- Portelli, Alessandro. 1991. *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories: Form and Meaning in Oral History*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ruby, Jay. 1991. Speaking For, Speaking About or Speaking Alongside—An anthropological and Documentary Dilemma. *Visual Anthropology Review* 7(2): 50–67.
- Spivak, Gayatri. 1988. Can the Subaltern Speak? In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, eds. Carl Nelson, and Lawrence Grossberg, 271–313. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Thompson, Edward P. 1963. *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Vintage Books.
- Tomaselli, Keyan. 1999. *Appropriating Images: Semiotics of Visual Representation*. Højberg: Intervention Press.
- . 2006. Orality, Rhythmography and Visual Representation: A Peasant's Lament. In *Writing in the Sand: Auto-ethnography Among Indigenous South Africans*, ed. Keyan Tomaselli, 131–157. Lanham, New York, Toronto and Plymouth: Altamira Press.
- . 2010. Miles and Miles of Bugger-all: Miles and Miles of HIStory, Aka Sand in the Tent. Unpublished Research Experiences, Rethinking Indigeneities Project, Culture, Communication and Media Studies, University of KwaZulu Natal, Durban.
- Weinberg, Paul. 2002. Transcript of a Structured Interview on Reading Ethnographic Photography. Conducted by Linje Manyozo Durban: November 8.
- . 1996. Footprints in the Sand. In *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*, ed. Pippa Skotness, 331–341. Cape Town: Cape Town University Press.
- . 1997. *In Search of the San*. Johannesburg: Porcupine Press.
- White, Hylton. 1995. *In the Tradition of the Forefathers: Bushman Traditionality at Kagga Kamma*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

CHAPTER 6

Visual Interventions: Film, Ethnography and Social Change

*Lajos Varhegyi, Richard Ndunguru, Søren Sønderstrup,
and Anders Høg Hansen*

INTRODUCTION: FILM SCREENINGS IN TANZANIA

Darkness falls in the small suburb of Kunduchi on the northern outskirts of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, on 12 November 2010. An English premier league football match is screened at a small indoor video café room nearby in the centre of the fishing village. Every seat is occupied. Sweating faces are turned towards the television screen in concentration. These audiences are not leaving for outdoor entertainment just now—or not yet. Three short documentary films, made by Tanzanian and Swedish students in collaboration, are to be screened a little later just further down the road.¹ We are about to witness the first Tanzanian public screening of student films

L. Varhegyi • S. Sønderstrup • A.H. Hansen (✉)
School of Arts and Communication, Malmö University, Malmö, Sweden

R. Ndunguru
Department of Creative Arts, University of Dar es Salaam, Dar es Salaam,
Tanzania

in the project Visual Interventions/Film for Change. We do seem to have an audience already—not depending on the football fans. Many others are out and about in the streets as usual. The mosque will slowly empty and people will drop by. Some preparatory information, mostly word of

Fig. 6.1 Screening in Bagamoyo. Photographer: Anders Høg Hansen. Used with permission

mouth, during recent days has been spread in the community and local participants/actors were notified that a screening and a discussion would take place. Tension is in the air. How will the locals respond to the stories on the screen? What kind of debate will our facilitator or 'Joker',² teacher Richard Ndunguru from the University of Dar es Salaam, trigger? The villagers themselves are actors/actresses in these films. Many of the viewers will recognize streets, homes and the 'local stars' on the screen. For the Tanzanian filmmakers present, this is also the first time their work is to be presented to a home audience.³

On a theoretical level, two central issues were prominent throughout, although they were not finally conceptualized until Sørenstrup did his research write-up. One was concerned with a particular pedagogy of mediation and dialogue through art (merged in the concept of 'cultural brokering'), and the other with how to generate new ideas and action

Fig. 6.2 Shooting for *Steps in the Path*. Zembwela in front of the camera. Photographer: Søren Sørenstrup. Used with permission

Fig. 6.3 Jalala in *Steps in the Path*, finding time to study

Fig. 6.4 Sharif and kids in front of video shop turned school in *Imuma*

(conceptualized as 'imaginative leeways'). We explored how the films worked as cultural brokering (Sønderstrup 2011a, b) where screenings would translate stories into endogenous development issues carried by a participatory perspective that also would highlight new imaginative leeways, a space for renewed formulation of possible ways forward. The

Fig. 6.5 Omar of *Kunduchi Fishing Village* debating community issues with barber while being shaved

Fig. 6.6 Omar's kid, watching television in *Kunduchi Fishing Village*, eagerly commenting, 'All the fighters have green clothes'

leeway would be opened in a practice of fictionalization or storytelling through the enactment of everyday communal issues concerning, for example, work, family and education.

