University of Massachusetts Amherst

ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

August 2023

Youth Producing Voice: A Video-cued Ethnography of a Media Education Classroom

Isabel C. Castellanos
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2

Part of the Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons, Instructional Media Design Commons, Language and Literacy Education Commons, and the Secondary Education Commons

Youth Producing Voice: A Video-cued Ethnography of a Media Education Classroom

A Dissertation Presented

by

ISABEL C. CASTELLANOS

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

May 2023

College of Education

Youth Producing Voice: A Video-cued Ethnography of a Media Education Classroom

A Dissertation Presented

by

ISABEL C. CASTELLANOS

Approved as to style and content by:

_____

K.C. Nat Turner, Chair

_____

Korina Jocson, Member

_____

Krista Harper, Member

_____

Shane Hammond
Associate Dean for Student Success
College of Education

DEDICATION

To my grandparents, Aurora Betancur and Hector Hincapié
&
Elvia and Gabriel Castellanos

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, K.C. Nat Turner for his support and his motivational spirit that helped guide me through the years. I'd also like to thank the faculty from the Language, Literacy and Culture concentration at the College of Education for the learning and teaching opportunities they offered me throughout the years. I would like to acknowledge and thank the members of my committee, Krista Harper and Korina Jocson for their much-valued critique, comments, and deep engagement with my dissertation project. I am also grateful for the knowledge and support I received from the late Dr. Sullivan during my research assistantships with her.

I would like to thank the College of Education for its assistance with my dissertation project through travel grants and the doctoral summer scholarship, as well as thank the UMass Office of Professional Development for their writing retreats, workshops and amazing staff who were such a big help in completion of this project. I would like to thank the high school students who participated in my study and a big thank you to their teacher who generously welcomed me into his classroom. I am also grateful for the cohort of peers I began the PhD journey with in LLC.

I am grateful for my family's love and support through this journey. I would like to thank my parents, Fanny A. Hincapié and Tulio E. Castellanos who taught me and showed me the importance of always working with care and commitment. I would like to thank my sisters and my brother and their families, all, for their love and support but also for all the kids' birthday parties, baptisms, graduations, and all the other family events that kept me in touch with life outside the dissertation. I would like to thank my aunt Luz M. Hincapié for inspiring me to pursue a path in scholarship and writing ever since I visited her in college.

I am grateful to Beth and Joe Tobin for their encouragement, patience, and academic support with my project. Thank you also to the whole Tobin family who always so kindly asked

ABSTRACT

**YOUTH PRODUCING VOICE: A VIDEO-CUED ETHNOGRAPHY OF A
MEDIA EDUCATION CLASSROOM**

MAY 2023

ISABEL C. CASTELLANOS, B.A., RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

M.A., THE NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

Ph.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor K.C. Nat Turner

From mini screens on our cell phones to large flat screens hanging in institutional
hallways, visual digital media are part of our everyday lives. This is especially true for
youth, who in their leisure time increasingly spend time watching and making video
content. Yet there are few opportunities for youth in either their community or school
settings to access formal instruction in digital media literacy, including video production.
In this dissertation, I examine the possibilities and challenges for doing youth media
inside schools. What do youth allow themselves to say when doing media production in
school and how do they voice their social and cultural concerns around pressing issues in
society? There is little research on youth media *inside* schools, even as video making and
video use continues to grow. Drawing from existing research on youth media, the new
literacies and critical media literacy, this study examines how student voice gets shaped
in a high school classroom and what role it plays for the students and the school. I carry
out a video-cued classroom ethnography to examine the class's norms, discourses and
structures. I analyze the students' video-cued focus group interview data, through the lens
of heteroglossia, drawing on Bakhtinian ideas of language and identity as heterogenous.

Video-cued ethnography provides the research with a multivocal dimension, as the same video clips are shown to various participants who each comment on it, thereby producing a dialogue across positionalities, space, and time. This study shows how student voice is constituted of multiple stances and ideas, at times conflicting ones. Students took on a variety of discursive strategies to produce their videos and to address an audience beyond the media production classroom through the school-wide student news program. The students use their creative agency to mobilize their peers on topics they believed were valuable to students and that point to a shared world within their school. Additionally, the research demonstrates that youth media practices inside school may serve as social and public acts that go beyond the classroom and that approach civic engagement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

VIDEO AND THE POSSIBILITIES FOR VOICE

Introduction

From mini screens on our cell phones to large flat screens hanging in institutional hallways, visual digital media are part of our everyday lives. This is especially true for youth, who in their leisure time increasingly spend time watching and making video content. Yet there are few opportunities for youth in either their community or school settings to access formal instruction in digital media literacy.

Walk into a classroom with a video camera and kids want to hold the camera, film, and see themselves on screen. Such excitement and sense of possibility has been a part of educational and community video since the latter half of the 20th century. Once the technology of video became portable and budget-friendly (to some extent), along with other technological innovations like cable television, video became a vehicle for self-expression, meaning-making, creativity, and participation in the public sphere. Community media entities like *Paper Tiger TV* and the public access cable movement were envisioned by many as a new electronic agora and formed part of the democratization of video (Stein, 1998). These entities focused on giving voice to individuals and non-profit organizations by providing them with an electronic forum to speak and to show topics of their choice. Parallelly, public school teachers from this era experimented with video and other audio-visual technologies as well. Educators not only used these new electronic tools to teach with but also incorporated them into the curricula (Laybourne, 1978), pushing the boundaries of creativity for kids. Now, in the dawn of the

21st century, the digitization and democratization of video continues to offer the possibility for individuals to express and disseminate their ideas locally and globally.

Research on *youth media* as I will refer to it here on, has argued precisely this -- that children and youth are capable of expressing and inserting their voices into the public sphere in authentic and creative ways with the tools of digital media, especially digital video. These practices have been well documented and researched in out-of-school settings, (Goodman, 2003; Halverson et al., 2009; Soep and Chávez 2010, Tyner, 1998) and have demonstrated that youth media practices may be transformative as they encourage critical inquiry of the media and the circulating media economy. As youth learn about digital media production, they also learn how to critique and question textual authority, facilitating youth to make informed judgements as media consumers, makers, and audiences as well as well-informed and engaged citizens (Buckingham, 2003; Hobbs, 1998; Kellner and Share, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

High school-aged students express themselves with video, the dominant medium of the 21st century. Yet, there is little research on youth media inside schools, even as video-making and video-use inside classrooms continues to grow. Having taught youth media classes in after-school and community media centers to teens and young adults in New York City, I understand how powerful this work can be for developing youth identity and voice, two concepts I will interrogate and complicate in relationship to youth media in what follows. In this study, I examine the possibilities and challenges for doing youth media *inside* schools, including how students make meaning of this practice. What do youth allow themselves to say when doing media production in school and how do

2

they voice their social and cultural concerns around pressing issues in society. This dissertation will present data and findings that suggest that youth media practices serve as social acts that go beyond the classroom, raising complex questions about voice and audience.

In this introductory chapter, I will first offer a brief description of the high school media class in which my video-cued ethnography took place as well as provide a brief description of this community's evolving demographics and its' evolving attitudes to diversity. I will then define what I mean by student voice, and then I will highlight key areas of research on which I drew from, mainly sociocultural theories of literacy, youth media and critical media literacy, and discuss some of the shifting research paradigms that are taking place in these areas of inquiry. Finally, I will provide the purpose and significance of my study.

Youth Media at Lakeview High School

The primary data in this dissertation is drawn from video-cued focus groups with students from Lakeview High (all names and pronouns are pseudonyms), who enrolled in an elective media production class and participated in the student-made news and entertainment TV show, the *Archive*. Lakeview High is situated in a semi-urban, small city that is a two-hour drive from one of the largest metropolitan cities in the Northeast. The small city is near several prestigious colleges and universities, thus impacting the cultural, social, and economic capital that the students at Lakeview High brought with them to school. The demographics of the city in terms of race and ethnicity have been slowly moving from white with mixed ancestry, to non-white and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity and race. For example, in 2000, the Hispanic or Latino total population in the

city was 1,484 and in 2020 it was 2,697 (US Census Bureau, 2000, 2020). Lakeview is representative of many small cities and towns across the country where the racial and ethnic composition continues to change, and with that, shifts in the demographic enrollments in public schools. According to the Pew Research Center (2021) the percentage of white students who attended a school where half or more of their classmates shared their race, dropped from 91% in 1995 to 79% in 2018. As an education researcher, these demographic shifts inform how I approach the meaning-making and sense-making of the high school students in my study. These quantitative changes in demographics provide a background for my study, mostly though because they affect the beliefs, norms and discourses that circulate in society and thus in a high school and its community.

Education research has tended to group schools and their corresponding student populations into categories which describe the general type of community the schools are found in, such as urban, suburban or rural. I found these labels to be unhelpful for describing my research site as well as for understanding how student voice unfolded. My own life experiences inform my knowledge on racial and ethnic diversity in schools. As a child of Colombian immigrant parents to the US, I attended a high school in New Jersey whose racial and ethnic composition was changing while my siblings and I attended it over the course of 15 years. Because of this, I understand that the process of change on cultural, racial, and linguistic matters inside schools can have an impact on student identity and voice. Lakeview High School had a mix of students from different races and ethnicities, along with the majority of white European-descent students. These sites are particular contexts for analyzing student voice and youth media. As my findings will

show, student expression and voice are impacted by the narratives and beliefs around racial diversity in schools. Indeed, the relative lack, or apparent lack of racial and ethnic diversity in their school was something that students spoke about in our interviews.

The origins of youth media interventions come from community and grassroots organizations that were centered around the democratization of video and that specifically aimed to give voice to the people. Urban community and out-of-school centers were spaces where youth media thrived, receiving funding from education foundations and other entities that supported educational media initiatives whose aims were to provide access to technology, media and arts-based learning opportunities to low-income and urban youth of color. Thus, much of youth media research has taken place in out-of-school settings. In this dissertation, I bring insight to education research by offering the unique perspective of examining youth media inside a public school, while still building upon the existing out-of-school youth media research that has been carried out in the last forty years.

Changing Perspectives of Literacy

In this study, while I use principles of literacy to examine the students' meaning-making in the class, I center the medium of video and in this way aim to show that while video composition shares a lot of the same qualities as writing composition, it presents its own potentialities for transformation. To be clear, this is not a comparative study of video and writing composition. Rather, I am studying how student voice works in a media production classroom where video is the main medium of expression. Many literacy scholars have already paved the way for me in this endeavor in their efforts to expand perspectives on literacy.

For some time now literacy and language scholars have theorized a more multiple and expansive perspective on the way education researchers and practitioners conceive of literacy. The aim of these new perspectives is to connect literacy teaching, learning, and research to the changing technological communication landscape and to consider how globalization and its societal effects impact the social and cultural needs of students and their families. The pedagogy of multiliteracies (New London Group (NLG), 1996) is an important source for these perspectives. Its main foci were to steer away from views of literacy that focused solely on skill acquisitions in decontextualized ways (Street, 1984). Instead, the NLG (1996) argued for a focus on the "multi," pointing to both the multiple contextual nature of literacies such as community settings, social roles, interpersonal relations, and identity, as well as the multiplicity of modes of communication such as written, visual, spatial, tactile, gestural, audio, and oral. The 'new literacies' scholarship (Coiro, Knobel, Lankshear & Leu, 2008; Lankshear & Knobel, 2007) focuses on the multiple nature of current day literacies. Focusing on the new ethos and sensibilities that digital media affords, these scholars aim to examine how media participation, expertise, authorship, and generic purity are challenged, countered, or dismantled by the new literacies (Lankshear & Knobel, 2007). It is within this framework of an expanded notion of literacy that I study voice in a media production classroom as a social practice.

Conceptualizing Youth Voice

In this study, I examine youth voice as both a form of self-expression and as a form of participation in community. While youth media research has reliably looked at the impact of youth voice in media production, scholars have become more critical of how the digital media practices of children and youth are studied and examined.

Epistemologies, theories, approaches, and strategies (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005) are shifting. In particular, the notion of "giving voice" to youth is being re-considered, as this discursively places youth in a deficit stance of not having voice already. Researchers are beginning to foreground dialogic-centered approaches, that consider the heterogeneity of the everyday life of young people. This has an impact on how scholars and researchers conceptualize "voice." In this new paradigm, student voice is not an autonomous, stable, abstract object (Lensmire, 1998). Instead, voice is multiple, full of conflict and tensions, and full of citationality (Bakhtin, 1981). Youth media researchers are conceptualizing voice by considering the technological tools, media genres, settings, and pedagogical designs as well as the broader contexts and interactions between these that shape what students produce (Dussel & Dahya, 2017). In my project, I foregrounded the discourses and strategies that students grappled with as they chose their video content and design, and I analyzed what this meant for student voice in this media education classroom.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this ethnographic study is to describe and examine the role that youth media practices within a classroom has on student voice and on the new literacies for students and teachers. There have been too few studies on in-school media production classrooms as sites to learn about how students make meaning and sense of the world around them. This project is guided by the following research questions:

1. How does student voice get shaped in this media production classroom?

2. What role does student voice have for the students and the school?

I do this by carrying out a video-cued classroom ethnography (Tobin, 2019) where I video-taped students as they engaged in the steps of making their films. I edited the

footage into short sequences, and then played these sequences back to the students, using the footage as cues for focus group interviews. This specific kind of ethnography gave my research a multivocal dimension, as the same video clips were shown to various participants who each commented on it, thereby producing a dialogue across positionalities, space, and time. I selected and edited sequences to focus on showing how youth media practices unfolded in the class. During the focus groups the students commented on their practices, at times confirming or rejecting some of my suggestions. For example, during my focus group with the student group Politics Now! (See appendix for a list and description of the groups), I asked them to comment on a video clip where the class is shown discussing whether students should focus on doing entertainment or doing serious news media. The Politics Now! group informed me that they did not really see this as one or the other, nor did they see it as a problem. Instead, they informed me that it is more about how they can present news and information in an entertaining way to the rest of the school. In Chapter Six, I discuss this and other findings on addressivity (Bakhtin, 1981) when doing youth media in school. Through my data, I present the voices of the students from the focus group interviews, as well as through video vignettes that demonstrate the cultural norms and practices of the class as the students do school and do video production.

Significance of the Study

While young people are engaging in media making all the time, they rarely get the chance to comment on their media making practices. By describing and analyzing students' reflections on their video production activities from the beginning to the end of

their productions, I aim to make a unique contribution to the field of youth media research in the following ways:

- By studying student voice in an in-school, elective, media production course in secondary education, I foreground how beliefs and ideas on schooling practices merge with ideas of youth media practices. With a few exceptions (Butler, 2010), youth media research has traditionally taken place in out-of-school learning sites. When it has taken place inside schools, youth media is researched as an add-on to one of the core subjects. Consequently, the knowledge the field has is based on mostly out-of-school experiences, leaving a gap. My dissertation contributes to the field by filling in this gap of knowledge.

- By carrying out a video-cued ethnography in a media production classroom, I am demonstrating how a visual and multimodal methodology works with high school-aged youth. It centers their voices around the process and practices of media-making, while also leveraging their funds of knowledge of media viewing and critiquing videos.

- By deploying a Bakhtinian lens as my analytical framework, along with video-cued ethnography, I am contributing to youth media research in examining student voice in ways that are relational, multi-dimensioned and contextualized, thus foregrounding how a heteroglossia of beliefs and norms make up youth voice in addition to a youth's lifeworld. This answers the call from the field to shift the focus in youth media studies from "giving voice" to recognizing the relationality of the students' worlds that shape students' creative media productions (Dussel & Dahya, 2017),

This study adds new conversations on what student voice can mean in this age of changing attitudes on cultural diversity and on the changing media landscape. Studying youth media practices in school can also help to inform why it matters and understand how we can teach educators and practitioners, not only how to teach it, but to teach it in a critical, engaging, and transformative way.

Outline of Chapters

This dissertation is organized into seven chapters, including this introduction. Chapter Two discusses the literature relevant to my research on literacies, voice and culture and how these unfold inside a video-centered classroom. I begin by reflecting on the utility of the continued use of the terms, "youth" and "youth culture," and present some thoughts on this by cultural studies scholars. I then describe the sociocultural perspective on literacy that I use in this dissertation to frame the practices of youth media. Next, I define youth media research and present examples from the literature that have centered around issues of identity, audience, and participatory culture. In this section I also include analytical critiques of youth media research in order to show how the field continues to evolve and to foreshadow my own analytical approach of employing a Bakhtinian lens in my analysis. Next, I review some of the literature in education that has carried out classroom ethnographies and has focused on issues of race and ethnicity. The literature on schools and race helped me frame and understand my findings on voice in a mostly white school, as presented in Chapter Four. Lastly, I finish with a presentation of my theoretical framework.

In Chapter Three, I explain my method of video-cued classroom ethnography to study a media production classroom. I address the methodological considerations and

procedures, including how this methodology both accounts for participant voices, as well as for the processes of the construction of voice. In doing so, I demonstrate how this method addresses youth media studies' concerns of cheerleading and unidimensional narratives (Dussel & Dahya, 2017; Soep & Chávez, 2010) prevalent in some youth media research. I then give in-depth descriptions of the research site, the context, and the research participants of the study, including my own researcher positionality. Then, I move on to describe Phases I and II of the study. These phases included classroom participant observations, the making of the research video-cues, and the video-cued focus group interviews. I provide in-depth descriptions of the six student production groups that I followed and carried out video-cued focus group interviews with. I also describe the two individual video-cued interviews that I had with the teacher. I conducted these teacher video-cued interviews as teleconferences due to the emerging Covid-19 pandemic. Lastly, I present and describe the analytical framework for my study. I deployed Bakhtinian-based, as well as social semiotic-influenced perspectives to find patterns and meaning in my data. The youth media practices were my unit of analysis. I treated both my field observations and the student responses from the focus groups as evidence of classroom culture, norms, and practices.

In Chapter Four, I explore how youth media practices in the classroom come into dialogue with discourses circulating in contemporary society on diversity, inclusion, race and ethnicity. As evidence for my claims, I analyze and interpret students' reflections from the video-cued interviews as well as present vignettes from my field notes. I illuminate how students make meaning of these discourses, take them up, or use them as discursive strategies. This was the case with the "not-my-place" media-making strategy,

11

which I claim was part of the students' norms and belief system. Through vignettes from the classroom, I describe the classroom's youth media practices, such as film-critique meetings, peer-led pitch meetings, and self-directed video-editing sessions. I reveal how the specific affordances of video and the video-making process provide students and teachers with the potential for cultural transformation to more fully engage with contemporary, pressing issues in our society.

In Chapter Five, I examine how student voice gets shaped by the students' choices in their genre selections, including elements of style, form, and content. In our over saturated media society, students have many models to draw on for their media projects. Thus, foregrounding the students' creative choices, I contend, provides us with insight into how voice is constructed. I show how the new literacies play a significant role in this process by highlighting the practices of remixing and imitation. As students draw from popular YouTube shows, they are participating in what new literacies scholars have termed as the "ethos" of participatory culture and new literacies (Lankshear and Knobel, 2007). I analyze the students' creative choices and their beliefs around them through the lens of Bakhtinian citationality, as such complicating notions of a unidimensional voice.

In Chapter Six, I examine what it means for students to create media texts for an audience beyond their teacher, complicating notions of audience. I describe who they addressed and how students addressed them, including through what I describe as peer citationality. I show how students saw themselves as sharing meaning in a shared place when doing video production in school. I then discuss what this means for student voice as a collective endeavor that I argue has the potential to become a form of civic participation and engagement.

In Chapter Seven, the concluding chapter, I discuss the themes and implications of this dissertation, with a focus on youth media pedagogy, as well as methodological implications. Youth media practices in school can offer ways for students to learn through project-based, inquiry-based, and student-led approaches. I highlight the media production teacher's pedagogy and demonstrate how limited teacher authority and student-led frameworks such as the peer-led pitch meetings, undergirds youth media pedagogy and its core principles of creative freedom and social responsibility and change. Youth media production prompts critical video production moments that can contribute to creating classrooms, schools, and a society better equipped to engage with issues of inclusion, race, ethnicity and diversity. Video-cued ethnography to research student voice, positions student media makers as the experts and authority. Using a video research methodology to study youth media draws on the students' media interests, literacies and making. In doing so, video-cued ethnography supported students having critical reflections on their learning and on their everyday lives at school.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW: LITERACIES, VOICE, AND CULTURE

Introduction

Media education, as a discipline to teach and learn is a content area that has been slow to catch on in our public-school systems, especially when compared to countries like England or Australia. In the United States, media education is not considered a central content area such as English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, Science or History. When it is taught, it is often offered as an elective or as a sub-section of ELA or as a sub-section of a technology course. However, this kind of arbitrary and unsystematic way of doing media education soon may prove to not be enough. The need for students to make sense of media of all types is increasingly made clearer by phenomenon like fake news and misinformation. Indeed, media education may one day become a central discipline in the K-12 public school system. In the meantime, however, education researchers, teachers and practitioners can benefit from the base of knowledge that currently exists from research conducted in out-of-school learning sites such as in youth media and after-school technology-centered programs. The youth media research that has taken place in these sites offers researchers, teachers, and practitioners, unique insights into the social practices, literacies, and the culture of media education.

This chapter reviews the scholarly literature useful for understanding high school media education, highlighting the unique opportunities and idiosyncrasies that these classes offer students for expression and participation in their high school and wider communities. Following my conceptual orientation, much of the literature presented features a socio-cultural perspective on youth media. I begin with a brief background and

contemplation on the use of the term "youth culture" when it comes to describing the media practices of young people. I then move to describing multiple perspectives on literacy, including the new literacies, multiliteracies and multimodality. I also include literature on media and critical media literacy. Next, I describe the emerging scholarship on youth media studies, as it has developed here in the United States, outlining some of the main concepts and ideas that are relevant to my study. I then draw on conceptualizations of *voice* and describe how this metaphor has been taken up by literacy and youth media studies as well as by writing and compositional studies. I suggest this metaphor continues to be both useful but also problematic in our current diverse and heteroglossic society. Lastly, I present implications for media education from scholarship on race, culture and media representations. I focus particularly on one of the main foci of race and representation scholarship, the concept of whiteness. This literature review on the new literacies, voice and culture all frame my study on student voice in the high school media production classroom.

Youth Culture

The terms "youth" and "youth culture" are widely used in the media literacy literature. One reason for this is that the study of media literacy and education is almost always examined within the populations of children and adolescents (even though everyone no matter their age living in contemporary society has a relationship to the media). The other reason is that media literacy and education, and by extension youth media share some of their ideas and concepts such as "youth culture" with the field of cultural studies.

15

According to Buckingham and Kehily (2014) the choice for certain researchers who study young people and their media practices to gravitate to the term youth culture can be traced to the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS). In the 1960's, the CCCS, led the emergence of the field of cultural studies in the U.K. Following a Gramscian framework, CCCS scholars analyzed youth subcultures as expressions of resistance to hegemonic conceptualizations and uses of media. In particular, they focused on young people who were perceived as living on the margins of society in the U.K., such as punks, mods etc. (Hebdidge, 1979). By analyzing these youth subcultures in new ways other than those of deviant or delinquent, the scholars opened new avenues for research and for public debate (Buckingham & Kehily, 2014). In short, the CCCS provided a "generative way of interpreting youth subcultures as inventions, imbued with meaning" (Buckingham & Kehily, 2014, p.2). However, one of the main critiques of the CCCS has been that these same scholars took a celebratory approach to these subcultures, framing them in "romantic notions of authenticity". Buckingham & Kehily (2014) contend that in essence "the CCCS offered a theory and analysis of subcultures and not of youth cultures more broadly" leading to a bias that "inevitably led to a neglect of the complexity and diversity of most young people's experience" (p.4). Buckingham & Kehily (2014) conclude that it does seem valid to contemplate whether these concepts still make sense in our given contemporary global landscape:

> Youth is of course, a matter of lived experience; but its cultural meanings are socially and historically defined... we might well ask whether it still makes sense to think of 'youth culture' as something that is specific to young people at all. (p.7)

Given the current education context of global, economic, and sociocultural diversity, the lines have been blurred. The division between youth subcultures, mainstream youth cultures, and just young people have grown less clear. As Bucholtz (2011) wrote in response to the CCCS conceptualization of youth:

> It is equally necessary to examine the less ostentatious styles that white youth take up as they position themselves in relation to their peers of color, for it is precisely through the perceived ordinariness of such styles, in contrast to the perceived conspicuousness of many nonwhite. . .youth cultures, that whiteness is ideologically reinscribed as normative and unmarked. (p. 13)

She argues that the tools of ethnography are essential to studying both marked and unmarked white youth styles since these tools allow researchers to "discover the local forms and meanings of stylistic practices, which may at times be hard to see from the outside" (Bucholtz, 2011, p. 13). When examining student voice and video-making in an increasingly multi-racial school, it is important to question how and why certain youth populations get named and studied, while others don't. It is equally important to recognize how American society thinks about young people. They are not yet adults but also not children anymore. We expect them to use the media intelligently but at the same time, think they need to be saved from the media. There are many contradictions like these, in how we perceive and treat young people. In my project I considered the youth in my study to make media from this specific position they hold in society, one that is fluid and shifting and subject to contradictory.

New Literacies, Multiliteracies and Multimodality

Lankshear and Knobel (2007) explain that the idea of literacy has moved from meaning the ability to read and write to the ability "to understand information however it is presented" (p.21). Lankshear and Knobel (2007) use of the term literacies has 3 tenets: 1. It is embedded in social practices. This means it is always in context and depends on the situation. 2. "encoding involves much more than 'letteracy" (p.225). They recognize a multiliteracies perspective where uses of other technologies besides alphabetic reading and writing (letteracy) is a legitimate form of communication, 3. "Social practices of literacy are discursive" (p.225). They define literacies in relation to discourses, meaning there are insiders and outsiders of discourses (p.225).

New literacies scholars (e.g., Coiro, Knobel, Lankshear & Leu, 2008; Lankshear & Knobel, 2007) talk about new literacies not just as the latest trend in literacy studies but rather as a sort of paradigm shift. They see the "new" in the term "new literacies" not in the sense that it is a new app, like Instagram vs. Facebook or a new device like a classroom projector vs. whiteboard or an iPhone vs. a 35mm film camera, but instead as a change in "sensibilities and ethos" (Lankshear & Knobel, 2007, p. 225) that allow for a new understanding of the material changes that a growingly post mechanical technological era affords us with its digital technologies. Lankshear & Knobel (2007) state:

> The more a literacy practice that is mediated by digital encoding, [and] privileges participation over publishing, distributed expertise over centralized expertise, collective intelligence over individual possessive intelligence, collaboration over individuated authorship, dispersion over scarcity, sharing over ownership, experimentation over 'normalization', innovation and evolution over stability and

fixity, creative innovative rule breaking over generic purity and policing,

relationship over information broadcast, do-it-yourself creative production over

professional service delivery, and so on, the more sense we think it makes to

regard it as a new literacy. (p. 228)

The concepts of participation, distributed expertise, collective, collaboration, dispersion,

sharing, experimentation, innovation, evolution, rule breaking, relationship and do-it-

yourself are all key ingredients to the ethos of new literacies. These are the main qualities

that new literacies ignite, nurture, and cultivate. Youth media research, as I will

demonstrate further in this review, has demonstrated that digital media practices with

youth in formal and informal education settings can foster and encourage many of these

qualities.

For clarification purposes, it is important to note that Lankshear and Knobel

(2007) make a distinction between the use of the term "literacy" in academia and in

colloquial or everyday language. The use of the word 'literacy' as metaphor for a

"competence or proficiency" (Lankshear & Knobel, 2007) has become an everyday idea.

Most of the time such phrases as "computer literate" or "technologically literate" (p.20)

simply means that someone can "make sense of and use" the object at hand. They remark

that this infiltration of literacy into our everyday language can be an indicator of how

literacy has become a "social issue and an educational ideal" in contemporary times (p.

20). Terms like oral literacy, visual literacy, or science literacy, to give a few examples,

mean that the user is able to "communicate or make meaning - as a producer or receiver -

using signs, signals, codes, graphic images" (Lankshear & Knobel, 2007, p.20). There is

specific language that goes along with each subject and to be literate in science for example means to be able to speak and write the language of the discipline of science.

Like the concept "new literacies," the concept of "multiliteracies" draws on the idea of recognizing diversity in literacies and learning. This literacy perspective is interested in looking at the "multi" in the literacies and languages of students. Kalantzis & Cope (2012) describe the "multi" pointing to both the multiple contextual nature of literacies such as community setting, social roles, interpersonal relations, and identities as well as pointing to the multiplicity of modes of communication such as written, visual, spatial, tactile, gestural, audio, and oral. The concept of "multiliteracies" was first coined by a group of scholars who gathered in New London, New Hampshire to discuss pressing issues around literacy and language education. The group is now referred to as the New London Group (NLG) and the manifesto they drew up is titled, *Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures* (1996). The manifesto has been highly cited and used in both theory and practice for the last twenty years. As a theory, multiliteracies can be considered a "remaking of the boundaries of literacy" as a response to globalization as well as a "political and social theory" to look at issues of curricula (Jewitt, 2008, p. 245). Around the same time that the theorization on multiliteracies and new literacies was growing in the late 1990s, the concept of multimodality was also surfacing in literacy studies, pointing to perspectives that included multiple, multimodal, and diverse ways of learning and communicating (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001; Jewitt & Kress, 2003). While multimodal texts do pre-date the Internet era, digital technologies have made it much more possible to make and share multimodal texts and this has

exponentially increased the amount of multimodal texts circulating globally. In the next section, I will define the theory of multimodality and some of the key aspects that are relevant to this literature review.

There are several approaches towards studying multimodality and the concept is operationalized differently across and within disciplines, however the shared reasoning for a multimodal approach is to expand semiotics or meaning making to attend to the full range of representational modes used in cultures (Jewitt, Bezemer, & O'Halloran, 2016; Mills, 2016). The theory of multimodality is based on a framework of social semiotics. Carey Jewitt, a leading scholar on social semiotics and multimodality, provides us with a comprehensive history of the emergence in the 1990s of multimodality as a theory (Jewitt et al., 2016). According to Jewitt and colleagues (2016), theorists like Gunther Kress and Theo van Leeuwen, as well as herself, strove to recognize, "a need to move beyond the empirical boundaries of existing disciplines and develop theories and methods that can account for the ways in which we use gesture, inscription, speech and other means together in order to produce meanings that cannot be accounted for by any of the existing disciplines" (p.2). In other words, they promoted a way of looking at meaning making that was holistic and that could use multiple research lenses in order, for example, that a linguist could bring in body gesture as part of their analyses instead of just analyzing speech.

One of Kress's (2003) main concerns has been, "the materiality of the resources, and in how humans *work* with them in the demands of their lives. I am interested in this matter of material, of stuff, and how humans have worked with it and have worked it" (p.13). He argues that as literacy practices and events have been worked on, it is time for

21

research to complement this work with "work [research] on the affordances and potentials of the stuff, the material which is involved in the practices' (Kress, 2003, p.13). This is significant to this review as many of the more recent studies on youth media have called for researchers to look at the materiality and hence the context of student multimedia narratives and productions. For the purposes of this review on voice and digital media, I'd like to highlight a multimodality concept that is particularly useful here. These is the concept of modal affordance.

Modal affordance

The idea that each mode has its own affordances became known as "modal affordance" (Kress, 2010). In this concept, Kress (2003) defines modes as speech, moving image or still image, writing, color, layout etc. and presents the idea that each mode offers discrete possibilities and constrains. Another way he explains modal affordance is to ask, what is this mode able to express, communicate or represent easily within its semiotic resources and what is more difficult. The modal affordance is shaped by social and cultural factors as well as the mode's history and materiality. This suggests that to analyze the modal affordance of a specific phenomenon (for example, video) the researcher will also examine the social norms and conventions that this mode (video) has repeatedly been used for. A modal affordance may also be looked at as a logic inherent to each mode as, for example the temporal sequencing that is a characteristic of speech but not of a painting (Mavers, n.d.).

