My Story or Your Story? Producing Professional Digital Stories on Behalf of Researchers

Ragnhild Larsson

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I share my experiences of producing digital stories on behalf of researchers, building on the method of helping people to create a short, first person, digital story developed by Center for Digital Storytelling, now Storycenter (Lambert 2013). The purpose is to investigate how we can use a personal story approach when producing a story on behalf of others. What are the merits and challenges of such an approach and what do the researchers themselves think of this process and the products?

I had been working as a journalist for 23 years when I became acquainted with Storycenter and digital storytelling (DST) in 2009. It was like entering a new universe and I was amazed by the power in the personal stories. In the constant flood of information, these short stories stood out in a very special way.

After having participated in several workshops producing my own digital stories, I facilitated some workshops on my own. Since I write a

R. Larsson (✉)
Konvoj Produktion, Gothenburg, Sweden

lot about science, I wanted to arrange workshops for researchers where they could produce their own personal research stories. There was only one problem. It was almost impossible to find a researcher with enough time or interest to spend two or three days in a workshop. Since most researchers are busy with their research and writing research articles to communicate with fellow researchers they seldom have the time to focus on communicating to the public outside academia, even if they realize this is becoming increasingly important.

I then came up with the idea of producing digital stories on behalf of, and in cooperation with, the researchers, drawing as much as possible on the method developed at Storycenter. In 2012 I produced nine digital stories for the Swedish Foundation of Strategic Research. The young researchers had just received funding in a program titled Future Research Leaders. Subsequently, I also produced a digital story with a young researcher who got funding from the Hasselblad Foundation and a story about a sports scientist at the University of Gothenburg. All researchers and their stories are to be found in Appendix 1.

Then, in 2015, I decided to go back to the researchers to find out how they had experienced the process and how they had been able to use the stories. Their answers have also given me the opportunity to improve and develop the method.

Why Digital Storytelling for Research Dissemination?

With the exception of one, the researchers I have worked with conduct basic research in natural sciences. Their stories, however, are not about a specific result or findings, but more about their fundamental research question, their passion and driving forces and, as such, illustrate well Boyer's reflections on the scholarship of discovery: "The probing mind of the researcher is an incalculably vital asset to the academy and the world. Scholarly investigation, in all the disciplines, is at the very heart of academic life. (…) The intellectual excitement fueled by this quest enlivens faculty and invigorates higher learning institutions, and in our complicated, vulnerable world, the discovery of new knowledge is absolutely crucial" (Boyer 1990, p. 18).

There are several different ways to communicate and disseminate science (Bucchi and Trench 2008) and in today's constant flood of information,

this constitutes a challenge. For the research to create an impact on society we need new ways to communicate (Negrete and Lartigue 2004). A press release is not enough and facts alone will not do the trick.

Researchers perform research that can change the world, have an impact on their field, or redefine the way we think or look at an issue. They really want to reach out to the public and are also obliged to do so and to explain what they do to both taxpayers and funding organizations. In order to accomplish these tasks, researchers must be able to apply and describe the insights of the research.

Storytelling in general, and digital storytelling in particular, is a powerful way to communicate science outside academia and to create an impact (Margles 2014; Zikovich 2013). "narratives are indeed an alternative and an important means for science communication to convey information in an accurate, attractive, imaginative and memorable way" (Negrete and Lartigue 2004, p. 120). Stories can help people see and understand the science and digital stories are ideal vehicles for reaching the general public (Olson 2015).

We know from research that the human brain has been evolutionarily hardwired to think, to understand, to make sense and to remember in specific story terms and elements (Gottschall 2012; Haven 2007). Emotionally engaging stories affect more areas of the brain than rational, data-driven messages. Stories are more memorable, trigger emotions and inspire people to take action (Boyd 2009; Zak 2012). Storytelling is also a way for researchers to reach new audiences: "The biggest perk is that people actually remember information conveyed in a story format. It's more intuitive than a graph, and the emotional response we have as listeners (or viewers) means the message sticks with us far longer" (Minke-Martin 2015).