Just a few weeks before the first screening in Tanzania, the films were finalized and screened in Malmö, Sweden, at a seminar for students on

Fig. 6.7 This article is dedicated to the memory of Lajos Varhegyi, the pioneer of this film project. He passed away in early 2015. We miss you! Here he is taking photographs (one of his other passions) in Dar es Salaam, December 2009. Photographer: Anders Høg Hansen Used with permission

the MA in Communication for Development programme (at Malmö University) as well as at the local cinema, Panora. The Tanzanians and Swedes had been editing for roughly a month in Malmö after researching and shooting in Kunduchi and Bagamoyo (situated north of Dar es Salaam) in August. The research, story scripting and shooting was done by six Tanzanian and three Swedish students split into three film teams, two Tanzanians and one Swede in each, spread across three locations: Kaole (eastern outskirts of Bagamoyo), Bagamoyo and Kunduchi (Kinondoni district of Dar es Salaam). For the editing phase in Malmö, one Tanzanian student representative for each film could travel. In these first two phases of the project the students were facilitated and taught by two film teachers, Lajos Varhegyi (School of Arts and Communication, Malmö) and Ndunguru (Department of Fine and Performing Arts [FPA], Dar es Salaam).

The intention was to establish a joint work process beginning with a research and scripting phase. The students would mingle with local resi-

dents, engage in conversation and move around with them in their everyday life to try to find the crucial issues or stories that could be enacted. This process was an important part of the 'cultural brokering', as Sønnderstrup later termed it. By using methods of 'film for development'—that is, adapting theatre for development and its involvement of local residents in storytelling and acting to documentary storytelling—the students would identify problems, situations and conditions suited to the transformation to traditional 'documentary' storytelling.⁴ Ndunguru, the Dar teacher and joker, led the screening event in Kunduchi while Søren Sønnderstrup was observing and interviewing.

PROJECT PHASES AND AIMS: COLLABORATION, COMPROMISE AND CHANGE?

The project was a 'pilot' testing collaborative media productions anchored in contemporary community themes and challenges. The filming locations were in Tanzania but could have been in Malmö, or ideally both locations. Funding did not favour two locations, so the decision was made to begin with Tanzania and then continue with the more favourable editing conditions in Malmö. We did, however, not want to continue with purely northern representations of the Global South, so the collaboration was meant to create different perspectives or even a clash on both a conceptual and a practical level. Tanzanian filmmakers worked with the Swedes, but also, importantly, acted as go-betweens when doing the research and filming in the communities—that is, nurturing a cultural brokering process.

In brief, the educational processes of researching, scripting, shooting and editing were followed by public screening events and discussions with local community members and actors to address the problems, and possibly desired changes, depicted in the films.

The initial planning meetings in March and June 2010 resulted in a six-step plan: (1) community selections; (2) student participants; (3) Visual Interventions Phase I; (4) an editing phase; (5) Visual Interventions Phase II, or a so-called 'follow-up' with screenings and community debate; and, finally, (6) reflecting back on the project and developing new media collaboration initiatives to continue the educational exchange.⁵

We aimed to create learning experiences or empower several typologies of *participants* both inside and outside the university, as points 1 and 3 indicate. One basic limitation was a shoestring budget for the pilot, with

limited time for fieldwork, filming, editing in Sweden and later screening in Tanzania. This fast-track approach was intertwined with logistic conditions or limitations, the availability of teachers and students, and for very specific and limited periods of time. This gave the project a 'quick 'n' dirty' character despite the carefully laid out steps/phases.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING PARTICIPATION AND COLLABORATION

Throughout the project a series of questions concerning participation and collaboration continued to haunt and enrich our learning experience: To what extent are we, and can we, affect and involve local participants *outside* university? No doubt, those who would be affected most strongly by this experience were the students, as Varhegyi noted. They were all, in different ways, mesmerized by the journey into the unknown or land of 'the other', whether Tanzanians in Sweden or Swedes in Tanzania. All of them were also put into cooperation constellations that they had never been in before.

In such constellations you can sketch out different levels or typologies of *participation* (see Mefalopulos and Tufte 2008, 6–7; Morris 2005). The community's residents were contacted by outsiders from the university. They were students and teachers of mixed artistic and academic backgrounds (theatre, documentary film, arts, development and anthropology) and they aimed for more than *passive* participation (where members are just informed about actions) and participation by *consultation* (Tufte and Mefalopulos 2008, 6), where stakeholders provide input. The timeframes were, however, decided and enforced from the outside. Would this allow enough time for a brokering that would let filmmakers loosen the control of the act of representation (Nichols 2001, 140)? While the project certainly developed stories in interaction with community individuals, it can be concluded that the documentary approach came to suppress the theatre for development approach,⁶ the latter setup being a more radically collaborative practice.⁷

Then there is the issue of the involvement of the university students and teachers. The Swedish film students did not have much time to settle in Tanzania and adjust to the environment. The Tanzanians did not have much time for editing either. The broader cross-media education at the FPA (compared with Malmö where the film students concentrated on 'film') indicated that the FPA students could have used additional preparation teaching/

coursework in Malmö before the actual editing phase. The collaborative aspect of the Malmö editing phase was challenged by the fact that several of the Swedish participants were busy with new assignments/coursework that made it difficult for them to be fully part of the editing phase. While any groupwork will involve divisions of work or degrees of involvement and *peripheral participation*, meaning differences in intensity of involvement which actually make groupwork easier (Lave and Wenger 1991), the lack of balance of involvement in the editing phase became a problem.