The idea of modal affordance and of materiality connect back to Kress's (2003) stance on literacy. Kress (2003) is clear that a multimodal theory cannot be a linguistic theory as the modes that occur whether alongside speech and writing in print media or

screen media "are constituted on different principles to those of language; their materiality is different; and the work that cultures have done with them has differed also" (p. 35). Hence, his approach is a semiotic one (and not a literacy one), which can account for, "gesture, speech, image, writing, 3D objects, colour, music and no doubt others" (Kress, 2003, p.36). He clarifies that the modes of speech and writing will also have to be considered through a semiotic lens as they are part of this landscape comprised of the many modes available for representation, and reminds us that these modes will nevertheless, still carry with them the "highly valued status in society and, in the case of speech, certainly still carry the major load of communication" (Kress, 2003, p.36).

Media Literacy

Media literacy scholarship examines how individuals, and especially children and youth, develop skills of critical understanding and sense-making, and actively participate in and with the media. Some of this scholarship explores how media literacy curricula impact youth as media consumers and producers (Buckingham, 2003; Hobbs, 1998). Some research focuses on media effects on vulnerable children and youth. I align myself with a line of research that focuses instead on youths' interests, tastes, and pleasures in their engagement with media, viewing media participants as "agentive selves" (Hull and Katz, 2006). This line of inquiry acknowledges students' media "funds of knowledge" (Moll, 1992), and takes up their "symbolic creativity" (Willis, 1990) by studying how students use media to inscribe new meanings on commonly understood symbols. Hoechsmann and Poyntz (2012) describe media as including both multimedia and multimodal texts as well as media technologies such as cell phones, computer technology or websites. Media literacy scholars study the various dimensions that media literacy

consists of, including listening, viewing, reading and interpretation and the impact media and culture industries have on the way individuals relate to the media (Sefton-Green, 2006).

Critical Media Literacy

From the beginning of media literacy studies, educators and researchers expressed concern that media literacy and production practices among youth could result in a decontextualized effort that "reproduces the hierarchy of Hollywood or the news industry" (Hobbs, 1998, p.20). One way that scholars and educators have addressed this concern is by providing students with a sociopolitical purpose that frames the learning and analysis of media learning and encourages students to challenge the cultural assumptions and dominant and oppressive political structures that may come from the media (Sholle and Denski, 1993). These educators are informed by the theory of critical literacy pedagogy. Critical literacy and pedagogy stems from the work of Gramsci, the Frankfurt School, the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS), as well as from such American critical cultural theorists as Henri Giroux and Peter McLaren (Morrell, 2008). This scholarship has defined critical media literacy as involving "counterhegemonic instruction aimed at developing a consciousness of the role of the media in configuring social thought" (Morrell, 2008, p.157).

Morrell (2008) defines critical media pedagogy as a pedagogy that not only teaches students to do critical readings of dominant media texts but that also teaches them the technical and digital skills to create new media texts which would then "serve a critical function in creating empowering counter-narratives of reality" (p.159). The term "counter-narrative" is meant to describe stories that "counter" what the mainstream

24

media outlets have historically presented to the public on youth of color. Morrell (2008) is explicit about who a critical media pedagogy is for when he states that it "targets populations that have been targeted by media industries" including "urban youth" and "urban youth public intellectuals" (p.158). Some media education scholars disagree with a media literacy and education agenda that includes explicit political and ideological agendas such as those described above and argue that "criticality" underpins any media literacy analysis since you are teaching students how to question textual authority (Lemish, 1997). According to this train of thought, this questioning in and of itself will promote the process of "internalizing the tools of self-reflection, critical analysis, and communication" for the students (Hobbs, 1998, p.23). Similarly, Buckingham (2003) argues that while critical media analysis aims to demystify the mass media, it too often privileges only one critical reading, that of the teacher.

Youth Media

I define *youth media* as a specific type of media education whose curriculum and pedagogy focuses on developing youth voice, agency, and identity. Youth media scholarship has looked at the reach and impact of "voice" on young adults, students and non-students alike, in order to examine how youth can be taught to affect, create or make social change (Castellanos, Bach & Kulick, 2011; Fisherkeller, 2011; Goodman, 2003; Pyles, 2011; Soep & Chavez, 2010). This line of research draws from both humanistic (voice as a singular, inner, always-there expression) and Gramscian (voice to the people) perspectives to examine student voice, agency, and identity. Undergirding much of this research is the notion that students' personal experiences and their own media "funds of

knowledge" (Moll, 1992) when brought into the curriculum create a powerful pathway for student learning and engagement.

In this line of inquiry, students' media projects whether in school or in "not-school" (Sefton-Green, 2013) spaces, gets described by researchers and teachers as giving young people opportunities to find their voice or to amplify their voices by providing them with access to digital media technologies and modalities to express their authentic selves and narratives (Charmaraman, 2013; Goodman, 2003; Goodman & Cocca, 2014; Jocson, 2013; Turner, 2011).

Identity

Youth media researchers have examined student identity formation and explicitly made the connection between media texts and identity as their main object of inquiry (Halverson, 2010; Levin, 2011; Gibbons, Drift & Drift 2011). Halverson (2010) examines youth filmmaking and considers it a rich, complex literacy practice that enables identity exploration, specifically for adolescents who are first considering the narratives of their own lives. Halverson (2010) draws from narrative studies and claims that personal filmmaking, where students are essentially performing true stories of their lives serve as:

> a reconciliation of the way you see yourself, the way others see you, and the way you fit into the communities to which you belong. Positive identity development in adolescence demands that individuals acknowledge these multiple senses of self and actively decide how to accommodate them as a necessary component of moving into adulthood. (p.2356)

The public nature of films or in other words, the *modal affordance* (Kress, 2010) of the

26

medium and process of filmmaking, which includes a telling and performance of personal experience narratives gives adolescents a venue to explore issues of identity during their making process. Halverson (2010) contends that because of this, a filmic text that relies on personal narratives can be analyzed as a "multimodal product of identity" (p.2354). This analytical framework allows the researcher to describe how the semiotic tools of expression in digital media enable students to "construct self-representations for a public audience" (p.2354).

Levin (2011) embraces the nuances that come up in identity formation during youth media-making: "Identity experimentation is allowed in making students' films, but the practice is limited. This balance is one of the things that makes students' films unique and worthy of study as social expression…" (p. 142). Levin (2011) understands student films as discursive identity-making products and he describes youth filmmaking as a chance for young people to try out possible identities.

Audience and Authenticity

Any kind of creative work and expression, no matter what the mode is, needs a reader, viewer, listener, watcher, etc. While this seems obvious, the "audience" dimension in youth media scholarship is rarely researched or foregrounded, leaving out a key ingredient to understanding the construction of voice. In media education the concept "authentic audience" means that student work will be viewed by individuals beyond the teacher and classmates, often in a group-like setting and ideally in a space outside of the classroom and school. Frequently, the assumption by teachers and researchers is that an authentic audience is beneficial to the student's learning and literacy needs. Along these lines, Stornaiuolo and Nichols (2018) studied how students cultivated audiences for their

media projects. The authors introduce the concept of "making publics" to describe the audience that students seek for their media products and how the anticipation of a public audience motivates them during their media production process:

> When young people saw themselves as civic actors, whose voices and perspectives mattered and could have an impact on others, they began to mobilize audiences and resources in new configurations. This process of mobilization involved young people seeing themselves as part of a shared world, with responsibilities to act in public ways to impact others around them and to participate with others whom they had never met or, in some cases, imagined. (Stornaiuolo and Nichols, 2018 p. 26)

The researchers observed that mobilizing a public for their student work was meaningful to some students but not to all. Some students did not think having an authentic audience to be all that meaningful to them. The researchers concluded that it is important as researchers and educators to keep this in mind in educational media production spaces.

Similarly, Buckingham and Harvey (2001) explain that in student films carried out in the classroom there is an imagined audience and a real audience and that giving students a real audience may push students to think deeply about their production choices and thus reflecting "critically on the relationships between intentions and results" (p. 174). They caution though that there are limits to this kind of motivation no matter how "real" the audience may be. It comes down to how students perceive this "real" or "authentic" audience as well as on other concerns student may have that are driving their student work.

They [students] may have other concerns and motivations which run counter to rationalistic models of 'ideal communication'. . .The kind of learning that takes place here [school classroom] is therefore likely to depend upon how 'real' the audience is 'perceived' to be. (Buckingham and Harvey, 2001, p. 174)

These "other concerns and motivations" that the authors note, may be related to peer-to-peer interactions or other forms of knowledge that as researchers and practitioners we may not be aware of. Pandya and Low (2020) write about the vagueness and ambiguity that exists in thinking about audience for students' digital products in schools. The scholars present a different approach to that of authentic or real audience. Instead, they foreground "addressivity," a concept of Bakhtin's (1986), when considering audience in student digital and networked media productions. Whoever the child is addressing should be considered the valid public or audience and not the audience that the teacher or researcher deems worthy. The authors question the idea of deeming the presumed "authentic audience" as the more worthy one:

Addressivity is an immediate move toward a child-centered view of authentic digital video composing, as children "turn to" the audience(s) they themselves deem to be their public(s). (Pandya and Low, 2020, p.61)

The authors contend that this kind of "dialogic addressivity" or "turning to" (Bakhtin, 1986) should be a main element when conceptualizing children's digital productions in classroom spaces and would move the pedagogy toward a child-centered view of authentic digital video composing (Pandya and Low, 2020). Examining the relationship between audience and student media productions in schools is significant to youth media

studies research, especially when studying student voice and the need to communicate with audiences beyond the teacher.

The question of addressed, authentic or imagined audiences leads to the question of genres. Cultural and media scholars have written extensively about TV and film genres, music genres, and other media genres, A socio-cultural perspective on genres takes into account how in addition to the students' creative decisions on their media making projects, there are social and cultural constraints and affordances. Mittel (2004) defines media genres as more than a category and argues that they are constructed by a "broad array of cultural assumptions of meaning, value and social function exceeding any textual definition" (p.60). Consequently, the culturally specific context should be looked at when studying genres. Mittel (2004) offers the example of the development of the cartoon genre in the U.S. and asks us to consider how differently this genre developed in the US. vs. Japan.

Buckingham and Harvey (2001) discussed genres as "media language" in student productions:

> In particular, it should lead us to question the idea that young people will somehow spontaneously 'discover' a form of media language that transcends cultural boundaries. If young people are to use media language to communicate (let alone to do so across cultures), they must inevitably utilize the forms of language that are available to them. Media languages are inescapably tied to social interests, and as such they are far from neutral. (p. 183)

In student media productions, students will grab ideas, designs, and content from what has been available to them through their own identities and cultural and social

backgrounds, as well as through their interests, drives and motivations. Buckingham and Harvey (2001) push back on the argument that students need to dig within themselves to "discover" their own unique media languages. This is the argument made by most traditional humanistic perspectives that see individual youth makers as having a singular creative voice within them, that needs to be discovered and unleashed.

While many more educators today include a multimodal component into their curricula, the idea of students copying or imitating from popular culture as they create their own media projects remains a significant obstacle for teachers who would like to bring media making into their classrooms. However, within a socio-cultural perspective, some of these "imitating" strategies can be shown to be creative and educational, as they demonstrate an understanding of the conventions and affordances of a genre. For example, Hobbs and Friesem (2019) examine the current participatory culture of remake videos and conclude that this form of expression may help develop media literacy competencies and creative skills through strategic copying and imitation of existing media.

This idea that students utilize the forms of language that are available to them is in line with multimodal theories on genres and learning. Kress et al., (2014) theorize the concept of genre as a useful concept to describe the stances that students take on as they create their multimodal productions and "choose a voice with which to speak to the reader" (p. 170). The authors state:

> We see genre as an aid to explaining the process of the selection of the text and of
> the production of texts, rather than a way of describing the text as a product. . .
> [It] maintains our focus on the dynamic process of textual production and helps us

to emphasize the work of students as active decision-makers who make choices

which realize their stance in the production of texts. (Kress et al., 2014, p. 170)

This way of thinking of genre is process based and recognizes the student as a creative

agent of their multimodal projects. In addition, like modal affordances, genres also have

specific constraints and possibilities, and the researchers see students' abilities to choose

from various genre conventions for their school multimodal projects as evidence of

learning.

Participatory Culture

Media studies scholar Henry Jenkins (1992, 2006a) coined the term "participatory

culture" to talk about fan culture, three decades ago. Since then, he and his colleagues

have expanded the term to include many other kinds of popular cultures (Jenkins, Ito, &

Boyd, 2016). One definition which is the most concerned with education and learning can

be found in the MacArthur Foundation funded white paper. Jenkins (2006b) states:

A participatory culture is a culture with relatively low barriers to artistic

expression and civic engagement, strong support for creating and sharing one's

creations, and some type of informal mentorship whereby what is known by the

most experienced is passed along to novices. A participatory culture is also one in

which members believe their contributions matter and feel some degree of social

connection with one another (at the least they care what other people think about

what they have created). (p. 3)

Jenkins argue that participation "cuts across educational practices, creative processes,

community life, and democratic citizenship" (p. 8). And that young people participate in

many ways including through "affiliation," or "expression," "collaborative problem

32

solving" and through "circulation" or distribution of media (Jenkins, 2006b, p. 8)

These new ways of thinking about the media communication landscape have a direct impact on student voice and learning. As Jenkins et. al (2016) observe, some institutions embrace participatory cultures while in other spaces, meaningful participation is "unevenly distributed" (p. 3). This is a concern that echoes across youth media research.

Problematizing Youth Voice

Research on youth media has not been without critique. Some scholars have argued that self-expression alone does not equal empowerment (Fleetwood, 2006) and that there is dissonance between what the youth media discourse imagines and the realities of carrying out critical media projects with youth (Blum-Ross, 2016). Buckingham (2011) contends that because the nature of youth media interventions has a "child-saving" rhetoric, the notion of self-expression or empowerment through media production needs to be questioned. He argues "youth media projects inevitably construct specific positions from which it is possible for young people to 'speak' or to represent themselves" (Buckingham, 2011, p. 377) and contends that one assumption researchers and practitioners make is that students want to speak the "truth."

Another concern in the field is the tendency of this research to lean towards technological determinism -- the idea that access to new technologies will automatically equal empowerment. This concern leads to the "uncritical consideration of digital media" (Dahya & Dussel, 2017, p. 3) by youth media researchers. More studies than not have emphasized only the benefits of youth media, neglecting any possible limitations on this kind of work. This is what one scholar called a certain "pan-optimism" (Hague, 2014)

among youth media researchers. Hague (2014) argues that when the "structures that allow youth to "do" media are obscured, the complexity of this work is compromised (p.472). As various scholars have begun to argue, in order to deeply examine issues of equity and ethics, it is key that researchers recognize the constraints that exist in relation to student voice (Archer, 2013).

Another critique that emerges across youth media literature is the uneasiness with the notion of "giving voice" to students and how this discursively positions young people in a deficit perspective (Ashby, 2011; Blum-Ross, 2017; Dussel & Dahya 2017). The idea that instructors, researchers or institutions give or provide opportunities for students to "reclaim," "discover" or "find their voice" implies that young people, otherwise, may not have the capacity to do so on their own. In her research with students who type to communicate, Ashby (2011) is explicit in questioning this deficit perspective and asks if claiming to give voice to students with disabilities doesn't serve to further segregate them from the non-disabled population. Blum-Ross (2017) argues that conceptions of participatory culture (Jenkins, 2006) should be about researching how youth "already" participate and insert their voices in civically mediated ways, meaning that youth find ways to participate in media culture on their own terms. These perspectives on voice described above are rooted in two similar but different conceptualizations of voice. One, comes from the field of student writing and composition (Writers' Workshop), the other from the political and educational perspective of critical pedagogy.

Voice in Writers Workshop

Writers workshop is a school of thought which emphasizes finding your own voice in writing by drawing on your own experiences. Its assumptions are that individuals

have an authentic voice that can be self-discovered. Writers' workshop proponents believe that by giving students the freedom to explore and write about their own topics, they are giving students the chance to discover this authentic voice and thus transform into real authorship. Writers' workshop advocates distinguish their pedagogy from that of traditional schooling where there seems to be only mechanical correctness and a lack of focus on the individual. As Lensmire (1998) points out, this unique self is based on the Enlightenment idea of self, one which is "stable, coherent, unitary, and autonomous" (p.264). The idea that student voice is an autonomous, stable abstract object, is precisely the thing that has been most critiqued about the writers' workshop model. It has been criticized for its understanding of voice as one which is too fixed, individual and non-changing. It assumes that "a voice" may be fully realized on paper as long as the "solitary writer" is willing to go through the struggle of digging into subjectivity and finding their voice. Critics argue that no writer is truly solitary and that "writing. . .is a means by which we form a self to express" (Harris, 1987, p.161 as cited in Lensmire, 1998, p.266).

Voice in Critical Pedagogy

Similar to writers' workshop, critical pedagogy also values individual student experience and similarly believes this experience needs to be incorporated into the classroom. However, unlike writers' workshop, critical pedagogy focuses on exposing the presence of dominant structures in society that may silence non-dominant discourses. Voice in critical pedagogy is in contrast to silence, a silencing of student speech and also a silencing of personal experience, stories, and history. As Giroux (1990) states:

> To speak of voice is to address the wider issue of how people become either
>
> subjects who are agents in the process of making history or how they function as

35

subjects oppressed and exploited within the various discursive and institutional

boundaries that produce dominant and subordinate cultures in any given society. .

. voice provides a critical referent for analyzing how people are made "voiceless"

in particular settings by not being allowed to speak, or being allowed to say what

already has been spoken." (p.92)

For critical pedagogues, dominant forms of knowledge and power need to be challenged.

Student voice means challenging power and dominant ideologies. It is a way for students

to change their social and political connection to the wider society.

Individual Expression and Social Participation

In his conceptual paper on voice, Lensmire (1998) presents us with two concepts

of voice: Voice as individual expression and voice as participation. Lensmire (1998)

contrasts these two concepts from the perspectives of writing workshop and from critical

pedagogy:

If the workshop sense of voice is evoked with the contrast, "my words versus

someone else' s words", then the contrast to voice within critical pedagogy is

silence, where silence points to oppressive conditions that keep certain people

from speaking and being heard. Rather than emphasize the attempt to distinguish

yourself from others, voice, here, emphasizes inserting yourself and your texts

into public spheres (p. 268).

Lensmire (1998) also provides us with two significant critiques on both of these

conceptions of voice. One is the denial to acknowledge the idea of conflict in the process

of expressing or reclaiming student voice in a classroom and to question what this

conflict does to the process and production of speech and writing. The second critique for

both these conceptualizations of voice is the lack of transformation. Lensmire (1998) argues that for writing workshop, student voice is meant to be found, not constructed, since it is always there, so there is little sense of the creation of a voice. Similarly, for critical pedagogues, while there is great concern on how to make the student's story lead to critical dialogue, it offers little sense on what effect this has on the development of that student's learning, identity and life in general. In other words, critical pedagogues lack attention to "what this critical work means for the transformation of individual student voices" (Lensmire, 1998, p. 279). Lensmire (1998) claims that these static notions of voice are connected to the first critique. In other words, because of the lack of theorizing on the conflict or the "pushes and pulls of actually speaking and writing in classrooms", one is not able to envision other dimensions of student voice (Lensmire, 1998, p. 278).

Media Representation and Popular Culture

Research in all domains of US media -- publishing, fiction, non-fiction, advertising, films, and television – reveals a lack of representational equity, with a disproportionate of protagonists, communities, products, and stories reflecting the lives solely of Americans of European-descent. Cultural studies scholar Richard Dyer (2005) notes that whites in media representations ". . .have the central and elaborated roles, and above all are placed as the norm, the ordinary, the standard" (p. 11). A central concept of the scholarship on race in the US is that white racial bodies go "unmarked" in cultural representations. This unmarkedness supports cultural and racial hegemony as it constructs the dominant group as the ordinary and the norm thus indicating that non-dominant, non-white groups are "the visibly other" (Bucholtz, 2011; Dyer 1997).

Cultural studies scholar Stuart Hall (1997) argued that people of less dominant and minority groups are often represented in the media in binary forms, such as good/bad. According to Hall, this is where the concept of stereo (meaning two or dual) type comes from. Stereotyping is a representational practice that "reduces people to a few, simple, essential characteristics which are represented as fixed by nature" (Hall, 1997, p. 257). Hall distinguishes clearly between the difference of categories and types and stereotype by recognizing that all cultures categorize and type people, objects, and practices in order to make meaning and sense of the world. For example, when we "type" someone in order to know them, we think of their societal roles, their group memberships, class, gender, age, nationality, race, language, sexual preference and so on, as well as their personality type. Dyer explains that "A type is any simple, vivid, memorable, easily grasped and widely recognized characterization in which a few traits are foregrounded and change or development is kept to a minimum (Dyer, 1977, p. 28). The difference between typing and stereotyping is that stereotyping is a process of getting "a hold of the few 'simple, vivid, memorable, easily grasped and widely recognized' characteristics about a person, reduce everything about the person to those traits, exaggerate and simplify them, and fix them without change or development to eternity" (Hall, 1997, p. 258). Stereotyping has its own way of being invested with power or, in other words, its own politics. Hall (1997) describes this type of power as a "hegemonic and discursive form of power, which operates as much through culture, the production of knowledge, imagery and representation, as through other means. Moreover, it is circular: it implicates the 'subjects' of power as well as those who are 'subjected to it" (p. 263). Both the powerful and the powerless are trapped by power's circulation, while certainly not equally. The powerless

and the victims of stereotypes can actually reaffirm the stereotype by trying to oppose it in the same terms with which it had been created, as according to this theory, no one can "stand wholly outside its field of operation (Hall, 1997, p. 261).

Race and Culture in the High School Classroom

Sociologist and race scholar Eduardo Bonilla-Silva argues that race and racism continue to be significant factors shaping society in the United States. In his book, *Racism Without Racists*, Bonilla-Silva has argued since the first publication in 2003 that racism in the US, is still as pervasive as it was during Jim Crow era. The author explains that this "new racism" is one that is harder to pin down as it is based on racial ideologies and racial hierarchy that contribute to inequality. He contends that central elements of liberalism such as individualism and meliorism have been rearticulated in post-civil rights America to rationalize racially unfair situations. One of the main ideas behind the post-civil rights racism is the idea that the US has moved beyond race or skin color and other phenotypes. This is known as colorblindness. Colorblindness is a perspective on race where:

> the fundamental source of inequality is seen not as racism but as race itself. Raising concerns about race-based inequality is therefore condemned in much public discourse as furthering racial division precisely because it calls attention to race. (Omi & Winant, 1994) in (Bucholtz, 2011, p. 166)

Liberals, in hope of improving social, economic and political opportunities for people of color, initially supported this colorblind way of thinking since the reasoning was that "race might become non-salient as a factor shaping social, economic, and political opportunities and outcomes, and it was put forth as a way to promote equality for people

of color" (Bucholtz, 2011, P. 166). However, as social and cultural research for over 20 years has shown, colorblind racial discourses can enable racism even though those advocating for it reject racist beliefs (Bonilla-Silva, 2003/2018). Public policies and discourses as well as individuals' colorblind talk all contribute to these beliefs.

Ethnographic research in education and race has shown that race plays a relevant role in students' everyday lives at school. In an ethnography on youth style and identity, Mary Bucholtz (2011) explores how race and language affect the styles and identities that European American youth took on at a diversely ethno-racial high school in northern California. Bucholtz shows how European American youth deploy various strategies to handle race and ethno-racial issues in their school, deploying mostly discursive strategies of colorblindness such as "evasion of racial terms, the disavowal of racism, and the displacement of race by other issues" (Bucholtz, 2011, p. 186). Bucholtz concludes that by engaging these discursive strategies, white students saw themselves as "doing non-racism" and made it a part of their identity work (p. 186). However, while the white students' racial agency for the most part fell in line with the "existing racial order and dominant racial ideologies" of their high school and of the US in general, the teenagers "did" whiteness in many different ways, including in ways that could help eradicate hegemonic whiteness. Bucholtz (2011) explains:

> Rather than simply "doing" whiteness according to established racialized patterns, these young people were "redoing" whiteness - rethinking it, reshaping it. These counter discursive forms of whiteness were not specific to a particular youth style: at different times preppy teenagers, nerds, and hip hop fans all engaged in

practices that seemed to offer some leverage for dislodging hegemonic whiteness in favor of a more productive engagement with race.

Bucholtz confirms that many of the students saw racism as morally wrong and that this was in line with their mostly progressive, cosmopolitan, middle-class backgrounds. Nonetheless, they preferred to not talk about it for fear of being labeled a racist. This fear led them to see the topic of race as a delicate and perilous matter that was best left unspoken. Bucholtz concludes that the participants' talk about race was not only "a product of the local context but also participated in broader racial ideologies and discourses" (p. 165).

Similar to colorblindness is the concept of "colormute." Mica Pollock (2005) defines colormute as the deletion in writing or in talk of a person's race or ethnicity in other words, "de-raced." Like Bonilla-Silva, Pollock argues that this muteness of race or ethnicity can actually harm instead of help inequalities:

Race talk matters. All Americans, every day are reinforcing racial distinctions and racialized thinking by using race labels; but we are also reinforcing racial inequality by refusing to use them. By using race words carelessly and particularly by deleting race words, I am convinced both policy makers and lay people in America help reproduce the very racial inequalities that plague us. (p.4).

In particular, Pollock (2005) argues for the importance of having conversations about the relevance of race in schools. This pertains to educational researchers who study race issues in schools, but determine race's relevance according to the researcher's agenda. Instead, Pollock (2005) argues that researchers should show empirically how students and teachers alike "wrestle" with race issues and how they determine the relevance race has in

their own lives. This is significant to Pollock's main argument that school race talk is:

"one key version of American race talk: for the way we talk in school both reflects and

helps shape our most basic racial orders" (2005, p. 4).

Pamela Perry (2002) conducted an educational ethnography in two high schools,

exploring dimensions of whiteness among the white students in two schools, one majority

white, the other with white students in the minority. Both of these public schools were

located in northern California. She concludes that the contexts and situations provided by

the schools, affected the white students' ideologies, attitudes and beliefs about race and

ethnicity, particularly about white culture and about US minority students that identified

as Latino, Black and Asian. According to Perry (2002) white students' narratives on

whiteness could be categorized into three domains -- normal, Euro-American, or post

cultural, and that there existed social processes which conditioned which of these

narratives surfaced the most and when at the schools. For example, factors like the

students' interracial associations or connections, or the schools' structured practices

about racial-ethnic difference mattered, as well as "the ways youth defined their

relationships to people of color" (Perry, 2002, p.97). One of the school practices Perry

(2002) identified as a significant factor was the lack of an integrated multicultural

curriculum. Instead, the curriculum included add-on multicultural events a few times a

year. Perry (2002) contends that while the multicultural events were appreciated by both

white and students of color, the events "reinforced a sense of whiteness as center and

standard (cultureless) and racial-ethnic others (by virtue of having culture to display) as

different and marginal to that" (p. 100). White students got to sit back and "gaze upon

racial-ethnic others without putting themselves on the line" (p.99). This is in line with

what race scholars (Bonilla-Silva, 2018; Dyer, 1997; Fine, 2004) speak about when they say that white Americans have a difficult time understanding the meaning of culture when it is their own and not non-dominant groups' culture that are put on display.

In the classroom, terms like "diversity" and "multiculturalism" have taken on catch-all and sometimes trivial meanings. These kinds of discourses may obscure the inequality that affects students of color (Castagno, 2014; Ahmed, 2009). Ahmed (2009) argues that there is a dissonance between the image, language, and discourses that universities do in relation to diversity, to that of actually addressing inequality in the institutions. Universities' marketing materials such as websites and brochures show "colourful happy faces" while inequities, Ahmed (2009) contends, go ignored. Similarly, Castagno (2014) argues for a better articulation, understanding and stance on what schools mean and want from policies of diversity and multicultural policies. Specifically, she disagrees with the way "diversity" in schools has become a buzzword and hence is disconnected from power and distribution of resources (Castagno, 2013). This literature on racial discourses informed my study on student voice in a visually mediated space, the high school video production classroom. Theories on media and representation, racial ideologies, and discourses, as I have described them anchor my study and will enable me to draw from them as I make meaning from my data.

Theoretical Framing: Bakhtinian Perspectives

The emerging research examined in the literature on voice and youth media calls for research that captures a contextual picture that includes all the actors, structures, histories, and materiality that have a role in the, what and how of youth making media in media education settings. From this epistemological stance, making meanings of student

media productions requires understanding that "different digital media tools, genres, and related pedagogies might elicit different kinds of "voice" (Dahya, 2017, p. 108). Youth media research (Asthana, 2011; Dahya, 2017; Hague, 2014; Jocson, 2018) has shifted its conceptual lens from "giving voice" to one that recognizes the many factors and actors that shape students' creative media productions and thus takes on a more contextualized approach. A Bakhtinian dialogic approach can help with these kinds of analysis.

Heteroglossia and Dialogism

Dialogism refers to the idea that knowledge of self can only occur from the perspective of the other and vice versa. Mikael Bakhtin is credited with developing this idea of dialogism as well as heteroglossia as a perspective on language and language use. This approach towards language consists of looking at speech and texts (including multimodal texts) as interpretations that the speaker experienced directly or indirectly in past and present encounters (Bakhtin, 1981). The speakers' utterances are made up of others' utterances, including structural, institutional, and cultural influences (Ball & Freedman, 2004).

For Bakhtin (1981), language is a "socio-ideological concrete thing" that "lies on the borderline between oneself and the other" (p.293) and it is not to be considered a neutral phenomenon. Instead, Bakhtin argued that "all words have the "taste" of a profession, a genre, a tendency, a party. . . a generation, an age group. . . Each word tastes of the context and contexts in which it has lived its socially charged life" (p. 293). This leads to one of Bakhtin's most cited statements which is that the "the word in language is half someone else's" (p. 293). By this, Bakhtin meant that everything we say, we have previously heard said by someone else. However, each utterance births a new meaning

depending on the context, time and space it is uttered in. Once this utterance gets voiced, it demands some kind of answerability. Morris (1994) describes Bakhtin's understanding of the utterance:

> On a basic level, an utterance is any unit of language, from a single word to an entire text. More importantly, however, an utterance for Bakhtin is not so much a purely linguistic concept, as [it is] the locus of encounter between my self-consciousness, my mind and the world with all its socio-historical meaning (q.v.); the utterance is always an answer to a previous utterance, and always expects an answer in the future. (p.251)

Morris's description leads us to the underlying idea at the heart of Bakhtin's theories which is dialogism. Morris (1994) states,

> There is no existence, no meaning (q.v.), no word (q.v.) or thought that does not enter into dialogue or dialogic relations with the other, that does not exhibit intertextuality in both time and space . . . . Monologic refer to any discourse which seek to deny the dialogic nature of existence, which refuses to recognize its responsibility as addressee, ... (p. 247)

Emerson and Holquist (1981) describe dialogism for Bakhtin as the

> . . . epistemological mode of a world dominated by heteroglossia. Everything means, is understood, as a part of a greater whole – there is a constant interaction between meanings, all of which have the potential of conditioning others. (Glossary, p. 426)

Dialogism or dialogic relations then can be thought of as relational mode of seeing the world and of making sense of it. Through the concept of dialogism, we can further

understand Bakhtin's other widely used concept, heteroglossia. Before I move on to defining heteroglossia though, a description of what Bakhtin meant by discourse is significant. Bakhtin (1981) thought of discourses as "forms for conceptualizing the world in words, specific world views, each characterized by its own objects, meanings and values" (p. 291- 292). Heteroglossia is a term first seen through Bakhtin's writings. "Raznorechie" in the Russian language means "different-speech-ness" (Morris, 1994, p. 248). On a societal level, Morris (1994) explains heteroglossia as the "conflict between. . . 'official' and 'unofficial' discourses within the same national language" (p. 248). On a micro-linguistic level, it means that everything that someone utters has within it the "trace of other utterances, both in the past and in the future"; utterances that consist of sometimes conflicting or multiple discourses (Morris, 1994, p. 249). Morris (1994) notes that heteroglossia does not mean the existence of two or more languages or dialects within a society. This is referred to as polyglossia.