The Process of Producing a Digital Story on Behalf of a Researcher

To produce a story on behalf of the researcher I have tried to use the method from a traditional Storycenter workshop in digital storytelling. One of the main differences is the lack of a story circle and the process of producing the stories together in a group which, as anyone who has been part of a workshop can testify, is a transformative experience (Hartley and McWilliam 2009). The story circle is replaced by an in-depth interview conducted by the science communicator, in this case myself.

Another important difference in the way I work with the stories is that the researcher does not participate in the decision as to what images and what music to use. Sometimes the researcher has film clips or photos that are included, but usually a professional photographer is responsible for taking the photos to illustrate the story. I am responsible for finding music. The part where the researchers have the most influence is in developing the script and the story, although the story emerges to a large extent from the questions I ask. Based on the interview, I write the script, which is then reviewed and approved by the researcher.

Both the researcher and I are responsible for recording the script. The voice of the researcher is crucial. I carry out the final editing, while sharing the final story is mandatory. There is no option for the researcher not to screen his or her film as would have been the case had he or she participated in a workshop.

Before discussing the issues, I have identified, it is beneficial to describe the method I have used, step by step:

Interview

After my initial investigations into the background of the researcher we meet for an interview. I explain in detail the stages of the process, producing the digital story, in order for them to know exactly what will happen. Some interviews are conducted by telephone. This usually takes about one hour. I almost always pose the same type of questions:

- How did you end up where you are now?
- Why did you start doing this kind of research?
- What is your main interest as a researcher?
- What do you want to achieve through your research?
- What are the opportunities?
- What are the challenges?
- Why is this research important to you?
- What are you doing right now?
- What makes you get up in the morning and continue your research?
- Can you tell me about a decisive moment/a turning point in your research?
- Tell me about your dream project.

The questions are open and quite loose, in order to provide space for a story. I very seldom ask the researcher specific questions about their research. The risk is that if you ask specific questions, you will get a long answer with factual details that are of little interest to people outside the specific field of research. Besides, I know I will in any case get the necessary factual information when they answer the other questions.

Writing the Script: A First Person Story

I transcribe the interview and typically end up with about 5000 words. I then spend a significant amount of time trying to build an interesting story and reducing the information to a script of 350–400 words in length. During this process, I feel at liberty to change the wording in order to make the script readable and understandable. Additional work is then required to make the story powerful.

The script is always written in first person. In the case of some researchers who are accustomed to presenting their research in a demotic way, this is a straightforward process. Other people not only write, but even talk, in a very academic way.

On completing the script, I send it to the researcher in order that he or she can implement changes and make the story their own. I advise them to read the script aloud to establish whether it feels like their own words. When the researcher is satisfied with the script, it is sent to a photographer who considers the question of images. The photographer also receives the recorded voice-over. Whereas the use of a professional photographer secures high-quality visual elements, it does result in less control and ownership as far as the researcher is concerned.

Recording the Voice-Over and Collecting the Visuals

I meet the researcher to record the script. First, the researcher reads the script aloud until she/he is satisfied. Then, we put the script away and I ask questions based on the script which allows the researcher to answer more freely. I then delete my questions in the editing process. Sometimes, the read script will turn out the best option and sometimes the edited recording prompted by my questions is better.

In the next step, the photographer meets the researcher in a suitable place. This could be their working environment, but it is always preferable to avoid a laboratory or an ordinary office. For instance, in the case of Natalie Barker Ruchti, a sports researcher and senior lecturer at the Department of Food and Nutrition and Sport Science at the University of Gothenburg, the photos were taken at a sports center. The pictures and video footage for the story about Caroline Johnson, a doctor at the Department of Chemistry & Molecular Biology at the University of Gothenburg, were taken at her house and in the woods nearby. In her case, this environment was relevant to the finished story since nature is of great significance to her and is directly relevant to her research into the way nanoparticles affect nature.

On occasions, the researcher may have short-film clips or images available for us to use, as in the case of Marie Dacke, a senior lecturer in Functional Zoology at Lund's University. Her film clips from South Africa were remarkable and illustrated a breakthrough in the department's research by showing how beetles navigate by the moon.

