'Let's Marathon!'

The Design of a Cultural Intervention
for the Re-Use of Audiovisual Archives

Mariana Salgado

Introduction

Virtual archives and online portals are currently changing the relation between the keepers and users of audiovisual heritage, by challenging the role of the archivist as the authority on the knowledge a collection represents (Noodegraaf 2011). In this chapter, I focus on the knowledge we produce while we creatively reuse archive material. The knowledge I refer to concerns the ways enthusiastic video makers retrieve and use audiovisual material for their creations, not the ways the archivist or the historian finds and classifies material. This approach suggests new strategies for contextualizing the audiovisual archives, expanding their relevance and currency. I propose hackathons and marathons[1] as new strategies for re-contextualizing audiovisual archives. In this chapter hackathons and marathons are in addition design (in a wider sense) interventions with intercultural potential.

Museums and archives have started to explore different strategies for user engagement, participation, and openness. In some cases, archivists and archival institutions take part in, or even initiate, participatory projects. For example, 'Waisda?' was a game that was initiated by The Netherland Institute of Sound and Vision, a cultural archive and museum. The game motivates users to add metadata to the archival collection (Oomen & Aroyo 2011). However, such projects are isolated cases and are not part of the core activities of the archival institutions.

Isto Huvila (2008) describes a participatory archive as one that has decentralized curation, radical user-orientation, and contextualization of both records and the entire archival process. Decentralized curation happens when the curatorial responsibilities are shared between archivists and the participants of the archive. Radical user orientation is the result of making the usability and findability of resources a priority. The contextualization should acknowledge the importance of the practices of originators, curators and users (Huvila 2008).

There is already a strong liaison between archives and media scholars; however, more rapport is required between archives and remix communities. Such commu-

nities include amateur video makers who are eager to tell stories by re-using audiovisual archives. Strategy-wise then, we are looking toward an approach that is neutral regarding content and at the same time committed to openness, availability, and user-orientation of archive material (Menne-Haritz 2001). Participatory archive practices exist; however, they are neither widespread nor legitimated. Facilitating the creative re-use of archival material is a participatory endeavour that has the potential to enrich existing practices, especially for those archives that want to develop their online presence, as well as to give media researchers the chance to study knowledge produced through use. Video tools are already widely-spread and increasingly user-friendly, which makes it possible to be more inclusive in planning and implementing experimental practices and interventions.

In this chapter, I analyse the case of the *Video Poetry Marathon* (VPM) that took place in Helsinki on 7 February, 2015. The aim of this event was to re-use and recontextualize archival material in a creative and empowering process of cultural hybridization. During the VPM the activity was to re-use audiovisual archive material and create video poems: short videos illustrating a poem. Video poems are a form of video art that mixes text, music, sounds and images. By analysing the design and facilitation of the VPM, I aspire to answer the following research question: How can collaborative methods such as hackathons and marathons be used to design digital tools for cultural exchange and innovation in archives?

The case: *Video Poetry Marathon*

During the course of a day, sixteen people – seven writers and nine video makers – realized a pre-defined task: the making of a video poem. The aim was to explore the re-use of audiovisual archives in multidisciplinary and cross-cultural teams and develop ideas for the creation of online tools for editing and publishing videos. Insights regarding the re-using of archive materials were compiled in order to make recommendations for interaction designers in the context of the EUscreenXL project (2013–2016). This European project aimed at producing a Pan-European audiovisual archive with content material from public organizations, national institutions, regional archives and university collections. In the design case described here, the design team, of which I was a member, investigated concepts relevant for the development of new online tools for re-using audiovisual archives. I planned and facilitated this event with help from a writer from Sivuvalo, and a video expert. The latter supported the VPM participants in making their videos, in understanding current practices of video making, and in contextualizing their work within archived audiovisual-content. For my research within the EUscreenXL project it was important to investigate the process of generating new audiovisual-content by re-using archive materials, and of making this new content available for re-use.

Other factors that made this event special included the following: (1) writers were protagonists as the event intended to make video poems based on their work; (2) the format of video poems was unfamiliar to the participating video makers; (3) the participants had never before been in hackathons, nor were they familiar with this type of event; (4) the participating writers and video makers did not know each other before the event and the teams formed spontaneously on the spot; and (5) participants were mostly immigrants living in Helsinki.