Conclusion

Voice as an autonomous, stable, and abstract object (Lensmire, 1998) is no longer a reliable and useful conceptualization when we examine youth media. Instead, voice, including youth voice is full of conflict and tensions and full of citationality (Bakhtin, 1981). Both Lensmire's (1998) and Dussell and Dayha's (2017) conceptualizations and critiques on voice inform how I approach student voice in my study, as I foreground the conflicts, struggles and "pushes and pulls" (Lensmire, 1998, p. 278) of doing youth media in the classroom, throughout my study. I do this to more deeply understand how youth voice gets constructed, how it is silenced, or how it is pitted against other youth voices. Understanding Bakhtin's (1981) discursive ideas of dialogism and heteroglossia and the

meaning of utterances can help us interpret how the students at Lakeview High reflected on their practices, norms and beliefs surrounding video production in their school. These new paradigms of studying student expression and youth media line up with Bakhtinian dialogic perspectives on voice and identity.

Discourses at the national level on education curriculum and policy, on literacy education like in-school vs. out-of-school learning, on race issues, youth media consumption and many more continue to be debated through media outlets, small and large, and their corresponding platforms of social media sites. It is therefore not a surprise that students in the Lakeview High School media education classroom spoke through and with some of these discourses. The fields of youth media, new literacies and classroom ethnographies on race, along with a Bakhtinian approach to language and identity, provide the theoretical and analytical framing for my study. In the chapters that follow these lenses help me explicate the process of media making in a video production class in a predominantly middle-class, white, suburban high school in the Northeast.

CHAPTER 3

VIDEO-CUED ETHNOGRAPHY AND YOUTH MEDIA

Introduction

As the places and spaces of youth media and media education continue to evolve, so do the methodologies that researchers deploy. Studying literacy practices that feature video and other multimodal modes require, I contend, methodologies that can account for the participants' voices, while equally accounting for the context, and for the process of the construction of voice. The tendency in the past, when it comes to these kinds of dynamic and multimodal education projects is for researchers to overlook the process and to focus instead only on the artifact that the student or student groups create. The rationale is that the artifact represents the knowledge, identity, and voice of the student. However, what these types of media text analysis miss is crucial to understanding the meaning-making process that happens in video production.

Ethnography for Youth Media

In this study, I carried out a video-cued classroom ethnography in order to be able to capture the meaning-making process, the literacies learning and the perspectives of the students. My project is a video-cued classroom ethnography. "Video-cued," because I used scenes from videos I recorded of the students' media-making process as cues for focus-group interviews with the students and teacher. "Classroom," because I conducted the study in a particular classroom and treated this one classroom as its own culture. "Ethnography" as opposed to, say a case study, because I privileged insiders' (emic) views; foregrounded the classroom culture (e.g., its discourses, practices, beliefs and areas of dissension); acknowledged and used my own outsiderness as a methodological

tool, as I asked the participants to explain to me their practices and beliefs. My primary

audience for this ethnography are readers outside of this classroom -- youth media

scholars, researchers and practitioners. To be clear, the videos I shot and edited for this

study are not the data, they are the instruments I used to cue my informants. It is their

reflections on the video cues, their words that are the data, the "stuff" that I present and

analyze in the pages that follow are the core of this dissertation. After I complete my

dissertation, I could edit the videos and create "a video ethnography" that would be a

companion to this written ethnography.

In this project I set out to understand how students made sense of the role that a

media production class had for them within their school in a middle-class, predominantly

white community in the Northeast of the United States. How did student voice unfold in

this classroom while they created videos for their weekly student news TV program and

how was voice impacted by the discourses, practices, beliefs and structures of the class?

Ethnographic research sets out to examine and understand people's daily lives and

culture. Researchers observe and document social life "in order to render an account of a

group's culture" (Saldaña, 2011, p.4). This methodology relies mostly on "interpreting or

understanding the meanings that humans attach to their actions" (O'Reilly, 2009, p.16).

Youth media research, in conjunction with ethnography shows that these

pedagogies and curricula, when implemented in out-of-school learning environments

such as after-school, youth organizations and other structured out-of-school learning

sites, can be transformative for young people. These educational experiences especially

where video is the prime mode of communication, provide possibilities for youth

engagement, enabling young people to insert their voice into the public sphere, to explore

personal expression and identity and to participate in community (e.g. Buckingham, 2003; Duncan-Andrade, 2007; Morrell, Dueñas, Garcia & López, 2013; Goodman, 2003; Halverson, 2010; Jocson, 2013; Turner, 2011). While my study centers around these same issues of voice, agency and self-expression, it differs in that I intentionally conducted my study in an in-school setting so I could examine the constraints and nuances of youth media-inspired classes when they are situated inside a classroom. In doing so, I am responding to media education's call to study in-school media-making spaces (Stornaiuolo & Nichols, 2018) in addition to out-of-school or "not-school" (Sefton-Green, 2013) spaces.

Conducting an ethnography in a high school media production class gave me the chance to observe and collect data in the classroom as student life unfolded and to consider the intersections of schooling practices with youth media practices. By focusing on the media production practices as they unfolded in the class, I examined the everydayness and the rituals of a media class. I worked from a constructivist paradigm (Cresswell, 2018) which allowed me to look at the ways in which student voice was constructed through and within the constraints and possibilities that the culture of school offers, and as such examined what Lensmire (1998) called the "pushes and pulls of actually speaking and writing in classrooms" (p.278). I designed my research questions and research methods for this dissertation to consider these pushes and pulls of doing video production and media literacy in a classroom.

Motivated by resent research on youth media, (Blum-Ross, A. 2017; Dahya, 2017; Dussel, I. & Dahya, N. 2017, Hague, 2014; Jocson, 2018), which asks education researchers to take a critical look at the role of voice and representation in media

education settings, I set out to look at the opportunities as well as the obstacles that students encounter as they make weekly TV shows covering a range of cultural and social topics for their peers and teachers. I viewed how knowledge was co-constructed through the students' participation and interaction within the class and thus looked at literacy and learning as a social practice (Street, 1984; Lave & Wenger, 1991). The sociocultural perspective of literacy, as articulated in the New Literacy Studies (Street, 1984; Gee, 1990, 2015) called for doing ethnographic work on literacy learning in order to provide a situated and social perspective of literacy as opposed to an autonomous, isolated, skill perspective. Jean Lave & Etienne Wenger (1991) also argued for looking at learning not as a realm of acquisition but instead as participation and contended that all kinds of learning should be seen as situated. With these theoretical underpinnings, I set out to examine voice and the literacy practices of a high school student news production class.

I used my field site and video-cued classroom ethnography, which I will explain in the following section, to answer the following research questions:

1. How does student voice get shaped in this media production classroom?

2. What role does student voice have for the students and the school?

Video-cued Classroom Ethnography

In order to explore the social practices that emerge in high school classes featuring video production pedagogy within the culture of school, I conducted the study as a multivocal, video-cued classroom ethnography. As the name of it implies, this is a specific kind of ethnography that uses video as both an interview tool and as a method that gives the ethnography a multivocal dimension. At the core of the method is the idea that an edited video can be shown and reshown to various participants, allowing for the

production of a dialogue among people across time and space. The method was first

developed by anthropologist Joseph Tobin and his colleagues (Tobin, Wu & Davidson,

1989) in order to produce a series of perspectives, or "voices," each commenting on the

same video-taped preschool activities and thereby prompting teachers, parents and

administrators to reflect on familiar and differing educational practices. The videos were

particularly useful when comparing educational practices among practitioners from

different countries, socio-economic classes and cultures (Tobin, Wu & Davidson, 1989;

Tobin, 2019). Because of the nature of video to capture a moment in time, the researchers

were able to compare educational practices across time and revisit the same preschools

twelve years later to have a diachronic conversation among new and old practitioners

(Tobin, Hsueh & Karasawa, 2009). Since the initial study, the methodology has been

taken up by numerous anthropologists and social scientists (Adair & Kurban, 2019;

Campbell & Valauri, 2019; Colegrove, 2019; Valente, 2019). Having used this

methodology in their own research, Adair & Kurban (2019) write:

> Video-cued ethnography is a mechanism that helps make implicit thinking visible.
> The primary goal of video-cued ethnography is to prompt discussions that help
> participants reveal their lives, experiences and worldviews, as a means to privilege
> insider voice. (p.314)

Focusing on "insider voice" or emic perspectives of the participants is key to this

methodology and by foregrounding participants' accounts of their lived experiences,

addresses the problem of the ethnographer representing the "other'." The method

encourages participants to establish for themselves what is most important to talk about

as they go through the video-cued interview process. This key element of the

methodology helped me address the youth media studies' concern that there are too many "unidimensional narratives" (Dussel & Dahya, 2017) or "cheerleading" narratives (Soep & Chavez, 2010) presented as the outcomes of this kind of research. The multivocality that the method offered me, through its use of multiple perspectives helped me answer my research questions on voice and creative expression in a high school media production class.

Research has shown that populations such as high school students often do not give rich responses in research interviews due to issues of trust, insecurity, or being uncomfortable in intimate one-to-one interviews. Adair and Kurban (2019) reason why a video-cued method works well with underrepresented populations and communities: "Video as a cue can be more compelling and accessible to informants than verbal questions, which tend to be more abstract and distancing" (p. 36), and they state it is "especially useful when the research involves groups that are not accustomed to participating in research projects" (p.36). I chose the video-cued method as I was aware that the majority of the students in my study were not accustomed to participating in interviews for research projects. However, the high school students in my project were familiar with the video production process that they engaged with which made me comfortable implementing a visual methodology with them. The students had self-enrolled in the elective media production class and most of them were media savvy and on their way to understanding video and film's biases and affordances. This was important to me when choosing this visual methodology because I felt that the more knowledge and skills the study participants had on media-making, the more empowered they would feel to participate and to respond comfortably in the video-cued interviews. I

also took in consideration some concerns that have been raised about using video as a research tool with students. Jocson (2018) explains the complexity and sensitivity that is needed when doing ethnographic work that is about, with, or in youth media production:

> On one hand, the visual affords layered meanings in representation and allows [youth] creators to lace image with sound and printed text through the use of digital technologies. On the other, the visual implies transparency and identification that may reinforce the dominant gaze on racialized and minoritized groups...The implications of digitality and visuality are significant to researching youth media. (p. 147)

Because of this, I use pseudonyms to identify the students and teacher. I also utilize transcripts of the video broadcasts in my analysis instead of including a link to the videos, even though these videos are part of the public domain as they are published on YouTube.

Context of the Study

I conducted my research in a media production elective course in a public high school. The curriculum of the class centered around the weekly production of a student news and entertainment show that was shown throughout the school and through the local community media access network. The weekly cycle usually began with a pitch meeting where student producers pitched their topics to the student leaders and then ended the following week with a classroom screening that served as a de-briefing of the weeks' segments and as a moment of critique and feedback. Each week followed a similar schedule. Students engaged in mostly self-directed learning activities including group discussions, researching their topics online, contacting individuals or groups to interview for their segments, scouting locations, filming in

their neighborhoods, writing monologues, and making video editing decisions. As a participant observer inside the classroom my goal was to observe and document through field notes, and then to capture on video how the students engaged in these daily activities.

Site Selection

My study was intentionally conducted in an 'in-school' setting, so I could examine a youth media-inspired curriculum situated in a formal educational setting. During my initial visits to the site, I noted how the curriculum brought in components from out-of-school structured youth media programs where students voluntarily sign up to learn about media production. I recognized this kind of teaching and learning, from my years teaching in community-based media programs. What was different though, was that we were in a high school classroom inside a school with its own school culture.

Many of the studies carried out on youth media take place in after school settings such as Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCAs, and public access TV centers. In these spaces learning is treated as spontaneous and fun, and boundaries can easily be broken. Julian Sefton-Green has coined a term for these kinds of spaces: "not-school" (2013). These not-school spaces have historically been sites where instructors can experiment with new technologies and engage in experiential, hands-on, student-centered, and self-directed learning styles. In contrast, in the media and tech learning that takes place inside school classrooms, we can assume that there will be more restrictions on learning styles, language use and on topics that students can focus on in their media projects due to the norms and rules of schooling.

Not-school spaces also have constraints. For one, there is often low or inconsistent attendance as the students voluntarily choose if they want to sign up. Even when students do sign up and are interested in attending, other priorities in their lives often take over, such as part-time

55

jobs, sports, or family responsibilities. Spotty attendance in after-school learning settings leads to a lack of commitment and investment in the projects by the students and the instructors. In addition, many non-profits and community media organizations struggle with funding, programming and staffing issues, all variables that affect the teaching and learning of the student media projects.

This study, in contrast, was conducted in an in-school, formal educational setting. I was intrigued to explore how video media education plays out in a high school classroom inside a school with its own practices, structures and beliefs. After visiting several local high schools, I found one that had a video production class that met my criteria. The classroom I chose had regular attendance and a consistent curriculum, following a recurring schedule of weekly activities. This was important for my research as I needed to observe and document routines and daily activities. Most important, I chose this site because from my initial visits, I got a sense that there was a high investment from the teacher and students in the video curriculum I would be studying. The class and its curriculum had been taught for several years, so it had developed its own culture and history. As I engaged in my participant observations, I realized that this culture and history would play a role in the students' perceptions and understandings of the norms of the class culture. Finally, I chose this site because it would allow me to examine what happens when high school students are given the freedom to make and produce a weekly news show in a way similar to how out-of-school youth media programs function. In other words, the setting allowed me to explore: What happens when youth media goes to school?

Geographic and Socioeconomic Context

Lakeview High School is located in a small Northeastern city with an estimated population of less than 30,000. The school's enrollment is about 1000 students. The ethnic

background of the student body is: 75% white, 13% Hispanic, 4% Asian, 5% Multi-Race, non-Hispanic, and 3% African-American. Socioeconomically, 20% of the students are labeled as economically disadvantaged (based on free and reduced lunch), 30% as high needs and 5% as students with disabilities. 7% of the students are labeled as English not being their first language and 2% as English Language Learners. Over 80% of its graduates continue their education, with half attending four-year colleges. This snapshot of the school and its city is meant to give a social, racial and economic location for the study. I will provide more in-depth descriptions of the participants and city later in this chapter as well as in the findings and analysis sections.

Research Participants

The student participants were all enrolled in a one semester elective media production class, from September to January. As a class they participated in producing the school's student news weekly show. In total there were 20 students who returned the signed parental permission slips and assent forms for the study. The participants ranged from 10th to 12th grade (see participant list in Appendix). Students who were enrolled in the class but did not sign the participation forms were not included in the interviews or focus groups, and I did not include them in the video sequences.

The teacher was also a participant in the study. The media production teacher was a white, European American male who had been teaching high school media production classes for over five years and who had earned a master's degree in learning and media technology.

Researcher Positionality: A Woman with a Camera

Reflexivity in ethnographic research means that the researcher carries an "awareness that ethnographies are constructed by human beings who make choices about

what to research, interpret what they see and hear, decide what to write and how, and that they do all this in the context of their own personal biographies…" (O'Reilly, 2009, p. 189). My own personal biography consisted of both a theoretical and practitioner perspective on student voice in media production youth classes. My professional experience of leading community and youth media programs in New York City with high school and middle school students, youth mentors, and K-12 teachers demonstrated to me how making media and telling stories is transformative but also complex and nuanced in a number of ways, including issues of race, class, gender and disability. My researcher positionality meant being aware of this prior knowledge. It also meant taking into consideration the implications of using the technology of video as a research tool.

I also was sensitive to my multiple social locations or, to use another term, my intersectionality (Crenshaw, 2017) and how this would be perceived by the study's participants. For example, I was aware of my role as an outsider to this high school media production class as well as my role as an adult with more power than the youth I was studying. Furthermore, I was conscious of the power that a video camera gives off -- the power to capture something and make it permanent and open for future interpretations. Simultaneously, however, I was also aware of my societal lack of power as a Latina, from an immigrant family, in comparison to the students and the male teacher who were predominantly of European white-descent and middle class. Throughout my study I was aware of all these intersections of my social positions, and I tried to locate myself in the study "honestly and openly, in an admission that observations are filtered through our own experience, rather than seeking to provide the detached voice of authority" (O'Reily, p. 191).

Data Collection

My primary data consisted of the focus group interview data with my participants. In addition, my participant observations and the student-made media texts were data as well (see Table I.).

Table I. Overview of Data

Data sources:	Medium
Ethnographic field notes	Field notes documents and memos
Video-cued focus groups with students	Audio files and transcription See Table II.
Video-cued interview with teacher	Audio files and transcription See Table II.
Student-made videos	Available on the class's public YouTube channel

Research Video Recordings

The video recordings were research instruments to video-cue the participants during our focus group interview. I video recorded the participants inside the media production classroom and in various locations in the school environment, depending on where the students' film shoots took place. In total, I video recorded six different student production groups each for 3-4 hours spread throughout the school week. This cumulated to a total of 18 hours of research video footage. I then edited this footage into six, 5-12 minute films (see Table II) that I then used as video interviewing cues. I also created six mini video clips of "youth media moments" that were meaningful to my research questions. These were between 30 seconds to 4 minutes long and were also used to video-cue the participants (see Table II).

Table II. Researcher-made Videos

	Research Videos for Video-Cued Focus Groups	Video Duration
1.	Crafts Show Sequence	12 min.
2.	Friends Show Sequence	10 min.

3.	Politics Now! Sequence	5 min.
4.	Saucy Sauce Interview Show Sequence	8 min.
5.	Our Cultures Sequence	4 min.
6.	Class Student Leaders Sequence	8 min.
	Youth Media Moments	
1.	Film-critique: Teacher and Will disagreement	30 sec.
2.	Teacher, Jess, & Politics Now! group talk about their show	1 min. 50 sec.
3.	Pitch meeting: Saucy Sauce Interview Show students express frustrations	4 min.
4.	Quiet conversations between student leaders and teacher	45 sec.
5.	Asian stereotypes: Conversation between Nina and Isaac selecting music for segment	2 min.
6.	Pitch meeting: Culture pitch from Angela	50 sec.
7.	Film-critique: Pendulum of Informative and Entertaining media	1 min. 43 sec.

Video-cued Focus Groups

Focus-group interviews made up the bulk of my data. In the second phase of the project and several weeks after the completion of the video sequences, I conducted semi-structured focus groups consisting of 2-5 students each, depending on the number of students in each production group (see Table III). The focus group interviews with the students lasted between 30 and 60 minutes. All the focus group interviews were transcribed by a professional transcription service, Rev.com.

Table III. Video-cued Focus Group Interviews

	Participants (pseudonyms)	Date	Duration	Location of Focus Group	Recording formats	Transcribed
01	Theresa, Samantha & Matt	December 20, 2019	35 min.	Robotics and Shop Classroom	Audio files and face screen shots	Rev.com

02	Tiana, Lina, Lennie, Clint & Elliot	January 10, 2020	50 min.	Robotics and Shop Classroom	Audio files and face screen shots	Rev.com
03	Francis & Richard	January 13, 2020	50 min.	Robotics and Shop Classroom	Audio file and face screen shots	Rev.com
04	Connor, Nathaniel & Kyle	January 14, 2020	30 min.	Robotics and Shop Classroom	Audio file	Rev.com
05	Angela & Sandy (ASL interpreter)	February 2, 2020	30 min.	Robotics and Shop Classroom	Video and audio files	Rev.com
06	Jess & Nina	February 14, 2020	1 hr.	Robotics and Shop Classroom	Audio file	Rev.com
07	Adrien (Teacher)	March 27, 2020	1 hr. and 5 min.	Zoom Tele Interview	Zoom Video Recordings	Rev.com
08	Adrien (Teacher)	April 3, 2020	1 hr. and 25 min.	Zoom Tele Interview	Zoom Video Recordings	Rev.com

Video-cued Interview

In addition to the six focus groups I conducted with students, I showed the same video sequences during the video-cued interview with the classroom teacher. We had two video-conferenced interviews for a total of 2.5 hours which I recorded and then had transcribed (see Table III.).

Phase I: Participant Observation and Research Video Design

In the first phase of my study, I began with participant observation and then moved on to collecting video footage of the class. For the first four weeks of the study, I

only did participant observations. During this time, I did not do video recordings. My intent was to observe the class first with my own senses, unmediated by the camera, to see, hear and sense the class institutional and social structures, the class routines, and the everyday feel of the class. For this reason, it was important to not begin these initial participant observation visits with a video device pointing at the students. I also felt that this would help develop trust between the students and myself by making myself more available. This made it easier for me to walk around the class, say hello to students, ask them what they were working on, and become familiar with their media projects. It also left me more open to take in "extra" or peripheral information that helped me understand the culture of this class, but that would not have been so obvious to me at first. An example of this kind of peripheral data was meeting another technology teacher down the hall who would often come in the class to chit chat with the Adrien, the video production class teacher.

In this initial period of participant observation and taking notes I began to get a sense of not only the rhythm of the class but also of the class groupings. There were six or seven groups on any given week, each with 2 to 5 students. These were video production groups of students who worked together on making a video for the *Archive*, the student news show. I came up with pseudonyms for the names of the groups that would reflect the topic of the segments they produced for the *Archive* and that had a similar tone to the original title, i.e. silly title, straight forward title etc. For example, the group with Theresa, Samantha and Matt who worked on a segment interviewing teachers about their hobbies I named "The Craft Show" group. This group did the same style and format for their videos every week and it consisted of making a craft with a teacher (see

62

Table V. for a description of student production groups). I met with each group casually during my participant observations to get a sense of how open they were to participate in the video-cued ethnography. Even though many students returned their signed consent forms, I took this opportunity to make sure they understood that I would be videotaping their group and through these casual conversations, I was able to confirm that they were okay with this.

In the next part of phase I, selected the groups I was going to follow for a week as they produced their weekly TV segments. My conversations with the teacher helped me make this decision. The teacher tended to recommend groups that were working out well and that met the class's deadline of producing a piece every week. I agreed to follow some of these productive groups; however, I also knew that I wanted to follow some groups that were having trouble with the requirements and curricula, having trouble fitting into the class, and therefore producing less. Again, getting to understand the culture of the class including its disagreements and tensions meant that I needed to see the diversity of the class, from the most to least productive groups of students. In choosing which groups to video follow I was also attentive to select groups that represented a cross section of gender, race, ethnicity, and ability as well as topics.

Group Video-shadowing

I began collecting video for my video-cued classroom ethnography by following the Craft Show group. This group, who in their focus group interview identified themselves as the "try-hards," was made up of Samantha, a European American senior, Matt, an Asian and Hispanic American junior, and Theresa, a European American sophomore. They were clearly high achieving students who followed the rules and for

whom getting an "A" was very important. I initially followed them for two days for one week. This was a practice-run for me, see what technical and logistical issues I might run into with camera positioning, lighting, and sound. After this practice-run I spoke to the group and got their input on which production week coming up would be good for me to shoot. They recommended I video-record them two weeks later for a shoot they were going to do centering on the upcoming Thanksgiving holiday.

Between the upcoming shoot I began to video record general footage inside the classroom and routine events like the weekly pitch and debrief meetings. During this time, I also followed the "Our Cultures" show group for three days of their production. This group was made up of Angela, a deaf student in the class of Hispanic and European American mixed race, her school interpreter, Sandy, and Kelly, a European American student. One day when I was filming here and there in the class, I noticed that Angela and Kelly were prepping the cameras to go out on a shoot. I asked them if I could help them out and come with them and they said "Sure!" I knew I wanted to do a shoot of one of Angela's projects, but I hadn't gotten around to scheduling it, so when this opportunity presented itself, I jumped at it and also tried to be of production assistance along the way.

Angela's videos were about the different race and ethnicities of students in the high school. Her idea was to interview individuals about the culture they identified with and in her words, "to get an idea of who the people are here in school. Not just the group of people that seem to be most common, I wanted to learn about other people's opinions, their rights, what they see in the world, if I could" (Angela, Interview, Feb. 2, 2020). At this point in the school year, she had produced two videos for the student news show-- one where she interviewed a student who identified as Puerto-Rican and another segment

on Deaf culture. Angela herself identified as mixed-race Italian and Puerto-Rican. The week I followed her she was interviewing fellow students for a project on Paganism.

After following and video-recording the Craft Show group, I followed the "Friends" group, who had done a few segments of different genres and topics. This group had fluctuating membership. The week I followed them they were investigating the purpose of the non-profit organization the College Board and questioning some of its biases. Their goal was to inform their peers about this issue. I am calling them the "Friends" group because of all the groups I followed this group seemed to get along best and like each other the most. The group was comprised of three boys -- Elliot, Clint and Timothy (all three white, European American), and two girls, Tiana and Lina. Tiana identified as African American and Lina as white European American. With the exception of Lina who was a junior, everyone else was a senior.

Another group that also had different members at different times was the group the rest of the class called "Sauce." The standing name of the segment they produced was "Saucy Sauce Interview Show." As the name suggests, it was a sit-down interview style show where the host and the guest ate very spicy food while they conversed on different topics that pertained to the school. The show was based on a famous YouTube show that has a similar theme, with participants in the YouTube show, who are celebrities, eating hot wings while they discuss politics, popular culture, and other topics. The Saucy Sauce group was having a hard time meeting deadlines and sticking to the protocols of the class and curriculum. Yet, the times they did manage to produce a segment the teacher and many other students were very excited and pleased with the results. The group was comprised of all boys. The week I followed them the participants were Connor, Kyle,

Nate, Will, and Adam. With the exception of Kyle, who identified of mixed race, white and Asian, the rest of the group identified as white, European American.

Lastly, I followed and videoed the "Politics Now!" group. This was a group of two students, boy and girl who produced a news show where their goal was to cover national news of the moment and present it to their fellow students in an easy-to-understand and funny way. The group was comprised of senior Francis, (who wrote the weekly monologue) and junior, Richard, who did all the camera work and editing. They both identified as white, European American. Through many of our informal conversations, I learned that they were proud of the hard work they put in and were also proud that they did not participate in all the "not-work" stuff that happened in the class, like gossip, drama, and messing around.

In addition to the above groups of students producing weekly segments, I also videoed the two student leaders of the class, Nina and Jess, two female European American students. Nina and Jess did not produce weekly segments; instead, their roles were to act as Senior Producer and Senior Editor. They had taken the same class the previous year and this year had been chosen by the teacher to serve in leadership roles. Their implicit role in the class was also to act as an intermediary between the teacher and the rest of the students. Nina and Jess were friends and they tended to stick together, hanging out in the same section of the classroom. They often walked out for breaks together and in general occupied similar roles on the hierarchy of the teacher to student spectrum. Many out-of-school youth media programs create these student leader positions, often calling them "peer leaders" and calling the learning strategy "peer-to-peer learning." These positions are often created by adults in media education to de-center the

66

teacher and make the media production process as student centered and directed as possible.

All together I followed and video-recorded six groups: Crafts Show, Friends Show, Politics Now! Show, Saucy Sauce Interview Show, and Our Cultures Show, as well as the two student leaders. There was a total of 16 students in the focus groups and a total of 20 students in the study (see Table IV in Appendix). For each group my main goal while videorecording was to capture the students making their weekly news show and "doing" this media production class -- fitting in or not fitting in, accepting the norms or rejecting them, as well as playing the authentic roles of video producer, investigative journalist, TV writer, video editor, and camera person.

Following the video-cued ethnography methodology, I tried to take the same steps for each group in my own video production process and thus video-recorded the production cycle for each group. However, what I quickly learned was that because each group was different, my process of video recording each group also ended up looking different. For example, according to the curriculum each group had one full week to research, discuss and pitch their topic, interview or act out their segments, edit them, and then submit their finished segments to the senior editor. However, the steps the students took to create and complete their segments were not evenly distributed throughout the week and many times the whole production process took place in just two to three days. Other times parts of the production process would occur during the weekends, and at other times groups did not finish the full production process in one week. All these factors made it so that my videotaping had to be adjusted and re-adjusted for each group.

Video Sequences for the Video-cued Interviews

After I videotaped one group, the next step was to edit the footage I had captured that week into a video sequence. In keeping with consistency and systematically collecting data, I created sequences that followed the same pattern for each group. For example, each sequence begins with "Day 1," and moves on chronologically through the week. Sequences include scenes from the pitch meetings, scenes of students setting up the gear, and scenes where the students are in the field or in school shooting their segments. I edited each of the videos to be between 5 and 12 minutes long (see Table II.). While video editing, my intention was to include scenes that reflected routine steps the students took in their production process and to highlight scenes that captured students engaged in making meaning about media representation, technical awareness, genre and topic selection.

Video Design for Video-cued Interviews. My aim was to create something like a "day in the life" kind of story. I chose to shoot with an "observational documentary." My intention with this choice of genre and tone was to give an objective quality to the video cues that I showed to the students. Because of this I chose not to add any music or narration to the edited videos. The editing style I was going for while creating the video sequences was similar to film montage. There are famous montage scenes in Hollywood movies there like the Rocky Balboa montage where he trains before his big fight. In film theory, a montage is "a series of edits that show an event or events that happen over time but are condensed into a brief episode of screen time." (Thompson & Bowen, 2009, p. 187). The purpose of this technique is to give the viewer a sense of time passing as the characters work towards a goal. This is different than an edit focusing on getting to know the characters through conversation or character development. I was influenced by this

technique because I wanted to create a video that focused on the "making of a TV show" process rather than on the content and storyline of the TV show. To do this, I edited bits and pieces of a variety of different activities that occurred during the week, emphasizing the students' actions over their conversations.

After conducting video-cued focus group interviews with the students from the first two groups (Craft Show and Friends Show) I realized that including more conversations among the students during their production process could prompt deeper discussions in the focus groups. Consequently, for the rest of the video sequences I tried to include longer scenes where the viewer could follow a conversation, while still keeping the genre of montage in order to show the passing of time.

Some Reflections on Researching with Video

The videotaping was a tool I employed in order to prompt my informants. I created them with my research questions in mind. I edited and crafted these videos with the goal of selecting shots and scenes I anticipated would function best as interviewing cues for students who worked on each project, who were the insiders to my ethnography and my primary audience. The videos undoubtedly include some of my interpretations, as I selected footage from a larger corpus of data. Similarly, when I was filming in the classroom, I was in a sense already introducing a level of interpretation as I chose what to include in the frame and what to leave out.

As I began editing and creating these sequences, I quickly realized that working with the footage in the digital software (Adobe Premiere Pro) offered me an opportunity to reflect as a researcher on what had happened in the field that week. Working with the video footage -- watching, listening, logging and sorting -- was a way of writing field

notes for myself. This activity also allowed me to virtually revisit my field site. I was able to re-experience and re-interpret the field visits by seeing things I had not seen while I was filming. I was able to zoom into a scene or pause the video to examine what was happening in the background. These are all affordances given to me by working with the medium of video.

Another aha moment I had while creating the video sequences was that this was a preliminary form of data analysis. While editing in Premiere Pro I was confronted with decision-making that brought together my analytical and technical video skills. When working with editing software you must choose how to organize your video footage by naming and labeling it and placing it creating bins. In a sense this is akin to coding as a way of categorizing your footage to help you navigate your edit decisions more efficiently. As I began this process, I found myself creating bins that I anticipated would be possible themes for my analysis at a later date. For example, I shot footage of a moment where a student is voicing his wish to leave class early and I capture him saying, "Why do I have to watch the broadcast [again]?" The student felt he didn't need to stay for the weekly class film screening and watch the videos together with the rest of the class, but the teacher thought otherwise. I immediately felt that this would be a video clip that was meaningful to my research questions and that I would want to come back to in my analysis and include in my writing. I was faced with a decision to label the bin I would put this clip into, thus beginning my analytical framing. I could label it "Classroom film screenings" and use the bin to hold video clips that have to do with the film screenings that happened every week as part of the curriculum of the class. I could also label it "dissonance between video production pedagogy and students." Or I could

label it "non-traditional school time" and use this bin to hold clips that describe how this classroom works in a non-traditional way compared to other subject areas like English, History or Math. Therefore, my video editing was a crucial stage in my data analysis and meaning-making.

Phase II: Video-cued Focus Group Interviews

In Phase II of the study, I began the focus group interviews with the participants. I used the video sequences as a cue to interview the students. In the video-cued method, the videos function like interview questions do in most qualitative studies, as a prompt to get people talking. I began each interview in a similar manner. I reminded the students of my research agenda about the practices of a student news production class and then went on to explain that we were going to watch a video I had edited from the footage I captured during production process. I then played the video-cues, and we watched it together.

