Using an International Videoconference in Problem-Based Inquiry Projects: The Role of Public Voice, Audience, and Positionality

J. Spencer Clark

Kansas State University

Abstract

This article discusses and reflects upon a problem-based inquiry project that culminated in an international videoconference between multiethnic and multi-faith secondary students from Macedonia and the United States. The videoconference provided an opportunity for students to share their action plans, which proposed methods of addressing local problems or issues students had identified through their inquiry. This article focuses on three ways students engaged with the project and videoconference: inquiry, audience, and public voice. These aspects of the project illustrate how the students' positionality on their chosen problem/issue shifted as they developed skills and knowledge through their inquiry. The article concludes with a discussion of implications for future problem-based inquiry projects in secondary schools.

Introduction

Many educators and schools are concerned with preparing students for civic engagement in their communities (Bischoff, 2016). Digital media and technology have only increased opportunities for schools to enhance their students' civic engagement locally, nationally, and globally (Levine, 2008). In this article, I will discuss and reflect upon a project that aimed to civically engage high school students both locally and globally by addressing local issues. My discussion will focus on an international videoconference between multiethnic and multi-faith students from The Republic of Macedonia and the state of Utah, in the United States (U.S.). The videoconference served as the culminating event for semester-long, problem-based inquiry projects that were developed by students in both countries. The videoconference provided an opportunity for students to share action plans they created to address the local problems identified through their inquiry. The problem-based inquiry projects allowed students to examine their positionality and develop public voice related to local issues, while the videoconference provided an audience (Levine, 2008) for the students to engage their positionality and public voice, receive comparative perspectives, and corroborate new knowledge gained from their projects.

In three previous studies (Clark & Brown, 2011, 2013; Clark et al., 2016), my colleagues and I found that using public voice through discussion with an audience of international peers, via videoconferencing, to be an effective way for secondary students to reflect on their own values, attitudes, and beliefs regarding public issues, as well as their own civic engagement and positionality within the context of their communities. Our findings were also similar to other studies that engaged international peers in

discussion through technology, which demonstrated that participants found the discussions to be engaging, valuable in increasing multicultural understanding, and a means for students to reflect on diversity in their own communities (Avery, Simmons, & Freeman, 2007; Cifuentes & Murphy, 2000; Gregerson & Youdina, 2009; Ke & Chávez, 2013). However, in our previous studies, the videoconferences focused on public issues that the teachers had chosen for the students to research and discuss, prior to the videoconference. While the curriculum in our previous studies could be characterized as critical and student-centered, it was not student-driven. Based on our findings in these three previous studies with secondary students, I wanted to explore the possibility of combining student-driven inquiry projects and international videoconferencing. By student-driven, I mean students were allowed to develop and justify their own public issues to initiate the inquiry process. I thought this shift could potentially be an important step in engaging their positionality and public voice in a more authentic and critical manner.

There is very little literature on engaging K-12 students' positionality regarding public issues (Klesse, 2010), and only a few regarding historical thinking (Endacott, 2014; Levesque, 2009; Vansledright, 2002). However, Levesque (2009) noted the importance of positionality in his conclusions, and provided rationale for this article in writing, "Consideration of the contemporary context represents one (perhaps the best) possible way of examining one's own positionality, as modelled by the community one inhabits" (p. 121). Engaging students' positionality about community issues is related to the recent and growing literature on critical consciousness in civic and citizenship

education (Epstein & Gist, 2015; Espino & Lee, 2011; McDonough, 2009). Johnson and Morris (2010) developed a framework matrix for critical civic education that draws from critical pedagogy to develop four critical characteristics (POLITICS/ideology, SOCIAL/collective, SELF/subjectivity, and PRAXIS/engagement) horizontally atop the matrix, and Cogan et al.'s (2002) definition of civic education (knowledge, skills, values, and dispositions) vertically aside the matrix. Johnson and Morris (2010) emphasized aspects of critical consciousness throughout their matrix. For example, they framed the intersection of *Dispositions* and *SOCIAL/collective* on the matrix as "socially aware; cooperative; responsible towards self and others; willing to learn with others" and the intersection of *Skills* and *SELF/subjectivity* as "capacity to reflect critically on one's 'status' within communities and society; independent critical thinking; speaking with one's own voice" (p. 90). Broadly, critical consciousness entails students being able to actively identify issues in their everyday lives and understand how to address those issues, or as Godfrey and Grayman (2014) conceptualize it, "the degree to which individuals are able to 'read' social conditions critically and feel empowered to act to change those conditions" (p. 1801). Critical consciousness demands that students use their positionality to identify the critical issues in their community - and not rely on adults or others to tell them – so that they are empowered to address those issues through their own authentic motivation. Therefore, critical consciousness is an important aspect of developing students' authentic public voice (Montgomery, 2014). This article will use data collected from students' inquiry projects and their discussion of issues in an international videoconference, to reflect on the educational outcomes of engaging their

positionality and public voice through inquiry and an international audience.