Designing the Video Poetry Marathon

The VPM was one track of a larger event called *Hack your Heritage! – Hack4fi* (Avo-inGLAM 2015), which aimed at re-using Finnish archive materials recently released with Creative Commons licences or were part of the commons. Making video poems by re-using audiovisual archive footage from Finland seemed to be an excellent idea because it could frame the participants' work as participatory activism and add a new dimension to their work. I consider such activism relevant in this discussion because, contrary to copyright limitations, it encourages '[…] the pulses and flows that give publics vitality' (Harold 2009: 137). Marttila and Hyyppä (2014a, 2014b) assert that copyright limitations restrict content availability and, as a consequence, design possibilities. They also claim that designers need to engage with legal frameworks for regulating content enrichment and re-use. In this context, intellectual property activists follow two models: some pirate corporate intellectual property to make a case for deregulation, and others adhere to the Creative Commons sharing model that tries to support people in the use of licences (Harold 2009). The VPM tried to follow the second model, in which participants used material released with Creative Commons licences and used these licences to publish their own creation.

The VPM was organized in collaboration with Sivuvalo, a group of writers who write in languages other than Finnish or Swedish.[2] This group organized festivals and concerts and supported the creation and sustainability of their ensemble since 2013. Roxana Crisólogo, one of the founding writers of the group recruited the poets for VPM. She invited each poet in person. Her selection criteria were that they had to live within or near the Helsinki Metropolitan Area, and that she had had positive experience with them in earlier events. It was not easy to gather seven poets as we could not offer them financial compensation.

To recruit the video makers, VPM was advertised through many channels and in various ways: posters, mailing lists of people who have participated in video courses at the University, and posts to Facebook groups for immigrants living in Helsinki. The Hack4fi website called for participation, and organizers of the Hackathon used their own media channels to promote it. In addition, I wrote several emails to people I knew and invited them to take part. We were looking for enthusiastic video makers with basic video skills. Eventually, most of the participants were personal acquaintances.

Facilitating the marathon

On the day of the VPM, participants were given information about the day's programme, the Sivuvalo group, video poems, the reasons behind the event, the re-use of audiovisual archive material, and publishing under Creative Commons licences. In addition, they received a brief introduction to the content of the two archives that they could use.

They then briefly introduced themselves. There were sixteen participants in the marathon, from twelve different countries. All the teams formed during the day were cross-cultural and multinational. Each poet displayed one translated poem. Each video maker picked one poem that resonated to her/him, and together with the author of the poem formed a group. Participants' wishes were respected. For example, one preferred to assist with sound instead of making a video, while two video makers selected the same poem and worked jointly.

When the teams were ready, they could copy the AV files that were on a hard disk. The high-resolution videos came from Catalonian Television (part of EUscreenXL project) and The Society of Swedish Literature in Finland.[3] Furthermore, participants could browse online archives and download from them. We provided the list available online from the Commons' free media resources of the Wikimedia Foundation (2015). Each of the archives in this list had a different search engine, most did not provide still-image browsing, and covered a great variety of content from many different periods.

Participants brought their own computers, on which they had installed video-editing software. They worked with different programmes, such as Magix Movie Edit Pro and Final Cut Pro. During the day, participants faced many technical problems, and needed assistance with making decisions in the creation of the videos or in achieving a certain goal. We, the facilitators, set up a YouTube channel titled *Video Poetry Marathon* (2015) and gave the passwords to all participants so they could upload their videos. Participants were free to take breaks whenever they wished and had lunch together. The whole event lasted nine hours.

One hour before the deadline, the participants and facilitators gathered to watch the works in progress and to discuss the experience and process of making these videos. Five videos were presented. One group showed sketches and explained their plans. At that moment, only one video was considered ready and was uploaded to the YouTube channel. The whole discussion during the presentation was recorded. Participants openly gave their opinions and shared thoughts about their collaboration. It was especially important that a video expert gave constructive feedback to each of the teams, most of which continued working on improving their creations.

The final presentation of the hackathon occurred the following day. Four groups from VPM made it to that day and presented their projects. Others finished their video for the Final Gala of the Hackathon that took place a month and a half after VPM.