The first focus group I conducted was with the Craft Show group. The focus-group interview took place in a classroom down the hall from the media technology classroom, where the robotics and shop classes were taught. The space looked more like a repair shop than a traditional classroom, but I didn't see a problem in using this space for the interviews. The pros outweighed the cons as the space was empty, quiet, near the media technology classroom yet separate, and had enough furniture to conduct interviews. I conducted all of the student focus group interviews in this space. For these interviews I set up my laptop on one of the tables available and asked the students to sit around it or in front of it, depending on how big the group was. I usually sat near the laptop in order to hit the "play" and "stop" buttons, situating myself in a way I could still see the screen. I set up my smartphone on a mini-tripod facing the students in

order to record the interview. For most of the interviews I began recording right after watching

the video cues and did not record the students watching the videos. I was unsure about whether

to record the students watching the video or just during the interview. Because of fear of running

out of memory on the smartphone, I tended to begin the audio recording just for the interview

portion. I did however make notes of anything that was said while we watched the video. For

example, sometimes students made comments under their breath like "Oh I look so. . ." or they

would giggle or comment on a peer's appearance in the video.

Once the video was over, I asked the students to tell me what they thought about it. I

stuck to open-ended questions in this first part of the interview as I wanted the video, we had just

watched to prompt their insight on their meaning-making process. After the "What do you think"

question, I asked more specifically "In what ways does the video represent "a week in the life" in

this class while you make your TV segments?" Then, I asked them to comment on specific youth

media practices that appeared in the video, and on their choices and meaning-making processes.

According to Adair and Kurban (2019) video-cued ethnography is:

> a way to prompt people to reveal their own thinking in ways that are reflective and
>
> compelling, rather than clinical or forced. And video-cued ethnography is a way to
>
> compare how people think about practices, policies, ideas, strategies, decisions,
>
> environments, institutions, discourses or materials. (p.327)

Once I finished conducting all six focus groups of students, I conducted video-cued interviews

with the class teacher, Adrian. I showed Adrian all six video sequences as well as some of the

short clips of life in the classroom. I did the interviews with Adrian virtually, through an online

video-conferencing platform, utilizing the function of screen share in order to watch the video

sequences simultaneously. This was necessary because the Covid-19 pandemic had begun right

around this time, making it impossible for me to visit the school anymore. After watching each video sequence, we discussed it, and I recorded the interview through the video conferencing platform. We had two video conferences, one for an hour and the other for one and a half hours.

This phase in the study also served as a member-check strategy as I asked the students and the teacher if the videos accurately represented their media practices and, if not, how not. I also confirmed with them if they felt the videos were suitable to show to the other stakeholders and informed them that if there was any section of the videos they felt uncomfortable with I would delete it.

Data Analysis

In my analysis, I looked at the cultural practices of a video production high school class. Each of the six groups I followed served as instances of the cultural practices of the class. The practices and not the individual groups, students or the teacher were my unit of analysis. By seeing the six groups carry out similar video production activities, I got a sense of the central practices, norms, and beliefs of this class, as well as of variations and tensions.

I treated, both the things I observed during my field visits-- the routines, class discussions and informal conversations, and the student responses from the focus group interviews as being evidence of a classroom culture and therefore treated all of it as data to analyze. In addition, I used the student video texts as artefact data. I did not do a media text analysis of the student videos. Instead by using the video-cued interview data, my field notes, along with the student videos as artefacts, I was able to focus on my research questions about how student voice is enacted in an in-school media production class and examine the process of student media-making.

Instead of using any one discourse analysis method for my observations, notes and interview data I looked for underline meanings, heteroglossia, dialogism and authoritative discourses. Some of these concepts come from Bakhtin, while other concepts come from a semiotic-influenced lens that have been used in language and literacy studies (Kress, 2003, 2010, 2014). This perspective suggests that each mode of communication, be it speech, moving or still image, writing, color, layout etc. offers discrete possibilities and constraints (Kress, 2003). Through this lens I explored the modal affordance and uses of film and video technologies, in a particular setting as shaped by materiality, history, and the social norms and conventions that this mode has repeatedly been used for (Kress, 2003).

Through Bakhtinian dialogism, I analyzed the students' utterances in the transcripts with an eye on instances of heteroglossia, such as citationality or hybrid construction of language. I also used a Bakhtinian lens when making meaning of the student videos as evidence to support their talk and reflections from the focus groups. My analysis framework also takes into account the method of classroom ethnography (Nespor, 1997), which examines explicit and implicit rules, norms and conventions as well as beliefs and ideologies that were held by the class (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018).

Analytical Moves: Transcription, Indexing and Patterns

Using a professional transcription service, I had the six video-cued focus-group interviews and the two teleconference teacher interviews transcribed. I then prepared the transcripts by numbering each individual line and added the names of the participants to the transcripts.

After this and in a separate document I indexed each transcript. Indexing (Nespor, n.d.) is a process of writing out short descriptive phrases that characterize the content of the interview. The purpose of this analytical technique is to be able to see in a shorter document what that interview is about and thus to "find your way in and out of the data easily and effectively, without detaching the indexed sections from their original contexts within the notes and transcripts" (Nespor, n.d.). The descriptors are not concepts or categories. I followed this technique of staying away from concepts and instead using descriptive phrases. Periodically I used "in vivo codes" as descriptive phrases as I found the participants' language use to be helpful as a descriptor for the content. I included them in quotes. In vivo codes are used by researchers when using participants' "own language as a symbol system for qualitative data analysis" (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). Saldaña (2016) suggest that in vivo coding may be especially useful in educational ethnographies with youth. The child and adolescent voices are often marginalized, and coding with their actual words enhances and deepens an adult's understanding of their cultures and worldviews" (p. 106).

The next step I took after indexing each focus group transcripts as well as my observational notes and video recording notes was to write out patterns that I saw and copy and paste the indices into each pattern. For example:

Reactions from school members outside their TV production class
77-94 "We do get some hate"
88 Some other students not into it.
94 "We enjoy the hate"
96-100 Students also come up to them and positively comment on their segment.
102-106 Compliments from students in the hallway who they don't know
260-262 Respect the comments from other teachers and look forward to them every week

I identified in Interview 01 a pattern of the students reacting to the comments they received weekly from school members outside of the TV production class. Multiple teachers in the school showed the TV show to their classes, which meant that the student producers would receive both formal and informal feedback throughout the week. I created a category and then plugged in sections of the data that fit into this pattern. This analytical strategy would often lead to more notes or questions, which lead me to annotation.

Annotation is an iterative process done with the purpose of trying to understand "what is going on in/with/at the place/people/situation" (Nespor, n.d.,). It is similar to the strategy of memo writing. According to grounded theorists Strauss & Corbin (1998), the purpose of memo writing is to "open up the text and expose the thoughts" (p. 102). A memo is "the researcher's record of analysis, thoughts, interpretations, questions, and directions for further data collection" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 110). Additionally, Charmaz (2014) states that a memo(s) "catches your thoughts. . . crystallize(s) questions and directions for you to pursue. . . creates an interactive space for conversing with yourself" (p.162).

The analytical moves of indexing and patterning that I carried out during my data analysis are similar to open coding in grounded theory in the sense that it is a preliminary form of coding however, it is different. While looking for patterns and beginning to annotate sections that I thought were meaningful in my data I also looked at how the person or situation was situated in a wider world. Nespor (n.d.) describes the difference between this way of coding and the grounded theory "open coding":

Against the [grounded theory] "coding" approach's emphasis on looking only at what's in the text (ignoring even basic considerations of how interviews fit into the discourse communities of the interviewees), I would look closely at the text but see it as an entry way into understanding how this person is situated in a wider institutional, organizational, and political world. ("Possible Step 1a: Indexing and Annotation" section)

As much as possible I tried to annotate my transcripts and notes with this idea of contextualization in mind. This helped me to address and understand the interactions of schooling practices and social and cultural discourses. By combining an analytical framework of the modal affordances of video, with a method of video-cued and classroom ethnography and a Bakhtinian dialogical approach to making sense of utterances, visual as well as verbal, my study aimed to expand how scholars and educators can work toward transformative social change in youth media programs in schools.

Conclusion

In this study, I carried out a video-cued classroom ethnography inside a media production class in a middle-class, mostly white, European American high school. I chose this specific methodology because unlike a media text analysis, it allowed me to capture both the media making process and the voice of the students. Looking at youth media practices inside school, brings to the fore, how complex and at times contradictory youth voice can be. My tools of interpretation like citationality as well as the modal affordances of film and video equipped me to analyze student voice in a way that highlighted its heteroglossia and the heterogeneity of society. In my analysis this

77

included different perspectives on race and ethnicity, on schooling practices, on youth popular culture and on what kind of literacy practices are legitimate for school. I believe this methodology also had real-life benefits to the participants. This method gave the students the chance to reflect on their schooling experiences, something high school students are rarely given the chance to formally do. Through the interviews and the video sequences capturing their daily media-making routines, I implicitly told them that what they do and the media they create is significant and their voices, perspectives and ideas mattered.

CHAPTER 4

VIDEO, VOICE, AND RACE AT LAKEVIEW HIGH SCHOOL

I wanted to learn about different people's culture, and I thought interviewing might be fun, so I joined this group. I just like learning about what people think about their culture because everyone thinks a different thing about the same cultures, you know, even though they are all a part of it. So, I ask sort of the same questions for every culture and then see what people say.

(Angela, Senior at Lakeview High School)

Introduction

Much of the research on youth media has been conducted in programs in urban areas where students' racial make-up and ethnicities are highly diverse. There is less research that has studied media education in dominantly European-American, white and middle-class neighborhoods which have an increasingly multicultural student body. U.S. high schools are becoming increasingly diverse in terms of students' race and ethnicity, abilities, gender, and linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, studying a media production curriculum in a school such as Lakeview High School, a historically white, middle-class, increasingly diverse school can offer insights into how white students as well as their classmates of color enact student voice while making sense of matters of race, ethnicity and other diversity issues in their schools.

Schools are key institutions where North Americans "make each other racial" (Olsen, 1997) and this was true for my field site. My research recognizes students as "agentive selves" (Hull and Katz, 2006) and recognizes the funds of knowledge (Moll, 1992) they bring to the classroom and deploy as they make videos for their high school media production class. In the process of doing video production, we can see students engaged in what Pollock (2004b) calls "race wrestling." This chapter therefore is located at the intersection of research on youth media, race, and education. In this chapter I

address my research question: How does student voice get shaped in a media production classroom? I focus on issues of racial and ethnic diversity as they arose in the class and as they impacted student voice.

The media production curriculum that I will describe in this chapter includes 1.) a weekly film-critique screening, 2.) the unstructured video editing sessions and 3.) a weekly student-lead pitch meeting. I begin by providing background on the literature of whiteness studies and high school culture and then present the analytical concepts of citationality and modal affordances that frame my analysis. I then present my findings. Utilizing interview data from the video-cued focus group interviews as well as vignettes from my field observations, I present the students' voices and reflections as evidence to my claims. This is then followed by a conclusion to the chapter. First, however I present a short introductory vignette of the class's weekly film screening in order to begin to give the reader a sense of the culture of the class.

Introductory Vignette: Film Screenings

It is a Friday afternoon on a fall day as I sit with the students in the class to watch the videos they had made that week for their student news and entertainment show, called *The Archive*. A projection screen had been pulled down, dividing the classroom into two distinct spaces. Before I get to describing the film screening, I will briefly describe the physical space of the media production classroom. What I am naming "the open space" consisted of a small lounge in the corner with two cushioned benches for the students and a table holding the teacher's coffee machine. This space also contained equipment for video production, including tripods, lights, a few editing stations, and a large whiteboard. The room had wall to wall carpeting and a large open space in the center with no

furniture. This was where the weekly student-lead pitch meeting took place. The other part of the classroom, in contrast, looked more like a typical computer lab, with computer stations wrapped around the room, facing the wall and a small island of computer stations in the center of the room. I call this room "the computer lab" as this is where most of the students digitally video-edited their projects. This room also housed the lockers where the cameras were secured, a shelf with the camera batteries, and a projector screen that could be rolled down, when needed. This meant that sometimes while a film screening was going on, a few students could be hanging out in the open side of the room.

The weekly film screenings which I will refer to as film-critique meetings, took place once a week in the computer lab. Every Friday the class came together to watch, critique, discuss, laugh, share and debate their ideas as they watched the video segments from that week. During the film critique meetings students would huddle in front of the projection screen in the computer lab, forming a messy U shape. This weekly routine was referred to by the class as the "Friday film screening." Adrien, the media production teacher, led the screenings and utilized this time to give the students feedback on their productions. Following is a typical opening of the meeting:

> Adrien (Media Production Teacher): Kyle, Francis, Clint, Timothy, get away from the computer. Ok. Let's do this fast. Um, couple of things. Alright. So. A couple of things now that we have everybody here. Um, that I want to bring up. First up. It actually looked, uh, I was like, "Oh this is not gonna turn out well." But the broadcast was actually pretty dope this week. . . (Field Note, November 1, 2019)

Adrien usually stood in front of the room near the projector screen as he remarked on the week's "broadcast." He usually bounced back and forth from his desk to the front of the projector screen as he paused, fast-forwarded, or re-wound the videos to highlight and discuss cinematography, lighting, narrative or anything else that stood out for him

81

about the videos they were watching. On this particular Friday, as he paused the video

clips, I heard one student say, "Can you just let it play!" while another from the back

spoke out, "No, just keep going. I saw this already" and then his friend remarked, "I

never watch *The Archive*." The mood of these screenings was casual, and students often

spoke out without raising their hands. These specific comments described above

reminded me of what youth media practitioner and researcher, Steven Goodman (2003)

said happens when teachers bring video into the classroom: "[it] places in-school and out-

of-school media viewing habits in tension with each other" (p.70). This tension in these

sessions, along with the fact that the screenings brought together all of the students in the

class to watch the student-made videos, proved to be very useful for me as I strived to

gain a better understanding of the culture of the class, including matters of power and

race dynamics. For example, a brief exchange on diversity in the school came up while

we watched a segment where one of the student hosts, Elliot, a Euro-American student,

interviewed students in the school hallway using a "man on the street" interviewing style.

The teacher remarked on the student's choice of interviewees: "This is pretty good, but

people, you have to interview all students, more diverse." Jay a student producer from the

"Sports Show" then responded to Adrien's comment on the lack of diversity he was

seeing on the screen, "What do you want from us? We are a mostly white school!" Some

students giggled, while others didn't seem to hear. No one else commented, and the

teacher moved on with the film screening. Later in the chapter, I will come back to these

comments and explain why I think they are significant to my research on social and

cultural discourses that emerge as students make media. First, however, I present a

statistical overview of the school.

At Lakeview High, white students were the majority. However, there was a

significant percentage of students (almost 25%) that were not of Euro-American descent.

In 2020 about14% of students identified as Hispanic, 8% as multi-race non-Hispanic, 3%

Asian, and 3% African American. In my focus groups with students from the media

production class at Lakeview High, issues of race and ethnicity surfaced only a few

times, and in nuanced ways. Yet incidents I observed, including the one during the film

screening described above, suggest that race and ethnicity played a larger role than the

interviewees explicitly noted. Issues on race and ethnicity surfaced throughout the media

production curriculum, including during the weekly film-critique meetings, during the

video editing sessions, and during the student-led weekly pitch meetings. People in the

U.S. are speaking out about racial and cultural diversity issues and, in particular on the

need to recognize the effects that unjust racial and societal norms have on society. What

does this mean for the high school media production classroom? How are we to interpret

Adrien's comment about the students' TV show not being "diverse" enough? I turn to the

literature on whiteness studies and education to assist me in framing my data.

Theoretical Framing

Whiteness is a racial category. Like other racial categories, it is historically and

socially situated (Omi and Winant, 1994). One of the main ideas behind the concept of

whiteness is the tendency in the U.S. to only see, categorize and experience race when it

has to do with non-white and non-European-descendant racial identities (Bonilla-Silva,

2018; Fine et al., 1997). Bonilla-Silva (2018) explains, "whereas whiteness is not

perceived as a racial category, other categories are; whereas a white neighborhood is a

'normal' neighborhood, a black neighborhood is 'racially segregated'" (p.129). Tatum

(1997) states that in the U.S. there are dominant identities and non-dominant identities, and it is the dominant racial identities that are seen as the norm and therefore remain unarticulated. One race is "unmarked", which then becomes categorized as "the norm," in contrast with the hyper-racialization of another race.

I also draw from the concept of whiteness in connection with media representation and visuality as theorized by Dyer (1997) who examines the reproduction and preservation of whiteness in visual culture. Dyer (1997) argues that in establishing and maintaining racial differences, color, in all senses of the word, plays a key role, especially in our contemporary, visually mediated world. While Dyer acknowledges that skin color (along with other phenotypes) is not the only form of racial categorization, he stresses that "it is part of the way that racial identity is thought and felt about, and is of particular significance in a culture so bound up with the visual and visible" (Dyer, 1997, p. 42).

This chapter builds on ethnographies conducted in white or mostly white high schools that have revealed colorblind as well as "colormute" (Pollock, 2004a) perspectives to be one of the dominant forms of addressing race and ethnicity among majority white students (Bucholtz, 2011; Perry, 2002; Pollock, 2004a). These studies caution that schools can unintentionally bolster "whiteness as center and standard (cultureless) and racial-ethnic others (by virtue of having culture to display) as different and marginal to that" (Perry, 2002, p. 100), instead of addressing inequality and equity. These classroom ethnographies, while not directly related to youth media literacy, provided a background and understanding for my findings on media-making and race in the classroom. Additionally, my analysis in this chapter uses Kress' (2003) concept of

social semiotics to analyze the modal affordances that communication technologies like video and film and the literacy practices of youth media afforded to the participants, as well as the Bakhtinian concepts of citationality to analyze students' reflections about their media.

Findings

The students in the video production class engaged with issues of racial, ethnic and cultural diversity by using discursive strategies which ranged from talking directly about the relevance of race to evading racial talk. In this chapter I analyze these discourses about race as they occurred at each step in the video production process as well as in my video-cued interviews with the students. My hope is to show how examining these everyday youth media literacy practices in relation to students' racial identities can help educators and researchers understand how they may leverage these critical moments for transformation towards a more equitable engagement with issues of race and ethnicity in schools.

The Pitch: Student-led Weekly Meetings

Pitch meetings were a time and place where the class came together once a week to check in on their TV productions and to pitch program ideas for the following week. In youth media education these kinds of meetings are viewed as important moments for the expression and development of student voice (Halverson & Gibbons Pyles, 2009). Gibbons Pyles (2017) describes the pitch meeting as the "moment in the filmmaking process in which the youth presented their ideas for their videos for adult approval. . .it is the moment when decisions are made about what the youth can express and why" (p.10).

The pedagogical strategy behind these meetings is to give students a chance to talk to their peers in a way that might not be possible in a traditional classroom, where the transmission or banking model of teaching (Freire, 1970) prevails. In youth media education the banking model is flipped, and the students are the ones that become the teachers or leaders. Pitch meetings are a component of video production classes where student voice is nurtured and taken seriously by the adults around them.

In the video production class at Lakeview High there were two student female leaders, Jess and Nina, who led the weekly meetings. These meetings often took a while to begin and as one student put it to me once, "Ahhh, this is chaos!" Many times, the student leaders shouted things like, "Let's go! Everyone in here! We're starting!" while the rest of the class finished something on their desktops, finished a conversation, or simply took their time to walk slowly into the meeting space. Similar to the Friday film screenings, these routine pitch meetings provided me with rich ethnographic moments to learn about the culture of the class, its values and its beliefs. In the following section I present a vignette from the pitch meeting and data from the two video-cued focus group interviews. This data supports my claims which respond to my research question: How does student voice get shaped in a video production classroom and what discourses does the class come into dialogue with as they produce videos?

Pitching Culture

In the following scene, Angela pitches her idea for her TV segment for that week to her classmates and specifically to the student leader, Jess. Angela was one of the few students of color in the classroom and the only one with hearing loss. Angela identified as mixed-race, Puerto-Rican and Italian heritage. Angela's pitch was for an episode in a

video series she was producing titled "Our Cultures." The basis of these segments was to

interview students and local community members on the cultures they identified with.

This week, she pitched her idea to the class of producing a segment on Black culture.

Vignette 2. Angela sits on the floor in the center of the room while Sandy, her

ASL interpreter stands nearby. Students sit on the floor and on chairs, while still others

stand around in a circle.

> Jess: Alright. Who wants to pitch for next week?
> (Jess stands in front of class and in front of the large rectangular whiteboard, holding an expo marker, ready to write each groups' ideas on the whiteboard.)
>
> Richard: Uh, we've already pitched.
>
> Jess: Yeah. You guys are good.
>
> Jess [Jess faces the whiteboard]: All right, so you guys are doing Epstein.
> [Jess turns to face the class and then faces Angela.] Angela, do you have a pitch for next week?
>
> [Angela looking at Jess, begins to sign, with Sandy, the ASL interpreter voicing] Um, I was thinking about [pause]. I was thinking about Black culture. Just cause there's a lot of people from that culture here, but I don't know [pause] how to get to that.
>
> Jess: [Pause] [Jess looks at Angela] I mean we can do that. I mean [pause] something we could start with uh, the, one of the presidents of the Students of Color Alliance, is like white.
>
> Lina: Yeah (in a tone of agreement)
>
> Tiana: Oh, but we love Mrs. Briggs. [faculty advisor to SOCA]
>
> Jess: This is a predominately a white area. We can talk about the struggles of. . . like. . .I don't know. Also, the difference between people just assuming you're Puerto Rican when you're not. [brief giggle]
>
> Angela: Yeah, yeah, yeah
>
> Jess: Yeah.
>
> <div align="right">(Field note, November 7, 2019)</div>

As Sandy voiced Angela's signing, the usually noisy class became silent. All eyes went to Sandy, Angela and Jess. Jess hesitated a second or two after Angela's pitch, but not for long, and responded to Angela's pitch by saying, "I mean we could do that" in a slow, not so sure tone, and then added that it might be a good idea for the video to highlight the fact that one of the presidents of the Students of Color Alliance (SOCA) at the school was "like white." She then points out that this is a "predominantly white area" meaning the city they live in, and then also points out that they [the producers of the show] could talk about "the struggles" and of the "difference between people just assuming you're Puerto Rican when you're not." Lina, a Euro-American student and Tiana, an African-American student, who were sitting on the floor towards the side of the class, spoke out when Jess mentioned SOCA. Lina agreed with Jess on questioning why the SOCA president is "like white" and Tiana agreed but at the same time was in favor of the SOCA president when she says, "but we love Ms. Briggs." Ms. Briggs is a Euro-American teacher who serves as the SOCA advisor. The club has two student presidents. Besides Tiana and Lina, no one else in the class commented. Jess didn't ask for comments and moved on to another student's pitch. After Jess finished, Angela nodded her head and the interpreter voiced, "Yeah."

I have watched my video-recording of this pitch many times to confirm the memory I have of this moment and to member check with my participants to gain greater insight into the nature of the discourse in the room that day. I remember the room falling silent. The loud noise coming from the chatter of all the students came to a stop, chairs stopped swiveling, and the body language in the class seemed to freeze. During our

video-cued interview I showed this video clip to Angela to ask her why she thought the room became silent during her pitch. She replied, signing, Sandy voicing for her:

> I think, in part, it's because people aren't used to me saying anything. When I come up with a pitch around a culture or something, I think people might've thought, because I'm not Black, I don't know if they thought maybe I shouldn't be involved in that.

> (Video-cued Interview, February 2, 2020)

Angela suggested that the silence that came over the class when she pitched her idea was due to two reasons: One, the students in the class were not used to her expressing an idea and hearing Sandy, the interpreter voicing; the other that the students may have disapproved of her producing this kind of segment because she is not Black. Angela is a student of mixed race, half Puerto-Rican and half European-American, who does not self-identify as Black.

In my video-cued focus group with Jess and Nina, the class leaders, Jess, told me that she liked this topic, but then added:

> But I don't know how honest it would be. Because, I mean, at the end of the day, if we put something in there that's anti-Lakeview High, it's not going to fall back on any of us, it's going to fall back on Adrien. So, there's a lot, and also just, this is a predominantly white school. I like the idea of it, just because we need more representation in The Archive in general. We need more pock.
>
> Isabel: We need more what?
>
> Jess: Pock. People of color.
>
> Isabel: Oh, okay.
>
> Jess: Yeah, but I don't know, I just, Black culture at Lakeview High [pause]. A white girl is the leader of SOCA [Students of Color Alliance]. So what is [pause].

89

Do we have Black culture at Lakeview? Because I don't think so. I don't think so.

(Video-cued Focus Group Interview, February 14, 2020)

Jess suggests here that producing a TV segment for the student news and entertainment show on Black culture could be problematic in a several ways. The show might come off as "anti-Lakeview" and this would then "fall back on" the teacher, but this would only happen if it were an "honest" take. In other words, Jess felt that if they really spoke the truth about issues of the Black community at Lakeview High, it might come off as anti-Lakeview. Later in our interview, Jess further explained why she thought that her school and the city of Lakeview might be offended at the making of a video piece on Black culture:

> Like you can't be too edgy because people at Lakeview are easily offended. Because they have nothing else to be angry about, to be honest. No one around here is struggling and in poverty and starving.
> (Video-cued Focus Group Interview, February 14, 2020)

Jess considered producing a show on Black culture and race "edgy." According to Jess, her predominantly white, middle to upper class community could be easily offended because "they have nothing else to be angry about." Another reason why producing a segment on Black culture didn't seem like a good idea to Jess was because the school was predominantly white and thus it didn't seem to her that there is really any kind of Black culture at the school. She backs this up by pointing out again, as she did during the pitch meeting, that "a white girl is the leader of SOCA." At another part in the interview, she also informed me that there are only two Black teachers in the whole school.

In their interviews both Angela and Jess addressed the belief that you are only allowed to speak on cultural issues that pertain to your own race or ethnicity. Jess questioned the validity of a show on this topic created by someone other than a Black

90

member of the school. Angela thinks her peers disapproved of her producing a show on

Black culture because she is not Black. Both students, one mixed-race, the other a Euro-

American, were familiar with the discourse that only people who belong to a group can

comment or speak about that group. Jess also cited the discourse that Euro-American,

middle-class people are uncomfortable and easily offended when matters of race are

spoken about. Jess and Nina responded to my question about how well they thought the

student news show represented students in the school:

> Nina: People tend to cover things that they're very comfortable with. . . Like I myself. . . the majority of The Archive each year I think I've seen is, or at least that I've been a part of it, students are uneasy when it comes to things that they're not super informed about or they feel like they don't really have the persona to talk about. Because obviously we're still in high school, there's a lot of drama, you don't want to be perceived in some way that you didn't mean to come off as.
>
> Jess: But like, I feel like, one, we don't have any POC reporters.
>
> Nina: No.
>
> Jess: All of the reporters are white. All of them. And I don't know, I feel like it is a hard place for white. . .a lot of reporters don't, the white reporters, don't want to report on racial issues because it's not their place and they   also don't want to be seen as racist or all this stuff that could come of it.
>
> Nina: I mean it's partially on the student reporters and also partially on teachers and just Lakeview. Like, Jesus.
>
> Jess: Lakeview is quiet.
>
> Nina: We praise being so open and honest and accepting, but nah dude. Y'all are. . . I'm going to go off.
>
> Jess: People in Lakeview are just as racist as people in Alabama.
> (Video-cued Focus Group Interview, February 14, 2020)

Jess and Nina's' comments here cite the implicit belief in their school that one should not

speak on behalf of a different ethnic or racial group other than your own. Jess comments

that it is difficult for white student reporters to create videos on "racial issues because it is not their place" and Nina adds that most student reporters will make media on topics that they are comfortable with, implying that they are not comfortable reporting on racial matters. They both comment that students would run the risk of being "perceived in some way that you didn't mean to come off as" or as Jess states, "they also don't want to be seen as racist or all this stuff that could come of it." However, contrary to what Jess says here, there were some students of color producers enrolled in the class. According to the class's roster, about 10% of the class were officially registered as Black, Latina/o or of mixed race. What Jess is emphasizing though is that the majority of the student news reporters were white and that with only a few exceptions the students were avoiding creating content that touched on issues of race or ethnicity.

There are contradictions expressed here by Jess. On one hand, she states that there really isn't Black culture at the school, and therefore Angela should not produce her show on Black culture; on the other hand, she complains that their show has no "pock" reporters, which ignores the fact that Angela, although not identifying as Black, identifies as mixed race. It is also telling that Jess utters the word "pock" instead of saying P.O.C. I suggest this shows that Jess is trying, perhaps too hard, to show that she is familiar with the concept of People of Color and wants to show that she is comfortable using the term. From a Bakhtinian perspective we can say that if Jess's reflections on Angela's project seem contradictory it is because she is citing the contradictory discourses about race that are present in this mostly white, mostly middle-class high school and community.

Digital Video Editing Class Time

> The conversations that happen around editing reveal the active representational choices that youth make toward communicating a narrative concept to a future audience. (Halverson & Gibbons, 2009, p.72)

Digital video editing is a process of assembling various media components to create a coherent story, with a beginning, middle and end. Video production classes in school rarely have a standard set of assessment or clear objectives. There are, however, some procedures and protocols that students and educators consistently use. Digital video editing in the classroom often consists of two students working together, sitting behind the computer as they pull together video and audio elements onto a timeline, following a plan, to compose a project. In a teacher-researcher study on video composition, Bruce (2009) discovered that the video composition process among high school students is a complex, non-linear, recursive process. Bruce observed that there were some common processes that student video editors engage with. In his analysis of his students' peer production groups, Bruce observed that in the editing stage the students: "1. Edited out of the linear sequence of the project 2. Evaluated and selected available footage to edit 3. Viewed scene/sequence multiple times while editing 4. Made evaluative comments about footage/edits 5. Viewed new work in context of entire work in progress for continuity and coherence 6. Demonstrated awareness of audience" (2009, p. 436). Similarly, Halverson and Gibbons (2009) have noted that when it comes to evaluating learning during the video editing process, it "is demonstrated through dialogue about how a piece should evolve, either among a group of youth or between a youth and his or her mentor" (p.72). This is quite different than other curricular components of the video production process, where oral, written or digital artifacts serve as indicators to show

where students are in the process. For example, the pitch can be evaluated on how well the student(s) describe the idea for their TV show; and the media design of a film can be evaluated on how well the students used lighting, camera angles and videography. However, during the editing process, moments of evaluation happen spontaneously and often go unheard and unseen by educators and researchers. As Soep (2006) has observed in her own media education research, "These naturally occurring assessment junctures [take] place over the entire course of the production project," and she sees these as moments or "episodes of critique" when "the process of production itself required a moment of display or performance" (p.758).

In the media production class I was studying, the majority of the video editing process was carried out solitarily or between two students with, for example, one student working on graphics and effects while the other worked on assembling shots from the raw footage chronologically. Even if the group had more than two students, only one or two of the students would participate in the video edit. They then shared their draft with the rest of the group members for feedback. "Episodes of critique" occurred routinely between group members, between group members and the student leaders, and between students and the teacher. In particular, they often occurred between the student producers and either of the two student leaders, Nina or Jess.

In the next section, I present a vignette from an editing session that highlights an episode of critique. It is an exchange between Richard, one of the producers for the politics and current affairs show titled, Politics Now! and Nina, one of the student leaders. They evaluate the video that Richard is editing and consider the appropriateness

94

of using a musical track that may potentially be stereotypical of Chinese culture. First, I describe the Politics Now! show in more detail.