Editing

When the script is recorded and the photo session complete, it is time to edit the story, which involves importing the voice-over and images into the editing program. I always start by editing the voice-over, and since the recording is usually well prepared little work is required. I do not always add music but, if I do, I try to commission someone to compose music customized for the story. During the editing process, I work alone without the researcher's involvement.

Voices of the Researchers

The data supporting my discussion in this chapter come from in-depth interviews with eight of the researchers intended to find out more about their values and opinions regarding their experience of being part of this production process.

My aim is not to draw any conclusions on a general level from these eight interviews. Rather, the aim is to investigate the advantages and disadvantages of using this method. My hope is that this approach will help to improve and inspire future ways of developing this method.

The following questions were sent to all 11 researchers with whom I had produced stories up to April 2015:

How did they experience the overall process and how were they able to use the finished story and for how long?

How did they value a digital story compared to more traditional forms of communicating science?

Did they feel that the stories I produced were *their* stories and would it be a different story if they had produced a story on their own?

How did they feel about being personal, talking about themselves rather than exclusively about facts from their research?

What reactions, if any, did they receive to the story?

Finally, I wondered whether they would like to participate in a traditional digital storytelling workshop, producing their own story.

Of the 11 researchers, eight answered the questions, three in a telephone interview and five by e-mail between May and October 2015. Of the other three, two indicated that, much as they would have liked to participate, they did not have enough time to do so, while one person failed to respond to my invitation.

Findings and Discussion: What Issues Arise?

Below I discuss the findings revealed during the process and in the interviews. As an introduction to the findings, we start by considering the story of Nathalie Barker Ruchti.

The Story of Natalie Barker Ruchti

Natalie Barker Ruchti is an associate professor in Sports Science at the University of Gothenburg. During the interview I asked her to recount how she ended up at the University of Gothenburg. She then told me the story about her experience as a gymnast in the Swiss National Team in artistic gymnastics. In fact, it was due to these experiences, which were sometimes challenging, that she eventually found herself conducting research into the relationship between the athlete and the coach. Although this was her motivation as a researcher, she had never talked about this before in public. When she first saw the digital story, she was very enthusiastic and told me that we had done an excellent job. She also stated that it was unusual for her to see herself so close up in the photos. It was only when I returned with the interview questions, in 2015, that

she revealed that she was unaccustomed to being the focus of attention. She felt a little intimidated when recording the script and found the photo sessions even more demanding. She said it would have helped if the photographer had explained the process in advance. It was clear that she also wished she had had a better understanding about the possible impact of a digital story. "The written script was developed by the journalist and myself. I was aware that the content and wording mattered, and this somewhat complicated the way I formulated the sentences. When recording the script, I felt a little intimidated, but I did not stumble too many times. The focus on me felt unfamiliar. It is not something I am used to" (Natalie Barker Ruchti).

USE OF THE STORIES: IMPACT?

At the time of the interviews, the researchers had used their digital stories in many different settings. "Sometimes I have used the story to show how I ended up where I am now. Then it becomes much more interesting to know about my personality than about the research itself. It also has a career value. In this setting we were portrayed as the Future Research Leaders, we were chosen because they believed in us as people. Then you need to add something personal. For younger people this is important" (Marie Dacke 2015). Alexander Dmitrijev said he had noticed that people remember the stories much better and can relate to them more than through traditional science communication dominated by facts and figures. He even suggests that the digital stories could sometimes replace press releases in which current research is also reported.

Most of the researchers published their stories on their personal webpages, on their departments' webpages and, in some cases, on the university's home page. Some researchers also included links to their stories in their e-mail signatures, in their presentations of their research and in funding applications.

The stories made on behalf of the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research have been shown to Swedish students between 16 and 18 years of age. They were produced with the aim of inspiring young people to carry out research and consider a career in the natural sciences, by showing the people behind the research. These stories were also published on the YouTube channel of the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research where four of these stories are among the ten most frequently viewed videos.