Analysis

For this analysis, I reviewed the video poems, the diary I had kept during VPM, the audio recordings of one interview I conducted during the event, and the audio recording of the final presentation and discussion. The diary included feedback collected during many screenings of the video poems in the two months after the event. The audio recorded interview with one of the participants lasted half an hour. Other participants were too busy to be interviewed during the VPM. The interview questions were: What process does your team follow? What are your roles? Which archives are you using? Have you used these archives before? How did you find it to search into these archives? What do you think of the event?

In this analysis, I focus on four issues that were the most relevant in relation to facilitating the process of re-using audiovisual archives during the VPM: (1) the facilitation of creative re-use as a means for cultural integration and hybridization; (2) the development of media literacy in relation to archival material; (3) the development of media literacy in the collaborative process among artists; and (4) the legal re-use of archive material.

The facilitation of creative re-use as a means for cultural integration and hybridization

This chapter proposes that multicultural encounters could be a way to investigate new practices and formats of cultural interventions making use of archive materials. I argue that the inclusion of marginalized communities such as immigrants by participatory archives would have a genuinely positive social impact. In many cases, immigrants face numerous challenges in integrating into the host society, making new friends, finding employment, and learning the language. In Finland, as in many other countries, there is more unemployment in immigrant communities than among Finnish nationals. In addition, there seems to be no connection between educational background and unemployment as highly educated immigrants still face higher levels of unemployment. This is why cultural interventions that allow for cross-cultural encounters are increasingly useful in societies that become increasingly multicultural. Such encounters can be spontaneous but also facilitated. According to Navas (2012), marginalized people become productive even within their marginal spaces. For immigrants on their path to integration providing spaces and opportunities for creative expression and cultural hybridization opens up opportunities. Archives too, I argue, could see benefits from the re-use of their materials.

While there are many hackathons in which the participants come from different countries, organizers rarely focus on enabling multicultural encounters between the participants. In the case of the VPM, I purposely invited a cross-cultural group of participants in order to prove that re-using audiovisual archives could be a means towards cultural integration. We gathered participants from twelve nationalities, most

of them non-European immigrants living in Helsinki. In addition, because the starting point was poems from various origins, nationalities and experiences, the nature of the event was multicultural from the start. In this section, through a reflection on the multicultural aspect of this event, I answer the question of how the facilitation of creative re-use can function as a means for cultural integration and hybridization.

First, I review the video poems. Then I analyse the decision-making process behind the facilitation of these types of events. Poems reveal times of change, when certain things happen in our lives that influence our view of the word around us and of ourselves within it. Poems describe a turning point in life that produces change. In some cases, this turning point is the actual migration of the author. Poems arise from the personal experiences of authors living in a war, feeling alienated, with a family member in need of mental support. Poems reveal the intimate spaces of the authors and their realities, their origins, where they are, and where they wish to go, not only in geographical terms but also in relation to their emotional territories.

As these poems reveal, hackathons could open what Bhabha (2004) describes as the hybridity of culture beyond multicultural exoticism or cultural diversity. These initiatives that explore cultural hybridity promote the integration of migrants and natives and give voice and agency to marginalized communities by offering spaces to create and/or explore the hybridity of culture. Hackathons as places for starting long-term relationships (Briscoe & Mulligan 2014) could also encourage the continuity of cultural hybridity.

In the media, migrants have been stereotyped, racialized, criminalized, objectified and subjected to hate speech (Paulissen 2014). It wouldn't be surprising then if migrants would mistrust and abstain from media events. However, maybe because hackathons are in the media fringes, many migrant artists, designers, and developers support them. Therefore, events that welcome migrants' multifaceted narratives may bring alternative views on their identities and a richness to the perceptions of their lives. Participation in media production projects by people who have been excluded can often transform their self-perception, building confidence, a sense of self-worth, and a social voice (Dowmunt, Dunford & Hemert 2007). As a design-researcher involved in the cultural production of these events, I cannot overlook the inclusion of immigrants as an approach towards opening up new mainstream formats such as hackathons. Neither can I avoid the political agenda that underlies these cultural productions. Shilton and Srinivasan (2007) state that by broadening their traditional tools to actively engage marginalized communities in the preservation process, archivists can preserve local knowledge and create representative, empowering archives. Societies decide what to remember and what to forget, which is why the inclusion of marginalized communities, such as immigrants, should not come as an afterthought but be embedded in the facilitation practices in relation to the creative re-use and the contextualization of the archives.