The community-centred theatre for development and Film for Change approaches were part of the FPA educational repertoire. The FPA provided contacts and entry to the actual communities that were chosen after planning meetings in March and June. The Tanzanian students acted as go-betweens and tried to bridge cultural and language barriers. Of crucial importance was the FPA's and Richard Ndunguru's experience with theatre for development—in brief, about experimenting with different forms of theatrical enactment expressing a story that occupies the minds (or the collective memory) of the inhabitants of the community. Theatre for development involves the locals to a large degree. The participants become performers and formulate the problems and stories through re-enactments under facilitation (see e.g. Bakiri in Salhi 1998), an approach not far from Boal's notion of the *spect-actor* in 'forum theatre' where a merging of viewer and player happens (Boal 2002). Such an approach can be effective since community members identify easily with the issues addressed—they jump into the enactments, which forms a natural part of their bodies and thinking. Enactments of problems can later on lead to the establishment of taskforces.

In Visual Interventions the extracted ideas from theatre for development placed an emphasis on real problems, local participation, storytelling and plays that could stimulate possible problem-solving discussions.⁸ The performances were documented audiovisually and became a tangible production/result for various future uses. The power of a story may inspire others and lead to new forms of cooperation.

DIFFERENT POSITIONS OF PARTICIPATION AND PRACTICE

From a methodological and educational point of view, we deliberately coupled different positions of participation as well as different artistic traditions, such as film and theatre, and different academic traditions, such as media and cultural studies, with different forms of ethnography and

applied visual anthropology. The academic and artistic traditions included an emphasis on development and social change. The strongly situated contexts of learning and its different levels of collaborative frameworks (the students, the community etc.), as opposed to the 'artificial' construction of a classroom petrol-station pedagogy of 'transmitting' facts to students' heads, implied action and interaction with informants which we were depending on (loosely inspired by Freire's philosophy outlined in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* [1971], perhaps here more for its social learning approach than its change approach).

While still maintaining control over the act of representation through the student/teacher-controlled editing phase, the filmmakers were, however, not in control of what kind of stories or content would develop. Depending on key actors' input, the stories and their points could go many ways. As in processual public art projects, participants may to a varied extent influence the actual art process-product since such processes allow for interaction with the community and the community members' appropriation of a given project (see e.g. Björgvinsson and Høg Hansen 2011). In Visual Interventions the actors/participants would raise ideas and point to stories they wanted to tell. Yet, in the end, the filmmakers selected among the material/footage produced.

The interaction, and positions of participation, were played out on many expected levels, such as between the two film facilitators, Varhegyi and Ndunguru; between the students cooperating on the films; between the filmmakers and the MA student, Sønderstrup, who embraced the project from another stance; and between the university folks involved (students and teachers) and all the other 'participants', audiences, actors, stakeholders and other university students.

Some of the learning processes apart from research and filming came out of classic classroom-based teaching or interaction. In the field, intentionally, things could go in many directions since this was also an exploration of culture and of the social with visual methods, a sort of applied visual anthropology (e.g. Pink 2007; Ginsburg et al. 2002), or embedded filming, as in modes of visual problem appraisal (Sønderstrup 2011b). To guide us in finding, formulating and re-enacting those themes/problems, we needed the communities and we wanted to ignite an ongoing process of debate or brokering that was dependent on the stories that let themselves show in the research, script and shooting phase. This is difficult when you only have a few weeks. Still, we aimed to create important learning and a tangible result. Also, the different

typologies of student approach were considered particularly useful. An important methodological device and of strong value for the project and the writing of this chapter was Søren Sønderstrup's position and field-work for his MA thesis, as a participant not belonging to the film crew or local community. His ethnographic approach could address cultural difference and post-colonial perspectives, in addition to the focus on social change.⁹ With his work we could systematize a position, on the 'side-lines', not bound up in camera movements or how to work with local community or actors, editing software, funding or facilitation responsibilities. Sønderstrup could observe and interview players on the ground, and also address the texts and events produced (the actual films plus the screening events) from a distance. The filmmakers, on the other hand, were in the lion's den, in the midst of the production of the films. The screening events were obviously tense and special moments for them with their art being shown in public.

While the students handed in written evaluations, the MA in Communication for Development works with a transparent field diary function online (viewable to both students and teachers), which Sønderstrup used to a large extent. This gave us on-the-spot impressions and analysis of the project's development (Sønderstrup 2011a, b).

IMAGINATIVE LEEWAYS?

In his observations, Sønderstrup found (2010–2011, 2011b) that the student filmmakers gave much space to participating actors to tell their stories while they let their cameras run. In the editing rooms, however, the students were in charge of what to select for the films. Before the editing phase, interesting dynamics between the different groups of participants could be detected. The students' presence in the communities stimulated debate among local stakeholders. This was reinforced by the screenings.

We may here talk about the jump or possible linkages between the everyday life and the issues/themes that the media production and its stories may give rise to. In his research, Sønderstrup adopted the notion of an imaginative leeway (Sønderstrup 2011a, b), characterized by, for example, high levels of participation, strategies of fictionalization and role casts. This relates to a form of brokerage—inspired by Sarah Pink's term 'cultural brokerage' (Pink 2007, 6)—where the actor-participants' storytelling and experimenting produce new ideas, which are grounded in the real world yet in parts are a fictionalization or actor representation. In

this process the remaining community is presented with a narrative that may create new energy and ideas for action, as well as shed a critical light on some of the barriers to change. Here the follow-up discussions and taskforces may make attempts to overcome or work with some of these barriers. What Søndersstrup refers to as an 'imaginative leeway' (2011a, b) brokers between different versions of the truth (and fiction), and between different regimes of power, interpretation and meaning. Where 'cultural brokerage' is a technical term to describe the use of media as a repository for intercultural dialogue or negotiation of meaning, 'imaginative leeway' describes how a participatory strategy enables participants to mentally jump into a paradigm of meaning, conditioned by shared beliefs and circulated culture on the ground. The ideal concept of the imaginative leeway is empowering in the sense that it takes away the focus from the film and onto the here and now perceived reality, mediated by the universe of the film. Thus the film is not the voice, or at least not the only voice. The impression left by the film in conjunction with the ensuing debate is of importance. The imaginative leeway is an educational process activating spectators and participants anew.