Because of her digital story, Natalie Barker Ruchti has reached out to new audiences and people she did not know before. The Swedish Gymnastic Federation invited her to give a keynote speech at one of their conferences. One of her former students saw the story and sent it to a regional soccer team, who invited her to talk at a conference on how to encourage more female coaches.

Marie Dacke shows her story when she is invited to talk about life as a researcher or to inspire female networks. She appreciates the fact that the story provides a complement to her own real-time voice and says it helps to change the pace in the presentation.

Caroline Jonsson has many international contacts and receives a number of requests from people who want to collaborate with her or to embark on a PhD. She says that her digital story is very useful because it serves to explain her work and research focus in an easily accessible way. The story is a way of promoting herself as a researcher as well as the field she works in. Caroline Jonsson has also sent the story to people she intends to collaborate with and to students who are interested in working with her.

A Digital Story Versus More Traditional Science Communication

The researchers consider the digital story to be a valuable complement for reaching new audiences compared with other ways of communicating science in a popularized way, such as press releases, news articles and traditional films (Bultitude 2011). One of the researchers said that this method resulted in a better story than a more traditional recorded interview would have done. The researchers also felt it was important to give me a degree of professional liberty.

What the interviewed researchers particularly liked was the pace in a digital story, and the fact that it is useful in many different settings. They said that the digital story feels more thoroughly worked through and the message more targeted than a short film where the researcher talks without a script.

Creating a Story Resembles Research

Some of the researchers felt that the digital story was easily accessible and that it was soothing to watch compared to ordinary films where

things happen continuously. Even though a digital story may be more time-consuming and more expensive to produce than a short-film clip on YouTube, the researchers still found it worthwhile. They considered it to be a more professional production and therefore more useful in professional settings where a hastily produced film would not be shown. One researcher also mentioned the possibility of using the digital story as a multimedia complement to her CV.

One of the researchers compares the digital story to the way research is done, implying that digital storytelling is a particularly appropriate way of communicating research. "Sometimes it is fast and lively (like a video), but sometimes one pauses and reflects. (…) It actually has this very human pace in it, how the story is told—it's not too fast, and not too slow, you have time to actually look through the illustrative images, and the video adds liveliness when it is just one part of the presentation" (Alexander Dmtrjev).

More Sustainable

Compared with other ways of communicating, the researchers felt that these stories could be used for a longer time, since the focus is on emotion and motivation rather than on facts. Thus, they provide a more general picture of the research in question. One of the researchers pointed out that, since she was involved in basic research, she found the digital story to be particularly useful and sustainable. Many of the stories referred to in this chapter introduce a bigger research question rather than a new finding. The story about engagement in how nanoparticles affect nature is a case in point; another instance is the background for questions on how to change the relationship between a coach and an athlete.

Other stories focus specifically on the researchers' motivation for engaging in a particular research issue, such as the researcher who is working to find methods for effective pain relief. She told a story about her father who had been badly injured in a car accident ten years earlier, and who suffered pain every day thereafter. This story will always be relevant when introducing her field of research.

Some researchers were concerned about the cost of producing a digital story. Not everyone will be able to afford such costs, and if, or when, the film appears to be outdated, it might be difficult to fund a new one. However, when considering that the story will be used for at least three to

four years, the production cost is very low compared with that of a more traditional news story.

Reactions from Audiences

Unfortunately, I have not been in a position to interview people who have seen the stories, so this information comes from the researchers' report on the reactions, mostly positive, that they have received. Natalie Barker Ruchti has received positive feedback from several sources. People have said that the story is professional, convincing and strong. She believes it moves people in a compelling way since the message is meaningful. Marie Dacke has noticed that her story gets attention when she shows it, and that people really listen. Some people also comment on the unusual format with still images. Caroline Jonsson is often told that the story is professional, and that it is clear that a great deal of thought has gone into it.

The Personal Story: Is It Trustworthy in an Academic Context?

The most obvious difference between a digital story and other, more traditional, ways of communicating research is that it is more personal, focusing on the researcher, rather than the research results alone. In digital storytelling, the storyteller's unique voice is pivotal (Burgess 2006; Lambert 2013; Lundby 2008), but researchers are not used to being the center of attention. In general, researchers talk about their facts and findings, while academic identity and credibility rely on personal distance. You must never say "I" in an academic paper. In a digital story, on the other hand, the personal voice is essential.

