

Transmedia Literacy: A Premise

Matteo Ciastellardi

Politecnico di Milano

Giovanna Di Rosario

Université Catholique de Louvain

doi: 10.7358/ijtl-2015-001-cias

matteo.ciastellardi@polimi.it
giovanna.dirosario@uclouvain.be

For several years now, when thinking of education and literature, we have seen that cultural references and practices are in a continuous process of transformation and redefinition, both because of the available digital tools, and because of several emerging channels of dissemination and distribution that reflect the increasingly dynamic abilities of mass (self)-production.

In a 2005 study by Amanda Lenhart and Mary Madden reported by Henry Jenkins, research emerged demonstrating that “more than one-half of all teens have created media content, and roughly one-third of teens who use the Internet have shared content they produced. In many cases, these teens are actively involved in what we are calling participatory cultures”. (Jenkins 2009, XI)

The participatory culture that Jenkins discusses represents an important milestone in the process of self-awareness and personal engagement in cultural production. The way people maintain a lifelong learning process no longer depends strictly on hierarchical structures devoted to educative purposes, but mostly on the socio-cultural environment of interpersonal and intermediated communication. Jenkins’ definition of participatory culture underlines specific aspects of this paradigm shift:

A participatory culture is a culture with relatively low barriers to artistic expression and civic engagement, strong support for creating and sharing creations, and some type of informal mentorship whereby experienced participants pass along knowledge to novices. In a participatory culture, members also believe their contributions matter and feel some degree of social connection with one another and, at the least, members care about others’ opinions of what they have created. (Jenkins 2009, XI)

If, on the one hand, this definition perfectly suits the attitudes of digital natives, conversely, it can be considered the most reliable definition of “prosuming audiences”, meaning people, of different ages, active in the production of creative content versus being passive consumers.

If we reflect on the evolution of cultural technologies and the possibilities that different supports have offered in terms of expression, circulation, and engagement, we notice an exponential transformation of what is today called Media Literacy. If the birth of language represented the first footstep into a new social dimension of consciousness and communication, then such has undergone exponential growth with media-based literacy. Three hundred generations ago writing reframed the principal social patterns of everyday life. Almost thirty generations ago, the printing press led to another step toward mass communication and improved pedagogical tools. Then, suddenly, from the eighteenth century to the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the industrial revolution led to shortened lines of relation, interpersonal communication, and greater participation between people. With the constant growth of “new” new media (telegraph, photography, telephone, cinema, radio, television, web, computer, mobile, wearable devices, etc.) what has changed is not only the possibility extending knowledge in unpredictable directions, but also the ability to explore new frontiers of communication. What has changed is the architecture of intelligence itself (De Kerckhove 2001) and the intellectual development of the brain. (Wolf 2007)

Moving a step backward, in order to gradually interpret this change through the lens of media history, according to Castells (1996), we can say that we have started this paradigm shift by moving from the model of the “Gutenberg Galaxy” (press, mass distribution), to the revolution of the “McLuhan Galaxy” (new media, hypertext, collective participation, etc.).

The first result of top-down driven communication spread through mass-media channels (television, newspapers, radio and cinema among the most popular) and this created a specific kind of media spectatorship, educated and trained to comply with monolithic aspects of “pretailored” consumption. The emergence of a networked society (Castells 1996; Taylor 2001) and the rise of a convergence culture (Jenkins 2006), both sustained by an impressive amount of tools, platforms, and systems to enhance participation, creation, and the self-construction of content, favoured the migration of media audiences in search of any possible entertainment experiences they wanted. This change of perspective has produced two consequences. Firstly, it has affected the transformation of media producers and consumers into participants of the same market economy: as Jenkins suggests, “convergence culture is getting defined top-down by decisions being made in corporate boardrooms and bottom-up by decisions made in teenagers’ bedrooms” (2006b). Secondly, this transition has triggered

a different form of understanding and learning, and a new asset of education for people at any levels and at all ages (not limited, thus, to the strictly scholarly perspective). This passage represents the last step of a shift which began in the last century, when the dimension of literacy moved from a semiotically-measured geometry (De Saussure 1916; Hjelmslev 1966) to a dislocation and a deconstruction of contents and channels that give expression to new products (Derrida 1974; Bolter & Grusin 1999). Therefore, the impact of social media on narratives, narratology, and storytelling has redefined the meaning of readership and authorship, and the constant growth of different supports and tools freely available to wider audiences has favoured new experiences across media, in an informal environment where skills can improve in a transparent way.