Editing (Out) Stereotypes

The Politics Now! group, was made up of Francis, who took care of the research and writing for the videos and Richard, who was in charge of camera work and video editing. This week's topic was a profile on the ethnic minority group, the Uighur Muslims living in China. An international news story had been released that month in the mainstream media, questioning the legality of the camps where they were living and so the students chose to make their video on this topic. The footage for this program included Francis' narration, introducing their topic:

> Francis (Close-up, facing camera): This week we're talking about the Uighur Muslims who up until recently were being held in what China called reeducation camps. Uighurs are an ethnic minority, with about 12 billion people worldwide. 11 million of which are in China, specifically the Xinjiang region, where these reeducation camps are, or were, depending on your view. . .
> (Transcript of *The Archive* YouTube Channel, 2019)

Vignette 3. Richard takes the lead editing the video. He sits in front of his computer, tapping on his keyboard and making small circles with his mouse on the keypad as the cursor moves around the two small video screens of the digital video editing platform. He has asked for Nina's advice on his musical choice, which is a musical track he downloaded from *Envato Elements*, an open-source online database. Nina stands about six inches behind him, with her arms crossed while she looks at the screen. Richard taps the keyboard to move the cursor to the beginning of the timeline in the digital editing software and hits the space bar to begin the video. Nina and Richard watch and listen attentively, without speaking. After playing about 10 seconds of the

opening credits with music, Richard stops the video and turns around and looks at Nina

with a "What do you think?" expression on his face.

Nina: (Smiling slightly) So. Hmm. (She nods her head slightly and pauses). I don't know. [pause] I really don't know. Did Adrien watch it?

Richard: (Swiveling his chair to face Adrien) Adrien, alright, opinions on this.

Nina: I don't think so. I don't think so.

Adrien: [Speaks from his desk which is a few feet away from Richard] What?

Richard: Come here. Opinions on this.

Adrien: What's that? Music?

 [Both Nina and Richard keep looking at the computer screen. Adrien doesn't come by.]

Richard: So. . . for comedic timing I need something in here.

Nina: How about…

Richard: If not FUN SIZE, then…[inaudible]

Nina: So you need. . .are you talking about trying to match the music?

Richard: Yeah

Nina: Okay

Richard: Cause that's all fine, right? [Richard points to the title of the show on the computer screen as Nina leans over to drag the mouse and looks at the digital timeline in the software.]

Nina: How long is it?

[I break my silence as an observer, researcher and video recorder]

Isabel: Yeah, I think you want to stay away from. . .

Nina: Yeah,

Isabel: . . . from sort of hinting that this is *all* Chinese, that this is happening in the whole Chinese community.

Nina: Yeah, it's stereotypical.

Richard: Yeah, fair enough.

Isabel: Yeah.

Nina: Yeah. Thank you.

Here, Richard called on Nina's expertise as one of the class's leaders. Richard was one of the more prolific and punctual members of the class and Francis, his co-producer had described him to me during our focus group as an "overachiever." During this episode of critique, however, Nina was hesitant to give Richard the "OK" on the music as she said, "I don't know, I really don't know." The music that Richard chose to use as background for his news show could be categorized as stereotypical Asian music from the turn of the 19th century. After doing a YouTube search with the words, "Chinese, Stereotypical Music," I learned that it is referred to as the "Oriental riff" or the "Asian riff" and that it stems from old Hollywood movies. However, it is still used today by musicians and video game makers (UncannyX, 2021). After a few minutes of observing Nina hesitating to say anything to Richard, and Richard on the other hand, seeming quite eager to complete the segment, I interjected and said, "I think you want to stay away from…" and then continued to try to explain why this music was not appropriate for the TV segment. Both Nina and Richard, agreed right away, after I interjected, and Nina labeled the music as "stereotypical."

In my video-cued focus group with Nina and Jess, I asked Nina to comment on this moment in class:

Nina: I remember this moment so clearly.

Isabel: Yeah, okay. So, let's see [I play the video clip]

97

Nina: And my response is so stupid.

Isabel: Well, I didn't really catch much of your side, so let's see [the video clip is playing]

[Video plays in background]

Nina: You can see, I'm like ...

[Video clip finishes]

Isabel: Yeah, so do you remember that moment?

Nina: I do. Yeah. He had used. . .I think, literally the *Envato Elements* title of the song was like "Chinese," like that was the title. I saw it in the timeline. And he was talking about the Muslim concentration camps in China. And it took me. . .because he had just called me over, it took me a second for it to click. And it was the word choice, the music, the context, all together I was like, "Oh, how do I. . ."

Jess: How do I say that this is inappropriate?

Nina: Like in my head I was like, "This is so. . . this is so stereotypical and racist and inappropriate, but I don't want to blame Richard for being. . ." I don't know.

Jess: I have no issue blaming anyone for being racist. I'm racist.

Nina: I eventually did, I was like, "That music choice is inappropriate. Try finding something that fits the topic of your segment more, or just don't have any music at all.

Jess: Or just play a normal, like just a regular song like everyone else. It doesn't have to be like, "Asian." Just don't do that. It's not funny, it's not cute, it's not quirky.

(Video-cued Focus Group Interview, February 14, 2020)

It is telling that Nina knew exactly the moment I was going to show her on video, when she says, "I remember this moment so clearly." Before I even showed Nina the video clip, she called her response "stupid." She described the video clip that Richard showed her as problematic across production elements: "It was the word choice, the music, the context, all together I was like, "Oh, how do I . . ."" Nina began to give a critical response but didn't complete it. Jess jumped into Nina's silence and finished the sentence for her, calling it "inappropriate." Nina explained that she "knew in her head" that using this music as background for the TV show would be "so stereotypical and racist," but she didn't want to "blame" Richard, her classmate, as a "a racist."

I then asked Nina, why in retrospect she thinks she hesitated to say something to Richard, who was after all seeking her advice. Nina replied:

> Honestly, just me being non-confrontational. That's a personal issue. And the [Archive] has really highlighted that. If something is wrong with someone's work, I'm so like scared to comment on it, but it's literally my job. So I've gotten better at that. And I don't know, that moment just really irked me. Like why Richard thought in his head that was okay, like "Come on, man. Like, come on!"

> Jess: Also, it's like, you don't want to see your peers or coworkers, I guess, in that type of way. So, you're just like, "Uh, that's ignorant, please don't do that, please don't be ignorant."

> Nina: And that's why I said, "Did [Adrien] watch this?" Like did Adrien pick up on this? Because I knew he had watched it before me.

> Jess: Adrien does not always pick up on that stuff.

> Nina: His mind is going. . .

> Jess: . . . a million miles an hour.

Nina and Jess see their role as the student leaders as one to give advice, as needed and requested, to their peers on their video production choices. In this case, Richard chose an

inappropriate stereotypical melody as background for a segment on Chinese Uighur camps. The melody was an artifact from an era when Chinese Americans were represented in the US media as the evil or the submissive other. Jess and Nina's reflections on that particular episode of providing critical feedback to a classmate reveals the heteroglossia of student voices in the class when speaking on matters involving ethnicity and race.

I suggest the hyperbolic responses expressed by Nina and Jess in this conversation such as, "I have no issue blaming anyone for being racist. I'm racist," had to do with these students trying out new positions to speak from. According to Bakhtin (1981) peoples' utterances are innately citational, repeating in a new context others' words and ideas. Should we interpret Jess' comment here as a personal admission of her being a racist? I don't think so. Instead, I suggest, she is citing discourses that circulate in her school, community, and the larger society that go something like, "We all have biases," and "Everyone's a racist to some degree." Her utterance here is what Bakhtin (1981) would call an instance of heteroglossia, a statement that is a hybrid construction in which a single speaker's utterance contains "intermingled within it two utterances, two manners of speaking, two styles, two "languages" (p. 304). In this utterance Jess simultaneously presents this discourse on racism while also distancing herself from it. Jess claims "I have no issue blaming anyone for being racist." But I suggest that if Jess had been there when Richard asked for feedback on his music choice that she would have acted as Nina did, hesitantly and tactfully, without accusing Richard of being a racist. In our focus-group interview, Nina expressed more uncertainty than did Jess, as Nina stated, "But I don't want to blame Richard for being. . . I don't know." Nina's cautious way of speaking about

racism and stereotypes demonstrates consideration and thoughtfulness before blaming her peer as racist. However, it also supports my claim that the class's prevailing discourse about race is to express a colorblind approach. Given that issues of race and ethnicity were rarely mentioned or spoken about in the class, then it is not surprising that these student leaders were unsure about how to deal with a "confrontational" matter in the class. In spite of this, I suggest that Nina's uncertainty also showed that Nina ultimately also cared about her fellow classmate and about their relationship as peers. This example is also helpful for our understanding of the role of student leaders in these spaces. In "not-school settings" (Sefton-Green, 2013) peer-to-peer exchanges of opinions on controversial issues, including offering critical feedback to peers, may be more common than in programs offered in schools, where students may look more to the teacher's authority.

Limitless Representation. The digital tool that Richard used to select music for his video, *Envato Elements,* is an open access music sharing platform that provides students with limitless songs, graphics, and stock photos for them to choose from to include in their stories. After visiting the site and entering the key words, "Chinese" and "fonts" some of the fonts that appeared were fonts that had been widely used in western societies when orientalism was seen as acceptable by Europeans and European-Americans. These fonts are still utilized by the mainstream media however to represent Asian culture.

In media production, including films and videos, communicating with music, sound, images, photos and graphics are common features that allow for more showing and less telling. *Envato Elements* and similar platforms are particularly useful for young

filmmakers as they are easily accessed and free. These platforms provide youth media producers with a quick way to search and select all types of media according to categories and types. Categorizations and typing are one of the main ways that people make sense and communicate meanings. However, youth media producers need guidance on how to select and contextualize these media elements to avoid employing stereotypes, where culture or a person is reduced to a few exaggerated, simplified characteristics (Hall, 1997). The affordances this tool gave to the Lakeview High students impacted the content of the students' videos. If a word search on the platform yields a plethora of otherizing images, then this will be reflected in the students' work. For example, the naming protocols of the *Envato Elements* database for its musical tracks afforded the choice of cultural stereotypes. Nina picked up on this when she pointed out, "I think, literally, the *Envato Elements* title of the song was like "Chinese," like that was the title. I saw it in the timeline." Nina was surprised that a database would title a music sample as simply "Chinese," as this shows a lack of nuance, complexity and thoughtfulness on the part of the company's algorithm. Nina picked up on the open-access database's arbitrary and possibly stereotypical labeling of graphic elements while Richard did not. This suggest that students bring varying degrees of media funds of knowledge into the media production classroom.

Place and Voice in the Video Production Classroom

In line with what prior ethnographies on whiteness in middle-class schools have shown (Bucholtz, 2011; Perry, 2002; Pollock, 2004), I also found that colorblind perspectives are one of the dominant forms of approaching race and ethnicity issues in learning environments. My project differs than these studies as it centers on the

102

technological and cultural practices of a media production classroom. To be clear, the concept of colorblind that I am drawing on here is the phenomenon in the U.S. of people who consider themselves well-intentioned and non-racists, intentionally not acknowledging racial differences in the hopes that this will lead to everyone being treated equally. Research has shown, however, that this lack of talking about race impedes improving social and economic conditions for people of color (Bonilla-Silva, 2018; Bucholtz, 2011).

As the examples I have discussed so far in this chapter suggest, most of the students in the media production class at Lakeview shied away from talking about race. When issues of race did surface, students fell into stereotypes or expressed colorblind platitudes, or awkward citations of what they considered to be politically correct concepts. However, there were two student productions I observed that dealt with race explicitly and more earnestly.

Video, Visibility and Race

Angela, the student media producer of "Our Cultures" was a young person who explicitly expressed ideas on culture, race and ethnicity in her videos. Angela communicated through sign language and had an ASL interpreter that accompanied her during the media production class. When I conducted the research in her class, Angela had produced three videos for the *Archive*. One was on Deaf culture, where she interviewed individuals from the Deaf community outside of the high school. In her second video, Angela produced a segment on Puerto Rican culture, where she interviewed students in the school who identified as Puerto Rican. In her third video, following a suggestion from one of the student leaders, Angela produced a video on

103

modern Paganism, a spiritual practice that is influenced by pre-Christian beliefs of pre-modern peoples in Europe and has themes of living in synchrony with the natural world. Notably, Angela did not end up producing her proposed show on Black identity at Lakeview High. I will address this further in the chapter.

Angela's videos made use of reportage or documentary-style genres. As she explained to me during our video-cued interview, her production process consisted of sharing her ideas at the weekly pitch meetings with the rest of the students, then emailing potential interviewees and asking them if they would like to be interviewed and filmed for her project. She then conducted the interviews in the school and the community. The week that I video-shadowed Angela, I helped her and another student producer, Kelly on their shoot. In the following vignette I describe what the set up of their video shoot looked like.

Vignette 4. I walk into the open space classroom on a Tuesday morning. The room is buzzing with chatter. A group of three students that were not part of the media production class are huddled by the doorway. Jess and Nina stand around the lounge benches talking amongst themselves while nearby three student producers from the Sports show hover over a computer and play music off of it. Kelly, who has been helping Angela with her shoot on the culture of modern Paganism, is in the center of the room, kneeling on the carpeted floor and setting up a tripod. I approach Kelly and ask her what she is doing. She informs me that she is testing the tripod and preparing the equipment for a shoot that Angela and she are going to do today in a nearby park. I ask her if they need help and if it would be okay for me to go with them on the shoot. In a few minutes we are off. Angela, Sandy (the ASL interpreter) Kelly, and me walk through the hallways

and out through the main entrance of the school carrying video production equipment (camera, tripod, lights, and a chair from the class). We cross the busy street and walk through the park to meet the interviewee. The trees' leaves are orange, yellow and brown, and many have already fallen to the ground, making a crunchy sound with every step we take. After walking about a mile through the park we arrive at the filming location and begin to set up. Luis, a middle-aged man with grey hair who Angela found through an online community forum is there waiting, ready for the interview. As Angela and Kelly conducted the interview, I videotaped the process with my own camera. Following is a transcription of a segment from the video I made and which I used in my video-cued interview with Angela:

> *Shot: Outdoors in the park, Kelly and Angela stand next to the camera that is set up on a tripod. Angela leans into the rear of the camera and looks through the viewfinder. She then looks at Sandy and begins to sign in ASL, with Sandy voicing:*
>
> **Angela**: Yeah, that looks perfect. Great.
>
> *Angela addresses the interviewee, Luis, who is sitting on a boulder about five feet away from the camera and the crew.*
>
> **Angela:** Ok. I'm going to stand over here. Um, I don't know if you've worked with an interpreter, but when you speak, if you could look at me for the shot, it will be better. I know it's weird cause you're gonna hear the interpreter and want to look at her. But if you could look at me that'll be a lot easier for our shot. Um, and also if you could use full sentences, so if I ask you what your favorite color is if you just say red that's going to be a little awkward in the transcripts. If you use full sentences...um.
>
> **Luis:** [laughs and nods his head] Okay.
>
> **Angela**: (*Smiling and nodding her head,*): Thank you.

I note how clearly and professionally Angela here is able to communicate interview protocol to her interviewee. She articulates both the protocol for speaking to a

deaf signing interviewer as well as a protocol that pertains to all video production. A rule of thumb when conducting interviews on video is to inform the interviewee to answer in full sentences. This helps in post-production when editing the responses together. At the end of the interview and after Angela has thanked Luis and shaken his hand, he asks her how she got into making these kinds of videos. Angela responds:

> **Angela**: I wanted to learn about different people's culture and I thought interviewing might be fun so I joined this group. Um, I just like learning about what people think about other cultures because everyone thinks a different thing about the same cultures, you know, even though they're all a part of it. So, I ask sort of the same questions for every culture and then see what people say.

> **Luis**: Sure. Sure. Great.

> **Angela:** Great. Thank you so much.

Through my participant observations like the one described above, as well as in our video-cued interview, Angela was clear in expressing her goals in her video making, telling me that she wanted to bring an understanding of different cultures to her school. However, I would add that she wanted to go beyond making videos that talked about different cultures. She more poignantly also wanted to make certain groups from her school more visible, to give them voice. Discussing her segment on Puerto Rican identity, Angela told me that her desire was to recognize and make difference visible:

> For Puerto Rican culture. . .So I'm Puerto Rican and saw that there are a lot of students in our school who are Puerto Rican, too. I decided I wanted to pick something for Puerto Rican people here in this school, people who actually go here. I wanted to know their opinion about the culture and just get their answers on that.
>
> (Video-cued Interview, February 2, 2020)

It is significant that Angela produced her show on Puerto Rican identity by focusing on students who "actually go here." She stresses that there are "a lot of students" who identify as Puerto Rican in this school, implying that this is a fact that is not always

recognized by students and teachers. When she states, "pick something for," I suggest she means that she picked a topic that would be meaningful for these students. Through her video, she was addressing (Bakhtin, 1981) students of color, while simultaneously addressing the whole school.

After this production and the one on modern Paganism, Angela then thought about producing a segment on Black culture in her school but did not get to complete it. When I asked her casually during class time, what happened with her video, she responded that "it was just too much work." During our video-cued interview, I asked Angela to expand on her initial thoughts and reasoning to do a segment on Black culture.

> So for that I wanted to do people of color, a group of people of color, because I'd already done Puerto Rican. Pagan has nothing to do with that, with skin color. I wanted to do something about skin color, more visible, just something that people might have seen in school, and talk about some of those people.
> (Video-cued Interview, February 2, 2020)

Angela, a deaf student of mixed-race, wanted to bring voice to students by interviewing them and placing them on the screen and in this way make some of the less dominant cultures at her school more visible. Angela was expressing herself by showing to her peers and teachers the diversity that she saw at her school. In her words, she wanted to present a diversity that is "more visible," something like the physical trait of skin color. Angela makes a distinction between race, culture and religion/spirituality. She noted that "Pagan has nothing to do with that," meaning with skin color. Furthermore, she states that she would like to talk about "skin color, black, instead of a culture." Referring to the segment she had already produced on Puerto Rican culture. We hear Angela expressing the wish to produce a segment for the student news show that would foreground culture

through the lens of skin color, directly taking on race. This is a counter discursive strategy to colorblindness.

I contend Angela was speaking to something that is common in many schools in middle-class neighborhoods across the U.S.: the invisibility and unheard voices of students of color in predominantly white, middle-class schools. Lakeview High seemed to have an established dominant culture that was European-American, represented by most of the students, teachers, and administrative staff. From Angela's perspective the less dominant cultures were that of students of color -- Black, Latina/o, Asian, mixed race-- and of students with disabilities. Angela wanted to put the spotlight on both of these groups of students through video production. She wanted to give them a voice and a place in her school. When I asked Angela how she came to this topic of exploring cultures, she explained:

> I knew that I wanted to do different cultures. I guess, I got here, in [Lakeview High] and I saw people of different cultures, different colored skin, different clothes. I wanted to interview and just get an idea of who the people are here in school. Not just the group of people that seem to be most common, I wanted to learn about other people's opinions, their rights, what they see in the world, if I could.
>
> (Video-cued Interview, February 2, 2020)

Similar to Angela, a few other students recognized the affordances of a media production class for conversations on and learning about racial issues in the United States. Kelly, a European-American student in the class was one of these students. Kelly was in her third year of high school and often worked independently on her own segments or helped Angela with the shoots and the editing portions of the "Our Culture" show. During my field work, Kelly had begun to produce a short piece for Black History month. Following is the opening from the broadcasted three-minute piece:

Kelly (Close-up, facing camera): Hi, I'm Kelly. February is Black History Month, a celebration of African-American achievements and roles in history. In 1926 the association for the study of Negro life and history, or ASNLH sponsored Negro history week. It was meant to promote schools and communities to hold local celebrations and host performances and lectures.

(Transcription from the *Archive's* YouTube site, 2020)

In her piece, Kelly highlights the civil rights movement and then interviews two Lakeview High students who identify as Black to speak on what Black History Month means to them. Kelly, like Angela, deploys techniques from the genre of documentary. As such, the video consists of such cinema elements as archival black-and-white footage of the civil rights movement as well as current day footage from Black Lives Matter marches. Significantly, both Kelly and Angela take on a distanced perspective where the narrator provides objective truth and neutrality to the subject matter. Kelly worked mostly on her own but did have some help from the student leaders. Jess shared her thoughts on helping Kelly with her piece:

She [Kelly] is very passionate about it. She did a very good job as well... I tried to help her out as much as I could just from the prior information that I have about African-American history. Just because that's what my mom got her undergrad in, so I just happen to know. But I don't know a lot.

(Video-cued Focus Group Interview, February 14, 2020)

At the end of her utterance, Jess admits that she doesn't "know a lot" about Black history. Gee (2015) suggest that social practices of literacy reflect a dynamic of insiders and outsiders. Jess here takes on an outsider position of not knowing as she says, "I don't know a lot" and has only second hand "academic knowledge" from her mom. By Jess saying in a sense, "I have [only] academic knowledge on the subject," she is acknowledging that she lacks an insider's knowledge on the subject of Black history. This discursive strategy may also be intended to deflect any criticism that might arise

about a white student with the supervision of other white students doing a piece on Black History Month.

There is a sort of hedging I found in other comments from the student leaders as they talked about the Black History month video segment. I observed this cautious way of speaking on matters of race throughout my field observations and interviews. Some examples are Nina's trepidation to inform her peer that the Chinese music he was going to use in his video was stereotypical and the silence I described during the pitch meeting when Angela discussed her idea to explore Black culture for her next TV segment. However, this was not the case with Kelly. She was committed to doing a segment on Black History month and, as Jess and Nina acknowledged, she showed passion for the topic. However, Kelly still found some aspects of producing a video on Black History month to be difficult. Nina told me about a conversation she had with Kelly about some of these difficulties:

> I had a similar conversation after school with Kelly. She was doing her segment on Black History Month, and she expressed to me that she. . .she kept asking me if what she said is okay, if the pictures and mural that she was using was honest and truthful and really depicting what Black History Month means. And I said like, "Honestly, I don't know, we're both white and speaking about Black history struggles and Black culture is not our place." But also, the fact that she went through with that idea and was so, like passionate about that idea.
> (Video-cued Focus Group Interview, February 14, 2020)

I am struck by Nina's statement, "it is not our place." Jess expressed a similar idea earlier in the focus group, when she comments on the student producers, " the white reporters, don't want to report on racial issues because it's not their place. . . " Similarly, Angela, in her video-cued interview, expressed this sentiment as well. What then, can Nina's statement tell us about her and her peers' understandings of the intersection of

110

race, student voice and media-making? If we interpret her statement considering the contexts of Lakeview High School, the surrounding community, and the country we can better understand her meaning. The national debates on anti-racism, police racial violence, politicians' prejudice remarks, and careless media representations of people of color all impact and shape students' understanding of what kind of media they can, should, and want to make.

Why did Nina, referring to her and Kelly, feel the need to state, "We're both white?" We can read this statement alongside Jess's comment earlier in the interview where she states that she doesn't think there is Black culture in their school, implying that there are no Black students. Another interpretation is that Nina during the process of our video-cued focus group recognizes how whiteness goes unmarked (Dyer, 1997) and, significantly, she is acknowledging her own racial identity. While she makes the argument that students of color in their school should be the lead voices on media-making about issues of race and ethnicity, she simultaneously acknowledges that the Black History Month video should be okay since it was done "truthfully" and carefully.

"Not-my-place" Media-Making

While Kelly and Angela made programs that spoke to the relevance of race for them and their school, they were the exceptions. For the most part, in their media-making process, the students used a discursive strategy of not speaking on behalf of people or issues belonging to a racial and ethnic group other than their own. I call this strategy "not-my-place" media-making and use it to describe this kind of stance in the media production classroom. I have constructed the concept through the lens of place-making. Jocson (2018) defines "place" as moving beyond spatial boundaries and accounting "for

difference, boundary, and connectivity in students' lives" (p. 95), and she sees place-making as crucial to student media production. This approach to place considers how youth media is shaped by youths' relationships with family and friends, as well as their relationship with where they live and their environment. The "not-my-place" media-making approach that Jess, Nina and other student producers used can be seen to reflect the fact that they lived in a middle-class, affluent neighborhood where racism and discrimination is openly disavowed, but where racial talk is not encouraged.

The cautious way of using student voice in the class and of deploying "not-my-place" perspectives on video production reflected the students' awareness of racialized ideas such as "for people of color, by people of color," a contemporary discourse intended to avoid misrepresentations and stereotypes. It is thought that if only those who make up part of a less dominant class, race, gender, or disability group are able to tell their own stories, then the stories will be true and authentic. This implies that individuals not from these less dominant groups would not be competent at telling others' stories.

Because students were not comfortable with talking about race issues, there was a general fear of "getting it wrong" or of saying something that would get you labeled "racist." I suggest, Kelly's stress while she made the Black History Month segment reveals a general anxiety on her part and on the community's part about racial representations. Similarly, Nina expresses this worry of getting it wrong when she reflects on making video productions in her school: "You don't want to be perceived in some way that you didn't mean to come off as."

Discussion

Citationality and Racial Talk

Across these discussion on race in the video-cued focus groups I had with Nina and Jess and with Angela, I see contradictions that reflect the citationality that is present in the students' utterances when they talk about race issues. According to Bakhtin (1981), the utterances of individuals cannot help but contain contradictions, as our society is made up of heterogeneous perspectives and discourses. It is therefore not a surprise that student voices in the media class were also shaped by these contradictions. For example, there is some inconsistency between what Angela expresses about the process of her media-making and in what she does in her videos. Angela cites the belief that one should not speak on behalf of other racial or ethnic groups. During our video-cued interview, she informed me that because she did not identify as Black, her media production class peers may have disapproved of her doing the segment on Black culture. However, even though she was aware of this belief, she still went on to create programs on Deaf, Puerto Rican, and Paganism cultures. She identified with some, but not all, of these cultures.

Nina and Jess also expressed some contradicting ideas. For example, while Nina was critical of two white media students producing the segment on Black History Month, she also said that she was happy that Kelly went through with it and expressed agreement and pride about the completed segment. Jess complained that there were no students of color at Lakeview High and therefore no Black culture, but at the same time complained that there were not enough student producers of color on the *Archive*.

113

Diversity on the Screen

The introductory vignette to this chapter described Adrien, the media production teacher, giving feedback to the students during the weekly film screening. After giving feedback to the Friends video production crew on camera angles, depth of field, and lighting, Adrien remarked that while the production of the show was okay, the segment needed to be more "diverse." Adrien was talking about the need for the segments to be more ethnically and racially diverse. It was evident that the show that week featured mostly European-American descent students based on the color of their skin and that this prompted the teacher to highlight this to the class. This utterance prompted a response from a student in the class, as Jay responded, "What do you want from us? We are a mostly white school." What prompted this utterance during a film screening in a video production class?

This kind of video production curriculum affords the ability for everyone in the class to see and/or hear the same thing at the same time. In other words, the screen brought together the class in a way where everyone was positioned as the audience. Jay's small but, I contend, critical response to the teacher during the film screening was an attempt from this student to try out a different form of whiteness, one which speaks honestly about racial differences inside their school. Similar to Nina, Jay was explicitly naming and labeling the student population in a racialized way, namely as "White." At the same time, Jay's inclusion of the word "mostly" acknowledges the diversifying student population of their "mostly" white school. These small but significant comments made by the teacher and the student during the class's weekly film showing, I suggest are

representative of the kind of critical dialogic moments that emerge in video production classes.

Conclusion

When Angela's pitch to the class to produce a segment on Black culture at the school was met with little response, I sensed I was witnessing the kind of silence described in scholarship on whiteness and race, a silence that comes along with a colorblind and colormute stance. Pollock (2004a) states that colormuteness, even though it is often carried out as a nonracist practice, reproduces racial inequalities instead of improving them. In the media production class at Lakeview High, I would argue that there was a kind of muteness, silence, and omission on the part of the class as a whole when it came to discussing matters of race and ethnicity, with the exception of a few students like Angela, Kelly, Jess and Nina. Nina captures this stance of the class when she says in our focus group, "Lakeview is quiet" a comment I take to refer to the silencing of racial and ethnic discussions in their school and community.

Inclusiveness and diversity is about more than skin color. At same time, theorist suggest color matters and, as Pollock argues, colorblind strategies are no solution to problems of equity and equality. Dyer (1997) argues that skin color plays a prominent role in racial categorization and "is of particular significance in a culture so bound up with the visual and visible" (p. 42). Through its student television news show, Lakeview High's media production class presented a visual culture to the school. Visual cultures can reproduce and preserve racial inequalities, just as they can also help undo them, a topic I return to in the concluding chapter.

In this chapter, I looked at how race, student voice and media making intersected inside a white, middle-class school with an increasingly multicultural and multiracial student body. I analyzed the data from the video-cued focus group interviews and connected it to the video production pedagogy and curriculum of the class. I analyzed the practices of the weekly film-critique screenings, the student-lead pitch meetings, and the independent, free-style video editing class sessions. In doing so, I examined the process of media making and was able to consider the social, cultural, and material contexts of the class, the school and the larger community that help shape student voice. I found that whole group viewing activities, such as the weekly film-critique screenings, could prompt informal discussions that are less likely to come up in traditional classes. Such events can push and encourage educators and students to move beyond their comfort zones and confront cultural and racial tensions in their school. I documented how the weekly student-lead pitch meetings helped shape the topics that the students chose to cover in their TV segments, making student voice a plural and not just an individual form of expression. And I have suggested how the affordances and constraints of digital multimodal tools, such as the *Envato Elements* open-access sharing platform, also help shape the videos the students produced.

Discursive strategies like "not-my-place media-making were taken up by the students as a way to deal with diversity issues as they surfaced in the media production classroom. However, while the class as a whole took on a colorblind stance to evade talking about diversity issues, this is not to say that all students in the class took on this perspective all the time, every day. Instead, the students' perspectives that I highlighted in this chapter can be situated on a continuum of working towards figuring out how and

116

when to talk about racial, cultural and diversity issues. Currently, colorblind discourses are being questioned more and more. We can see this questioning through the Black Lives Matter movement across the globe. We can also hear more explicit conversations about race and ethnicity in the mainstream media. Bakhtin states that what people say reflects their cultural worlds. The Lakeview High students brought their cultural worlds into this non-traditional class, which was permeable to the outside world, and in doing so, they showed me what they value, what they are struggling with, and how they make meaning with video.

CHAPTER 5

REMIXING AND AUTHENTICITY IN YOUTH MEDIA

Politics are boring and elitist and are purposely made for people who are not educated white men to not get involved in and get educated on. So, the purpose of the show was to basically allow younger people, less educated people, not that elitist group, to be able to understand and absorb politics in a way that isn't mind-numbingly boring and in a way that they will remember. That is snappy, quick and hopefully gets the big points down.
(*Francis, student producer at Lakeview High*)

Introduction

This chapter is a response to my research question: How does student voice get shaped in this media production classroom? I focus on understanding how the new literacies practices shaped student voice. In the following vignette, I present a scene of the students, the student leader, and the teacher discussing their ideas on how and what they perceive their student-made TV show to be. Their discussion reveals tensions between the teachers' and the students' visions of what the show should be. The discussion took place during the weekly film-critique meeting.

Introductory Vignette: "Who Wants to Watch That?"

Students begin to trickle into the computer lab for their film critique session. Some students bring desks to the center of the room, while others sit further back at the computer work stations. Francis and Richard from the *Politics Now!* show sit up close to the rolled down projector screen, ready for the teacher. Tiana, Lina and Clint, from the *Friends show*, sit further back, dividing their attention between their computer screens and the projector screen. There is a light hum in the classroom on this fall morning, as students speak softly to each other. Jess, one of the student leaders sits towards the side of the class, near the teacher's computer, and in this way positions herself as a student

118

leader. Before beginning the film-critique screening, Adrien, the media production

teacher, addresses the class to talk about student grades as well as to discuss the different

categories that should make up the student news show. Adrien writes down the different

categories -- "school-based," "local-based," and "national-based" on the poster board that

stands near his desk. Jess, sits a few feet away from Adrien, faces the class.