Unused to the Personal Focus

Being personal was a challenge for some of the researchers and I do not think they always understood the need for this before they saw the complete story and saw how it affected themselves and others. Also, in my opinion, not all of them understood that the interview would result in such a personal story. Still, only three of the interviewees saw potential disadvantages in using a digital story to communicate research. One of them said that others might not like the fact that it focuses on one person

only. Some of the interviewees were concerned that their colleagues and other scholars might not like the personal focus since "research is commonly seen as something that should be done as objectively as possible, and hence talking about your personal connection to a research topic might irritate" (Nathalie Barker Ruchti 2015).

After the process of making the digital story, and in some cases before, most of the interviewees believed that the personal angle is suitable in this context and is good from an outreach perspective. Some of them pointed out that my questions stimulated them to come forward and talk about themselves. One describes it as follows: "The personal touch is very important—and actually I had people (young researchers) quoting my words about this from the video later when they talked to me". "So it obviously made an impression on them" (Alexander Dmitrijev 2015).

In my experience, it is easier for younger researchers to be personal than it is for their older colleagues who were raised in a tradition where it is regarded as non-credible and unprofessional to show one's personality. Also, those researchers who were more used to popular outreach were less uncomfortable talking about their personal driving forces. They had experienced a positive response from making their research available outside academia. In fact, they believed that the personal story was extremely important in order to reach out to the public beyond academia. One researcher felt that the digital story was a pleasing contrast to how he was usually presented in the media where he was often depersonalized and reduced to the "researcher".

My Story or Your Story?

In the traditional way of producing digital stories in a workshop, it is essential that the storyteller produces her own story, with some guidance from the facilitator. In this case, one could say that I took on the role of a very active facilitator and co-storyteller, both writing the script and editing the story.

So how did the researchers feel about this approach? Since none of them had experience of participating in a digital storytelling workshop, they were not in a position to compare the two approaches. Therefore, I was curious to find out if they felt it was *their* story. When asked, some of the researchers had not even considered the option of doing a story on their own. One said that would never happen, due to time constraints and lack of interest. Another researcher said he believed that, if he had done

it himself, it would have been fairly close to the story I produced for him. Yet, another researcher said she would focus more on the subject and that she would not dare to focus so much on herself.

Most interestingly, all the researchers interviewed said they felt the story was their own and that they had got their most important message across, although they said they would not have used exactly the same words or highlighted the same parts of the story. In some cases, they felt the story was more specific and targeted than if they had written the script on their own. Since a targeted message often elicits feedback from peers or other readers they were satisfied with the assistance of a professional storyteller. Because the researchers were invited to read and change the script, they felt they were in control and that the script was in their words, even though I changed the order of the paragraphs and omitted some parts.

None of the interviewed researchers made any significant changes to the script I had written. Most accepted my first draft and appreciated my skills as a professional communicator in building a story. They also felt it was important to give me a degree of professional liberty. Overall, I felt there was a great deal of mutual respect, which I believe is a precondition for a good result.

This is perhaps especially true for researchers who are used to writing in a way that is almost the opposite to the way a story is created, starting with the background, ending with the results and then expanding on their doubts. Applying this way of writing would result in a boring story. "A digital story produced in a professional way lessens the likelihood of it becoming boring and reduces the risk of feeling that you are watching an ordinary slideshow" (Marie Dacke 2015).

One advantage, according to the researchers, was that it was easier for me to find a good story behind the facts, than it would be for them. They commented that, with a very deep knowledge of their research themes and outcomes, the challenge of explaining it in an easy and understandable way was far greater.

Nathalie Barker Ruchti did not see the digital story until it was ready and I realize that if she had been more involved she might have made other choices, for instance when it comes to the photos. This is a reminder to the professional storyteller to be wary about challenging the "main character" to reveal things they might not be prepared to share and to be aware that the story can make the person who is in focus realize things they have not previously fully understood themselves. This is also a reason

why it is important to allow sufficient time for the process and ensure that the researcher understands the various stages.