From the ability to use, understand, and create media and communications in a variety of contexts, to a model of convergence culture where content fully permeates the audience's lifestyle, favouring the use of multiple platforms where every element contributes in a unique way to create and explore entities in a narrative universe, we can affirm that we have moved from the perspective of Media Literacy to a more pertinent Transmedia Literacy.

In this sense, Transmedia Culture defines a new cross-networked and amniotic literacy, considering that we are not facing a simple adaptation of different narratives from one media to another: different media and languages participate and contribute to the construction of a transmedia environment, where several audiences can express, through various supports, their participation in any possible emergent pattern in a socio-narrative space.

In order to capture and study the models of this change, in 2013 we set up, in Barcelona, a transdisciplinary research program and organized the first International Seminar: "Transmedia Literacy. From Storytelling to Intercreativity in the Era of Distributed Authorship". The initiative was aimed at building a research model and a research hub on the topic of Transmedia Literacy, an interdisciplinary, interconnected, and immersive model, in which the goal was not to analyse and interpret the transposition of different narrative forms from one channel to another, but to develop a framework of joint observations and participations, where different media platforms, languages, and formats contribute to forming a meaningful environment for users.

Linked to the seminar and the research hub was the idea of creating a new journal to describe, analyse, reflect on, and discuss the concept of transmedia as a process of emerging literacy, taking into consideration the epistemological sphere of participation, production, and transmission of knowledge and culture, the crisis of authorship, the new dimension of participation and relationship offered by the Web, the liquid structures of narrative spaces, and the intercreativity favoured by network narratives and collaborative digital environments.

The concept of Transmedia Literacy, which we have been exploring since 2013, stemmed from the need of changing the analytical perspective of the previous models that had discovered different stages of development and evolution over the past years. The very idea of literacy has always been linked to the concept of written text and its method of analysis and creation. As we have said in brief, the advent of mass media has successively introduced an initial change of perspective, offering the opportunity to broaden the spectrum of skills and ways of learning through a variety of channels, languages, platforms, and formats to communicate and use different contents. What ensued was Media Literacy, and, afterwards, with a different depth, Digital Literacy, which has found widespread support in many educational settings, as it has enabled skills' developments in the use of new media, and has offered new forms of expression through registers that emerging technologies began to provide to users.

Media Literacy has been defined in many different ways. For example, Ofcom (the Independent regulator and competition authority for the UK communications industries) defines Media Literacy as “the ability to access, analyse, evaluate and create media in a variety of forms”. (Livingstone 2004, 2) The very definition of Media Literacy proposed by Ofcom is based on the homonymous concept developed at the Aspen Institute in 1992. Media education does not concern only the ability to decode information available in a variety of media, but also to acquire the necessary abilities to respond critically and to produce the same amount of contents with the same tools. Paul Gilster defined this digital literacy as: “the ability to understand and use information in multiple formats from a wide range of sources when it is presented via computers [...] (Not) only must you acquire the skill of finding things, you must also acquire the ability to use those things in your life. Acquiring digital literacy for Internet use involves mastering a set of core competencies. The most essential of these is the ability to make informed judgments about what you find on-line”. (Gilster 1997, 1)

Certainly, the users' abilities — users that have become active audience and participative consumers (prosumer: union of producer and consumer) — and the constant sharing of contents and experiences, through mixed channels of decoding and fruition, has further shifted the focal point of the question, not focusing on tools or on media any longer, but on means of expression, production, and the consumption of the content itself.

A first concept that reorganizes the scenario in this direction is the “Transliteracy” one. This concept was born in the Anglo-Saxon world, between the two coasts of the Atlantic. In 2005, in the United States, Alan Liu developed and formalized the term “Transliterations” at the English Department of the University of California, Santa Barbara. Simplifying, according to Liu, “Trans-

literacies” are the set of practices related to reading online. Almost simultaneously in England, at the University of Montfort, Sue Thomas, inspired by and reworking Liu’s work, proposed the concept of “Transliteracy”, defining it as “the ability to read, write and interact across a range of platforms, tools and media from signing and orality through handwriting, print, TV, radio and film, to digital social networks”. (Thomas et al. 2007, online)