In his research, Søndersstrup estimated that the project did not receive a satisfying level of participation; it lingered on *participation by consultation* (Muniz in Søndersstrup 2011) and did not quite lead to the empowerment or self-mobilization that a Film for Change approach envisions. However, an open-endedness to questions and problems in the film may also emphasize that 'change' can be viewed as a complex phenomenon to be explored rather than formulated precisely. The film can, by remaining open-ended, invite audiences to continue narration and maintain curiosity.¹⁰ The films all address the issue of education, for young and old alike, and they may have come to pose and expose *trial realities*—addressing how difficult it may be to create change. In this chapter we do not aim for an in-depth analysis of the actual texts/films (owing to the focus on methodology), although comments are about the presentation of the films in the next section.

THE FACES OF THE FILMS: JALALA, SHARIF AND OMAR

The films follow the life of locals, each struggling with their daily hassles and joys, empathetically portraying their lives, either by giving voice to their thoughts or by producing imagery and sound to accompany their walking and talking in the community.

In *Steps in the Path* we follow the barefoot boy Jalala walking to school, on the bumpy road to knowledge and a better life? In between work tasks for children in the village, at the end of the film he enjoys a precious moment under a tree finding some time to read. The little boy doesn't do any talking, and the filmmakers used his silence during enactments effectively to capture his innocence and powerlessness, and other adults appear as talking heads in the film. One of these is the elderly Zembwela, who could be Jalala's father but isn't. He is in front of the camera for most of the film, talking frankly and insistently about his problems maintaining an income. Jalala's mother has to involve Jalala in work instead of letting him study. These two adults come to frame Jalala's predicament. The conditions and context, despite Jalala's walking and reading, do not easily pave the way for a new path. No explicit suggestions for improvement are made. These are left for the audience to imagine.

In *Imuma* we follow the young man Sharif and his work with a former video shop now turned into a home and school for orphaned children and youth.¹¹ Sharif is portrayed as an eager and idealistic entrepreneur who has managed to create a useful place in a community struggling to give their youth learning or future prospects. In contrast with the characters in *Steps in the Path*, Sharif embodies a way forward, a self-made change under difficult conditions. The cry for education is the same in both films, all authors agree.

In *Kunduchi Fishing Village* we follow the talkative fisherman, Omar, trying to get by and earn enough for his big family. However, fishing is impacted by environmental and political hardships, from pollution to corruption, and also unrest in Kunduchi. During the very first research trip in June (Varhegyi, Høg Hansen, Søndersstrup, Shahà 'Biggie' Mohamed, Gabriella Brungelsson and Zena Mchujuko present) the police came in with truncheons in hand and violently approached a few they thought had been involved in crime. In this film, which through its sharp-tongued protagonist appears edgier than the others (though without posing solutions), we do, however, get a mixture of humour and realism. Possibly to a greater extent than the other films, it uses a few thoughtful cinematic strategies.

A 'one-handed barber', wounded in one of the periods of unrest noted above, shaves the head of the visiting customer, Omar, while they dryly discuss the difficult conditions in the village. How can they/we respond to that reality with the forces above them? Behind Omar is an image of the white rapper and rebel Eminem, 'the wigger'. Also, last in the film, there is an incident which to great effect mirrors the screening event in Kunduchi.

That night, once darkness has fallen, dozens of children gather eagerly to gaze at the screen. Now, just like them, a boy is watching television (Omar's child) and he provides a little cultural comment: 'All the fighters have green clothes. All of them,' he says wide-eyed (*Wamaevaa nguo za kijani, wote wamevaa nguo za kijani*). Soldiers fighting each other are a world-scale phenomenon, and so may be the sharing of green 'fashion'. A boy's view of the strange world of adult conflict. The boy is looking at the television watching a movie. Now the final cut is screened and he has become a spectator watching himself. The Kunduchi residents are being watched by the police but are rarely heard. They can watch over reality, most often disempowered. The screen presence does not automatically project them onto a new *leeway*, but as Snderstrup (2011b) notes, values, ideas and symbols had found clear shape in the films, in representation, if not so in the debates on the ground at the screenings. The project, as theatre for development, twists the mirror and positions of actor and spectator, and may also trigger the belief in changing who represents and who can act. This time the students (and their teachers) had their final say in the editing rooms and this is how our re-enacting came to look. Next time it may be us.

