

Digital Storytelling and the Conditions of Democracy

Robert Dahl in his theory of polyarchy - a cautious account of the preconditions of a democracy that does not yet exist - prescribes that ‘citizens should possess the political resources they would require to participate in political life pretty much as equals’ (Dahl, 1989: 322). Among the resources which Dahl thinks it most important to distribute more fairly for this purpose are not only economic resources but also ‘knowledge, information and cognitive skills’ (1989: 324). It is in relation to the latter that digital storytelling is potentially relevant, but to see this, we need to supplement Dahl’s account with Nancy Fraser’s more recent demonstration of the interconnection between the distribution of resources and the distribution of recognition as dimensions of justice (Fraser, 2000: 116). Correcting injustices of recognition means counteracting ‘an institutionalized pattern of cultural value that [constitutes] some social actors as less than full members of society and prevents them from participating as peers’ (2000: 113), but crucially as Fraser argues this involves a redistribution of resources too.

We can complete the link to digital storytelling by noting that the extreme concentration of symbolic resources in media institutions constitutes an important dimension of social power precisely because it institutes an inequality of social recognition in Fraser’s sense: as a result, we can talk not only of the hidden injuries of class (Sennett and Cobb, 1972) but also of the ‘hidden injuries of media power’ (Couldry, 2001). Digital storytelling in principle represents a correction of those latter hidden injuries since it provides the means to distribute more widely the capacity to tell important stories about oneself – to represent oneself as a social, and therefore potentially political, agent – in a way that is registered in the public domain. Digital storytelling is perhaps particularly important as a practice because it operates outside the boundaries of mainstream media institutions although it can also work on the margins of such institutions (Nancy Thumim’s work examines how power asymmetries are worked out in digital storytelling sponsored by media institutions such as the BBC (Thumim, 2006)). In that sense digital storytelling contributes to a wider democratisation of media resources and possibly to the conditions of democracy itself. Digital storytelling vastly extends the number of people who at least in principle can be registered as contributing to the public sphere, enabling again in principle quite a radical revision of both of Habermas’ accounts (pessimistic and more optimistic) of the public sphere (Habermas, 1989, 1996).

We need to understand in more detail how, given the previous analysis, the practice of digital storytelling can be understood to work in this broader way. To introduce that discussion, I want briefly to look at the language of the leading exponent of digital storytelling Joe Lambert, founder of the Center for Digital Storytelling in Berkeley (www.storycenter.org).

Lambert's book *Digital Storytelling* (now in its second edition: Lambert, 2006) is intended as an inspirational as well as a practical guide. It discusses the background to the practice of digital storytelling in a way that relates interestingly to the history of mass media: needed, he argues, is not just an expansion of digital literacy but a greater faculty for listening to others' stories (2006: 16, 95) that contrasts explicitly with the normal context for consumers of broadcast media. The aim of digital storytelling is not to produce media for broadcast, but to produce '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: 17). Lambert has a sharp sense of the hidden injuries of media power; 'we can live better as celebrated contributors, we can easily die from our perceived lack of significance to others, to our community, to our society' (2006: 3). Digital storytelling is offered as a technique for increasing understanding across generations, ethnicities and other divides, and as a tool in activist organizing, education, professional reflection and corporate communication (2006: 111, 112, 114, 165).

Digital storytelling is a tool with such diverse uses that it almost certainly cannot be understood as having any one type of consequence or even form. I want to concentrate however on the claims made by Lambert for digital storytelling's links to democracy, particularly the practice of 'storycatching' which through meetings of 'storycircles' in particular communities catch stories which otherwise would not be exchanged. The aim is, in part, political: 'to engage us in listening to each other's stories with respect and then perhaps we can sort out new solutions . . . by reframing our diverse connections to the big story' (2006: xx-xxi); 'as we envision it, storycatching will become central to planning and decision making, the foundation upon which the best choices can be made' (2006: xxi). It would be easy in an academic article to pass by this (for some, utopian) vision without comment, but it would be a mistake, since this vision addresses a problem for many contemporary societies identified in academic analysis too: the problem of the disarticulation between individual narratives and social or political narratives. Alain Touraine has put this in almost apocalyptic form:

we are witnessing the end of the close correspondence between all the registers of collective life – the economic, the social, the political and the cultural – that were once unified within the framework of the nation. (Touraine, 2001: 103)

Others (Bennett, 1999; Turner, 2001) have expressed similar concerns in less dramatic terms. Storycircles, seen from a sociological point of view, are a practical setting, easily replicable, for mutual exchange of stories that at least test out the degree to which we find each other's lives incommensurable with our own and that therefore test out, since each

of us is differently inserted in the various 'registers of collective life' (Touraine), the degree to which the contradictions between the levels of our own lives are resolvable.