Again simplifying, Sue Thomas focuses on interaction, on the practices of writing and communication. Although the term here does not relate to the concept of “Transmedia”, as to the meaning of “transliterate” (in *Transliteracy: Crossing Divides*, the authors clarify that for them the English word “transliteracy” comes from the verb “to transliterate”), the model carried out by Thomas and her colleagues opened up a first breakthrough towards a more comprehensive and interdisciplinary field of research. According to them transliteracy in fact offers a broader analysis of reading, writing, and interaction across a range of platforms, tools, media, and cultures: “Transliteracy does not replace, but rather, contains the ‘Media Literacy’ and also the ‘Digital Literacy’”. (*ibidem*)

If the concept of “Transliteracy” has a double origin (on the one hand the American approach of Alan Liu, conversely, the British one proposed by Sue Thomas), the two models, though complementary, offer two different contents. To these two approaches, according to Alexandre Serres, it would be necessary to add a third, characteristic of libraries and of certain Anglo-Saxon universities, where the transliteracy concept covers the set of digital skills, especially communication skills, proper to information processing and social networks. (Serres 2012)

In parallel to this scenario, a complementary one has been developed, which has gradually captured the signs of change: from production modes to consumption practices of content. This model is one that sketches, within different perspectives, the transmedia concept.

The term transmedia was used for the first time by Marsha Kinder in 1991. Kinder used the term “Transmedia Intertextuality” to precisely define and discuss how narrative for children had moved into different forms of “media” (movies, television, and video games) and presented different levels of interaction. The prefix trans- (also present in “Transliteracy”), in fact, suggests the idea of passage, to go further, to change from one condition to another, and to exchange. Since Kinder’s definition, Transmedia has normally been accompanied with “storytelling”, assuming a specific connotation on how narratives based on different channels and multiple languages are constructed.

Henry Jenkins was the first researcher to formalize the concept of Transmedia Storytelling. Already in 2006, Jenkins prefaced, in his book *Convergence Culture. Where Old and New Media Collide*, the change of the user’s role, of

the market, and the ways in which new contents were produced in a fully transmedia context. According to Jenkins, “Transmedia Storytelling represents a process where integral elements of a fiction get dispersed systematically across multiple delivery channels for the purpose of creating a unified and coordinated entertainment experience. Ideally, each medium makes its own unique contribution to the unfolding of the story”. (Jenkins 2007, online)

The unique contribution made by different media is also highlighted by Marie-Laure Ryan. According to her, the medium-term embraces a wide range of phenomena and should distinguish between: a) media as channels or information systems/communication/entertainment; and b) media as material or technical means of expression (Ryan 2003). Ryan, indebted to McLuhan’s expression “The medium is the message”, reminds us that the use of each medium influences the type of information that can be transmitted and, therefore, may alter the conditions of reception.

Moving from an idea of transmedia (storytelling) as an example of knowledge and production (Jenkins) and Sue Thomas’ vision (who also saw in “transliteracy” an open source model intended to evolve over time), the concept of Transmedia Literacy will offer a set of theoretical and analytical tools to be able to acquire the skills needed to critically understand the characters and the possibilities of the emerging culture.

This first issue of the International Journal of Transmedia Literacy aims to function as a starting point to reflect on, analyse, and discuss Transmedia Literacy as an emerging but fundamental literacy for contemporary society and culture. This issue comes as result of the input given by research presented during the International Seminar “Transmedia Literacy. From Storytelling to Intercreativity in the Era of Distributed Authorship” we mentioned above.

Some of the papers published herein were presented during the above-mentioned seminar, whose title is now the title of this publication. We also decided to have a section called TL Grassroots, where we will republish articles and/or interviews we consider important so as to retrace a history of Transmedia Literacy in order to put forward new analyses and new approaches. In TL Grassroots, we would like to highlight the theoretical frameworks that have defined the origins of transmedia in terms of a different literacy. For this first issue we decided to republish Lev Manovich’s “Cinema as a Cultural Interface” (1997), which, according to us, perfectly underlines some of the most important passages that have constituted the definition of a “Transmedia Literacy” moving from the recognition of cinema as a cultural interface. The other paper published in this section is the interview Henry Jenkins made with Marsha Kinder in March 2015. This interview enables readers to quickly reflect on the evolution of the digital arts and humanities and on the term “transmedia” itself, while it also proposes alternative ways of framing issues

of medium specificity. Moreover, it draws on how the term “transmedia” has been reformulated, moving from Transmedia to Transmedia Storytelling, to Transmedia Learning, Transmedia Branding, etc. In this, the interview demonstrates how reformulations of the term are possible. As noted, the aim of this journal is to foster discussions about a new literacy, shifting the focus from Transmedia Storytelling to Transmedia Literacy.