THE FILMS RETURNING TO THE COMMUNITY

The first screening in Dar es Salaam in November was met by another kind of excitement and tension compared with the Malm lectures and screenings just a few weeks before. The audience in the Panora cinema and in the lecture hall in Malm were not on screen, but in Dar es Salaam many in the audience saw themselves now as movie actors. The film had in a way come home, but the representations may nevertheless be seen as belonging to others? And some of the community people in Dar were also keen to address the role of the filmmakers behind the camera and what their work will lead to.

At the end of the screening, Ndunguru took the stage and shouted 'Kunduchi!' The crowd roared as Snderstrup wrote with excitement in his field diary.

Now back in the community, the filmmakers are tense as they face the residents/actors again, trying to give voice and build stories around their sense of needs and rights. The films were meant as a reaching out and now the finished productions have talked back. Backed by stories derived from community voices, they are related to a move towards a citizen journal-

ism approach (for a related argument about citizen journalism in relation to the films, see Snderstrup 2011b), although still adhering clearly to a documentary genre where the filmmaker took over the control of the final 'writing'. The little boy's gaze towards the screen can be seen as a replacement for his father Omar's address, earlier in the film. He may want to go on film, like his father (Hall 1997, 60). This technique can be seen as liberating, signifying the possibility of the individual making a change, to speak out and become part of the public sphere. Yet the films do not stick to stories of individuals detached from, or outside, context. This is about individuals belonging to communities that structure their limited possibilities as well as nurture their possible actions (for more extended textual analysis of the films, see Snderstrup 2011; for other visual storytelling examples of the relation between community and the individual, see e.g. Hg Hansen 2013).

The message about a need for education goes through all three films, as noted earlier, though without being one-dimensional or making specific proposals. The emphasis on 'talk', and to a large extent talk characterized by coping rather than solutions, leaves room, maybe too much room, for further debate about the films. Although they use interesting symbolism as indicated above, the films do in general appear *literal*. You can trust their points coming direct from their characters. Although showing some engagement or battle with different traditions, there is a leaning towards continuity editing and 'voiceover gods' (John, one of the filmmakers, is *Voice of God* in *Imuma*; Nichols 2001). This format lends a didactic approach to the films with an emphasis on problem definition and a portrayal of cultural practice seen in ethnographic film, in particular when following Omar's craft practice on the boat, although he did not catch anything that day. The films also present content on education and fishing that can be coupled with other sources. Locals can thereby use this for roundtable and/or other educational uses. Depending on the availability of hard copies (the films are available online, but that does not secure easy access in a small Tanzanian community), residents may bring them along in task groups or as 'topic pointers' to raise with the authorities, whether in terms of daily needs/work conditions, ecology/environment, citizenship or schooling, as Ndunguru tried with his follow-up facilitation at screenings. In Kunduchi the community said that they were deprived of their basic rights, and the film clearly showed this. We experienced, first hand, a toughened police force visiting the community on the first day of research in August 2010. The 'visit' demonstrated a tense relation-

ship with local police and the authorities. After that particular incident in August, many community members went on a march to protest at a local municipal office.

At the screening some months later, some community members requested a civil rights workshop, and talks have begun with the School of Law at the University of Dar es Salaam to dispatch experts to teach the community about its legal rights.

CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

While the response in Kunduchi was very enthusiastic and positive, one of the screenings in Bagamoyo brought several comments along the lines of 'What's in it for us?' This could indicate that some of the audiences viewed the project as primarily aimed at student education, and possibly also that it was anchored in a northern or European agenda.

In this way the screening events were characterized by predictable responses. Many were positive after seeing the community being shown on screen with the participation of its members, but also critical in relation to what this leads to or what the community can do with it. The follow-up was intended to grapple with the difficult steps forward. The films may thus link the community with its stakeholders. The debates need to be relevant and contemporary, or at least such that the issues covered in the film can easily lead into community and stakeholder discussion at the time of the screening. In all three settings the issues appeared to be very much relevant and contemporary. However, the invited stakeholders did not always turn up. As this chapter has shown, we did not intend to produce standalone ethnographic documentary films, but to provide actual events of contextualization (Pink 2008, 144). The screening events were a key pillar in the follow-up or a means of leeway, connection and contextualization. As an experimental process, the screening events were successful. Several important ideas were formulated by locals in Kunduchi, for example, in the aftermath of the screening. Sønderstrup conducted an interview with a teacher who stressed the importance of civil rights education in the village. Teachers should simply go out there. If villagers knew a teacher would come, 'it will be easy for the villagers to go there and learn', he said (for more, see Sønderstrup 2011).

The communities' stories are now told and mediated in narratives—the films managed, to a large extent, we believe, to point towards common nec-

essary changes, yet they remained open in addressing how or who can bring this about. This leeway is what the follow-up screenings began to address.

A community member or teacher can go back to the film and use it in a specific new context. It may have an impact tomorrow or next year or never. A film may trigger debate, and it may not be its specific content but what it triggers in its aftermath. Film may have been a particularly good medium to begin with: flashbacks, fades, senses, sound and motion. Omar slurping his tea, a kid playing with his spaghetti. A cut and mix—as memory (Hodgkin and Radstone 2003, 14) in our heads, viewed as crossings or junctions of mental material (visual, sounds, smell). This material does not appear in a clear order, although the films aimed to produce particular points and narratives. The film's didactic orientation can be seen as a strength as well as a weakness. In these film narratives, however, the Tanzanian and Swedish students managed to depict human conditions and feelings that many of their audiences could relate to. Clearly, the filmmakers have made a strong attempt to transform what they saw and heard onto a screened representation. The sense of passing on a story or voices is similar to oral history methodologies documenting individual relationships to already recognized events or social histories. Oral history (as Visual Interventions) often takes the perspective of people overlooked by 'History' (with a capital H) or hidden from an authoritative and dominating History. The plurality of 'hidden histories' in the project may give the films a particular resonance among locals.