> **Adrien**: When we're talking about school, local and national, it's informing you of
> . . .of, of . . . latest things going on more. That's what I'm trying to get at.
> **Jess**: Like, a reminder that this is the school newscast. With all the arts and
> entertaining, . . . entertainment segments it feels more like a talk show and that is
> not what this is.
> **Adrien**: Yeah, we're moving just a little towards, um. Cause, remember, going
> back to our mission statement. We're trying to make informative and entertaining
> stuff for our audience. We've just pushed, (Adrien gestures with his arms and
> pushes an imaginary wave to the right.). We've just pushed the, the pendulum
> swings all the time (moving his arms like a pendulum), but it's swinging to
> entertainment right now and we're missing some of that informative and research-
> based news.
> **Tim:** (in a whiney tone) Who wants to watch that?!
> *[This comment gets a few claps from some students and a few others shout out
> "yeah!"]*
> **Francis:** Me!
> **Adrien:** [stomps his feet and pretends to be a kid] Who wants facts?!
> **Student 1:** (shouting): Nobody. Nobody likes...
> **Student 2:** (shouting): No one...
> **Student 3:** (shouting) Nobody watches the *Archive* for news....
> *[The class noise level increases]*
> **Adrien:** Okay, okay but this is the thing. Think about this. What teacher in their
> right mind is going to just show four segments of people eating food and sweating
> on nachos?
> *[The sound of the class gets louder and more chaotic. Many students talk to each
> other as the teacher tries to speak over them.*
> **Adrien:** Who's going to take 20 minutes of their day to do that?!
> **Francis:** [standing up and faces the teacher] You can make things factual and
> entertaining. . .
> **Adrien:** Exactly
> **Francis:** . . .which is literally the entire goal of my segment.
>   (Video field note, November 15, 2019)

The sound of the class increases from quiet to loud as most students join in the

discussion. If a stranger walked into the classroom it would seem like chaos; but I see the

students talking on point and poignantly about the matter at hand: What kind of media do they want to produce and what kind of media do they think other students want to watch?

These kind of class discussions took place often throughout the months I spent with the class. During the film-critique meetings as well as during the student pitch meetings, students spoke loudly to comment on the purpose of their media and voiced what they thought would make the student news show better. They complained openly about things where they disagreed with the teacher. These argumentative discussions were telling and significant to my research as they revealed the norms, values, and beliefs of the students, and specifically what they believed to be the role of the student media show, what they wanted to say through their shows, and how they built their videos together. In this chapter I analyze the making of student videos through the lens of Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia and how the students employed their understandings of various media genres. I draw on concepts from the fields of new literacies and youth media to help me frame my findings.

Theoretical Framing

A "new literacies" conception of literacy includes remixing practices as a form of expression and meaning making. Lankshear and Knobel (2006) note that individuals, especially young people, "craft their identities through their practices of remix and the wider social and cultural work that sustains these practices, this new literacy" (p. 136). With the proliferation of digital media making, "remix" has taken on a specific meaning: combining digital images, texts, and sounds from existing popular texts to create a new text with new meaning and, possibly to a new audience. Hobbs (2010) suggests that this kind of appropriation of cultural materials is a powerful way for students to understand

the media they consume as well as develop a point of view. She cautions, though, about this kind of work occurring without the maker's understanding of copyright issues. Palfrey (2010) notes similarly that when examining digital media learning,

> We do need to help students understand the line between riffing off and ripping off the work of others. We riff off of one another all the time in academic work; we must all avoid ripping one another off. (n.p.)

It is important also to note the cultural ramifications of remix, as there is more to it than just the technical skill of slicing, cutting and pasting. Remix may be broadly looked at as part of culture as " . . . we remix meanings every time we take an idea or an artefact or a word and integrate it into what we are saying and doing at the time" (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006, p. 107). Jocson (2018) reminds us that remixing in all forms of popular culture is equally about changing the context of the artefact as it is about changing the content. Applying this concept to the Lakeview High's student productions requires looking at the relationships between the student producers, their peers, their teacher, and the popular culture texts they drew from, all in the context of the cultures of their school and surrounding community.

I also draw on Bakhtin's ideas on heteroglossia and citationality to conceptualize how students cite popular media texts. According to Morris (1994), Bakhtin understood the utterance as the contact point between the speaker's mind with the socio-historical world that exists outside it. Bakhtin's famous phrase "the word in language is half someone else's" (1981, p. 293) refers to the sociality and citationality of language. The phrases, expressions, and words we utter have already been uttered in other times and spaces. Because of this, "language is inherently citational, hybridized, and double-

voiced" (Tobin, 2000, p. 20) and therefore a Bakhtinian perspective on conversation will always include tracing citations. I use the concepts of citationality, hybridity and addressivity to analyze the students' choices as they make their videos, as well as the statements they made in the focus groups as they reflected on their video production process.

Additionally, I draw from sociocultural perspectives on genres and learning. Mittell (2004) asks us to think about media genres as more than just a category (e.g., sci-fi, horror, rap music), and instead to think about media genres as part of situated, contextual and historical moments. Genres "are formed by a broad array of cultural assumptions of meaning, value and social function exceeding any textual definition" (Mittell, 2004, p. 60). Kress (2003) examines the role that genres have for student learning, suggesting that "the students need to adapt a stance to their story, to choose a voice with which to speak to the reader" (p. 170). He says that teachers and researchers can evaluate the ability of students to choose from various genre conventions in their multimodal projects, as this may be considered evidence of learning. Kress's writings on genre in multimodal learning leads us to ask what purpose is served by the choice of specific genres and what each genre affords the expression of student voice in student media productions.

In this chapter, I explore how each of the five production groups of Lakeview High students I studied, as well as the class student leaders, perceived and addressed their audience. I examine the forms, styles, and genre conventions that the students used in their videos as evidence of the students' values and presentations of their identities in this diverse classroom. I consider the texts and discourses the students were citing and

responding to and consider, through their media productions what kind of answerability they were hoping for.

Findings

Across the student video production groups, the student producers cited globally circulating popular cultural texts and remixed these texts to create their own videos. Through this practice they employed strategies of humor, imitation, and authenticity to produce their student voice.

Remixing Humor

Particularly when doing video production, students remix genres and styles, and cite ideas from popular movies, music, social media sites, video games and other forms of popular culture. For the student producers in my study, this often meant making their productions humorous. Literacy and media education research say humor, including especially satire, is a common feature of learning in the media classroom (Alvermann, Moon & Hagood, 1999; Buckingham & Sefton-Green, 1994). These media scholars suggest that students' employment of parody, satire, irony, and other literacy techniques of humor can provide evidence of their critical understandings of media genres and encourage researchers to examine these techniques when researching media-making.

"We Still Want to be Funny:" Laughter in the Making

Almost all of the students who participated in my study expressed the desire to be funny and to make their audience laugh. For example, Francis and Richard, from *Politics Now!* took a humorous approach to informing their audience on national current affairs. Their show's purpose, in their words, was to make "politics accessible for teenagers through comedy and lightheartedness." Francis, a senior at Lakeview High, identified as

Jewish and as an "artsy" kid, who was into the visual arts and theater. She informed me she was going to direct one of the high school's plays the following semester and that she belonged to one of the state's youth political committees. During the course of my study, Francis was accepted to a private, research university in the Northeast. Richard, a junior, was hoping to get accepted to do an internship that summer at the Ken Burns documentary production company. He informed me in our interview that he had his first YouTube channel when he was nine-years old, and that "constant practice" got him to where he is now in terms of video editing skills.

The *Politics Now!* show was written, video-taped, and edited by Francis and Richard. In addition, Francis was the host of the show. The show intentionally took on the same format each week, one where Francis stood in front of the camera and addressed her audience directly and informed them on news and current affairs that they had chosen and discussed during the pitch meetings with the student leaders and the teacher. In my video-cued focus-group interview with Francis and Richard, they informed me that they were inspired by the style and genre of a YouTube show titled *Unraveled*, produced by Polygon, a website that focuses on video game culture. Polygon is in turn owned by VoxMedia, a major U.S. mass media corporation. Francis and Richard describe to me where they got the stylistic idea for their show:

> Francis: The wall slappy thing comes from our show inspiration which is a Polygon series called "Unraveled" which is about video games. Where it's the "slap-y-ness," is kind of this light-hearted fun thing. We use it to [for] comedic effect normally.

> Richard: We wanted to make it "Unraveled," but politics effectively. And [Adrien] seemed to want to make it a Daily Show kind of thing. And I don't think either of us enjoy watching the Daily Show.

Francis: No, I like the Daily Show, but it doesn't have the same chaotic energy that I was going for to make it more accessible.

(Video-cued focus group, January 13, 2020)

"The wall slap-y-ness thing" that Francis is referring to is a type of rhetorical and performative device she employed of slapping index cards and pictures onto a bulletin board behind her as she addresses the viewer. This is a performative device that is seen in *Unraveled*. In the show, a young twenty-something male host stands in front of the camera while he scrutinizes trendy and popular video games through highlighting the game elements that most likely only loyal fans would recognize, making this a type of sharing of insider knowledge. The production quality of the show is high, which isn't surprising as it receives advertising money and is streamed and hosted by Polygon.

The "chaos" that Francis comments on is achieved in *Unraveled* by the use of this performative device, along with the use of a two-camera shoot, where the host switches in mid-sentence from one camera angle to the second camera angle, as they address the viewer and speak quickly. All the while, the host slaps index-sized cards on the wall behind him, which contains information about the video game characters and the places or the objects he is describing. By the end of the show, the bulletin board behind him resembles a typical scene from a crime show where the detectives lay out all the characters, maps, places and objects that pertain to solving a case. Francis and Richard perceived the "slap" and "chaos" as a performative and visual device that could help them attract a young audience to their show.

I suggest the student producers from the Politics Now! were engaging in remixing practices. Hobbs and Friesem (2019) discuss imitation in video production as the careful copying of elements such as narrative content, character identity, setting, format and

125

cinematography from another video. As described above, the student producers imitated

the performative device of slapping index cards onto the wall to narrate the news and

employed cinematography and editing conventions used in *Unraveled*. However, the

content of their student-made video was not, as is *Unraveled,* about video game culture,

but rather about current affairs and politics. An excerpt from one of the show's openings

gives a sense of the tone and content of the *Politics Now!* show:

> **Francis (Close-up, facing camera):** Hello and welcome to [Politics Now!]. A show where I rave about politics with the hopes that you understand them a little bit better. This week we'll be discussing the 23 people that are running for president of the United States.

From the start of the segment and throughout it, Francis brings high energy and humor to

lighten up what she perceives as a topic that many teens, including teens in her high

school, have a hard time understanding. In our interview Francis explains,

> Politics are boring and elitist and are purposely made for people who are not educated white men to get involved in and get educated on. So, the purpose of the show was to basically allow younger people, less educated people, not that elitist group, to be able to understand and absorb politics.
> (Video-cued Focus Group Interview, January 13, 2020)

Francis describes politics as "boring" and "elitist" and believes that if the news and other

media outlets addressed young people more directly, young people would be able to

make better sense of current day politics and in turn be interested in it. Following is

another example of Francis's writing and tone for the show:

> **Francis (Close-up, facing camera):** Hello and welcome to [Politics Now!]. The show that was light-hearted in origin and now has gotten much, much darker. If you thought last week was bad it only goes down hill from here.

That opening was from their segment on Jeffrey Epstein, the millionaire who had been

arrested for human trafficking and other crimes and then found dead in his prison cell.

The week that I followed *the Politics Now!* group was the week they were covering this

national news story so the video-cue I used for interviewing them prompted our

discussion of this particular segment:

> I am willing to say that I think the [Smith] episode was our worst episode because
> it was so hard to be funny, it was so hard to do the goal of the show which is to
> make politics accessible for teenagers through comedy and lightheartedness.
> (Video-cued Focus Group, January 13, 2020)

When I asked Francis and Richard why they had chosen to cover this topic, they said

Jess, the student leader had suggested it to them, so they did it. They then explained that

once they began producing it, they realized it was not an easy topic to cover. In

particular, they found the topic of suicide to be difficult to produce in the style that they

were trying to go for – funny, but informative.

After watching the video sequence of their production process in our video-cued

focus group interview, Francis reflects on the trajectory that their TV show series had

taken during the course of the semester.

> We started off funny, got depressing because the world's a sad place, and at the
> very end tried to make it happy again. So it was in this weird middle bit, we were
> like, "we still want to be funny. . ."
> (Video-cued Focus Group, January 13, 2020)

In Francis's eyes, their segment evolved from funny to not funny, to funny again. Even

so, they kept going at it even while recognizing that some of their segments were not very

funny. They were one of the more prolific groups in the class, producing a 3-5 minute

segment each week during the semester, even when they were not happy with the

outcome of their show. This was the case with the Epstein segment that Francis described

as "one of our more depressing episodes." Francis and Richard felt that going ahead with

an unfunny show was better than showing up that week to class without a production and

possibly getting a zero for that week. This was one of the impacts that producing a show

for an in-school class had on some of the students -- they submitted media pieces they were not satisfied with because they were aware of the consequences if they didn't.

Francis and Richard wanted to communicate political content that they believed to be important for their fellow peers to know about and at the same time to be lighthearted and funny. They intentionally chose their genre-- a mix of the *Daily Show* combined with conventions and elements of the *Unraveled* show, to fulfill their purpose of educating other young people on the nation's news and political affairs. They believed it was important for them to do this in order for other young people "to be able to understand and absorb politics in a way that isn't mind-numbingly boring and in a way that they will remember." The duo took up performative devices, like "slapping" index cards onto a bulletin board, a two-camera shoot, and "snappy" edits that they thought would afford them an audio and visual "chaotic" energy and thus attract young people to their show. Francis and Richard took on the literacy practice of remixing and strategic imitation with intention and purpose for their peers, who were a new audience from the original.

"*Let's Rip-off Hot Ones:*" *Imitation in the Making*

Taking inspiration from well known, niche YouTube shows was a practice that other student groups engaged with as well. The student production group the *Saucy Sauce* show was no exception. The *Saucy Sauce* group was made up of five boys, four of whom identified as European-American and Kyle who identified as Asian and white mixed race. While I was doing my research, this group had two successful productions that they were able to include in the *Archive* broadcast. In casual conversations I had with students from the class, I understood that the class perceived this group as not reliable to produce a segment every week, and some characterized the *Saucy Sauce* group as having taken the

class just for an easy grade. For example, Francis described them to me as "slackers." The *Saucy Sauce* group was often not ready to pitch ideas during the weekly pitch meetings and two out of the five crew members were not in class on a consistent basis. The *Saucy Sauce* group did manage to get a few shows done, however, while I was there, and thus I was able to observe, follow, and then conduct a video-cued focus group with three out of the five participants from the group.

The *Saucy Sauce* group took inspiration from a food hybrid YouTube talk show named *Hot Ones*. The premise of the *Hot Ones* is that celebrities are interviewed over a dish of hot wings that gets progressively spicier as the interview progresses. The show boasts the idea that the host asks celebrities deep-probing questions both personal and career-focused, and that viewers get to see celebrities in a vulnerable and authentic light as they struggle to eat extraordinarily spicy wings. The *Hot Ones*, which began in 2015, has won several awards and now mostly invites only A-list celebrities. The *Saucy Sauce* group show centered on the premise of interviewing a student from their school while the host and his guest(s) ate food that they topped with extremely spicy sauce.

During my video-cued focus group interview with three of the five students from the group, Kyle, Connor and Nate, I asked them how they chose their weekly topics and who to interview. They said it depended on what was going on in school or, as Kyle put it, "whatever people are complaining about, pretty much." On the week I shadowed them, the Saucy Sauce group covered the topic of student privacy in school, in particular privacy in the school bathrooms. This excerpt, from their segment that week, gives a glimpse of the topic, the tone and style of their video.

> **Nate (Close-up, facing camera)**: Hello and welcome back to the Saucy Sauce interview show. I'm your host, Nate and this week I'm joined with:

Male Student: Milo.
Female Student: Lisa.

[The video cuts to the graphic intro of the show, which includes animated text along with animated visuals of the outline of food with red and orange flames surrounding it, against a black background. Contemporary hip hop style music is playing in the background]

Nate (Close-up, facing camera): We're just going to dive right into the sauce. [All three students begin to put hot sauce on their food]
Nate: So this week we're going to be talking about the bathrooms at Lakeview High and the fact that they're routinely being locked and propped open, if not locked.
Milo: Hmmm, interesting topic. (With a smile)
Nate: Yeah, well it just felt relevant, considering recent events.
Milo: Such as?
Nate: Such as the bathrooms being routinely locked and propped open [the three students laugh]
Nate: Alright. Let's go. 3, 2, 1. [all three students put a piece of food with hot sauce in their mouths]
Nate: Um, has the issue of the bathrooms being locked like affected you or have you noticed it affecting anyone?
Milo: The only way it has affected me is when I gotta do my business (the female student smirks) and I don't have that much time and I gotta run all the way down to like the first floor and then run all the way up to the third floor. You know I've been in situations where first floor and second floor have been locked and then I've gotten late.
Nate: You've gotten late? Like you were marked as tardy?
Milo: Uh huh, that's not OK.
Nate: That's not cool, man. [Nate opens up a can of Arizona Iced-Tea]
Lisa: During 1st period a lot of the time the 2nd floor bathroom is locked and like it's just annoying to have to search and roam. . .
Nate: . . .for an unlocked bathroom...
Lisa: . . .for an unlocked bathroom, when it should just be available.

The show continues with this rhythm of eating interspersed with questions from Nate, the host. All three students agree that bathrooms being locked or being propped open is "a little weird" and that it could be considered "a violation of student privacy." Nate asks them if they think that these tactics from the administration to prevent vaping inside the bathrooms are working. The two students replied:

Lisa: Maybe.

Milo: No! [both students laugh]
Nate: Have you noticed like a decrease in use?
Milo: No, I've noticed [pauses] parties [video cuts to a found footage video clip of random students dancing inside a school bathroom] an increase.

In the final video, as we hear Milo say, "I've noticed parties," we see footage the editors have spliced in of high school-aged kids from another school dancing in what is clearly a bathroom inside a school. Like the *Politics Now!* group discussed above, the *Saucy Sauce* group uses distinctive visual codes that imitates a well-known show, in this case the *Hot Ones* You Tube show device of interviewing while having your guest eat some fast food with lots of hot sauce on it. They also deployed cinematography and editing techniques that are used in the original, such as using close-ups when the guests are putting a hot wing/chip in their mouth. Similar to the Politics Now! group, this group employed strategic imitation as well as humor. In our video-cued interview, when I asked them to tell me about the genre and idea for their show, the group described how they were different and the same as the original program:

> **Kyle:**
> Well, we were like, you know what people like? Hot Ones. You know what we should do? *Hot Ones*.
> **Nate:**
> Just rip off *Hot Ones*, yeah.
> **Isabel:**
> Do you feel like you're ripping it off?
> **Kyle:**
> A little bit but I feel like we've done stuff like original enough, it's not like. . .
> **Connor:**
> We're not eating wings or anything, it's just [other food].
> **Nate:**
> Yeah
> **Kyle:**
> We're using their sauce.
> **Connor:**
> The only difference between us and *Hot Ones* is that we don't have as many. . .
> **Nate:**
> First of all, we're literally using the *Hot Ones* sauce.

131

Connor:

The only similarity is that we're using the sauce though.

Nate:

We're also, the only difference between us and them is, other than production quality, is they have more sauces than we do and.. .

Connor:

We have more sauce. We've just never used them.

Nate:

We should have. And also like, that's really it, everything else about it is the same. It's like it's literally *Hot Ones,* but with a different food.

Kyle:

But also, if you took our show and took away the sauce, then there's no similarities between it.

Nate:

Well, then it's just a regular interview show.

Kyle:

It's just an interview where you eat.

Nate:

It's boring.

<div align="right">(Video-cued Focus Group, January 14, 2020)</div>

As they reflect on how little or how much their show is similar to the original one, they agree and disagree with each other. Nate states, "the only difference between us and them, is, other than production quality, is they have more sauces than we do." While Kyle states, "But also, if you took our show and took away the sauce, then there's no similarities between it." This is in contrast to what Nate says that "everything else about it [their show] is the same. It's like it's literally *Hot Ones* but with a different food." I suggest that these contradictions have to do with the students' relationships, the original text they were remixing, and the context they were creating their media in, including their school peer networks, their media production class and the teacher.

The Saucy Sauce group always filmed inside the school. They would carry the audio and video equipment upstairs and set up in a small room the size of a tiny office, located inside the school library. The space they used for the interview show was quite simple. It consisted of a table with a black tablecloth and chairs, in front of a backdrop of a black curtain. Not surprisingly, this mirrors minimalist set up that of the celebrity show. The students used a three-camera set-up, with each camera on a tripod. One camera was set on auto, while Kyle and Will stood behind the other two cameras. Using a three-camera set-up gave the students different angled shots to edit from. This included reaction shots of the interviewees, close-ups of the host, and a wide shot of all of them. The result was a visually dynamic show that cut between the host and his guests as they ate hot sauce, while trying to talk about serious topics.

The show they are imitating and citing, the YouTube show the *Hot Ones*, is produced by Complex Networks, a national media company that creates and distributes content to platforms including Hulu and Netflix. Their target audience is the 18-35 age bracket, so it not surprising that the boys in this group were fans of this program. In our interview, Nate says that one of the ways their show was different from the original was in their "production quality," while not mentioning that their show is also different in the subject matter that is being discussed. Their TV show focused on student-centered topics that for the most part pertain to their school. There are other things also that are different, such as the music of the show, and that the interviewees are fellow students and not celebrities. This emphasis by the students in their reflecting on their project on production values falls in line with what other research has found on youth media production, which is that youth often place a significant amount of importance on the production quality of

their media and in doing so, other elements, like story or writing. may get eclipsed (Castellanos, Bach & Kulick, 2011).

One interpretation is that these students felt more comfortable with the technical aspects of video production, such as setting up a three-camera shoot, lighting, and set design, and with assessing the fidelity of their copy of the look and feel of the YouTube show, and less comfortable with the practice of being an outlet for voicing student concerns about topics such as vaping and bathroom privacy. That week the group managed to complete their production on bathrooms and vaping and get it broadcast on the school channel. To their surprise, the segment made it into a local newspaper that published a story titled, "Vaping in the Bathroom: Does keeping doors 'locked open' actually work?" where information and a few quotes were taken from the *Saucy Sauce* episode.

Schooling and Remixing. Why did this group use the term "rip-off," which implies that it is a direct and cynical copy of something? And why the use of a term that is self-deprecating? In the focus group discussion, the group oscillates between stating that their show is "original enough" to stating that it's a "rip-off." My field notes and videos show the students participating in the media production class in many ways and caring about their work. In addition to a complex and well thought out technical set-up for their shoots, they also showed investment in their project during other parts of the production process. For example, the week that I followed them, Kyle went out of his way to go buy fast food for the show. He drove to a local restaurant and brought back food for the show. On another occasion, Kyle and a peer from the class spent almost an hour filming one bottle of hot sauce in the video studio, creating different lighting

scenarios for the hot sauce bottle and filming it if from different angles. This was a technique also used by the celebrity show. On another occasion, the five students all approached the teacher to talk about camera lenses and the varying visual effects each lens would have on their show. This kind of participation in the class, along with their elaborate three-camera set-up I, is evidence that the students were invested in their project.

Yet, during our video-cued focus group, their responses were full of conflicting ideas as well as sarcastic remarks. In the transcript segment from above, Kyle is the first to respond to my question: "How did you come up with the idea of the Saucy Sauce Show?" He quickly names the celebrity show, *Hot Ones*, stating: "Well, we were like, you know what people like? *Hot Ones*. You know what we should do? *Hot Ones*." Then Nate, follows up and states, "Just rip-off *Hot Ones*, yeah." I suggest in this last remark, by Nate, he is expressing two conflicting ideological ideas or discourses "within the arena of an utterance," (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 358). Nate is not simply saying that the group is going to do a straight copy of the YouTube celebrity show, as this would imply unoriginality and unauthenticity. Instead, his utterance, in an instance of hybrid construction (Bakhtin, 1981) is built on two ideas. He is indirectly saying, "Yeah, we are youth who have no originality and are simply copying someone else's work" while at the same time saying, "You, adult, wouldn't get how this is a kind of literacy practice we kids are into." I contend Nate and to some degree Kyle and Connor, who agreed with the "rip-off" statement, are critiquing closed and static views of literacy, views which do not value the practice of remixing. I read these statements as these boys indirectly citing and

distancing themselves from the normative discourse on youth which contends that the popular culture that youth participate in is unimaginative, trivial and pointless.

The Saucy Sauce production crew's reflection on their project also touches on the scholarly debate about the difference between in-school and out-of-school literacy practices. The debate emphasizes that in-school literacy practices are "dreary, dusty, traditional school activities" (Bulfin & Koutsogiannis, 2012, p. 343), whereas out-of-school literacy practices, such as online and digital viewing and making practices are rich and authentic. Much research has shown, however, that these boundaries are not so clear cut and that both in-school and out-of-school digital media practices inform each other. Both kinds of literacies struggle for authenticity and engagement to be original while working within established genres and citing other texts.

Parody. Another thing that struck me as noteworthy about the genre choices of this group was their desire to communicate not only through humor but through a kind of excessive silliness. Their production has a suggestion of parody. This may be connected back to the original show, the YouTube series, *The Hot Ones,* which is itself a pastiche of foodie culture, obsession with celebrities, and a critique of formal, traditional journalism. Feminist scholar Emily Contois (2018) considers *The Hot Ones* as representative of a culturally coded masculinity where food like hot wings "are situated within "bro" media and spaces, appearing throughout the menus, programming, and advertising at sports bars and at-home football-viewing parties, particularly the Super Bowl" (p. 769). Contois (2018) also interprets the act of eating spicy food that makes you sweat as signaling masculinity. To this analysis, I add that the original is also indirectly parodying the formats and pretensions of traditional broadcast journalism.

I suggest that by self-consciously and explicitly citing the style and format of *The Hot Ones* the student producers from the Saucy Sauce show were also indirectly commenting parodically on authority. The excessiveness of eating on screen, sweating, and turning physically uncomfortable due to the spicy sauces are kinds of carnivalesque behaviors that are traditionally not allowed in school. In this video production the students were commenting on school conventions as well as testing creative boundaries. Additionally, I suggest that the student production group, which was all made up of boys, may have also been trying out identities of masculinity, coded through food (Contois, 2018), and thereby taking on insider positions of white, male youth discourses. In the above script of the show, it is clear that the two guest students are familiar with the original show and thus have no trouble playing the role of the guests by saying sarcastic comments and remarking on how hot the sauce is, and how it is making their bodies react. Simply by agreeing to be on the show they signal that they are insiders to this discourse. As Kyle rationalizes, kids in his school liked to watch *Hot Ones*, so therefore, their group should do a show like *Hot Ones*.

Real Friendship, Real Media: Authenticity in the Making

Producing media that felt authentic or "real" was one of the student producers' main concerns. Each production group strove for authenticity in different ways, but they all shared the idea that their video-making had to tap into something that other youth would recognize and relate to. The production group Friends had clear ideas about this. For the Friends group, authenticity in media production required chemistry between the hosts and talk among the hosts and guests that feels authentic and demonstrates real friendship. This production group included two female students, Tiana and Lina, and

three male students, Elliot, Timothy and Clint. All except Tiana, who identified as Black, were of European descent. In our video-cued focus group, Tiana, Timothy, Lina, Clint, and Elliot described to me what made one of their recent TV segments so good.

> **Elliot:**
> Camera work was awesome. Cinematography, [crosstalk 00:25:19]
> **Tiana:**
> Me and Elliot have pretty good chemistry.
> **Elliot:**
> Camera work is fantastic.
> **Tiana:**
> We're pretty funny.
> **Elliot:**
> Tiana and I are friends, so we know how to talk. There was no script. Don't tell Adrien. [teacher] There was absolutely no script.
> **Tiana:**
> Yeah. That's facts. There was no. . . I'm so proud of us. Wow.
> **Elliot:**
> The reason it was so good is I don't think there was a script. [The Friends show] is something that shouldn't be scripted.
> **Timothy:**
> Yeah, exactly.
> **Lina:**
> It can't be scripted.
> **Timothy:**
> That's what Adrien didn't like about it. He kept trying to make us become more informative and this and that, but no one's going to want to watch it.
> **Lina:**
> When it becomes scripted, then it becomes boring.
> **Timothy:**
> Yeah.
>
> (Video-cued Focus Group, January 10, 2020)

According to the Friends group, script writing equals boring. The genre they value is one where the hosts speak in a way that does not sound scripted. Having a planned and pre-written script would make the show predictable, and unlike how they and their peers communicate in real life, which would make other students in the class and the school not want to watch it. They point out that Adrien, the media production teacher, wanted them to work on a scripted show. However, they all disagreed with this kind of genre which,

according to this group, would have been "informative" but "boring." The students

prioritized spontaneity, authentic talk and the craft of being funny over being informative.

Unsurprisingly, these are elements typical across many YouTube genres. As Lina and

Tiana explained, their goal was to adapt a familiar YouTube genre for their own

purposes:

> **Tiana:**
> [Addresses this question to me]. Do you know any vloggers on YouTube?
> **Isabel**
> Not really.
> **Lina:**
> Do you know the idea, though, where you just kind of. . .
> **Isabel**
> Yeah. Uh-huh (affirmative).
> **Lina:**
> Yeah.
> **Tiana:**
> I'll explain it. There's a lot of YouTube groups that are just groups of friends who just do funny stuff. I think that's kind of what . . .
> **Lina:** And they're funny, and. . .They have millions of followers. They make tons of money just from recording videos of them with friends. . . .If you had two people that weren't friends and didn't know each other, it would be so awkward to watch. . .
> **Elliot:**
> The four of us actually being friends and hanging out very routinely outside of school aided the process so much because we know how our chemistry works, and we know how to yell at each other, and we know how to get in fights, and we know how to come to a conclusion, and we know there's no bad blood. It becomes tricky when you don't have that.
>
> (Video-cued Focus Group, January 10, 2020)

For the *Friends* group, being friends with your co-producers was something that they

perceived as vital in their media productions. Making a video with a stranger would be

strained and thus "awkward to watch." Creating media that read as authentic depended on

carrying the same feeling as in their everyday lives hanging out and spending time

together inside and outside of school. Authenticity was also produced by the student

producers being comfortable enough with each other to disagree and to know "how to get

in fights," and "how to yell at each other," but without hostility. All of these elements read as real friendship and by extension, real media. Similar to the *Politics Now!* show, the *Friends* group also valued humor and making viewers laugh, and similar to the *Saucy Sauce* group, they were hyper-sensitive to their TV segment being perceived as "boring."

Discussion

Remixing as Social and Cultural Critique

The Politics Now! group believed that one of the obstacles that young people encounter when engaging with civics and politics are the genres and media conventions that are traditionally used by the mainstream media to inform and educate the public. The mainstream media through its genres and conventions addresses a specific person, one who is Euro-American, middle-class and male. Francis and Richard, the producers of *Politics Now!* expressed a critique of mainstream news outlets, and specifically of the gatekeeping effects of these outlets. To address this, the *Politics Now!* group appropriated some of the conventions from youth-centered YouTube shows like *Unraveled* to present the news to youth. Similar to symbolic creativity (Willis, 1990), the students took up remix and imitation practices to create something new. The students' remixes were intended to address a different network of people and reflect a different worldview than the original program. In this way they showed a critical understanding of mainstream media genre conventions, which then they disrupted. I suggest these critical, disruptive practices are of great value in our current times of social media and where there is a lack of understanding of how and by whom media gets made. In other words, Francis and Richard were operating within a framework of critical media literacy and production.

140

Nate, Kyle, and Connor from the Saucy Sauce student show were upfront about using a famous YouTube program as their main influence in their own student-produced show. However, they expressed mixed feelings about this genre choice. At times they took pride in their media production, as when they informed me that "they were in the newspaper!" Other times, they were self-deprecating about their work, referring to it by using the term "rip-off." As I have shown in my interpretation above, these mixed feelings may have been due to their desire to deploy "new literacies" creative strategies such as "rule breaking" (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006) and imitation strategies (Hobbs & Friesem, 2019), but felt they couldn't because of school structures, rules and sanctions.

Conflict in the Media Production Classroom

In the introductory vignette of this chapter, I presented a scene from one of the film critique sessions. I suggested that this vignette showed how the student's perspective on the role and function of the student-made news and magazine show differed in significant ways from that of the teacher's. While the teacher encouraged the students to do informative, high-quality media, the students interpreted this as "boring" and not funny enough. One of their main concerns when doing media production in school dealt with the freedom to choose styles and genres that they found authentic and engaging to their peers. These genres and styles tended to come mostly from contemporary and trendy YouTube programs. For example, in one of the class discussions, the teacher insisted that students stop deploying a cinematographic technique of doing a fast zoom onto a person's face:

> Adrien: This is something that your generation does that's kind of annoying. But I guess it's alright. The zooms. . .
>
> Jess: Adrien, stop talking about the zooms!