Development of media literacy in relation to archival material

In the previous section, I presented the ways collaborative design methods, such as the VPM, could support cultural integration and provide counter-narratives to the current immigration politics. This section focuses on understanding what participants actually created in the VPM.

The videos our participants created dealt with travels, life changes, immigration, and mental and emotional strain. They did not try to take the viewer back to the original footage, and they did not hide the creative work of remixing archive material. The pre-existing context of the footage gave way to the new narration. These digital narratives can then represent a national archive even if an immigrant produced the original poem or story (see Image 1). Working with material from archives that represented different cultures in itself supported cultural understanding because many topics were common to different cultures. When dealing with national collections, as in the case of participants reusing Finnish collections, immigrants and their quest for identity could be the key to understanding local culture and identity.

Image 1. Video poem

Screenshot of one of the video poems in which Finnish landscape is used to visualize a story that happened in Burma.

These video poems are representative of the memories of the artists, taking shape from the combination of multicultural instances: the poem, the footage, the music, and the artistic work that combined them all. These inspirations had multiple origins. In the case of the poem *Infinito*, for example, the writer was from Peru, the video maker from Australia and the footage from the Netherlands, USA and Finland.

On one hand, archives could see these works as an interpretation of their own archival material and, on the other, they could host them as part of their collection. Most importantly, the hosting of these works enriches the collection of the archives with international and artistic insights that could not otherwise have been part of the archive. This process of artistic contextualization is fundamental to the archives. For example, the video poem based on Tanya Tynjelä's poem *Law 0*, contextualized footage from the archives by giving new meaning to the images from an entertainment park (Durall 2015).

Image 2. Law 0

Image from Law 0 showing an amusement park at dark. The sky is lit up by fireworks.

> *Law 0*
> *Receiving the Nobel Prize only made his schizophrenia worse*
> *Life was causing him so much pain*
> *The autopsy said: death by overdose of bio-modified benzodiazepine*
> *They shoot the horses, don't they?*
> (Translation by Tanya Tynjelä)

The video makers read the poems, like the one above, and looked for material that was visually effective, aesthetically attractive and gave their creations the right atmosphere. They selected the footage not in relation to the original but mostly in relation to their own interest or feelings towards the images. Our video makers re-contextualized the original clips into new creations disregarding historical accuracy; unlike researchers of the past interacting with archives. In our VPM, it became apparent that *searchability* and easy retrieval in archives are key aspects towards creative re-use.

Archivists are used to organize archival records according to geographical origin, which stipulates that records produced by the same administrative body should be kept together (Cook 1997). This way, documents are not only preserved but also useful for

researchers who deal with the meanings of these artefacts in the past. However, this method of organization is not relevant in facilitating creative re-use.

In the case of the VPM, participants did not have a certain image of a concrete object in mind but more an atmosphere that could be created using different means. Most of them explored the archives randomly. The footages they found they used in a metaphorical way in relation to the words in the poems. Our video makers did not try to use material that described exactly what the poem said; they used images to visualize them. If the aim were to better support the creative industry in their use of archive material, random searches and visual- and sound-oriented search (by colours, textures, soundscapes, music, rhythms, or drawings) would be useful. Tools that allow visual searches are already developed within European projects, such as Culture Cam (2015) allowing searches for colours and textures. Still, we have to wait until these tools are widely available and mature enough to be able to support creative re-use of audiovisual archives. In conclusion, archives involved in recognizing the needs and wishes of enthusiastic video makers should plan accordingly their presence, tools, and future strategies for archiving their collection and holdings online.

Development of media literacy in the collaborative process

This section describes the ways in which the artists developed their media literacy in the collaborative process that took place during the VPM. Hackathons by their nature include a multidisciplinary aspect as the participants have different backgrounds. However, in certain teams, participants might come from the same discipline. In the VPM, the multidisciplinary process was assured by including at least one video maker and one poet in each group. The flexibility and way of working was negotiated within the teams. This multidisciplinary teamwork could change the meaning that the writers gave to their narratives.