The Participants, Project, and Context for the Videoconference

The participants in this study were all secondary age students from the U.S. state of Utah and the Republic of Macedonia. These two sites were chosen because of my previous connections with educators in Macedonia and my position at the time in Utah. I had worked with the teachers in both Utah and Macedonia on previous civic education projects, and thought they could collaborate well together. The Utah teacher taught civics and psychology courses, and the Macedonian teachers taught English; one teacher taught Macedonian speaking students and one taught Albanian speaking students. I also thought these two groups of students would be a good pairing for the project because of the similar split in each context between ethnicities and religions.

Figure 1: Study Participant Demographics

Site	Ethnicity	Religion	Course	Age Range
Utah, US (59)			Civics	16-18
	Latina/o (26)	Catholic (24)		
	White (33)	Church of Latter Day Saints (LDS) (35)		
Macedonia (45)			English Language	16-18
	Albanian (21)	Muslim (21)		
	Macedonian (24)	Orthodox (24)		

For this article, I will focus on one group of twelve Utah students that developed their problem-based inquiry project around the topic of marriage equality, and specifically, defining marriage in both a legal and religious way.

The student projects had several components. The overall goals for the project were to have multiethnic/faith students identify common community problems, engage in inquiry to find ways to address these issues, and then develop an action plan to address the issues in their community. To meet these goals, the projects followed a semi-structured model that borrows aspects from two well-established civic education programs -

Project Citizen and *Deliberating in a Democracy*. The model was flexible to maximize teachers' curricular control, but the steps followed this basic structure:

1. Identify Common Community Problems/Issues
2. Research the Different Perspectives on Problems/Issues
3. Deliberate Using the Perspectives on the Problems/Issues
4. Research Multiple Ways to Address the Problems/ Issues
5. Choose or Develop a Way to Address the Problems/Issues
6. Develop an Action Plan to Address the Issue in their Community

7. Share Action Plan with International Peers at Videoconference
8. Share Action Plan with Community Stakeholders
9. Revise Action Plan Based on Feedback
10. Take Action on Problems/Issues

The problems/issues were chosen entirely by the students, who were in groups of 8-12. The students chose a range of issues, from the issue at the center of this study, marriage equality, to cyber security and immigration. The students deliberated each problem/issue in their groups and engaged with different perspectives on the problem/issue. The students engaged in research that included data collection techniques, such as surveys, meetings with community members, and interviews with stakeholders. The action plans included pertinent information from the previous steps, which they shared with the community members and Macedonian peers in the videoconference. Then, once they received feedback on their action plan, the students revised their plans and took steps to implement it in their community.

Conceptual Lenses

This article will use three conceptual lenses to understand the underlying educational outcomes of the students' projects: positionality, public voice, and audience. Since the students' projects were student-driven, and developed from their own interests, their positionality was central to their engagement throughout the project. Students used their ethical frameworks to determine what constituted a problem or issue in their community. Each group of students chose an issue that focused on injustices toward individuals in their community, and highlighted a personal ethical dilemma for members of

the group. The religious engagement of students in both groups helped prioritize their ethic of care for people in their community (Noddings, 2005), as both religious organizations, Catholic and LDS, focus on helping individuals in their communities. Some Catholic students especially drew upon a social justice lens to rationalize the need for addressing their particular issues (e.g. immigration). Once they identified a problem or issue to address, they developed an ethical position on that problem or issue in relation to society, and assessed how they could potentially take ethical action on the issue in their community. In this way, their positionality was central to understanding their ethical stance because they considered their own positions on complex issues before considering authentic ways of addressing the issue to benefit everyone in their community. By demonstrating a "caring reasoning" for their community that values understanding differences among people, they were better able to understand themselves (Thayer-Bacon, 2003), as well as their own positionality. Positionality, as Maher and Tetreault (1993) write, represents:

> Gender, race, class, and other aspects of our identities are markers of relational positions rather than essential qualities. Knowledge is valid when it includes an acknowledgment of the knower's specific position in any context, because changing contextual and relational factors are crucial for defining identities and our knowledge in any given situation. (p. 118)

For the group of students, whose project is the focus of this article, they demonstrated that gender, ethnicity, religion, and age were factors in choosing their issue and how they engaged the concepts related to their issue throughout

the project. They decided to approach the topic of marriage equality and their interest arose from their own experiences, ethical dilemmas, and positionalities related to the issue at home, school, and in the community.

To better understand how the students' positionality shapes their discussions and engagement with peers and community members, I also draw upon the work of Peter Levine (2008) and his use of two related concepts: public voice and audience. Levine (2008) defined public voice broadly as "any style or tone that has a chance of persuading any other people (outside of one's intimate circle) about shared matters, issues, or problems" (p. 121). He clarifies his definition by noting that public voice "encompasses topics beyond conventional politics" such as the practicality or effectiveness of a media application (Levine, 2008, p. 121). Rheingold (2008) further described public voice as "not just active, but as generative – a public is brought into being in a sense by the act of addressing some text in some medium to it" and argued that "in the twenty-first century, participatory media education and civic education are inextricable" (p. 103). Many would argue (e.g., Hess, 2009) that discussion in classrooms enable students to exercise important civic skills, and engage students' public voice; however, the audiences with which students interact at school are typically their classmates and teachers (Levine, 2008). Levine (2008) pointed out that this is problematic because a student's most immediate audience, their classmates, often ignore their public voice. Therefore, it is difficult for students to fully develop their public voice in their school community alone, and students need opportunities to further develop their public voice with new and diverse audiences.

Levine (2008) further discussed the relevance of audience in student created civic projects. Audiences outside of the students' own school context provide a means to authentically practice and further develop their public voice with diverse peers and people. The key, however, is for the audience to be active. Rheingold (2008) discussed this distinction, "Public voice is learnable" if students could be "consciously engaging with an active public rather than broadcasting to a passive audience" (p. 104). If a school wants to promote multicultural civic engagement through the development of students' public voice, then students need to be connected to *others* outside of their school community, in addition to the diverse perspectives that may be in their own school community.

Methods

I collected data using critical action research (Madison, 2005; McNiff, 2013) methods to analyze the videoconference, as well as the students' preparation for the videoconference. I chose action research because I facilitate problem-based inquiry projects and international videoconferences on a regular basis, and I wanted to improve my facilitation of the curriculum, as well as improve the effectiveness of the curriculum for the students. This project included several critical dimensions. The participants chose projects that highlighted unfairness or injustice and chose to take action and use their voice to address these injustices. I chose to study and document the participants' work in hope of informing and modeling methods of addressing injustice for secondary students and teachers. In this way, I hope that the participants' work and growth illustrated in this article will encourage others to address unfairness and injustice in effective and productive ways through

their school curriculum.

Data Collection and Analysis

I collected five sources of data over three-months: 1) Focus Group Interviews (FGI); 2) Videoconference Transcript (VT); 3) Utah Student Videoconference Reflections (VR); 4) Utah Student Artifacts (SA); 5) Researcher Observations (RO). I conducted three focus group interviews, using a semi-structured protocol, at three points in the project: 1) after the deliberations; 2) after the action plans were developed; and 3) after the students shared their action plans with both the community stakeholders and their Macedonian peers at the videoconference. The two-hour videoconference was transcribed. This is the only data point that included the Macedonian students. The Utah students wrote 2-3 page reflections following the videoconference. The Utah student artifacts that were examined included mainly the action plans, as well as the associated resources and data they used to create the action plans. The artifacts took a wide range of forms depending on the problem/issue being addressed. For the marriage equality group, the artifacts included: surveys, interviews, articles, and the action plan. Lastly, I observed the students working on the project at several points: 1) problem identification; 2) deliberations; 3) action plan development, 2-days; 4) sharing of actions plans with community stakeholders and Macedonian students.