The first article by Raine Koskimaa, *Playing with Time in Digital Fiction*, analyses a particularity of digital fiction: the use of time. The article discusses the temporal dimension of two digital fictions: the *Braid* (by Jonathan Blow, 2008) and the *Spore* (by Will Wright for Maxis, 2008), focusing on the possibilities given to time thanks to digital writing. Susana Tosca’s *We Have Always Wanted More* proposes the concept of “transmedial desire” to characterize the impulse of audiences to engage with their favourite fictions across different media. The third article, *Transmedia Ekphrasis. From Analogue to Digital Formats* by Asunción López-Varela Azcárate, examines Lewis Carroll’s poem *Jabberwocky* (which is included in his novel *Through the Looking-Glass*), and compares it to Jan Švankmajer’s 1971 movie of the same title. This article also analyses Simon Biggs’ 2010 installation *reRead*, which was inspired by Carroll’s novel. The three works are used as examples of art works which break analogic principles and bring to the fore, each in a different medium, the metamorphosis of ekphrastic processes. George P. Landow’s *We Have Always Had Mashups, or Mashing Up Transmediality*, observes the intertwined concepts of media, information technology, and mash-ups, and then draws upon examples from ancient Greek literature based on orality, Latin scribal culture, and printed poetry to demonstrate that the practice of the mash-up is central to our understanding of both media and transmediality. Some of the other papers propose case studies: Gemma San Cornelio and Antoni Roig Telo, in their paper *Being Lucky. Transmedia and Co-Creation Practices in Music Video-Clips*, take as a case example the “Evolution of Get Lucky”, a collective experiment by musician PV Nova, to analyse co-creation practices from the perspective of Transmedia Literacies in music and video music. Valentina Bazzarin’s *Is the Community a Medium? Is ‘That’s Me!’ the Message? The Story of #Placevent: We Are Using Social Media to Hack the Academy* examines a research/action plan to collect and observe students’ self- and community-representation, by using digital-ethnographic methods and assigning students —involved in the research/action plan — problem-solving tasks. They created a group — #placement — where students promoted innovation through different communication practices. Edorta Arana, Bea Narbaiza, and Libe Mimenza offer in their paper *Korikka, A Transmedia View*, another transmedia case study: Korikka, a popular relay race in favour of Euskara, which also involves the use of social networking, web resources, and social mobilization elements, puts forward

a transmedia experience/practice. Mariana Ciancia's *Transmedia Design Framework. Designed-Oriented Approach to Transmedia Research* defines the "design-oriented" approach used for her PhD research in the transmedia field. The description of methodology and methods enables each researcher to develop observations about their role of studying this field, as well as the relationship between researching and teaching experience. *Friends, Partners & Co: A Sustainable Model for the Media?* by Gabriela Pedranti analyses a transmedia object: *Orsai, nadie en el medio*. Born as a blog, *Orsai* became a high-quality paper magazine with no advertising in 2011 and later a publishing house. Pedranti studies the role of prosumers (or active audience) in building up the transmedia product. *Paratextual Prometheus. Digital Paratext on Youtube, Vimeo, and Prometheus Transmedia Campaign* by Sérgio Tavares focuses on correspondences between book literacy and online video platform literacy. In particular, he studies the role of paratext, the authors, and (active) audience in online video platforms. *New Technologies On the Street. CINEMATIC* by Lucía Amorós offers us an example of daily life using ICTs on the street (in an educational open environment) in order to promote quality education through the analysis of the use and impact of ICTs. And, finally, Fernanda Bonacho's *Alice's Anima: The Obligation of Transmedia Reading* studies *Inanimate Alice* by Kate Pullinger and Ian Harper (the cover of this issue of the journal is taken from a scene of *Inanimate Alice*) as an example of a transmedia narrative that triggers a new reading experience whilst proposing a literary alterity between reading and performance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Henry Jenkins, Marsha Kinder, and Lev Manovich for allowing us to republish their contributions in the "TL Grassroots" and for the stimulating dialogue since the beginning of this project. We also express our gratitude to Derrick de Kerckhove and Geroje Landow for their support along this project. A special thank to Ian Harper and Kate Pullinger for *Inanimate Alice's* image: the cover of this issue. We wish to thank as well the Universities that have supported our initiative: the IN3 – Internet Interdisciplinary Institute (Barcelona - Spain), the Department of Art and Cultural Studies of the University of Jyväskylä (Finland), the Design Department of Politecnico of Milan (Italy), and the English Department of York University (Canada).