The poets were extremely open to edit and adjust their poems, giving video makers substantial freedom. In one video poem called *Infinito*, the video maker created a new poem combining two poems from the same author. In *Law 0* and in *X-Written* the team decided to create a new shorter poem by selecting fragments of the existing one. The author of *Is the time* said:

> My poem had a different meaning when I wrote it than after making the video poem. This has now a subliminal message that is more positive. You can interpret the poem in many ways. But at the end we stay with the message that 'love can awake the world'. So, it was kind of turning the message of the original poem upside down.

Many of the video artists confessed that while they were curious about the poems when they chose them, they could not really understand them. One of the video makers discussed the importance of working with the poet who would then tell the video maker about the literary sources of her poem. After working all day with the poem, she could understand new dimensions that were hidden for her in the first reading

of the poem. The writer of the poem *Travel by train to find the faces from yesterday* narrated the story behind her poem:

> I am from Mexico City and my mother is from Sonora. So, we often went by train to see my granny when I was a kid. I have a lot of memories from the window of that train. Some time ago we went for holidays to Croatia. We took a train from Montenegro to Belgrade. This is where the poem was born. It was a trip to the past.

In this case, the story behind the poem inspired the video makers to find the images and the tone of the video poem.

One of the poets mentioned that, for him, the event was a learning experience because, by witnessing the way the video maker worked, he not only learnt about the technical part of video-editing but also learnt about the process of creating a visual interpretation of a poem. He had created video poems before but had never used archive material. Instead his video poems consisted of video recordings of him reciting. The video maker introduced this writer to a new way of thinking of images in a poetic way, giving space for the creation of the artwork. Researchers in media literacy have identified a variety of approaches such as visual literacy, audiovisual literacy, critical literacy and print literacy (Freire & Macedo 1987). Here is a clear example of how participants in these events could develop media literacy. Media literacy is the ability to access, analyse, evaluate and create messages in a variety of forms (Aufderheide 1993). Livingstone (2004) sees literacy as a way of empowering people while benefitting from the use of information and communication technologies. Participants involved in the VPM advanced their media literacy by collaborating in the making of the video poems. Through this one-day event, they learnt about each other, gained insights on different visual and poetic languages, understood a new media form (poetry or video art) and grasped the creative process of a creator in another artistic field.

On the legal re-use of archive material

In the initial talk on the day of the VPM, I mentioned the importance of using archives respectfully and publishing under licences that could allow creative re-use by others. However, I noticed that one of the pitfalls of a one-day event was that it was too short to support participants in developing respectful practices. Some of the participants paid little attention to the importance of creating titles and adding the sources and titles of the archival materials used. This shortcoming should have called for reflection from the group and me as a facilitator. Participants were first-time users of archives and in order to understand the best practices of referring to original footage, they should have been provided with examples. Formal and proper referencing is not a straightforward task because as Harold (2009: 151) points out: 'artists wanting to incorporate fragments from existing culture into their own work must increasingly become amateur legal scholars in order to avoid the often costly penalties for ignorance.'

Another issue is the identification of archival fragments. In many cases, participants extracted only short clips from the original videos. Unfortunately, without a shared clip bin available that could facilitate remix, as Shaw and Schmitz (2006) propose, the identification of these fragments was and is quite difficult. In principle, using the licences correctly should allow fragments of videos to be traced back to the original pieces. For this to happen, video creators would have to be extremely vigilant in the way they refer to archival material and add titles to their videos. In practice, however, this process takes too much effort and, as a consequence, people don't bother to do it (Shaw & Schmitz 2006). Some of the participants in the VPM referred to the archive, but not to the name of the video. This makes it impossible to trace the original archival material. In addition, this is even more difficult with videos that have different versions uploaded under the same title. This is normal in remixing, as people collaboratively improve the original; however, not all of the versions are archived in a consistent way. As a result, many remixes have the same name, and it is hard to identify them.