141

Adrien: But it's bad quality.

Jess: But it's bad quality on purpose.

Clint: It's so outdated!

"Bad quality on purpose" captures in one phrase the essence of contemporary media-making by many youth and the resistance from the teacher to accept the class's valued media effects.

With the introductory vignette I also aimed to describe the quality of these class discussions, which were rambunctious, loud, and at times chaotic, as we see in the above exchange. I suggest these highly charged discussions were at the core of this media production class and had an important learning and social function. They made the class stand apart from the "upstairs classes" in a way that constructed this space as non-traditional, different, and more like an out-of-school learning space where elements of play, unpredictability, humor, and even conflict can be brought to the fore. There was a thread of conflict that ran through the film-critique meetings, the pitch meetings, the video-edit sessions, and at times even through my own video-cued focus groups. I suggest this constant struggle and tension was because there was a lot at stake for the students, as well as for the teacher, within the structure of school to be able to make productions that expressed their creativity, style, identity and voice. The "pushes and pulls of actually speaking and writing in classrooms" (Lensmire, 1998, p. 278) became audible and visible throughout the class, evidence that students cared deeply about what and how they created their videos in school.

Conclusion

Through my data and interpretation, I have shown how student voice is shaped by the new literacies of remixing, which also connects to students' critiques of normative and authoritative discourses. Student producers from *The Politics Now!* show and the *Saucy Sauce* show constructed their videos by citing popular and trendy media from YouTube. They engaged in specific kinds of remixing, including strategic imitation (Hobbs & Friesem, 2019) that allowed the students' own vision and perspectives to co-exist with those from YouTube genres. By theorizing these student-produced videos through a heteroglossic lens (Bakhtin, 1981), I have problematized the idea that student expression and creativity reflect individuals' fixed, unique beliefs, tastes, and knowledge. Instead, I have shown how the students in my study cited media situated in the larger society and how this kind of intertextuality points to the possibility for students to engage with the new literacies and participatory cultures through in-school video production practices. In chapter six I will discuss a similar citationality practice that students engaged in and that leads to researchers and educators better understanding students' shared worlds in school.

CHAPTER 6

SHARED WORLDS THROUGH VIDEO PRODUCTION

> *I think the main goal of our segment, in terms of students, was just to get more knowledge to the students.*
> (Theresa, Lakeview High student producer)

> I *used to watch the Archive and I would always be so excited for that to come on. . . . I wanted to take this class and have a segment. . . that everyone is like,* "*Ah, I can't wait to see that.*"
> (Lennie, Lakeview High student producer)

Introduction

The nature of video and film is a social one. By this I mean the affordances, including the materiality, the histories and conventions that have developed over time for this medium have a social nature. We can see evidence of this in how we have traditionally watched movies - movie theaters, living rooms, and other group settings. It is also evident in the making of films, think of the preferred group production work in the classroom or huge groups of employees in large Hollywood productions. In the classroom, when teachers bring in film, video or social media, they also bring in the conventions that follow these tools and modalities. For many young people, the sociality of film and video comes with excitement and potentiality. We can hear this in Lennie's statement above as he explains to me why he chose to take the video production class. In this chapter, I look at how this social quality of film and video impacts student voice. The Lakeview High student media producers had a "real" audience -- an audience that went beyond the teacher and the classroom. Imagined, potential or real audiences can create a sense of belonging and a sense of our lives being intertwined with others. Similarly, dialogism or dialogic relations (Bakhtin, 1981) can point to living in this world in

144

relational ways that can have an impact on our understanding of ourselves and of others. This is especially important for students in secondary education. In this chapter, I address my research question: What role did student voice have for the students and the school? How did the students think of audience for their videos?

I employ Bakhtin's concepts of "addressivity" and "citationality" to examine how students were addressing their media text viewers. I also define contemporary notions of audience and publics to re-frame conventional understandings of audience for student-made films. I then present my findings, focusing on how shared worlds and shared knowledge is mobilized through the students' video productions. Lastly in the discussion, I ask how scholars and educators may rethink about the roles and purposes of student-made films in school communities.

Theoretical Framing

In this chapter I draw from Bakhtin's ideas on addressivity and will also draw from youth media literacy scholarship. Pandya and Low (2020) describe authentic digital video composition as a practice where students "turn to" (Bakhtin, 1981) an audience, immanent, imagined or real that they value and deem appropriate for their creations. Morris (1994) describes the utterance as "always an answer to a previous utterance, and [it] always expects an answer in the future" (p.251). As the utterance gets voiced it also asks for some kind of answerability. "Addressivity. . . indicates that an essential feature of language is that it is always oriented to a listener" (Moreson, 2016, n.p.). This means that you cannot just say something without your words directly or indirectly addressing a listener; language is not neutral. In this chapter I frame my analysis in a similar way, and I argue that constructing a video text will also always

orient towards a listener/viewer/watcher, and an audience and possibly a publics. Consequently, this has implications for how the video is made, its genres and stylistic choices and the role it has in the community it is being created.

Talking about film and videos will almost always undoubtedly point to a larger audience than just the maker. When we talk about audience, we are also conjuring ideas of publics. As a noun, publics has often pointed to civic engagement. Livingstone (2005) defines civic engagement as referring " to the realm of collective interest and mobilization, the values, institutions and practices geared towards social and political outcomes that enhance democracy." (p. 37). According to Livingstone (2005) the distinction between "the public" and "an audience" in our current mediated times is difficult to delineate. Livingstone states about audience and publics: But they do not refer to wholly separate realities. In a thoroughly mediated world, audiences and publics, along with communities, nations, markets, and crowds are composed of the same people" (p. 18). However, as she explains, they are often thought of as opposites. Media audience as "trivial, passive, individualized" and publics as "active, critically engaged and politically significant." Livingstone (2005) proposes a kind of continuum that would include audience, civic culture, civil society, and publics and argues that these terms would be a better fit to describe audiences or publics in our mediated society.

Drawing from Livingstone (2005), Stornaiuolo and Nichols (2018), I deploy their concept of "making publics" to emphasize the idea that audiences do not appear from nowhere and that they must be cultivated, especially youth media audiences. "Making publics" points to the idea of students contributing through their media productions to a shared world or in some cases to civic culture. Similarly, Poyntz

146

(2009) points out that youth media "feeds a form of thinking and doing that is attentive to the ways all meaning has a social and historical context" (p. 383).

Additionally, I highlight the significance of "place" in youth media production. Jocson (2018) defines place-making as crucial to student media production and pushes for a definition of "place" that moves beyond spatial boundaries and that "accounts for difference, boundary, and connectivity in students' lives" (p. 95). This approach to place considers then how youth media is shaped by the youth's relationships with family and friends as well as with their physical surroundings. Place-making can mean drawing on your own experiences to figure out your place in the world. Students at Lakeview High drew from their experiences inside their high school as they looked to this "place" for responses and for ideas for their videos.

Following these scholars' constructs of audience, publics and place, I map new literacies practices onto existing schooling practices and analyze what impact this has in understanding student voice in my study. I ask if the students saw themselves as belonging to a shared place with other student producers and with their imagined audiences. Ideas on participation and collective engagement in social and cultural issues are heard in the new literacies' ethos (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006), and in Jenkins, Ito & Boyd's (2016) ideas on participatory culture. These ideas will form the backdrop for my findings.

Findings

My data and interpretation demonstrated how students understood the role of student voice inside their school as one of social answerability where video-making was a

public and social act 1.) to educate, inform or teach other students as they addressed social problems; 2.) to cultivate audiences beyond their teacher and their classroom.

Getting Knowledge to Peers

Student producers from the Lakeview High media production class were aware that the media they produced in school had the possibility of being watched by students across the grades. Did they then make media intentionally for an audience of the whole school? How did they address them and who was addressed specifically? In our video-cued focus group, the Craft Show group informed me that they imagined younger students like first- and second-year high school students to be part of the audience for their show. The Craft Show group was comprised of three students, Theresa, a Sophomore, Samantha, a Senior, who had already been accepted to a four-year college, and Matt, a junior. Theresa and Samantha identified as White, European American and Matt as mixed-race, Hispanic and Asian. They also self-identified as "Try Hards." They used this self-label as a way to explain the reason they consistently produced high quality video productions every week without missing a beat. So in other words they "tried hard" to do good work. Their video series consisted of interviewing a teacher from their school while they made crafts together. The set up was always the same-- the teacher sat in the center while two of the student producers sat on each side. All three faced the camera. On the week, I filmed them, I observed the various steps they took to transform the classroom into a TV studio-- closing the window blinds, moving desks around, and setting up the lights and the cameras. They set up for a two-camera shoot where one camera was placed in front of the interviewees, while the other camera faced them diagonally, creating some dynamic visuality for the final edited video. They also tinkered

with the shutter speed and aperture settings of the cameras, looking at the mini LCD

screen in the back of the cameras. Before they got to these production steps though they

had to carry the equipment from the media production classroom down in the basement

upstairs to the third floor where this shoot was going to take place. Here is how the group

described their production process:

> Theresa: We go around the school so much. If I had my phone on me the whole
> entire   time, I'd probably walk almost a mile around the school every day just in
> fourth period.
>
> Samantha: Heavy cameras.
>
> Theresa: Yeah. I probably got so much upper body strength because we have to
> carry all the cameras like three floors up. I think at one point I had a tripod on
> [one] shoulder, tripod on [the other] shoulder, with the cameras on and I had two
> lights in my hand, and you just walk up the stairs like that. It kills you, . . . And
> when you get up there and then you have to bring all of it down. And so I think
> just all the walking around.
> <div align="right">(Video-cued Focus Group, December 20, 2019)</div>

The Craft Show group followed a tight schedule:

> Theresa: We film Monday, edit Tuesday, Wednesday, edit Thursday, and then get
> it out and then we go find a new teacher... Yeah. So I think for the most part, that
> is the order that it goes in. We find a teacher, we do pre-interviews, we film, we
> upload the stuff, we do the narrative, then we edit, and then we do the meeting. So
> I think mostly that is what we do, yeah...
> <div align="right">(Video-cued Focus Group, December 20, 2019)</div>

The group, compared to the other four production groups I followed was the most

organized. They followed the same pre-productions steps every week, including what

they called a "pre-interview." A pre-interview entailed of two or all three of them,

visiting the teacher for that week's segment several days before the shoot and doing an

informal interview with them. This gave them a sense of what kind of questions they

were going to ask and what kind of answers they were going to get.

Talking to Teachers

The topics the Craft Show group interviewed teachers on varied but mostly revolved around the teachers' hobbies, family and career. When I asked the Craft Show student group how they had developed this genre of crafting meets interviewing teachers, they informed me that they had gotten inspiration for their show from a prior student-made *Archive* segment.

> Theresa: So it was still the question, asking the teachers questions stuff, but their thing was cooking. And so, I really liked that idea . . . but I thought I could make it a little more exciting. I was like, "Oh, let's do it again but with arts and crafts or something"
>
> Matt: . . . so we had to create an actual segment and me working on [Let's Cook] last year, I knew the setup, I knew the general format of it. And I personally wanted to, I liked the idea of [inaudible]
>
> (Video-cued Focus Group, December 20, 2019)

They liked the idea of the student-made video series, "Let's Cook" which they had seen last year in school and so they swapped the cooking element for a crafting activity but kept the teacher interview elements of the show. Additionally, Matt was familiar with the format and production set up.

The Craft Show group felt that seeing this side of teachers was important for the rest of the students.

> Theresa: I think the main goal of our segment, in terms of students, was just to get more knowledge to the students. Because I know I didn't know most of the teachers so I think we did that so that the students would know the teachers better, and I think that it's also beneficial to them.

Similarly, Matt informs me how he enjoyed the concept of talking to teachers:

> But yeah, I like the concept of talking to teachers and getting to know them better as well as pushing that to the students, to familiarize themselves with the teacher.
>
> (Video-cued Focus Group, December 20, 2019)

Theresa and Matt agree that "pushing" "more knowledge to the students" was the main

goal of the show. They believed that it was beneficial for their peers to learn about their

high school teachers' personal hobbies, interests, career choices and family. They

valued students being more familiar and comfortable with their school's teachers. More

so, they have personally experienced real-life gains from this knowledge. All three of the

students informed me that since they began doing the show, their relationships with

teachers had transformed.

> Samantha: It's also helped me with relationships with teachers and staff in the building. I see teachers in the hallway now they're like, "Hey, what's up?" And this is kind of cool. This is a freshmen teacher that I've never had before but we know each other now. And also Ms. Harvey [pseudonym], the woman we just watched, she's actually my stats teacher and I sort of had a relationship with her before, but not anything too involved, and so now we sort of have some sort of common ground after the episode.
>
> (Video-cued Focus Group, December 20, 2019)

Similarly, Theresa thinks she'll benefit from this experience later in her high school

trajectory, as she says in the focus group that she will have "a one up over the other

students" as she will already have met the teachers and will "know" the teacher better

than do her fellow peers. It is significant to note that the group's self-label of "try-hards"

can be interpreted as someone who tries too hard to do the right thing or to be perfect.

Some students may see interviewing teachers as a way of trying to be "teacher's pet."

However, I contend while this is something that this recognized, this was not their initial

impetus for choosing this genre and topic. Instead, I suggest they believed that they were

helping the rest of the students by providing them with knowledge their peers may have

not otherwise had access to. They wanted to show and teach the rest of the students in the

school a personal side of their teachers, something they may not have known about them

and also communicate to their peers the value of having closer relationships with teachers. The Craft group saw video production as a way to mentor younger students in the high school by presenting to their audience a personal side of teachers in their school.

Student producers in the other four groups also saw video production in their school as a way to inform, teach and get knowledge to other students. Francis and Richard from *Politics Now!* repurposed genre conventions with the intent to inform and educate their fellow peers on the world of politics and world affairs. Similarly, Kelly and Angela through their videos wanted to teach their fellow peers about difference. They saw the role of video production as an opportunity to teach across the school about different cultures, races, and ethnicities, in particular those of students from their school who did not belong to the dominant, white, Euro-descent students in the school. The Friends Show group also wanted to inform students. They did this by leveraging the "authenticity" that they believed they had amongst each other and using it to address their peers. By authenticity in video production, they meant no scripts and lots of spontaneity. They perceived this to be best strategy to reach their peers, while informing them on things like where to find the cheapest burger in town or other local based things to do.

Lastly, the Saucy Sauce Interview Show, I contend did not see their role necessarily as teaching, informing, or educating. Instead, they were creating a dialogue among students in their school through the casual conversation style of their show. The week I observed them, they were covering a serious issue like student privacy and the policies that the administration was carrying out, but more typically their topics were less serious, like student clubs, or student hobbies. Moreso, at times the students who were guests on the show did not necessarily know each other, which led to them becoming

acquaintances after the filming of the video. I suggest because of the conversation-style that the show had, the Saucy Sauce Interview Show group created a mediated space where they focused on students- student hobbies, home life, sports and mundane, everyday life issues. I contend this group, perhaps more than other more prolific or less "slacker-like" groups "addressed" (Pandya, 2019) their audience in a student-centered and authentic way.

"What was the Name of that Show?"

As described above, the students saw the role of video production for the most part as a way to teach, inform and educate. As I have described in detail in chapter five, students did this through emphasizing properties of authenticity, humor and engaging in intertextual strategies. Similar to the Politics Now! and the Saucy Sauce Interview Show groups, the *Craft Show* group was also remixing content, cinematography, setting and format production elements. However, unlike these two production groups, the Craft Show group did not draw from trendy, famous YouTube shows. Instead they looked to a much closer place for inspiration, their high school. The Craft Show group based their concept on a past show from their school, "Let's Cook." In my video-cued focus groups and to my surprise, I began to notice how students were referencing past student-produced videos that had broadcasted on the *Archive* and that they had watched before they took the class. For instance, in the following excerpt from their focus group, we hear Lennie referencing a past video production that he recalled watching on the Archive*:*

> **Lennie:**
> Okay. What was the show last year that they had with the two guys at the
> end?
> **Lina:**
> Oh, I know.
> **Elliot:**

The Thread
Lennie:
I want a show like that.
Tiana:
Lennie would be so good with The Thread.
Lina:
He would be so good.
Lennie:
I used to watch the *Archive* and I would always be so excited for that to come on.
Tiana:
That's facts. I love The Thread
Lennie:
That's what I wanted. I wanted to take this class and have a segment, and it was good, but I want to have a segment that everyone is like, "Ah, I can't wait to see that."
Lina:
That's what everyone felt about that segment too. It was so funny every week and everyone was like, "Oh, can we just watch The Thread?"

<div align="right">(Video-cued Focus Group, January 10, 2020)</div>

Here, the student producers reminisce about a past segment, named *The Thread*, that was made by students who had taken the media production class in prior years. Lennie, Lina and Tiana all agree that this show was "so funny" and that everybody wanted to watch it. Lennie states that watching this show was what prompted him to enroll in the media production class. Lennie, who was a senior during the course of my research, tells me in the focus group that he didn't feel like he got to produce this kind of video production he remembers so fondly. He recognizes that what he and the rest of the Friends Show group did this year "was good, but. . ." regretting that it was not as good in his eyes as his memory of *The Thread*. His motivation to take the class was to produce a show similar to *The Thread*.

Along the same lines, student class leaders, Jess and Nina also looked to old *Archive* videos produced by students to explain their media production interests and motivation for taking the class.

Jess: But I feel like even when, our freshman year when Lisette did--
Nina: That's what I mean.
Jess: Lisette killed it! ... she always did like pop culture and how race is involved in pop culture. So she talked a lot about when Kendall Jenner and Kylie Jenner made a clothing brand with Tupac's face and Biggie Smalls, that's when I knew that I wanted to be in the *Archive*. I watched that episode and I literally cried because I was so upset.
Nina: That's who I was thinking of when I said that.

<div align="right">(Video-cued Focus Group Interview, February 14, 2020)</div>

Here Nina and Jess say how much they loved a show that a senior student producer (Lisette) made when they were only freshman. In Jess's words, "Lisette killed it," meaning that Lisette had done an excellent show that was probably also perceived as very cool. It is noteworthy to notice all the details of the production that they remember. They also explained that the fact that this student was able to talk about race and pop culture all in one show, was what they enjoyed so much and that contributed to their motivation for signing up for the course.

In the focus group, Nina and Jess also do a "then" and "now" comparison and explain to me that things in the *Archive* feel different now and that they feel "like, I [we] feel like, one, we don't have any POC reporters." This statement is in line with my findings from an earlier chapter where I explain how the Lakeview High media production students felt that they could not partake in specific discourses on Black culture since the students themselves did not identify as Black. In the chapter, I suggested that this was a discursive strategy students used and I called it "not-my-place" media making.

Connor, Kyle and Nate from the Saucy Sauce Interview Show also do a "then" and "now" comparison in our focus group as they explain to me their beliefs on the role of their videos in school. They say that that Lakeview High students do not want to watch

serious shows and instead want funny ones. Then Connor stated, "They want the old *Archive*." By this Connor means that the "old" Archive had funny videos on it and that the current one doesn't. More significantly though is that he is implying that the "old" Archive was better, funnier and had more content that students wanted to watch.

Across the student production groups, students' remixes draw on not only global, virtually networked media but also on the hyperlocal -- from their own student-made TV show, *the Archive*. This is significant to my research as it demonstrates students "citing" other students and thus points to peer memory as a factor in how student voice gets constructed. I am naming this practice "peer citationality" and will speak to its significance in terms of sharing place and building community later in this chapter.

Discussion

Through my data and interpretation, I have shown that students in my study leveraged the modal affordances of video to share knowledge, educate, and inform peers inside their school. The student producers did this by citing cultural texts both from global and local platforms in purposeful ways. In the discussion that follows, I take a deeper look at what it means for students to do media in school in this way. What opportunities arise when we look at the various factors that together construct student voice, including looking across time and place, across school-wide relationships.

Lights, Camera, Publics!

The structure of this class meant that the student producers had a "real" (Buckingham & Harvey, 2001) and authentic audience. They intentionally chose genre conventions to address their peers across the school. Given this audience, they saw the role of video production as one that they could use to educate, inform and teach. They

approached video production as a way of addressing concerns in their school and in the wider society and in this way treated it as a form of social answerability. The Craft Show students, Theresa, Matt and Samantha, worked towards cultivating relationships between students and teachers through their media production. As Matt said in the video-cued focus group, he liked ". . . getting to know them [teachers] better" and he also wanted to encourage the rest of the students in the school to do the same.

Research has shown that supportive teacher-student relationships have academic and social benefits for both the youth and the adult (Pianta, Stuhlman and Hamre, 2002; Nasir, 2012) and have called this a kind of "relational resource" (Halpern-Meekin, 2019; Nasir, 2012). I suggest the Craft Show group was mobilizing "relational resources" inside their school. Through their media production and student voice, the group was opening up a space for the cultivation of student-teacher relationships in a unique way and in a way that may have real life consequences for their peers. The Craft show group offered Lakeview High students, and especially newer and younger students an entry way into increased collegiality with their soon-to-be Math, English, History or Science teachers. In this way, Theresa, Matt and Samantha contributed to a sense of shared community in their school. Through the genres and themes of their videos, they implicitly said, "Teacher-student relationships are important. We recognize that some students come to school without relational resource, so we are going to help them get it."

The Politics Now! group also mobilized a youth audience, although in a different way than the Craft Show group. Francis and Richard addressed a problem they perceived in the American political news landscape, which had to do with the way

157

politics are mediated, presented and disseminated to the public in ways that fail to address or engage young people. In Francis's words, politics are "boring and elitist," and only address "educated, white men." In order to address this, The *Politics Now!* group employed conventions from popular YouTube shows like, *Unraveled,* to present the news to peers and in this way to mobilize their interest in politics. This is consistent with Stornaiuolo & Nichols's (2018) argument that media education programs encourage youth to cultivate or "mobilize" an audience for their media.

I suggest through these video production "public acts" (Poyntz, 2009), students saw themselves as part of a shared place, "with responsibilities to act in public ways to impact others" and "to participate with others whom they had never met..." (Stornaiuolo & Nichols, 2018, p. 26). The public that the Lakeview High students addressed clearly went beyond the teacher and the classroom. For the student producers there was a tangible, in-person, non-abstract audience,- their peers (some they knew, others they didn't), their teachers, administrative staff and at times family members as well. Exerting their agency through their creative choices, Lakeview High media production students mobilized an authentic audience for their videos. I suggest that they were creating more than a TV audience; they were producing a publics.

Peer Citationality and Place

The students in the media production class engaged in literacy practices, drawing ideas and inspiration not only from social media sites like YouTube but also from videos produced by peers in their school from the past *Archive* shows. Students were citing from other student work across their local media ecosystem. I am calling this hyperlocal form of media influence, peer citationality. For instance, Theresa, Matt

and Samantha were able to create a remix of the *Let's Cook* show made by students in the media class two years prior, and in this way created something new while strategically imitating the function and purpose of the original.

By engaging in this kind of citationality, I suggest the students from the *Craft Show* group produced videos that were, Jocson's term, a form of place-making (Jocson, 2018). Their topic on sharing "relational resources" embodies an understanding of what it means to share a space with shared cultural and social practices. Through their videos, they were producing a sense of place, creating texts that crossed time and space. Similarly, Angela from "Our Cultures" was creating a place in the school via the visibility of the screen, for students of color, or to use her words, "less common students" including herself. Her desire to make videos about the cultural and racial identities of students that attended Lakeview High and that were not part of the dominant, white, European ancestry majority, demonstrates Angela doing critical video-making. This kind of video-making "accounts for difference, boundary, and connectivity in students' lives" (Jocson, 2018, p. 95). In this way her media-making practices were also about critically engaging in shared worlds.

The students did not only turn to peer-made media from their school's media ecosystem to find inspiration and create videos, they also turned to it when describing their interests in making media, in enrolling in the media production class and in thinking about genres and potential audiences for their current segments. Indeed, this type of peer citationality and media-making served as the main motivation for students like Lennie, Jess and Nina to take the class, as they informed me that they remembered watching the *Archive* and anticipating seeing themselves on it and producing videos for it one day.

Young people citing media made by other students from their school community is a powerful reminder for media educators and scholars that not all media learning, identity and literacy activities are based in the virtual and the global. The local also has direct influences and connections to adolescent media makers and watchers.

Conclusion

Coming into this project I knew that I would find young people having fun, exploring, and experimenting with media genres and video production technology as they created their school-made videos, what I did not expect was how relational their media-making would be with the rest of the school community. By examining voice in the media production class through the concepts of dialogism and youth media perspectives on audience and publics, I have been able to demonstrate how the students' media practices were in dialogue with their concerns of and for their peers, their teachers, and the larger publics. Through intertextual citations of YouTube and local videos from their school's media ecosystem, the student production groups I interviewed addressed their peer viewers and saw themselves as sharing meaning in a shared place, where they could mobilize an audience and come closer towards community and civic engagement. In these ways media production gives young people a sense of belonging. My research adds insight to how in-school media production has an impact on developing a personal and collective sense of belonging. As more schools implement new literacies practices, this is a significant finding that can help shape curriculum for schools.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

Teaching youth media in schools is radical. It has the potential to radically transform teaching and learning in our public schools, to transform what and how students learn, and to transform how they see themselves and their peers as belonging and participating in the shared world of their school and beyond. Youth media can do this inside schools, so why are classes like media production and the work students do inside them too often perceived as not serious enough, not original enough, not authentic enough, and simply not school-like enough? This study contributes to a reframing of beliefs about these alternative, "located in the basement" courses that high schools offer as electives for students. My research challenges the conventional belief in secondary education that media classes lack rigor and value. The students that I spoke to in my video-cued focus groups all saw this class as much more than a chance to get an easy grade. Instead, students saw this class as an opportunity to develop life-long communication skills, to create a sense of community with their fellow students, and to share knowledge and information beyond the classroom.

In this dissertation I explored and discussed the cultural practices the students employed in their media production classroom to construct student voice. My research questions were:

1. How does student voice get shaped in this media production classroom?

2. What role does student voice have for the students and the school?

The concept of voice I have used in this project is one that legitimates and confirms the students' experiences in their media production class. I examine student voice as a phenomenon that is produced in the media production classroom and recognize the relationality of the students' worlds that shape students' creative media productions. Basing my research on the students' reflections on the class and on my participant observations, I examined the class's norms, discourses and structures. I analyzed the students' video-cued focus group interview data, through the lens of heteroglossia. In doing so I explored how student voice is constituted of multiple stances and ideas, at times conflicting ones. I also presented data in the form of representational vignettes where I described classroom moments that were significant to my research questions. These vignettes also contextualized the video-cued focus group interview data.

In this concluding chapter, I suggest the implications of this study for media education, including critical media literacy and youth media, and more generally, for secondary education. I include pedagogical topics like teacher authority and peer-to-peer learning in youth media spaces. I discuss implications for researching youth media practices with video-cued ethnography and include final thoughts on student engagement in the media production classroom as well their digital lifeworld. First however, I offer a summary of my findings and interpretations from this inquiry, beginning with Chapter Four.

In Chapter Four, I described the pedagogical structures that Adrien, the media production teacher employed, including the film-critique meetings, the student-led pitch meetings and the open video editing sessions. Using vignettes, I described classroom moments from the pedagogical structures to show the youth media practices as they

unfolded. My findings from this chapter revealed that weaving through the youth media practices were subtle but present discourses of ethno-racial identities and diversity, and that with a few exceptions the students were out of their comfort zones when it came to talking about race in the classroom. For this reason, discursive strategies like "not-my-place" media making were enacted by some of the students. Several of the students wanted to engage more with racial discourses but had mixed or conflicting ideas and worried about getting it wrong. Their strategies reflected colorblind approaches to race and ethnicity issues.

In chapter Five I highlighted the practices of remixing, imitation strategies and citationality practices in video-making that the students engaged in. Citing from social media sites like YouTube, students showed mastery in the literacy of these texts as they deployed some of the original show's form, setting, visual devices and other visual and audio elements. All of these practices are ways of learning in school that make up the new literacies. In-school and out-of-school literacy practices may no longer be divided. As my study has shown much of the new literacies makes up the ethos of this class. The students also valued using humor and authenticity when they designed their videos and made intentional choices from where to speak from in their videos.

Lastly in chapter Six, I show how students in my study embraced the social properties that film and video afforded them and leveraged this to get their student voice out of the classroom and into the rest of the school. The student production groups I studied saw the role of making videos in their school as a way to inform, educate, and teach. Through practices like peer citationality which connected to peer memory and place, students were producing a sense of belonging. They used their creative agency to

mobilize their peers on topics they believed were valuable to students and that pointed to

a shared world within their school.

Youth Media Pedagogy

I begin with a brief quote from a video-cued interview I conducted with the class teacher,

Adrien. After watching the six videos I made on the student projects, Adrien commented:

> It's reassuring to see some of that stuff playing out when I'm not there. That's good, because it can often times be like, "Oh man, I hope they're not just at Dunkin Donuts. . ." They're actually thinking about this stuff, and grappling with it and, for the most part, treating each other with respect. It's good to see that community component play out for sure.
>
> (Video-cued Interview, March 27, 2020)

Adrien's statement is a useful starting point for appreciating how ideas of trust, limited

teacher authority, and scaffolding underlie Adrien's pedagogy. He comments on how

reassuring it was for him as he watched the videos to see his students carrying out video

production tasks, "thinking" and "grappling" with this "stuff." His statement also points

to the social and collaborative nature of video production pedagogy and the integral role

it plays in and out of school. Youth media practices at the core are about freedom --

creative freedom, as well as the freedom to move around your school, your town, and

your community. The teaching practices I observed inside the media production class at

Lakeview High looked very different from conventional notions of teaching and learning,

such as a classroom with twenty or so desks lined up neatly in rows while an adult stands

in front of the class transmitting knowledge to youth. Adrien's comment that he is glad to

see "stuff playing out" when he's not there sums up one of the core tenets of youth media

pedagogy, which is trust in your students and the ability to stand back and limit your

teacher authority. Instead of "transmitting" media literacy and production knowledge to

164

the students, Adrien saw his pedagogical role as one to create and facilitate a space for students to experience and engage in learning by doing.

The ideas underlying this pedagogical approach are not new. They can be traced back to Dewey's (1938) and Kilpatrick's (1918) ideas on education. Sullivan (2017) explains how both Dewey and Kilpatrick's notions, including "freedom of intelligence," "continuity of experience," and guidance and community all have influenced pedagogy today:

> [it] honors the interests, experiences, and purposeful aims of the child, while guiding her toward consideration of, and positive engagement with socially responsible activity in the world today. (p. 76)

Current day pedagogies such as project-based learning, inquiry-based, and student-led echo many of Dewey (1938) and Kilpatrick's (1918) ethos.

Each time I visited the classroom in my study, I saw the students and teacher participating in a kind of learning that embodied this ethos. Students hanging out in small groups in different areas of the classroom, talking, sometimes loudly and rambunctiously and sometimes leaving the room, as well as fellow teachers coming in to talk to Adrien, all created a social environment that is not typical for most high school classrooms. Eventually, I began to see the structure beneath the formlessness. The student-led pitch meetings, the teacher-led film-critique meetings, and the weekly broadcast submission deadline all provided a structure that guided the activities of both the students and teacher. These events happened every week on the same day at the same time. These structures gave the students routines and expectations. In fact, it was the repetition of structure, week after week that created the class's unique culture. The clarity

and repetitiveness of the class provided a foundation for the students' creativity. It also provided an authenticity to their schoolwork that is too often lacking in high school courses.