REFERENCES

- Adams, Randy, Steve Gibson, e Stefan Müller Arisona, 2008. *Transdisciplinary Digital Art: Sound, Vision and the New Screen*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bolter, Jay David and Richard Grusin. 1999. *Remediation: understanding new media*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Borgman, Christine L. 2003. *From Gutenberg to the Global Information Infrastructure: Access to Information in the Networked World*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The rise of the network society*, Cambridge, MA; Oxford: Blackwell.
- De Kerckhove, Derrick. 2001. *The Architecture of Intelligence. The IT Revolution in Architecture*. Basel; Boston: Birkhäuser.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1974. *Glas*. Collection Digraphe. Paris: Éditions Galilée.
- Gilster, Paul. 1997. *Digital Literacy*. New York: Wiley & Co. Publishing
- Hjelmlev, Louis Trolle. 1966. *Le Langage*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Jenkins, Henry. 2006. *Convergence culture: where old and new media collide*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jenkins, Henry. 2006b. *Welcome to Convergence Culture*. Confessions of an Aca-Fan. Official Weblog of Henry Jenkins. Last access October 15, 2015. URL: http://henryjenkins.org/2006/06/welcome_to_convergence_culture.html
- Jenkins, Henry. 2007. *Transmedia Storytelling 101*. Confessions of an Aca-Fan. Official Weblog of Henry Jenkins. Last access October 15, 2015. URL: http://henryjenkins.org/2007/03/transmedia_storytelling_101.html
- Jenkins, Henry. 2009. *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: media education for the 21st century*. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Reports on Digital Media and Learning. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Kinder, Marsha. 1991. *Playing with Power in Movies, Television, and Video Games: From Muppet Babies to Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lenhart, Amanda and Mary Madden. 2005. *Teen Content Creators and Consumers*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project. Last access October 15, 2015. URL: <http://www.pewinternet.org/2006/07/19/part-1-introduction-4/>
- Livingstone, Sonia. 2004. "What is media literacy? ". In *Intermedia*, 32 (3). pp. 18-20. Last access October 15, 2015. URL: http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/1027/1/What_is_media_literacy_%28LSE%29.pdf.
- Manovich, Lev. 2001. *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure. 2003. "On Defining Narrative Media", *Image [&] Narrative*, Issue 6. Medium Theory. Last access October 15, 2015. URL: <http://www.imageandnarrative.be/inarchive/mediumtheory/marielauryan.htm>

- Saussure, Ferdinand de, Charles Bally, Albert Sechehaye and Albert Riedlinger. (1916) 1986. *Course in General Linguistics*. LaSalle, Ill: Open Court.
- Serres, Alexandre. 2012. *La translittérature en débat: regards croisés des cultures de l'information (infodoc, médias, informatique) et des disciplines*. GRCDI, Séminaire, 7 septembre 2012. Last access October 15, 2015. URL: http://culturedel.info/grcdi/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Seminaire-GRCDI-2012_texte-A.Serres.pdf
- Stylianou, Hatzipanagos. 2009. *Handbook of Research on Social Software and Developing Community Ontologies*. Hershey, Pennsylvania: Idea Group Inc (IGI).
- Sue Thomas, Chris Joseph, Jess Laccetti, Bruce Mason, Simon Mills, Simon Perril, and Kate Pullinger. 2007. "Transliteracy: Crossing divides". In *First Monday*, Volume 12 Number 12 - 3 December 2007. Last access October 15, 2015. URL: <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2060/1908>.
- Taylor, Mark C. 2001. *The Moment of Complexity. Emerging Network Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wolf, Maryanne and Catherine J. Stoodley. 2007. *Proust and the squid: the story and science of the reading brain*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.