Most people will not be critical about how they appropriate media, and emerging technologies make it easier to sample, take, borrow, or steal from pre-existing works, disregarding the history of a work (Navas 2012). 'I added the archive from where I took the footage; do you need something more there?' one video maker asked. This participant did not feel the need to be accurate and careful in the way he appropriated the footage; due credits seemed like a necessary evil imposed by the person facilitating the activity. A more thorough discussion about the correct use of licences would have been appropriate since most video makers paid little attention to this. Overall, the requirement to identify the videos and the archive in the titles at the end of the video-poems seemed tedious for most video makers. Only a few of them did it with care and copied all the details found about the footage. This resulted in lengthy credits – in some cases half the length of the video-poem – which may pose a problem if the creators want to send their video-poem to festivals where there are restrictions about the length of poems.

When enthusiastic video makers produce remixes, they are not possessive about their creations; they want to share their content and get others to remix it (Diakopoulos et al. 2007). This was also the case in our VPM: no participant opposed the suggested Creative Commons licence regarding their work. They used 'CC by', which allows others to re-use videos if the author is mentioned, to adapt the work to be shared, and it even allows for the commercial use of the work. We explained these conditions to our participants, but it is not clear if participants agreed with 'CC by' because they were not familiar with these licences and conditions, or if they were indeed eager to share their creations because this event motivated them. It is possible that creatively re-using existing footage encouraged our participants to also share their work with open licences, allowing for creative re-use. Considering that our poets as well as video makers constantly produced and publish materials, it would have been relevant to further investigate if their use of licences and their own understanding of the conditions and possibilities of licences had changed after this one-day experience.

Discussion

In this chapter, I analysed the model of a one-day VPM. A marathon that utilized a hands-on video editing approach while re-using audiovisual archives. The resulting eight videos can be seen on the YouTube channel.[4] Other forms of collaboration, such as setting up an online platform with tools available for editing video, could also give media researchers and archivists the opportunity to observe and understand current collaborative practices related to the production and distribution of videos. However, the effort and resources to produce such online digital services are enormous in comparison to the organization of a one-day event.

Concerning our VPM, professionals in the creative industry have praised the video-poems for their high-aesthetic value and the metaphorical use of images that provide a harmonic counterpoint to the spoken narrative. Resulting from the collaboration are not only the video-poems but also the meaningful connections, learning, and networking that took place during the event. The learning process of making video-poems together in a multidisciplinary and cross-cultural environment was key in developing our participants' media literacy and shaping their experience.

During the final reflection of the day, most poets mentioned that working on the visuals of their poems was very enriching because their poems took other forms. A video-poem is an interpretation of a poem; in this case, made in collaboration with video makers. Video makers got inspired by poems and materials from the archives to create videos. None of the participants gave up, even when their project did not meet the deadline. In that sense, the project succeeded because the motivation for participation transcended the event, as participants worked long hours after the day of the marathon to be able to create a better result. Some of the video makers mentioned that it was useful to get to know what is available in the archives as this could be useful for future projects. They also mentioned that they could have devoted more time in searching the archives.

In conclusion, closer familiarity with the archives would have been beneficial in many ways. This lack of familiarity is the reason why this analysis concentrates on highlighting the ways in which audiovisual archives could develop facilitation processes for re-use and make use of the outcomes. Working together with users in the creation of these participatory archives by facilitating practices of re-use is one way to deepen the understanding of emerging user cultures and media practices. Archives could take the lead and perform a visible role supporting new media practices for the appropriation and re-use of materials to create digital storytelling, transmedia, and remixes. If remix practices continue to occur within an illegal and ambiguous framework, we provide fewer opportunities for dialogue and creative encounters between archives and video makers. To date, these two groups fight about the rights to the materials. Based on the lessons from our VPM, I propose that both groups should be on the same side rather than being competitors.

There are many benefits for the archives when they facilitate the creative re-use of their holdings in marathon-style events. Firstly, they could influence current remix practices by contributing to the design of new tools. Secondly, archives could contextualize their collections with metadata and artistic insights that otherwise would not have been part of their materials. Thirdly, archives better reach out to communities that are, or could be, interested in their materials and together co-design future digital services. Last but not least, archives should understand the challenges of legal re-use of audiovisual content and learn how to better communicate with different communities about their licences and conditions.