Positive Experience of the Production Process

The majority of the respondents mentioned the effectiveness of the production, and the fact that it did not take too much time out of their tight schedules, while allowing them to feel they were in control of the process. One of the researchers compared this process with a film team that spent a week at his office to produce a film of the same length. Using "my" method the researcher contributed three or four hours of their own time.

All the researchers appreciated the planning, having done the preparatory interview and being able to collaborate on the script before we recorded their story. "I felt I had a good overview of the final product, and I was able to contribute with comments, shaping the story. So it was really a collaboration. I liked it" (Alexander Dmtrijev 2015).

Caroline Johnson said that the production process became an excellent learning experience. As a researcher she could focus on the message she wanted to convey while I took care of all other aspects, such as writing the script, building the story and deciding which photos and film clips to use.

No Time to Participate in a Workshop

Most of the interviewees said they would like to participate in a workshop to produce their own story, but that they would not have the time. Natalie Barker Ruchti would like to participate in a workshop to produce a story, not so much about herself, but the individuals she researches, to communicate her research findings through a narrative story of a research participant, for example, a case study of an athlete. If this opportunity could be offered, she would be very keen to attend. On the other hand, Marie Dacke explained that time constraints would prevent her from participating in a workshop: "The way you did it took very little of my time. Since the currency I use is time, I got a lot out of that investment and I would like to do it that way again".

"What If": Would the Stories Be Different?

There are many ways to tell the same story and there will obviously be a difference if I tell your story or if you tell your own story. In the end, it is

the researcher who decides what should be included and excluded in the script. So far, I have not experienced any disagreements concerning the finished script.

I wish every researcher could have the opportunity to experience being part of a digital storytelling workshop, since it is only through such a workshop that you can fully understand the power of creating your own story. I am convinced that researchers would benefit from sharing their stories with others in a research group or collaborative setting as described by Hydle in Chap. 13 in this book; it is necessary to experience a story circle in order to understand its power.

Professionally Produced Digital Story: A Useful Alternative

To conclude, I find that producing digital stories on behalf of others, building on the method of a classical digital storytelling workshop, is a useful alternative when working with researchers who do not have time to participate in a workshop. Obviously, the stories will not be the same as they would have been if the researchers had completed their own stories in a workshop. As a journalist, I am used to telling other peoples' stories, and these are always filtered through my eyes. When producing digital stories on behalf of researchers, their stories will also partly be my stories, colored by what fascinates me in the stories they share. These researchers have not experienced the challenge and possibilities of workshop participants in deciding what to tell and how to tell it. Workshop participants have the final say even though the facilitator plays an active part in the process. On the other hand, many of the digital stories described here would never have been told if I had not created them. It is possible to claim that I have tried to combine the journalistic method with the traditional DST method, adapting it to the reality of the demanding lives of researchers.

Producing stories on behalf of researchers and inviting researchers to create their own stories are two different methods of communicating. One is not necessarily superior to the other. I believe we can learn a great deal from both methods in an attempt to develop new ways to promote research through meaningful personal stories and create impact.

One advantage of using the skills of a professional journalist or storyteller, who is trained in finding and writing stories, is that the finished stories may be more powerful. When facilitating a workshop, you will always

help participants develop their stories, but with a larger group the focus on each individual will necessarily be less intense.

Also, since most researchers are not used to being in focus as individuals, I believe their stories might become more personal when a professional storyteller helps them to find and shape the story.

To develop this method, there are several aspects worthy of further exploration. For example, it would be interesting to try and increase the researcher's involvement in the process of developing the script, finding the photos and choosing the music. It is impossible to tell how these particular stories would have turned out if the researchers had produced their own. Therefore, as a research design, it would be interesting to produce stories on behalf of researchers in the way described above, and as a control, arrange for researchers to produce their own stories and observe the differences, both in process and in product.