I used a constant-comparative data analysis method to identify commonalities that emerged in the experiences of participants across the data sources and the project groups (Creswell, 2002). The three focus group interviews were analyzed for initial lists of codes. The post-videoconference written reflections were coded and compared to the initial focus group codes. All the other data sources were scanned to triangulate the initial codes. Following the second analysis, the codes were reduced from five – public voice, audience, inquiry, silence, positionality shift – to the three focused upon in this article: inquiry, audience, and public voice.

Research questions

The research questions that served as a basis for data collection arose in a naturalistic process of trying to develop critical civic education curriculum. The two underlying questions were:

1. How does critically engaging with a problem-based inquiry project focused on community issues develop students' public voice?
2. What role does a multicultural and global audience play in the development of students' public voice and positionality?

Discussion

The discussion will focus on three aspects of the videoconference, and specifically on the discussion of marriage equality at the videoconference. First, the students developed, and better understood, their public voice in preparation for the videoconference by engaging in the process of inquiry on the issue of marriage equality. Second, the students were able to demonstrate and deepen their understanding of marriage equality through engaging with the international audience of peers. Third, the students used their public voice to acknowledge and demonstrate their new knowledge by problematizing their Macedonian peers understanding of marriage equality and the unconscious ways they were silencing the issue in Macedonia.

Developing Voice through Inquiry

We led the groups of students through each of the ten steps, and provided guidance in their inquiry for steps one-four. For some groups, it took a while to complete the first step of identifying a common community problem/issue, while for other groups the general topic was decided quickly. One group of twelve students promptly decided that they wanted to address the topic of LGBTQ civil rights. While this group was quick to identify a topic, they had to spend a lot of time researching the topic and figure out how to narrow it into an issue on which they could develop an action plan in their particular community. For the second step of the inquiry process, we helped this group of students break down the topic into concepts, and related synonyms, to research. The students' research uncovered a lot of perspectives around the concept of marriage (e.g. civil rights, economic/tax, religious, LGBTQ), and the students decided to focus on marriage. The students split into four groups to research these perspectives further. After researching, they began step three and engaged in deliberation for one class period, with each group arguing for their respective perspective on the concept of marriage. In the deliberation, the students demonstrated they had already completed step four of the inquiry process in their initial research, by highlighting the way states and other countries had addressed the issue. At this point, the group decided that developing an action plan around distinguishing between legal (civil and economic/tax) and religious concepts of marriage would be best for their local community and context.

The twelve students developed their problem-based inquiry project around the topic of marriage, and specifically, defining marriage in a both a legal and religious way. The goal of their project was to better educate their community on marriage in the legal sense, as a means to justify marriage equality. The issue was personally relevant to all of the students because they each felt a split between their own personal views on marriage equality and how their family and religion viewed marriage equality. The students were influenced by two dominant religions in their community: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and The Catholic Church. Therefore, all twelve of the students noted that through this project they realized they use, or didn't use, their public voice in different ways at home, church, and school. For example, Tim described his realization:

> One day when we were working on the project it hit me, I have like a filter, when I talk about Gay rights at home, that I don't have at school…but like I can talk about Gay rights at home but not marriage – that's going too far. (FGI3, p. 3)

Anna followed Tim's comments and said, "the project made so much sense to me, it represented my two selves or two worlds, family and school" (FGI3, p. 3). In this way, the project helped the students better understand their public voice and how they used it to negotiate two seemingly different worlds regarding the issue of marriage equality.

The 'two worlds' that students identified were not so clearly delineated in their minds at the beginning of the project. Sam noted this in the focus group discussion, "Yeah, when Carl mentioned doing marriage equality, I was like what is the issue? And then Maria, was like, what does your dad think about it? And I said I don't know, and I'm not going to ask him" (FGI1, p. 5). The students all mentioned that they wanted to focus on marriage equality for their project, but they had a

difficult time developing a question and thinking about a potential action plan for addressing marriage equality in their community. Through the development of the project the students realized that they would have been comfortable just researching and discussing marriage equality at school, but since the outcome of their project was to take action in the community, the students felt much more constrained. The students did not give up though and they thought of a strategy that would negotiate their two worlds. This is when they decided to define marriage in both of their worlds, and try to help their families and religious communities understand that everyone has a right to be married as a citizen of their state and country, even if it is not acceptable as members of their religion. Danny noted the groups' realization, "It was funny, it hit us that maybe we could cite that church and state thing, or law, and look at it that way. It made sense to us. We separate the two" (FGI1, p. 2). The students spent a lot of time trying to figure out how to use their public voice most effectively, as a result of thinking about the two worlds they negotiate, regarding the issue of marriage equality. The impetus to think about the effective use of the public voice through the project occurred as a result of thinking about the audience for their community action.