At times the student producers sought Adrien's expertise on video production, while at other times they resisted it. In other words, the students saw Adrien as a source of knowledge about media production and as having clear ideas about the goals for the weekly show, but they also felt comfortable disagreeing with him and selectively following his advice. This is evident as we hear Adrien's voice and his pedagogical approach cited across the comments made by the students during the video-cued focus groups. For example, Theresa states: "So we can kind of see when the shot, we know he's [Adrien] going to want to change [it] because it's not exactly what his criteria is for a good shot." Richard states, "And Adrien seemed to want it to make it a Daily Show kind of thing. And I don't think either of us enjoy watching The Daily Show." Or when during a film-critique meeting, Jess, the student leader informs Adrien that the quick zoom effect students were including in their video designs was "bad quality on purpose." These quotes suggest that while Adrien was not always physically present in the day-to-day media production experiences of the students, his technical expertise, his ideas, and indeed his voice all contributed to the students' video productions and by extension to student voice. The fact that students at times both sought and resisted Adrien's knowledge and ideas, is evidence of the kind of dialogical tensions that characterized this classroom, tensions that Adrien was well aware of and in fact saw as evidence of the success of his pedagogy. Adrien's classroom was a setting in which students acknowledged, cited, and resisted the teacher's authoritative discourses (Bakhtin, 1981) in

ways that I suggest helped them create and establish their own voices and form a vibrant classroom community.

The Struggles, Pushes and Pulls of Doing Youth Media in Schools

A media production class such as the one in my study gives students more latitude than they have in most classes to address and engage with larger social and cultural issues. For example, media production can open the door for students to voice opposition to school policies that impact the quality of their daily lives, such as school administrators locking open bathroom doors in the name of preventing drug use. Similarly, students may voice perspectives circulating in the wider society on racial and ethnic diversity or the lack thereof. Students may also question the textual authority and literacy gatekeeping that happens in schools, where certain stylistic genres are valorized, and others disparaged.

The media production teacher then has a tough pedagogical task: how to invite and allow for the students to carry out projects that reflect their own interests and ideas, while also scaffolding the process in ways that (gently) guide the students away from serious mistakes (such as broadcasting media with stereotypes). This requires what Van Manen (2015) calls "pedagogical tact." This is the ability in the moment for a teacher to make good decisions about when to hold back from intervening and when to intervene with students, and how to do so effectively, so as to not shut down or silence students. It is also about providing space for someone other than the teacher to step up and intervene or interrupt problematic statements or content in a student-made film. Since these films may get broadcast to the school community, it's highly important for media production teachers to know when to anticipate and discuss potentially problematic moments and to

guide the class on how to produce videos that cover difficult but important topics. For example, at Lakeview High some media production students felt out of their comfort zones to cover topics that had to do with race, ethnicity and other diversity issues, yet they still thought it was important to cover topics like these in their school media show.

These critical video production moments require teachers to employ "pedagogical tact" and to see these moments as opportunities to help students unpack issues of race in media production. Pollock (2004) reminds us that one of the most consistent questions North Americans deal with when it comes to race is when or when not to racialize events. Teaching media production will inevitably bring up this question for teachers and students because, as I have shown in this study, the visual and the social nature of video production affords conversations around race and media representation.

Teacher Authority

In the opening quote from Adrien, he admits that he worries at times that the students may be taking advantage of the freedom they are given to make their weekly videos. Seeing proof of the students' investment in learning and doing media production during our video-cued interview was revelatory for him. While he trusted his students, it was still encouraging for him as a teacher and evidence of support for his pedagogy, to see his students engaging in the process of interviewing, technical problem-solving on matters like lighting and camera operations, and grappling with all the other production elements that need to happen in a video production shoot. However, whether, when, and to what extent to relinquish or minimize your own teacher authority are questions that have no easy answer and carry different risks for teachers in different school contexts and in different stages of their teaching careers. Making good decisions about letting go of

teacher authority requires knowledge of the curriculum, students, and school context as well as courage and pedagogical tact.

Peer-to-peer Education

Adrien's pedagogy approach combined a self-conscious holding back of his teacher authority with a trust in the value of peer-to-peer learning. Influenced by out-of-school youth media programs, many in-school media education programs implement these types of learner-led learning styles. Meetings like the student-run pitch meeting were a core element of the youth media pedagogy in my study, as they allowed students to take on different roles and engage in peer-to-peer learning that fostered a sense of ownership, voice, and community. In my study, the two student leaders, Jess and Nina, dealt with technical and video technology matters as well as with less tangible matters. Daily, they were confronted with questions about video content and form, including issues about audience, relevance, and appropriateness of the videos the students made and were to be shown outside of the classroom. Jess and Nina also solved problems that arose, dealing with student group dynamics and classroom gossip, as well as other issues that required their social and emotional labor. Indeed, Jess and Nina's roles as student leaders consisted of much more than just tech assistance for the teacher. Before initiating a peer-to-peer learning structure in their media production classrooms, teachers need to assess not only the technical skills and abilities of their students, but also get in touch with the social mood of the class. Teachers can establish social norms of attention, courtesy, and care for the class leaders as well as establish an environment of learning and sharing technological and creative knowledge.

Implications for Methodology

In this dissertation I offered a multimodal way of studying youth media practices in the classroom. I chose video-cued classroom ethnography and Bakhtinian interpretive tools to help me interpret student voice as a phenomenon that is multi-voiced and that could take into account the heteroglossia of youth voices in a classroom. Focusing my research on the process of video-making, I mapped the narratives, norms, and beliefs of the class onto the students' videos to see how the structures and pedagogical practices of the class helped shape student voice.

Positioning as Expert and Authority

As the student producers watched the videos during the video-cued focus group interviews, they got to engage in an activity that most young people do not of commenting on their media-making practices. My videos positioned these students as experts and authorities on the meanings of their videos and the processes that went into making them. They explained to me the steps they needed to take each week to complete their videos, how they came up with ideas for their videos, and the potentialities and difficulties they experienced while making media in school that they considered meaningful for them and their audience. I became their audience during the focus groups, as I listened and treated them as the authority.

My research project relied on the students' media viewing literacy practices, and their ability to engage in meta-level reflections on the purposes and practices of their video productions in school. In this way, my project was based on assuming that the Lakeview High students, who were enrolled in the elective video production class would interpret my questions and my video-cues as meaningful and interesting to them. The

170

interviews asked them to explain their video production processes, which was an opportunity for them to step back and engage in a deeper reflection of their media-making, producing insights which I hope and believe can positively influence their work in the future. These learning reflections may also contribute to a more critical engagement with media making in school as well as in virtual, social media sites.

In this sense the video-cued research method is also a form of pedagogic encounter, an opportunity for learning. It is also an embodied form of answerability, which Bakhtin (1981) argued is a deeply ethical responsibility, where it is our obligation to not only listen but to respond to the utterance of others, as through these dialogical exchanges people come to see and understand themselves.

Filming Filmmakers

The meta-ness of this project that is embedded in the methodology did not escape me while I was carrying out the research. The core of my method was filming the students as they filmed their films, as well as video-interviewing them about their video-interviewed projects. This created at times a kind of two-level interpretation. As I interpreted the students' media-making process, I also reflected on my own media making process. For example, when thinking about genre, form and styles that the students chose to work with in their videos, I stopped to analyze my own choices and think about addressivity, purpose, context, and place. My choice of an "observational documentary" style for the video-cues was intentional. I tried to show the thing as it is, with no narration or music. This choice of genre and tone was intended to give the most objective and "real" qualities to the video cues I showed to the student producers, which I hoped would allow for them to comment in the most "objective" and "real" way.

New Literacies Implications

In their video productions, students at Lakeview High took up new literacy practices of remixing and imitation to talk about issues that were important to them. In doing so, their remixes both drew on and disrupted media genre conventions as they addressed a new audience. The student remixes demonstrate their mastery of an important and growing form of youth agency in our current times. However, remixing, and other practices of new literacies, such as critiquing through imitation and satire are not always welcome in schools. Teachers who assess student work based on traditional humanistic perspectives may interpret imitation and remixing as a form of mindless copying or even plagiarism. Teacher education programs need to include teaching teachers to look at these new literacy practices as resources of learning (Kress 2003), a perspective that can help teachers better and more generously assess student work. Cultural texts that youth engage with in their everyday lives can be sources of both pleasure and learning. Teachers should be encouraged to think about how to leverage the fun that youth take in remixing and make it part of the curriculum.

Implications for Youth Media and Critical Media Literacy

As critical media literacy scholars continue to examine how youth may speak back or counter narratives from the mainstream media especially, negative stereotypes of non-dominant communities, I suggest the field must expand its notion of "counter." Students in my study resisted mainstream media narratives but in ways that don't necessarily fit a classic counter-hegemonic framework. For example, students like Francis and Richard felt that the news media all too often covered politics in a way that was solely for older citizens or for white, male citizens and this excluded youth from

national and global political conversations. In response to this, Francis and Richard specifically created their news videos to attract other youth, to get them excited about politics and to mobilize this new young audience. However, they did this precisely by leveraging the mainstream media. They turned to sites of media that they enjoyed and identified with. They grabbed, remixed, and strategically imitated from mainstream and corporate-funded YouTube shows. These high-end media productions provided students with the material to remix and rewrite stories they wanted to tell, allowing them to mobilize young people. While they were critiquing a part of the media, they were also engaging with it in a way that I argue is more relational than countering.

Studying youth voice is about researching all the factors and forces that come into play when young people produce, create, and make media and other creative texts. What the students say or do may not always be what the researcher or educator wishes to hear in terms of resisting dominant oppressive narratives. We as researchers may need to look at the complex webs that exist between young people, popular culture, and media literacy. Examining how social and cultural discourses come into dialogue with the everyday school life of students and their media-making practices may be one way to do this. For instance, students like Nina and Jess explained to me that it was not their place to create media about issues that pertained to cultures they did not feel they were a part of. This too must be heard. As youth media researchers, we must not erase student voices that don't match up to counter-hegemonic ideas. Instead, we can ask, how do student expressions and ways of participating relate to the other social and cultural factors going on in school and in the students' communities?

Participatory cultures engage with popular culture and technology in non-conventional and at times non-conforming ways. For youth media research, this may mean examining youth participating with media production on their own terms, levels, and expertise. In other words, as Dussel and Dahya (2017) have been encouraging youth media researchers to do so. It would look less like giving the opportunity for a youth to find, discover or reclaim her voice and more about looking at how her voice gets shaped, silenced, or constructed in a particular space and context. However, this does not mean that educators and researchers shouldn't continue to help make spaces for youth to enact voice. In fact, we need to open up more of these educational spaces whether they are in-school or out-of-school. Now more than ever, youth need to have access to these kinds of making, creating and production spaces where they can materialize and produce their voices.

Towards an Emerging Civic Culture

School-wide TV shows, like the one at Lakeview High can support a sense of place and of belonging. It is of importance that media educators consider and understand that who and what is on the video screen has implications for student inclusivity and equality. Similarly, we need to take into account the significance of "place" in media education and design curricula that leads to explicitly "place-based" approaches to video production. These approaches, for example, can give more emphasis to video productions that examine "place" in their school, in their local community, or in imagined places that cross cultural, linguistic, and ethno-racial boundaries, thereby supporting students' sense of belonging.

School-wide TV video shows such as the one at Lakeview High contribute to a school culture that is to some extent "bound up with the visual and visible," which can work to maintain as well as challenge social injustices and prejudices (Dyer, 1997, p.42). In this study, many students understood this even if they could not articulate it. I suggest that the task of making videos for the whole school pushed students to think more deeply and critically about the context in which they were producing (and screening) their videos.

Students gained a sense of belonging from watching other student-produced media that implied shared meanings and shared worlds and this prompted them to think about video production in relation to the rest of their school community. In this consideration of community, youth media offers the promise of "civic culture" (Livingstone, 2005). Media production in schools then, has the potential to move student media makers, as well as educators and researchers to in turn, to consider, context, community, and finally an emergent civic culture, one where students are engaged and participating in something larger than themselves.

Concluding Thoughts

The student producers in my study drew on genres that were not only attractive to them, but I suggest, also had a pedagogical format and twist to them. Students chose genres that entertained their viewers while informing them about topics they considered important. For example, the "Craft Show" group did this by interviewing teachers doing and talking about crafts, as a way to inform their audience about teachers' lives. The "Saucy Sauce Interview Show" ate spicy food on screen in order to educate students about school policy issues. These genres which the students watched on social media

175

sites worked similarly -- they had a hidden pedagogy of educating or teaching which they masked through the facade of people engaged in a "task." My point is that in our current mediated environment, where sites like YouTube have become, the 21st century agora, education researchers should be thinking about how traditional forms of "teaching" are similar and different from the way informing and teaching works on sites like YouTube and TikTok. Evidence of the pedagogical power of these social media sites is the countless times people go to them to learn how to do something. Young people go to TikTok and YouTube to learn new dances, computer gaming and programming strategies and older people go to these sites for instruction on cooking or plant care. It is clear that the boundaries between passive viewing and active learning and authoritative and "amateur" sources are increasingly blurred. It is no surprise then that the student producers at Lakeview High were grabbing hold of these media genres and incorporating them into their videos.

This study has shown the potential of youth media courses in schools. As educators and teacher educators, we want to promote media courses in schools, but we also want to keep in mind the challenges within the structures of contemporary secondary education in doing so. Most preservice and in-service teacher education programs do not provide a solid background on the principles and practices of media education. Because of this, the media education curriculum is often "individual, piecemeal and disorganized" (Butler, 2010, p. 205) at schools. And as I have shown in this dissertation, doing youth media in school can bring up complexities, uncertainty, and even conflict in the classroom. Nevertheless, I would argue that despite these concerns, media education needs to be given greater support in schools and in teacher education programs and it

needs to be taught to account for the critical video production moments that surfaced in my study. In fact, it is through acknowledging and grappling with these challenges and complexities that both teachers and students can grow and learn. To study youth making media and enacting the new literacies is to acknowledge the importance for our society to cultivate self-expression and participation in community, in civics and in the publics.

APPENDIX

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

Participant List

	Pseudonym	Pseudonym for Groups	Gender	Year	Role	Race/Ethnicity MA DOE codes
1.	Theresa	Crafts Show Group	F	Sophomore	Student	White
2.	Samantha	Crafts Show Group	F	Senior	Student	White
3.	Matt	Crafts Show Group	M	Junior	Student	Hispanic or Latino, Asian
4.	Angela	Our Cultures	F	Senior	Student	White, Hispanic or Latino
5.	Kelly	Our Cultures	F	Junior	Student	White
6.	Francis	Politics Now!	F	Senior	Student	White
7.	Richard	Politics Now!	M	Junior	Student	White
8.	Tiana	Friends Show	F	Senior	Student	Black or African American
9.	Lina	Friends Show	F	Junior	Student	White
10	Lennie	Friends Show	M	Senior	Student	White
11	Clint	Friends Show	M	Senior	Student	White
12	Elliot	Friends Show	M	Senior	Student	White
13	Will	Saucy Sauce Interview Show	M	Senior	Student	White
14	Connor	Saucy Sauce Interview Show	M	Senior	Student	White
15	Adam	Saucy Sauce Interview Show	M	Sophomore	Student	White
16	Kyle	Saucy Sauce Interview Show	M	Senior	Student	White, Asian
17	Nate	Saucy Sauce Interview Show	M	Junior	Student	White
18	Jay	Sports Show	M	Senior	Student	
19	Nina		F	Junior	Student Leader	White
20	Jess		F	Junior	Student Leader	White
21	Adrien		M		Class Instructor	White

Student-made Videos

	Student-made video show	Participants (pseudonyms)	Genre	Presentation Style	Filming Location	Topic
01	The Craft Show	Theresa, Samantha & Matt	Interview / Talk Show	Two student interviewers plus teacher guest interviewee	Inside School	Teachers' lives
02	Friends Show	Tiana, Lina, Timothy, Clint & Elliot	Mix: Entertainment/ Documentary	One to two student hosts.	Mixed: In-school and out of school	Local food business
03	Politics Now!	Francis & Richard	Political News Show / Monologue	One host, no guest	Inside School	Politics
04	Saucy Sauce Interview Show	Connor, Nathaniel & Kyle	Interview / Talk Show	One student interviewer plus guest(s)	Inside School	Students' lives & school issues
05	Our Cultures	Angela & Sandy (ASL interpreter)	Interview/ Documentary style	One host, guests sometimes	Mixed: In-school and out of school	Cultural identities

REFERENCES

Adair, J.K. & Kurban, F. (2019). Video-Cued Ethnographic Data Collection as a Tool Towards Participant Voice. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 50*(3), 313-332.

Ahmed, S. (2009). Embodying diversity: Problems and paradoxes for Black feminist. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *12*(1), 41-52.

Alvermann, D.E., Moon, J.S. & Hagood, M.C. (1999). *Popular culture in the classroom: Teaching and researching critical media literacy*. National Reading Conference

Archer, A. (2013). Voice as design: Exploring academic voice in multimodal texts in higher education. In M. Böch & N. Pachler. (Eds.). *Multimodality and social semiosis: Communication, meaning-making and learning in the work of Gunther Kress* (pp. 150-161). New York, NY: Routledge.

Asthana, S. (2011). Youth media imaginaries in the Arab world: A narrative and discourse analysis. In J. Fisherkeller. (Ed.). *International Perspectives on Youth Media: Cultures of production and Education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Ashby, C. (2011). Whose "voice" is it anyway?: Giving voice and qualitative research involving individuals that type to communicate. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, *31*(4).

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Ed. by

   M. Holquist (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of

   Texas Press.

Ball, A.F. & Freedman, S.W. (2004). *Bakhtinian Perspectives on Language, Literacy and

   Learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Blum-Ross, A. (2017). Voice, empowerment and youth-produced films about 'gangs.'

   Learning, Media and Technology, 42(1), 54-73.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2018). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence

   of racial inequality in America,* (5th edition). New York, NY: Rowman &

   Littlefield.

Bucholtz, M. (2011). *White kids: Language, race and styles of youth identity*. New York,

   NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bruce, D.L. (2009). Writing with visual images: Examining the video composition

   processes of high school students. *Research in the Teaching of English, 43*(4),

   426-450.

Buckingham, D. (2003). *Media education: Literacy, learning, and contemporary

   culture*. Malden, MA: Polity.

Buckingham, D. (2011). Foreword. In J. Fisherkeller. (Ed.). *International perspectives on

   youth media: Cultures of production and education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Buckingham, B. & Harvey, I. (2001). Imagining the audience: Language, creativity and

   communication in youth media production, *Journal of Educational

   Media, 26*(3), 173-184.

Buckingham, D. & Kehily, M.J. (2014). Introduction. In D. Buckingham (Ed.), *Youth cultures in the age of global media* (pp. 1-20). UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Buckingham, D. & Sefton-Green, J. (1994). *Cultural studies goes to school. Reading and teaching popular media*. Taylor & Francis.

Bulfin, S. & Koutsogiannis, D. (2012). New literacies as multiply placed practices: Expanding perspectives on young people's literacies across home and school. *Language and Education, (26)* 4, 331-346.

Butler, A. (2010). *Media education goes to school: Young people make meaning of media and urban education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang

Campbell, K. H., & Valauri, A. (2019). Our voices matter: Using video-cued ethnography to facilitate a conversation about race between parents of color and preservice teachers. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *50*(3), 333-339.

Castagno, A. E. (2014). *Educated in whiteness: Good intentions and diversity in schools*. University of Minnesota Press.

Castellanos, I., Bach, A. & Kulick, R. (2011). Youth channel all-city: Mapping the media needs and interests of urban youth. In P.M. Napoli & M. Aslama. (Eds.). *Communications research in action: Scholar-activist collaborations for a democratic public sphere*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

Charmaraman, L. (2013). Congregating to create for social change: Urban youth media production and sense of community. *Learn Media Technol, 38*(1), 102–115.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory*. London: Sage Publications.

Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Leu, D. (2008). Central issues in new

    literacies and new literacies research. In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C.

    Lankshear, & D. Leu (Eds.), *Handbook of research on new literacies*, (1-

    22). New York, NY: Peter Lang

Colegrove, K.S.S. (2019). "Gracias por escucharnos": Listening and learning

    from Latinx immigrant parents through video-cued ethnography.

    Anthropology & Education, 50(3), 291-312.

Contois, E.J.H. (2018). The spicy spectacular: Food, gender and celebrity on the

    Hot Ones. *Feminist Media Studies, (18)*4, 769-773.

Crenshaw, K.W. (2017). On intersectionality: Essential writings. New York, NY: The

    New Press.

Cresswell, J.W. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing*

    among five approaches. Sage Publications.

Dahya, N. (2017). Critical perspectives on youth digital media production: 'Voice and

    representation in educational contexts. *Learning, Media and Technology, 42*(1),

    100-111.

Dewey, J. (1938/2015). *Experience and education*. Free Press.

Dezuanni, M. (2011). Youth media production and technology skills acquisition:

    Opportunities for agency. In J. Fisherkeller (Ed.), *International perspectives on*

    youth media: Cultures of production and education (pp. 121-137). New York,

    NY: Peter Lang Publishers.

Duncan-Andrade, J.M.R. (2007). Urban youth and the counter-narration of inequality.

    Transforming Anthropology, 15(1), 26-37.

Dussel, I. & Dahya, N. (2017). Introduction: Problematizing voice and representation in youth media production. *Learning, Media and Technology, 42*(1), 1-7

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. London, England: Routledge.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L.C. & Wong, M.L. (Eds.). (1997). *Off white: Readings on race, power, and society*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fleetwood, N.R. (2005). Authenticating practices: Producing realness, performing youth. In S. Maira & E. Soep (Eds.). *Youthscapes: The popular, the national, the global*, (pp. 155). University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fisherkeller, J. (2011). *International perspectives on youth media: Cultures of production and education*. Peter Lang.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Penguin Books.

Gee, J.P. (2015). *Literacy and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gibbons, D., Drift, T., & Drift, D. (2011). Whose story is it? Being Native and American: Crossing borders, hyphenated selves." International Perspectives on Youth Media: Cultures of Production & Education. Ed. Fisherkeller, JoEllen. New York: Peter Lang Publishers, Inc. 172-191.

Gibbons, P. D. (2017). A social semiotic mapping of voice in youth media: The pitch in youth video production. *Learning, Media and Technology, 42*(1), 8-27.

Giroux, H (1988). Literacy and the pedagogy of voice and political empowerment. *Educational Theory, 38(*1), 61-75.

Goodman, S. (2003). *Teaching youth media: A critical guide to literacy, video production, and social change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Goodman, S. & Cocca, C. (2014). Spaces of action: Teaching critical literacy for

    community empowerment in the age of neoliberalism. *English Teaching: Practice*

    and Critique, 13(3), 210-226.

Hague, C. (2014). Youth media and agency. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of*

    Education, *35*(4), 471-484.

Hall, S. (1997). The spectacle of the other. In S. Hall (Ed), Representation: Cultural

    representations and signifying practices (pp. 223-285). Sage Publications.

Halpern-Meekin, S. (2020). Social poverty and relational resources. *American*

    Sociological Association. *19*(2).

Halverson, E. R. (2010). Film as identity exploration: A multimodal analysis of youth-

    produced films. *Teachers College Record, 112*, 2352-2378.

Halverson, E. & Gibbons, D. (2009). "Key moments" as pedagogical windows into the

    video production process. *Journal of Computing in Education*, 26(2), 69-74.

Hebdige D. (1979). *Subculture: The meaning of style*. Routledge.

Hobbs, R. (1998). The seven great debates in the media literacy movement. *Journal of*

    Communication, *48*(1), 16-32.

Hobbs, R. (2010). *Copyright Clarity*. Corwin. California.

Hobbs, R. & Friesem, Y. (2019). The creativity of imitation in remake videos. *E-*

    Learning and Digital Media, 16(4), 328-347.

Hoechsmann, M. & Poyntz, S.R. (2012). *Media literacies: A critical introduction*. West

    Sussex, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hull, G.A. & Katz, M.L. (2006) Crafting an agentive self: Case studies of digital

    storytelling. *Research in the Teaching of English, 41*, 43-81.

Jenkins, H. (1992). *Textual poachers: Television fans & participatory culture*. Routledge.

Jenkins, H. (2006a). *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century*. [White Paper]. The MacArthur Foundation. https://www.macfound.org/media/article_pdfs/jenkins_white_paper.pdf

Jenkins, H. (2006b). *Fans, bloggers and gamers: Essays on participatory culture*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Jenkins, H., Ito, M. & Boyd, D. (2016). *Participatory culture in a networked era: A conversation on youth, learning, commerce, and politics*. Polity Press.

Jewitt, C. (2008). Multimodality and literacy in school classrooms. *Review of Research in Education, 32*, 279-306.

Jewitt, C., & Kress, G. R. (Eds.). (2003). Multimodal literacy (pp. 34-55). New York: Lang.

Jewitt, C., Bezemer, J., & O'Halloran, K. (2016). *Introducing multimodality*. Routledge.

Jocson, K. (2013). Remix revisited: Critical solidarity in youth media arts. *E-Learning and Digital Media, 10*(1), 68-82.

Jocson, K. (2018). *Youth media matters*. Minnesota Press.

Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2012). New learning: A charter for change in education. *Critical Studies in Education*, *53*(1), 83-94.

Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2005). *Qualitative inquiry: Approaches to language and literacy research*. Teachers College Press.

Kilpatrick, W. (1918). The project method. *Teachers College Record, (19)*4, 319-335.

Kellner, D., & Share, J. (2007). Critical media literacy, democracy, and the

    reconstruction of education. In D. Macedo & S.R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Media*

    literacy: A reader (pp. 3-23). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Kress, G. Jewitt, C., Ogborn, O. & Tsatsarellis, C. (2014). *Multimodal teaching and*

    learning: The rhetorics of the science classroom. Bloomsbury.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the New Media Age*. London, England: Routledge

Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to communication*. New

    York, NY: Routledge.

Laybourne, K. (1978). *Doing the media. A portfolio of activities, ideas, and resources*.

    McGraw Hill.

Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. (2006). *New literacies: Everyday practices & classroom*

    learning. (2nd ed.). Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*.

    Cambridge University Press.

Lemish, D. (1997). Kindergartners' understandings of television: A cross cultural

    comparison. *Communication Studies*, *48*(2), 109-126.

Lensmire, T. (1998). Rewriting student voice. *J. Curriculum Studies*, *30*(3), 261-291.

Livingstone, S. (2005). On the relation between audience and publics. In S. Livingstone

    (ed.). *Audiences and publics: When cultural engagement matters for the public*

    sphere. Intellect Books. (pp. 17-41).

Mavers, D. (n.d.). MODE: Glossary of multimodal terms.

    https: // multimodalityglossary.wordpress.com/affordance/

Mittell J. (2004). *Genre and television: From cop shows to cartoons in American culture*. Routledge.

Moll, L. C. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(1), 132-141.

Moreson, G.S. (2006). Addressivity. *Encyclopedia of language & linguistics* (pp. 55-58). Elsevier, LTD. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00389-8

Morrell, E., Dueñas, R. Garcia, V. and López, J. (2013). *Critical media pedagogy: Teaching for achievement in city schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Morrell, E. (2008). *Critical literacy and urban youth. Pedagogies of access, dissent, and liberation*. Routledge.

Morris, P. (1994). *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writing of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. London, England: Bloomsbury Academic.

Nasir, N.S. (2012). *Racialized Identities*. Stanford University Press.

Nespor, J. (n.d.). *Coding – not*. Nespor's Used Cabbage. [Notes] https://sites.google.com/site/usedcabbage/handouts-for-qualitative-methods-courses/coding---not. Retrieved on December 1, 2020.

Nespor, J. (1997). *Tangled up in school: Politics, space, bodies, and signs in the educational process*. New York, NY: Routledge.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60-92.

Olsen, L. (1997). *Made in America: Immigrant students in our public schools*. New York, NY: New Press.

Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States*. (2nd ed.). New

  York, NY: Routledge.

O'Reilly, K. (2009). *Key concepts in ethnography*. Sage Publications Ltd.

Palfrey, J. (2010, September 10). "Rethinking Plagiarism in the Digital Age," Interview

  with John Palfrey. *Project Information Literacy; Smart Talk*, (*3*).

Pandya, J. Z., & Low, D. E. (2020). Theorizing the addressive audience in children's

  digital video production. *Written Communication*, *37*(1), 41-68.

Perry, P. (2002). *Shades of White: White kids and racial identities in high school*.

  Durham: Duke University Press.

Pew Research Center. (2021, December 15). "U.S. public school students often go to

  school where at least half of their peers are the same race or ethnicity." Pew

  Research Center, Washington, D.C.

  https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/12/15/u-s-public-school-students-

  often-go-to-schools-where-at-least-half-of-their-peers-are-the-same-race-or-

  ethnicity/

Pianta, R.C., Stuhlman, M.W. & Hamre, B.K. (2002). How schools can do better:

  Fostering stronger connections between teachers and students. *New Directions for*

  Youth Development, (93), 91-107.

Pollock, M. (2004a). *Colormute: Race talk dilemmas in an American school*. Princeton,

  NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pollock, M. (2004b). Race wrestling: Struggling strategically with race in educational

  practice and research. *American Journal of Education*, (111), 25-67.

Poyntz, S. (2009). "On behalf of a shared world"; Arendtian politics in a culture of youth media production. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 31(4), 365-386.

Pyles, D. (2017) A social semiotic mapping of voice in youth media: the pitch in youth video production. *Learning, Media and Technology, 42*(1), 8-27,

Saldaña, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research*. New York, NY: Oxford.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London*:* Sage Publications Inc.

Saldaña, J. & Omasta, M. (2018). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life*. London: Sage Publications Inc.

Sefton-Green, J. (2006). Youth, technology, and media Cultures. *Review of Research in Education, 30*(1), 279-306.

Sefton-Green, J. (2013). *Learning at not school: A review of study, theory, and advocacy for education in non-formal settings*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Sholle, D. & Denski, S. (1993). Reading and writing the media: Critical media literacy and postmodernism. In C. Lankshear & P.L. McLaren (Eds.). *Critical literacy: Politics, praxis and the postmodern*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Soep, E. (2006). Critique: Assessment and the production of learning. *Teachers College Record*, *108*(4), 748-777.

Soep, E. & Chavez, V. (2010) *Drop that knowledge: Youth radio stories*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Stein, L. (1998). Democratic "Talk,": Access television and participatory political communication. *Javnost/The Public, 5*(3), pp. 21-34.

Stornaiuolo, A., Hull, G.A., & Sahni, U. (2011). Cosmopolitan imaginings of self and other: Youth and social networking in a global world. In J. Fisherkeller (Ed.), *International perspectives on youth media: Cultures of production and education* (pp. 263–280). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Stornaiuolo, A. & Nichols, T.P. (2018). Making publics: Mobilizing audiences in high school Makerspaces. *Teachers College Record*, *120*(8), 1-38.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Sullivan, F. (2017). *Creativity, technology, and learning: Theory for classroom practice*. Routledge.

Tatum, B.D. (1997). "*Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race*." New York, NY: Basic Books.

Thompson, R. & Bowen, C.J. (2009). *Grammar of the edit*. Burlington, MA: Focal Press.

Tobin, J. (2019). The origins of the video-cued multivocal ethnographic method. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 50(3) pp. 255-269.

Tobin, J., Wu, Y.H., & Davidson, D.H. (1989). *Preschool in three cultures: Japan, China and the United States*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tobin, J., Hsueh, Y. & Karasawa, M. (2009). *Preschool in three cultures revisited: China, Japan, and the United States*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Tobin, J. (2000). *Good guys don't wear hats*. Teachers College Press.

Turner, K.C.N. (2011). "Rap universal:" Using multimodal media production to develop ICT literacies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 54*(8), 613-623.

Tyner, K. (1998). *Literacy in a digital world: Teaching and learning in the age of information*. Lawrence Elbraum Associates, Inc.

Uncanny X (2021). That famous Asian theme in video games: The oriental riff. *YouTube* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oa2ldADwn04&t=199s

US Census Bureau (2000). *Decennial Census of Population and Housing*. https://data.census.gov

US Census Bureau (2020). *Decennial Census of Population and Housing*. https://data.census.gov

Valente, J.M. (2019). A deaf lens: Adapting video-cued multivocal ethnography for the "kindergartens for the deaf in three countries" project. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 50*(3), 340-347.

Van Manen, M. (2015). *Pedagogical tact: Knowing what to do when you don't know what to do*. New York: Routledge.

Willis, P. (1990). *Common culture: Symbolic work at play in the everyday culture of the young*. Boulder, CO: Westview.