Appendix 1: List of Involved Researchers and Links to the Digital Stories

Alexander Dmitrijev, Associate Professor, Bionanophotonics, Department of Physics Chalmers. http://www.chalmers.se/sv/forskning/vara-forskare/Sidor/Alexander-Dmitriev.aspx

Natalie Barker Ruchti, Associate Professor, Sport Science, Faculty of Education Gothenburg University. http://iki.gu.se/english

Marie Dacke, Associate Professor, Functional Zoology, Department of Biology Lunds University. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LeSgdzMm16c

Caroline Jonsson, Doctor, Nanoparticles, Department of Chemistry & Molecular Biology, Gothenburg University. https://vimeo.com/150806315

Johan Mauritsson, Associate Professor, Atom Physics, Faculty of Engineering, Lunds University. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fFNCDX2bqlE

Johan Malmström, Associate Professor, Infection Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Lunds University. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j9sghCazy50

Martin Högbom, Associate Professor, Structural Biochemistry, Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, Stockholm University. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nmp2mNiawr8

Peter Nilsson, Professor, Chemical Biology, Department of Physics, Chemistry and Biology, Linköping University. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_h6GeLOfZt8

Camilla Svensson, Assistant Professor, Molecular Pain Research, Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Karolinska Institutet. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LFmtbxHfDZQ&list=PLAwDfLnMNIOZ4kG0OKmE1fy6ey1bgsU53&index=15

Sebastian Westenhoff, Associate Professor, Membrane Proteins, Department of Chemistry & Molecular Biology, Gothenburg University. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cqp7u6NGlww&index=5&list=PLAwDfLnMNIOZ4kG0OKmE1fy6ey1bgsU53

Rickard Sandberg, Associate Professor, Cell and Molecular Biology, Department of Cell and Molecular Biology, Karolinska Institutet. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hU_DzpK3ZMw&index=6&list=PLAwDfLnMNIOZ4kG0OKmE1fy6ey1bgsU53

References

Barker Ruchti, N. (2015, August). *E-mail exchange between the author and Nathalie Barker Ruchti*.

Boyd, B. (2009). *The origins of story evolution cognition and fiction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bucchi, M., & Trench, B. (2008). *Handbook of public communication of science and technology*. London/New York: Routledge.

Bultitude, K. (2011). The why and how of science communication. In P. Rosulek (Ed.), *Science communication*. Pilsen: European Commission.

Burgess, J. (2006). Hearing ordinary voices: Cultural studies, vemacular creativity and digital storytelling. *Continuum Journal of Media and Cultural Studies, 20*(2), 201–214.

Dacke, M. (2015, August). *Telephone interview between the author and Marie Dacke*.

Dmitrijev, A. (2015, September). *E-mail exchange between the author and Alexander Dmitrijev*.

Gottschall, J. (2012). *The storytelling animal, how stories make us human*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Hartley, J., & McWilliam, K. (2009). *Storycircle. Digital storytelling around the world*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Haven, K. (2007). *Story proof: The science behind the starling power of story*. Westport: Libraries Unlimited.

Lambert, J. (2013). *Digital storytelling capturing lives creating community*. New York: Routledge.

Lundby, K. (2008). *Digital storytelling, mediatized stories: Self-representations in new media*. New York: Peter Lang.

Margles, S. (2014). *The mahi-mahi & the map: Digital storytelling for science*. Cool Green Science. http://blog.nature.org/science/2014/02/18/themahi-mahi-the-map-digital-storytelling-for-science/.

Minke-Martin, V. (2015). *Narratives of nature: Use storytelling to reach new audiences with your research*. Canadian Science Publishing. http://www.cdnscience-pub.com/blog/narratives-of-nature-use-storytelling-toreach-new-audiences-with-your-research.aspx.

Negrete, A., & Lartigue, C. (2004). Learning from education to communicate science as a good story. *Endeavour, 28*(3), 120–124.

Olson, R. (2015). *Houston, We have a narrative: Why science need story*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Zak, P. (2012). *The moral molecule actions. The source of love and prosperity*. Dutton: Penguin Group.

Zikovich, B. (2013). Telling science stories. *Scientific American*.