Shifting Positionalities: The Audience

The Utah students deepened their understanding of the marriage equality issue, beyond their project work and preparation for the videoconference, through interaction with their Macedonian peers in the videoconference. The Utah students presented their position to the Macedonian students. Their position stated that based on the definition of legal marriage all people should have the right

to be married in a court of law based on the 14th amendment and an equal opportunity to receive the tax benefits related to marriage. They also argued that any religious organization has the right to refuse same-sex marriage ceremonies in their places of worship; however, for the government to adopt a religious conception of marriage would violate the first amendment, especially if the Bible was the only basis for marriage to be defined as between a man and woman. They further noted, as citizens we should all recognize the right to marriage for all fellow citizens under the law, and equally respect the right of religious organizations to not recognize same-sex marriage. After the Utah students made their presentation about marriage equality to the Macedonian students, the Macedonian students had several questions.

Interestingly, the Macedonians said that marriage equality was not an issue in their country, and asked why it was so important in the U.S. The Utah students answered and cited civil rights and inclusionary principles. Then, the Utah students asked the Macedonian students why it was not an issue in their country, and if people were not accepting of LGBTQ culture? The Macedonian students said that they, the students, were all accepting of people who identified as LGBTQ, and that most people were accepting, which is why marriage equality was not an issue in Macedonia. Carl asked if marriage for all couples was legal in Macedonia, to which the Macedonian students replied, "no" (VT, p. 21). Carl then asked, "Are there any laws against couples getting married?" (VT, p. 22) And the Macedonian students collectively replied, "No, of course not" (VT, p. 22) (However, in January 2015, two months after the videoconference, the Macedonian Parliament passed a law that defined marriage as between a man and a women).

There, was a long pause following the response to Carl's question, then, Maria asked, "Why don't same-sex couples get married?" (VT, p. 22). A Macedonian student, Victor, replied, "I don't think they want to, it is not their goal" (VT, p. 22). Another Macedonian student, Alma, replied, "I think he means they don't talk about this, there is no demanding, and so no persons talks about it" (VT, p. 22). The Utah students demonstrated their understanding of the marriage equality issue through their questioning of their Macedonian peers.

From their exchange with the Macedonian students, the Utah students came to understand the pervasive power of silence on an issue. For example, Amy's reflection made connections to silence and views on same-sex marriage in the U.S., and wrote:

> Our discussion with the Macedonians made me think of the Baker case we read about in our research. It was in the early 1970s, and was not taken seriously by the courts and silenced by everyone…it took us 30 years to break the silence…I had never even heard of the case till we did our research. I thought same-sex marriage was a new thing, and I think that's what they [Macedonian students] thought too. (VR, p. 1)

Through the combination of their research and the videoconference discussion, the Utah students saw that silence could lead to a perception that the issue is non-existent, not relevant, or the associated marginalized groups do not find the issue of importance. The Utah students discussed this in their focus group discussions and their videoconference reflections. Many of the students, reflected on their understanding of marriage equality prior to their work on the project.

They made connections to the way they were silent on the issue most of the time, but especially outside of school. Andy, for example, discussed his silence in his reflection, "I definitely cared about the issue, but it was not a big part of my life. I see now…if you care, you need to find ways to voice your care with others, otherwise it just contributes to the silence" (VR, p. 2). In the focus group discussion, as well as in six students' reflections, the students discussed the realization that being accepting of marginalized groups is not enough, if they really wanted to support the group's civil rights (FGI2, p. 7). The students' reflections demonstrated a major realization in the students' thinking because they felt secure in their "two worlds" and had resigned to simply being accepting of marriage equality, and only implicitly accepting of marriage equality outside of school.