However, the residents saw outsiders enter and leave after a brief production period—and then return for a screening. It may be possible to create one media production together, but a more ambitious format is to arrange for a durability of brokering and leeway production. This may also involve a production of community ownership, which the project did not arrange for; it was not possible within such a tight timescale. We may have been focused on the timeframes of our students and teachers, and fought with the limited budget too. Ideally, artistic engagements with development take time. Smaller projects in future could incorporate clearer training elements for the communities involved (and not just for students), and hand over modes of production and funding. Then communities could return to the universities to hire help and inspiration for their leeways.

Acknowledgments Thank you to the students, Tanzanian and Swedish, and the people in the three communities, all of whom made these films and this project possible. A last thank you, and dedication, goes to Alex Mwingira for helping out during the screenings in Bagamoyo. He died in December 2013.

APPENDIX

1. Community selections. The selection happened in June 2010 by Varhegyi and Ndunguru after they visited the locations and discussed story potential. The discussion about cases had begun in March 2010 between Høg Hansen, Ndunguru and Herbert Makoye, head of the FPA. Ndunguru and Makoye at that meeting made some suggestions for communities with good training and story opportunities, and local willingness to cooperate.
2. Selecting typologies of student participants, different programmes and skills. They selected students from the FPA's third-year BA to participate in film productions as part of their apprenticeship/work practice, from August 2010 onwards, plus students from Malmö's filmmaking course, plus a minimum of one student from the MA in Communication for Development programme, also to some extent participating/analysing the project as part of their final thesis work. The master's student would then spend the following spring term writing up their thesis on the film project.
3. Visual interventions I: researching, scripting, shooting. This was a research and film production phase in August facilitated by the film-making teachers, Varhegyi and Ndunguru. It involved (roundtable) discussion and interviews, with story development and scriptwriting, cast recruitment and finally a shooting phase with local actor/community members enacting issues/problems selected during research, discussion and scriptwriting.
4. Editing (and first screenings in Malmö). This phase was slightly longer than the researching, scripting and shooting phase. The students were now working together to finalize/edit the films in Malmö under guidance (Varhegyi and Ndunguru). Three Tanzanians, one from each team, went to Malmö to work with their Swedish counterparts. This should ensure technical training for the Tanzanians, while the Swedish students were more familiar with the process and the tools needed for editing. Intentionally, Western documentary storytelling and the film for development methods could be com-

- bined, but collaboration was not so easy. The Swedish students prioritized new educational tasks and were not part of the editing phase to the same extent as the Tanzanians. Also Varhegyi had to take time to do other tasks. This gave Ndunguru a responsibility greater than intended for completing the films, and this limited his time to elaborate on other aspects of the collaboration. The screening at Panorama cinema gathered some 50 people, the same number as the screening during a communication for development seminar the day before. None of these audiences had been involved in the project. At Panorama, some attended as a result of their interest in African issues, some because of earlier experiences of/in Tanzania and some out of pure curiosity. The reactions gauged at the time were very much dependent on the audiences' personal background and varied from 'Oh, how the locations depicted have changed!' to 'I've heard about these conditions, but seeing them is a different matter.' In all, one could say that the films, considering the limited marketing, attracted a reasonable crowd and had the expected impact. Following this screening the films are being used as tuition material at the School of Arts and Communication in Malmö, and as examples of work completed by the students involved for their own promotion.
5. Visual interventions II: 'follow-up'. This involved planned screenings and discussion in the three communities, as well as other forms of ad-hoc follow-up. Community discussions in the light of the field research and enactments can begin at any stage. However, three screening events were planned as the minimum activity. As noted earlier, a joker (Ndunguru) triggered a debate by provoking or stimulating the members of the audience. Part of this trigger activity was to promote the establishment of a taskforce among the present stakeholders at screening events. This approach is based on the previously mentioned Film for Change methodology. Initially, Film for Change follows the same process which is used in theatre for development: a participatory approach where researchers live with the community, observing its daily life, getting to know the themes and issues that have people's interest. At a later stage in this type of observing research, the participants and researchers discuss and prioritize, selecting the most pressing issues to address in the theatre. (For examples of theatre for development and related approaches, see e.g. Bakari in Salhi 1998; Boal 2002.)

Among other forms of 'follow-up' are, for example, university screenings and discussion; collaboration with the university and other NGO television; and participation at film festivals, such as the Zanzibar International Film Festival. A continuation of the collaboration between the two departments will also ensure that a stock of productions will be established over a number of years and used for different occasions. This relates to the last point.