Conclusion

Academic discourse on audiovisual archives concentrates on the deep analysis of certain collections, their publishing policies (Kelibach 2011), and the need to enrich and contextualize these publications (De Neef 2012; Treleani & Mousou 2012). Media scholars have highlighted that it is in the missing materials of archives that meaning can be found (Robertson 2011; Mustata 2012). In this chapter, I argued that archivists, as well as media scholars studying archives' practices, will benefit by understanding knowledge-production through use by promoting creative re-use in collaboration with communities. In addition, archivists and media scholars in order to preserve and develop the archives could improve media practices and lead future archival strategies. If one of the aims of archives is to understand what people are doing with media, subcontracting video makers in order to creatively re-use their audiovisual material, seems counter-productive. Creating *together* is crucial so as to understand the implications for design and the creative industry: how to improve media retrieval, browsing, and authoring applications. Future directions for preserving, collecting, and publishing should be the output of this collaboration.

The creation of new video footage out of the combination of existing ones enables a deep interplay with the original materials and motivates creative practices that are complex and fertile for contextualization. The relative proportion of non-researchers among users of the archives is expected to increase in the future (Menne-Haritz 2001). Therefore, more research on these new practices and cultural interventions could lead to new types of archival strategies that better serve anticipated and unanticipated uses of the archives. Cultural interventions and hybridization could become the new strategies for contextualization of the audiovisual archives, and open a new path for media innovations in the sector of cultural heritage.

Kalantidou and Fry (2014: 1) introduce the idea that 'design needs to be recognized as the decision and direction embodied in all things humans deliberately bring into being, as they relationally constitute the made environments of our existence'. Thus, designing and facilitating the creative re-use of archival material is an opportunity for media scholars and archivists to create media environments that commit to the

memory of a wider and more inclusive public. As video tools get easier and friendlier for people to use, it is also possible to be more inclusive in planning cultural interventions and implementing new practices. Hence, including marginalized communities and comprehending amateur video makers would help participatory archives make a genuinely positive social impact.

Notes

1. While the majority of hackathons (etymol. hack+marathon) are focused on software development, some focus on generating concepts or preliminary ideas within a certain domain. These informal gatherings last between a day and a week, when participants get the opportunity of building relationships because of the prevailing collaborative ethos. There are many types of hackathons, some tech-centric and some focus-centric (concentrated on one topic). What all hackathons have in common is that they are output-oriented, inclusive, and value learning even from failure (Briscoe & Mulligan 2014). In addition, in the design field such events gain momentum by gathering together people from different backgrounds for a short and intense period of time to create different outcomes (e.g. prototypes or design concepts for new products or services). In the case I analyse in this chapter I purposefully use the abbreviation VPM that includes the term "marathon" to highlight the intensive nature of the event, and the fact that it resulted in new media not software.
2. Finnish and Swedish are the official languages in Finland.
3. One of the missed opportunities of the VPM was the lack of collaboration from the archival institutes. I had requested audiovisual materials from two Finnish archives. One of them made a copy for the marathon of high-resolution video footage while the other had no audiovisual materials to share for re-use but, instead, pointed to existing material of audio extracts that could be downloaded from the Internet.
4. See https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCjKKJa9SM2BON9YLrRhdJMA

References

Aufderheide, Patricia (ed.) (1993). *Media Literacy: A Report of the National Leadership Conference on Media Literacy*. Aspen, CO: Aspen Institute.

AvoinGLAM. (2015). *Reusing Finnish Cultural Heritage – Best Concepts of 'Hack your heritage'* [Available at <http://avoinglam.fi/>. Accessed 19 August, 2016].

Bhabha, Homi K. (2004). *The Location of Culture.* London & New York: Routledge.

Briscoe, Gerard & Mulligan, Catherine (2014). Digital Innovation: The Hackathon Phenomenon. *London's Digital Economy* [Available at <http://www.creativeworkslondon.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Digital-Innovation-The-Hackathon-Phenomenon1.pdf>. Accessed 20 August, 2016].

Cook, Terry (1997). What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift. Archivaria. *The Journal of the Association of Canadian Archivists*, 43: 17–63.