Using Public Voice to Demonstrate Understanding

The Utah students demonstrated the knowledge they had gained from their inquiry project during the videoconference. They problematized their Macedonian peers understanding of marriage equality, and the unconscious ways they were silencing the issue in Macedonia. The Utah students were able to explain silence to the Macedonian students, and demonstrated the relevancy of their project. They also illustrated the silence on the issue, by citing the fact that there were neither same-sex marriages, nor laws prohibiting same-sex marriages in Macedonia. It was difficult for the Macedonian students to understand, especially because they repeatedly said that they "support LGBTQ rights" (VT, p. 26). After some discussion, Carl asked "how do you support LGBTQ people, or your friends that are LGBTQ?" (VT, p. 28). Several Macedonian students spoke, and said that they don't know any

LGBTQ people, but they would support them in various ways if they did know them. Maria said, "well that is still silence, I think, but not your fault" (VT, p. 28). The Macedonians were visibly concerned, and pushed back a bit against Maria's comment and asked, "How do you know gay people are supported in your school and community" (VT, p. 29). At this point Carl stood up, and said, "Well, I am gay, and I feel supported because my classmates chose to do this project with me, and in other ways too!" (VT, p. 30). At that moment, two of Carl's classmates stood up and said, "We support him!" (VT, p. 30), and then, the rest of the students stood up and some vocalized support for Carl. It was a very moving moment for all in attendance, and included big smiles and clapping from the Macedonian students.

When the Utah students stood up for their classmate, it was a symbolic show of support that demonstrated the Utah students' own reflective realization about their own silence. The videoconference allowed Utah students the space to not only identify the silence on an issue in another country, but also reflect on their own silence and take actions to demonstrate their new self-awareness on the issue. At no point were the Utah students condemning the perspective or silence of the Macedonian students, however, they saw similarities to their own silence on the issue and wanted to demonstrate their new sense of awareness on the issue. Their new awareness and empowerment on the issue enabled the Utah students to demonstrate their new knowledge and understanding. They saw the videoconference as a way to begin implementing their action plan, but started by educating global perspectives instead of local perspectives. John was able to describe the value of sharing their action plan with the global audience, before a local audience, in his videoconference reflection:

> When we identified the silence on marriage equality in the videoconference, it gave me confidence that I could explain it to people in my community. I know it will be more difficult in my community because I know them, and can't hang-up on them, but I know I can at least talk through our plan. (VR: 2)

The videoconference allowed the Utah students, and potentially the Macedonian students, to practice their public voice and develop self-confidence for their future public voice related to the issue of marriage equality.

Implications

The videoconference with Macedonian students legitimized the positionality (e.g. Madison, 2005) of Utah students' public voice. The problem-based inquiry project engaged the Utah students in the development and shifting of their positionality, regarding the issue of marriage equality. The students' positionalities were best demonstrated through their decision to address the issue through defining the concept of marriage in both civil and religious contexts. This decision not only reflected their own identities and positions in their community, but also reflected what they considered the most effective way to engage their community in a productive discussion of marriage equality – by defining marriage in their two-worlds. The decision to frame their inquiry in this manner generated new knowledge for the students. The videoconference, and the experience of their Macedonian peers, was vital in providing an initial opportunity to apply their public voice and demonstrate recognition of their positionality. The most

generative articulation of their voice and positionality was in their recognition of silence on marriage equality in their own lives, and in Macedonia.

The students were not able to fully understand silence as an oppressive element in their community until their videoconference discussion. The discussion allowed the students to use their knowledge and experience to reason with their Macedonian peers in locating the silence on marriage equality in their society. The Utah students were compelled to critically reflect on their own community in order to illustrate the complexity of marriage equality to their Macedonian peers. This highlights one of the productive qualities of engaging in discussion with new, diverse, or global audiences who inevitably have different knowledge and experience based on their socio-cultural context (Levine 2008). The Utah students quickly realized in the videoconference discussion that their Macedonian peers did not understand the importance of marriage equality for recognition of LGBTQ citizens' civil rights (Camicia, 2016), or the role their silence plays in limiting LGBTQ citizens protection under the law. The Utah students also realized that their Macedonian peers mirrored their own experience, prior to the project. The Utah students responded by breaking down the issue, reflecting on their own experience and knowledge, and generating awareness of silence on marriage equality in Macedonia. The Utah students benefitted from the distinct Macedonian audience because it initiated reflection on their own community and enabled them to demonstrate and apply their knowledge.