In so far as the digitalization of storytelling is offered as a means by which to address a fundamental problem in contemporary democratic societies, how are we to understand this claim and the sociological conditions through which it might be realizable? More specifically, which of 'mediatization' or 'mediation' would prove more useful for grasping the dynamics of such processes? Mediatization is concerned with the systematic consequences of the standardization - of media formats, and reliance on access to media outlets - for particular areas of contemporary life. It is clear that, if digital storytelling becomes standardized in particular ways, this might be significant, but there is no strong reason to believe in advance that such standardization would be more consequential socially than the experiences of group formation, exchange and learning that such storytelling involved. More consequential, I suggest, are questions we might address through a concern with 'mediation': questions about how the availability of digital storytelling forms enable enduring habits of exchange, archiving, commentary and reinterpretation, and on wider spatial and social scales than otherwise possible; questions about the institutional embedding of the processes of producing, distributing and receiving digital stories.

We need, in other words – if we are to take Lambert's vision of digital storytelling's potential contribution to democracy seriously, as I believe we should – to follow closely through extended empirical work not just the forms and styles of digital storytelling and not just what types of people in what locations are involved in digital storytelling, but in what wider contexts and under what conditions digital stories are exchanged, referred to, treated as a resource, and given recognition and authority. The fear – articulated abstractly in my earlier adjustment to Silverstone's notion of the dialectic of mediation – is that digital storytelling is, and will remain, a largely isolated phenomenon, cut off from broader media and, more importantly, cut off from the broader range of everyday life, both private and public/political: to put it crudely, a phase that individuals and groups 'go through', that is not recognized more widely in the regular distribution of social and cultural authority or respect. The hope – strongly articulated as a vision by Joe Lambert – is that, from out of local practices of making, exchanging and collecting digital stories, wider networks and habits will stabilize, just as they did around the practice of reading, with consequences for the wider distribution of power in intensely mediated but also often increasingly unequal societies.

The realization of that hope depends on many other types of transformation too, not least the addressing of what elsewhere I have called the crisis of 'voice' in neoliberal democracies (Couldry, forthcoming),⁶ which in turn will require major shifts in the political and economic landscape.

Conclusion

I have argued that digital storytelling is a good topic from which to explore the respective strengths of two influential wide-range concepts for to understanding the broader social consequences of media, including new media: mediatization and mediation.

My general aim has not been to show that one concept is always more useful than the other (both are useful and important), but that we need both in our conceptual toolkit, since they are complementary. However the greater attentiveness of certain approaches that prioritise the term 'mediation' (particularly that of the late Roger Silverstone) may be better attuned to capturing the complexity of the multiple, often and dialectical processes through which the range of practices we gather under the term digital storytelling will transform society and politics. For that reason alone, it is important to retain within the developing field of new media theory the legacy of the concept of mediation.

References

- Altheide, D. (1985) *Media Power*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Baudrillard, J. (1983) *Simulations*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Bennett, L. (1998) 'The Uncivic Culture: Communication, Identity, and the Rise of Lifestyle Politics.' *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31(4): 740-761.
- Benson, R. and E. Neveu (eds.) (2005) *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Brake, David (2007) 'Filling the "About me" box. Questioning the centrality of self reflection in online identity-related spaces', paper presented to 57th ICA Conference, San Francisco 24–28 May.
- Calhoun, C. (ed.) (1992) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Couldry, N. (2000) *The Place of Media Power*. London: Routledge.
- Couldry, N. (2001) 'The Hidden Injuries of Media Power', *Journal of Consumer Culture* 1(2): 155: 174.
- Couldry, N. (2003a) *Media Rituals: A Critical Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Couldry (2003b) 'Media Meta-capital: Extending the Range of Bourdieu's Field Theory', *Theory and Society* 32(5/6): 653-677.
- Dahl, R. (1989). *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Foster, C. (2006) *British Government in Crisis*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Gumpert, G. and R. Cathcart (1990) 'A Theory of Mediation' in B. Ruben and L. Lievrouw (eds.) *Mediation, Information and Communication*, pp. 21-36, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Habermas, J. (1989) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* . Cambridge: Polity.
- Habermas, J. (1996) *Between Facts and Norms*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hjarvard, S. (2004) 'From Bricks to Bytes: The Mediatization of a Global Toy Industry' in I. Bondjeberg and P. Golding (eds) *European Culture and the Media*, pp. 43-63, Bristol: Intellect.