6. Evaluation and further project development to establish a continuous collaboration around media productions which, taking turns, can be developed in the North (Sweden/Denmark) and then again in the South (Tanzania). When we began writing this chapter in early 2011, Richard Ndunguru, Ylva Ekström and Anders Høg Hansen had a Linnaeus Palme application accepted. This is a three-year exchange programme which funds teachers and student exchange for courses and projects. Planning journeys and teacher exchange during late 2011 and early 2012 resulted in the development of a shared blog project, 'Youth in Transition', which is now running as this chapter is being finalized. The blog project is discussed in the last section of the chapter.

NOTES

1. Film titles (locations/communities) and, teams: *Imuma* (Bagamoyo), John Mwakilama, Hellen Bernad and Henrik Hallberg; *Steps in the Path* (Kaole), Happiness Mengondi, Nicholas Ngowi and Alex Wolf. *Kunduchi Fishing Village* (Kunduchi) Shahà 'Biggie' Mohamed, Zena Mchujuko and Gabriella Bryngelsson. John Mwakilama, Happiness Mengondi and Shahà 'Biggie' Mohamed are the three Tanzanians who went to Sweden for editing in October. Henrik Hallberg, Alex Wolf and Gabriella Bryngelsson are the Swedes.
2. 'Joker' is a term used by Richard Ndunguru in an interview by Søren Sønderstrup and Anders Høg Hansen, Malmö, October 2010. It is also used by Augusto Boal, though in his slightly different context of forum theatre. The joker is here viewed as "the wild

- card, the leader of the game", one that "encourage[s] both parties not to stop playing" (Boal 2002, 244).
3. The three Swedish filmmaking students were funded to go to Tanzania for research, scripting and shooting in August, with Malmö filmmaking teacher Lajos Varhegyi. For the screenings/follow-up in November, the Swedish students were not present but the Tanzanian students were there with joker Richard Ndunguru, researcher Søren Sønderstrup and Anders Høg Hansen. Varhegyi and Hansen did the initial development of the project with Ndunguru.
 4. The students were helped to set up a plan for the division of labour in each film team. One could act as the camera operator, for example, another could oversee sound issues and a third person could take care of the director role. Specific tasks could be shared among the participating students, although this was not recommended. With this planned, the students went into the shooting phase.
 5. See the Appendices for a detailed description of the project phases.
 6. A variety of documentary film traditions and definitions obviously exist, also historically—and theatre for development may not be seen as one clear-cut tradition, yet we are here working with a broad distinction between the two, where the degree of participation of the actors in the process marks one important difference.
 7. Søren Sønderstrup hints at a possible conflict of interest in his field diary (18 August 2010). The film students are interested in some sort of control of what they will be shooting and editing, and the visual stories they will tell, while the communication for development (and as well theatre for development) approach may involve a necessary involvement of the actors and local stakeholders in the research, shooting and editing processes. However, as Sønderstrup also writes, the dialogue (or tug of war) between the different players' involvement in the project became a creative impetus to raise questions of representation, ownership and identity.
 8. Among the writers of this collaborative chapter, different vocabularies for visual genres of documentation have continuously been negotiated. For example, the notion of a 'documentary form', and also the notion of 'observational form', have been used. However, we do not favour 'observational'. The documentary form is in itself a visual *intervention*.

9. Most of the participants, students and facilitators had little time to acclimatize or feel at ease with the investigation. This was the case for the Swedes/Danes in Tanzania, as well as the Tanzanians in Sweden. They were put to work immediately. The project, which can be criticized for its 'openness', allowed for questions such as 'What exactly are we doing?' and 'What are we going to accomplish?'
10. This *incompleteness* may also be perceived as an aesthetic genre reference to classic African film where narratives often portray the protagonist as a tragic figure bridging tradition and modernity, transformed from being in control to becoming a fool in the face of modern complexity: How is one to deal with development and the modern world? (Diawara 2010)
11. *Imuma* is short for *Imani* (faith), *Upendo* (love) and *Matumaini* (hope). For a presentation of the school/centre, see <http://imuma.awardspace.com/>.

REFERENCES

THE FILMS

Imuma (Bagamoyo), John Mwakilama, Hellena Bernad and Henrik Hallberg. *Steps in the Path* (Kaole), Happiness Mengondi, Nicholas Ngowi and Alex Wolf. *Kunduchi Fishing Village* (Kunduchi), Shahà 'Biggie' Mohamed, Zena Mchujuko and Gabriella Bryngelsson. Fine and Performing Arts, University of Dar es Salaam, and School of Arts and Communication, Malmö University, 2010. The films are available on vimeo: <http://vimeo.com/user12784875>. The School of Art and Communication also holds DVD copies.

ARTICLES, BOOKS AND OTHER SOURCES:

Bakari, Juma Adamu. 1998. Satires in Theatre for Development Practice in Tanzania. In *African Theatre for Development*, ed. Kamal Salhi. London: Intellect Books.

Björqvinnson, Erling, and Anders Høg Hansen. 2011. Mediating Memory: Strategies of Interaction in Public Art and Memorials. *Journal of Arts and Communities* 3(1): 3–22.

Boal, Augusto. 1992/2002. *Games for Actors and Non-Actors*, 2nd ed. (transl. A. Jackson). London: Routledge.

Diawara, Manthia. 2010. *African Film, New Forms of Aesthetics and Politics*. Berlin: Haus der Welten/Prestel.

Freire, Paulo. 1971. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin.