The project and subsequent videoconference allowed students to address complex issues on their own terms, and through their own process. The process of the problem-based inquiry project enabled the students to address the silence on marriage equality. The components of the problem-based inquiry project were not necessarily innovative or revolutionary, and draw upon and integrate components from two well-established civic education models (*Project Citizen* and *Deliberating in a Democracy*). The most innovative aspect of this project was the focus on audience. The Utah students engaged with a different audience at each stage of the project. Just like with the Macedonian students, they engaged in discussion and received feedback with a variety of community stakeholders. For example, the students who addressed marriage equality set-up a booth at both the local farmers market and the county fair to discuss the topic with community members. The marriage equality group had a target audience for their work clearly in mind. The audience they had in mind encompassed students like themselves, families like their own, and fellow citizens in general who did not fully understand their role as citizens in a civil rights issue, such as marriage equality. Once the students understood their own shifting positionalities, it helped them define their audience and shape their public voice. This enabled their public voice in the videoconference, and hopefully will enable their public voice as they continue to discuss the issue in their community.

References

Avery P., Simmons, A., & Freeman, C. (2007). *The deliberating in a democracy project evaluation report: Year 3*. Chicago, IL: Constitutional Rights Foundation of Chicago.

Bischoff, K. (2016). The civic effects of schools: Theory and empirics. *Theory and Research in Education*, *14*(1), 91-106.

Camicia, S. P. (2016). *Critical democratic education and LGBTQ-inclusive curriculum: Opportunities and constraints*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cifuentes, L. and Murphy, K. (2000). Promoting multicultural understanding and positive self-concept through a distance learning community: Cultural connections. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *48*(1), 69-83.

Clark, J. S. & Brown, J. S. (2011). Empowered voices: Considerations from an international videoconference. *The Social Educator*, *29* (1), 16-25.

Clark, J. S. & Brown, J. S. (2013). Developing civic agency in an international videoconference: Reflecting on audience and public voice in participatory media. *Journal of the Research Center for Educational Technology: Social Studies Special Issue, 9* (1), 2-23.

Clark, J. S., Brown, J. S., & Jandildinov, M. (2016). Enriching preservice teachers' critical reflection through an international videoconference. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 25*(4), 431-450.

Creswell, J. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Epstein, T., & Gist, C. (2015). Teaching racial literacy in secondary humanities classrooms: Challenging adolescents of color concepts of race and racism. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 18*(1), 40-60.

Espino, M. M., & Lee, J. J. (2011). Understanding resistance: Reflections on race and privilege through service-learning. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *44*(2), 136-152.

Endacott, J. L. (2014). Negotiating the process of historical empathy. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *42*(1), 4-34.

Godfrey, E., and Grayman, J. (2014), Teaching citizens: The role of open classroom climate in fostering critical consciousness among youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *43*(11), 1801-1817.

Gregerson, T. and Youdina, T. (2009). An intercultural communication event via video bridge: Bringing Russian and American students together. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 20*(2), 262-266.

Hess, D. E. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion*.
New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, L., & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *The Curriculum Journal*, *21*(1), 77-96.

Ke, F., and Chávez, A. (2013). *Web-based teaching and learning across culture and age*.
New York, NY: Springer.

Klesse, C. (2010). Teaching on 'race' and ethnicity: Problems and potentialities related to 'positionality' in reflexive and experiential approaches to teaching and learning. *Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences*, *2*(3), 1-27.

Lévesque, S. (2009). *Thinking historically: Educating students for the 21st century*. Toronto, CA: University of Toronto Press.

Levine, P. (2008). A public voice for youth: The audience problem in digital media and civic education. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.) *Civic life online: Learning how digital media can engage youth.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Madison, D. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Methods, ethics, and performance.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maher, F. A., & Tetreault, M. K. (1993). Frames of positionality: Constructing meaningful dialogues about gender and race. *Anthropological Quarterly*, *66*(3), 118-126.

McDonough, K. (2009). Pathways to critical consciousness: A first-year teacher's engagement with issues of race and equity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *60*(5), 528-537.

McNiff, J. (2013). *Action research: Principles and practice.* London, UK: Routledge.

Montgomery, S. (2014). Critical democracy through digital media production in a third-grade classroom. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *42*(2), 197-227.

Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach t o   e d u c a t i o n .*
New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Rheingold, H. (2008). Using participatory media and public voice to encourage civic engagement. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.) *Civic life online: Learning how digital media can engage youth.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Thayer-Bacon, B. J. (2003). *Relational "(e)pistemologies."* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

VanSledright, B. (2002). *In search of America's past: Learning to read history in elementary school.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.