De Neef, Rianne (2012). A Critical Analysis of the Virtual Exhibition Builder's Potential to Engage Audiences. [Available at <https://www.academia.edu/4498858/Research_Report_EUscreen_A_Critical_Analysis_of_the_Virtual_Exhibition_Builders_Potential_to_Engage_Audiences>. Accessed 20 August, 2016].

Acknowledgements

Diakopoulos, Nicholas; Luther, Kurt; Mednynskiy, Yevgeniy & Essa, Irfan (2007). Remixing Authorship: Reconfiguring the Author in Online Video Remix Culture. Georgia Institute of Technology [Available at <https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/19891/GIT-IC-07-05.pdf>. Accessed 20 January 2018]. Dowmunt, Tony; Dunford, Mark & Hemert, Nicole V. (eds.) (2007). *Inclusion Through Media*. London: OpenMute.

Durall, Eva (2015). Law 0. *Video Poetry Marathon* [Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PKpPhqtHXUc>. Accessed 20 January August 2018].

Freire, Paulo & Macedo, Donaldo (1987). *Literacy: Reading the Word and the World*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Harold, Christine (2009). Inventing Publics. In Our Space, pp. 133–155 in *Resisting the Corporate Control of Culture*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press.

Huvila, Isto (2008). Participatory Archive: Towards Decentralised Curation, Radical User Orientation, and Broader Contextualisation of Records Management. *Archival Science*, 8(1): 15–36.

Kalantidou, Eleni & Fry, Toni (eds.) (2014). *Design in the Borderlands*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Keilbach, Judith (2014). The Eichmann Trial on East German Television. *VIEW Journal of European Television History and Culture*, 3(5): 17–22.

Livingstone, Sonia (2004). Media Literacy and the Challenge of New Information and Communication Technologies. *The Communication Review*, 7(1): 3–14.

Marttila, Sanna & Hyyppä, Kati (2014a). Practices and Challenges in Creative Re-Use of Audiovisual Media. Paper presented at the 2014 *Cumulus Conference*, 8-10 May 2014, Aveiro, Portugal.

Marttila, Sanna & Hyyppä, Kati (2014b). Rights to Remember? How Copyrights Complicate Media Design, pp. 481–490 in *Proceedings of the 8th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Fun, Fast, Foundational*. New York: ACM.

Menne-Haritz, Angelika (2001). Access – The Reformulation of an Archival Paradigm. *Archival Science*, 1(1): 57–82.

Mustata, Dana (2012). History in The Backstage of Romanian Television Archives. *VIEW Journal of European Television History and Culture,* 1(1): 57–60.

Navas, Eduardo (2012). *Remix Theory: The Aesthetics of Sampling*. Vienna & New York: Ambra Verlag.

Noordegraaf, Julia (2011). Remembering the Past in the Dynarchive: The State of Knowledge in Digital Archives. Paper submitted to the conference *Media in Transition 7*: *Unstable Platforms: The Promise and Peril of Transition*, Boston MIT 13-15 May, 2011 [Available at <http://web.mit.edu/comm-forum/mit7/papers/Noordegraaf.pdf>. Accessed 19 August 2016].

Oomen, Johan & Aroyo, Lora (2011). Crowdsourcing in the Cultural Heritage Domain: Opportunities and Challenge. Paper submitted to the *5th International Conference on Communities and Technologies*, 29 June – 2 July, Brisbane [Available at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.464.6933&rep=rep1&type=pdf>. Accessed 21 January 2018].

Paulissen, Vivian (2014). *Remixing Europe. Migrants, Media, Representation, Imagery*. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation.

Robertson, Craig (ed.) (2011). *Media History and the Archive*. London & New York: Routledge.

Shaw, Ryan & Schmitz, Patrick (2006). Community Annotation and Remix: A Research Platform and Pilot Deployment, pp. 89–98 in *HCM '06: Proceedings of the 1st ACM international workshop on Human-centered multimedia*. ACM Press.

Shilton, Katie & Srinivasan, Ramesh (2007). Participatory Appraisal and Arrangement for Multicultural Archival Collections. *Archivaria. The Journal of the Association of Canadian Archivists*, 63: 87–101.

Treleani, Matteo & Mussou, Claude (2012). Retelling the Past with Broadcast Archives: Context Makes Sense. *VIEW Journal of European Television History and Culture,* 1(1): 61–66.