Ginsburg, Faye, Lila Abu-Lughod, and Brian Larkin, eds. 2002. *Media Worlds. Anthropology on New Terrain*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hall, Stuart. 1997. *Representation. Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage.

Hodgkin, Katherine, and Susannah Radstone. 2003. *Contested Pasts. The Politics of Memory*. London: Routledge.

Høg Hansen, Anders. 2006. Dialogue with Conflict. Education and Conflict Coping in Israel. *Social Identities. Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture* 12(3): 285–308.

———. 2010. Social and Non-Formal Learning Environments. *Glocal Times* 14, May. <http://ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/gt/article/view/2608/2327>. Accessed March 18, 2016.

———. 2013. Time is But the Stream I Go A-Fishing in. Present Pasts in 20 Years of American TV Serial Fiction from Northern Exposure to Mad Men. *Continuum. Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 27(1): 141–159.

IMUMA website. <http://imuma.awardspace.com/>. Accessed March 18, 2016.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, Nancy. 2005. The Diffusion and Participatory Approaches. In *Media and Global Change*, eds. Oscar Hemer, and Thomas Tufte, 123–144. Gothenburg/Buenos Aires: Nordicom/Clacso.

Nichols, Bill. 2001. *Introduction to Documentary*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Mefalopulos, Paolo, and Thomas Tufte. 2008. *Participatory Communication*. The World Bank Working Paper No. 170. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTDEVCOMMENG/Resources/Participatorycommunication.pdf>. Accessed 18 March 2016.

Pink, Sarah. 2007. *Visual Interventions. Applied Visual Anthropology*. New York: Berghen Books.

———. 2008. "Analysing Visual Experience". In *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*, edited by Michael Pickering, 125–149. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Radstone, Susannah, and Katharine Hodgkin, eds. 2003. *Contested Pasts. The Politics of Memory*. London: Routledge.

Sønderstrup, Søren. 2010–2011. Field Diary Extracts. Communication for Development09 Course Website, June 10–March 11. Diary Entries. Course Site Entries Not Public.

- . 2011a. Film for Change. Communication Rights and Social Change in Tanzania. MA thesis, Malmö University. Available online at MUEP (Malmö University Electronic Publishing). <http://dspace.mah.se/handle/2043/12353>. Accessed 18 March 2016.
- . 2011b. Locating Agency in Film for Change. In *Glocal Times* 16, September. <http://ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/gt/article/view/2601/2320>. Accessed 18 March 2016.
- Traces of a Young Diaspora*. 2004. Malmö University, School of Arts and Communication. Coordination Lajos Varhegyi and Kathrine Winkelhorn.
- Youth in Transition* blog. 2012. <http://wpmu.mah.se/yit>. Accessed 18 March 2018.

CHAPTER 7

Countering Malnutrition: Participatory Intervention as an Act of Revelation

Zeenath Hasan

The project of malnutrition alleviation in India has, for the last few decades, had a policy and governance focused frame where, I contend, public discourse, media portrayal and policy reform are at a crossroads with the social reality of the malnourished. While interpretative studies have repeatedly shown that there is a real connection between social relations and nutrition for community health, there remains, however, a paucity of strategies that meet the everyday circumstance of the malnourished. While each actor acknowledges the complexity of the situation, their various perspectives tend to frame malnutrition as a malleable object that not only unconsciously disavow the affective reality of the impact but also rob the generative potential of the process. At one level, substantive interactions are left on the responsible shoulders of the activist whose infrastructure-limited prerogatives tend towards community-based awareness building, at another level, I argue, there is potential for interventions that lead to generative outcomes.

As a self-identified member of the Participatory Design (PD) community, I set myself the task of exploring ways in which one can intervene

Z. Hasan (✉)

Media and Communication Studies, School of Arts and Communication,
Malmö University, Malmö, Sweden

This book identifies the strengths and weaknesses of different methodological approaches to research in communication and social change. It examines the methodological opportunities and challenges occasioned by rapid technological affordances and society-wide transformations. This study provides grounded insights on these issues from a broad range of proficient academics and experienced practitioners.

Overall, the different contributions address four key themes: a critical evaluation of different ethnographic approaches in researching communication for/and social change; a critical appraisal of visual methodologies and theatre for development research; a methodological appraisal of different participatory approaches to researching social change; and a critical examination of underlying assumptions of knowledge production within the dominant strands of methodological approaches to researching social change.

In addressing these issues through a critical reflection of the methodological decisions and implications of their research projects, the contributors in this book offer perspectives that are highly relevant for students, researchers and practitioners within the broad field of communication for/and social change.

Norbert Wildermuth is Associate Professor in the Department of Communication and Arts (DCA) at Roskilde University, Denmark.

Teke Ngomba is Associate Professor in the Department of Media and Journalism Studies at Aarhus University, Denmark.

palgrave
macmillan

Cover image © Jenny Matthews / Alamy Stock Photo

ISBN 978-3-319-40465-3

9 783319 404653

www.palgrave.com

palgrave
macmillan

Methodological Reflections on Researching Communication and Social Change

Edited by Norbert Wildermuth
and Teke Ngomba

Methodological Reflections on Researching Communication and Social Change

Edited by
Norbert Wildermuth
and Teke Ngomba

Palgrave Studies in Communication for Social Change