Hjarvard, S. (2007) 'Changing Media, Changing Language: The Mediatization of Society and the Spread of English and Medialects', paper presented to 57th ICA Conference, San Francisco, May 23-28.

Honneth, A. (2007) *Disrespect*. Cambridge: Polity.

Krotz, F. (2001) *Die Mediatisierung kommunikativen Handelns. Der Wandel von Alltag und sozialen Beziehungen, Kultur und Gesellschaft durch die Medien*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Lambert, J. (2006) *Digital Storytelling: capturing lives, creating community* 2nd edition. Berkeley, CA: Digital Diner Press.

Lazarsfeld, P. and R. Merton (1969) [1948] 'Mass Communication, Popular Taste and Organised Social Action' in W. Schramm (ed) *Mass Communications* 2nd edition, pp. 492-512. Urbana : University of Illinois Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1990) *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Leys, C. (2001) *Market-driven Politics*. London: Verso.

Madianou, M. (2005) *Mediating the Nation*. London: UCL Press.

Martin-Barbero, J. (1993) *Communication, Culture and Hegemony*. London: Sage.

Mazzoleni, G. and W. Schultz (1999) "'Mediatization" of Politics: A Challenge for Democracy?' *Political Communication* , 16: 247-261.

Meyer, T. (2003) *Media Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity.

Pattie, C., P. Seyd and P. Whitely (2004). Citizenship in Britain : values, participation and democracy. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Sassen, S. (2006) *Territory, Authority, Rights*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Scannell, P. and D. Cardiff (1991) *A Social History of Broadcasting*. Volume 1. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schulz, W. (2004) 'Reconsidering Mediatization as an Analytical Concept', *European Journal of Communication* 19(1): 87-101.

Silverstone, R. (1994) *Television and Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.

Silverstone, R. (2002) 'Complicity and Collusion in the Mediation of Everyday Life', *New Literary History*, 33: 745-764.

- Silverstone, R. (2005) 'Mediation and Communication' in C. Calhoun et al (eds.) *The International Handbook of Sociology*. London: Sage.
- Stallybrass, P. and A. White (1986) *The Poetics and Politics of Transgression*. London : Methuen.
- Strömback, J. (2007) 'Four Phases of Mediatization: An Analysis of the Mediatization of Poltiics', paper presented to ICA 57th Conference, San Francisco, May 23-28.
- Thumim, N. (2006) 'Mediated Self-representations: "Ordinary People" in "Communities"' in S. Herbrechter and M. Higgins (eds) *Returning (to) Communities: Theory, Culture and Political Practice of the Communal* , pp. 255-274. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi Press.
- Thompson, J. (1995) *The Media and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Touraine, A. (2001) *Beyond Neoliberalism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Turner, B. (2001) 'The Erosion of Citizenship', *British Journal of Sociology* 52(2): 189-209.
- Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wuthnow, R. (1989) *Communities of Discourse*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

¹ I am not referring exclusively to stories told within workshops run by the Center for Digital Storytelling at University of California, Berkeley, although I will briefly consider the work of that centre later on.

² These reflections have been developed in the context of, and supported by, the Mediatized Stories network run by the University of Oslo since 2005 and funded by the Norwegian Research Council. Thanks to my collaborators in the network and particularly to Knut Lundby, its leader. Thanks also to the journal's anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on an earlier version.

³ As we will see, there is some definitional violence here, since some theories of 'mediation' are closer to 'mediatization' in their emphasis on a linear logic of transformation.

⁴ As noted by Schulz in his discussion of mediatization (Schulz, 2004: 92).

⁵ I want to acknowledge the influence in the following paragraphs of my conversations between 2001 and 2006 with the late Roger Silverstone whose breadth of insight will, for a long time, be greatly missed.

⁶ Compare Pattie Seyd and Whiteley (2004) on the lack of a deliberative culture in Britain.