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Background and Theoretical Frame
The field of New Literacy Studies brings together thinking across several disciplines to expand the notion of literacy to literacy practices that are embedded in social relationships and differ as enacted across time and space (Gee, 1990, 2003; Street, 1995; also Heath, 1983). In this sociocultural approach, literacy is not singular, “autonomous” or neutral (Street, 1995), but rather contextually purposeful, and shaped by power issues and identities.

A recurring problem with teachers’ uses of such new literacy practices in classrooms is inattention to multimodal design and to new ways of knowing (e.g., Leu, Kinz, Coiro & Cammack, 2004, p. 1600; Miller, 2007, 2008, in press). The needed changes in schooling to include multimodal composing could begin in teacher education by providing opportunities for teachers to transform their roles, knowledge, and beliefs--including their views on what counts as literacy and evidence of learning (Koehler & Mishra, 2005; Miller et al., 2003; Miller, 2007).

In a recent digital composing project (City Voices City Visions Digital Composing) focused on providing teachers with such professional development
opportunities, research evidence has shown increased student engagement and achievement in their classrooms and a general change in some teachers’ roles and beliefs (Miller & Borowicz, 2005, 2006; Miller, 2007, 2008). Similar recent research suggests that students who made digital video in classrooms with scaffolded support from teachers became capable of more complex thinking (Spires & Morris, 2008). However, a new line of program research invites teachers’ reflective responses to specific instances of integrating such activities into their classrooms. In this presentation we will demonstrate how we use video analysis as a tool to promote teacher stimulated recall and reflection, aiming to answer the question: What and how do teachers learn from talking with a collaborative partner as they comment on a digital video record of multimodal composing activities in their classrooms?

Overview of Research

Using digital video with practicing teachers has garnered interest in the past decade. The focus of this work is to investigate the ways of using digital video to promote teacher learning. For example, some recent research has returned to using video tape in traditional ways for recording microteaching experiences, while others have investigated new approaches such as using online videos of teaching for instructional purposes (Brunvand & Fishman, 2007; Harris, Pinnegar, & Teemant, 2005), for video study groups (Tochon, 2007), and for video clubs (Sherin, 2007; van Es & Sherin, 2006). These different uses vary in the purpose, content and context: using video of teaching events (1) to model effective pedagogical strategies or to prompt reflection on pedagogy; (2) to capture one’s own or others’ teaching over time; or (3) to use existing videos (e.g., online) for promoting discussion and reflection, especially in groups.
In short, as teacher learning tools, some video uses are more instructive, where teachers compare teaching with representations of best practice. Other uses are more generative, where teachers choose what to observe, how to analyze video, and for what purposes. We suggest that when these innovative teachers’ attention and commentary drive the conversation, their interpretations prompt opportunities to make their goals explicit and to plan for ongoing change; in some cases these outcomes depend on the dialogue that ensues about the classroom video. What teachers comment on as they exert control over viewing and talking provides a window on the nature of teacher beliefs, teaching knowledge, attitudes towards students, learning, and multimodal literacy. However, the act of viewing their own teaching, in itself, prompts reflecting and questioning. It provides a means of holding up real practice alongside a teacher’s perception of goals for practice. The discrepancies prompt deeper thinking—even among accomplished teachers. This, in turn, seems to influence teacher learning outcomes.

**Methodology**

The two case study teachers reported on here taught high school English and U.S. History in a large urban school district in the U.S. Northeast. Of the 200 teachers who had participated in the project, these two had been among the most successful at integrating DV composing into the curriculum. That is, these two teachers were selected for the video analysis in order to trace the ways that they attended to their teaching and their students in their innovative practice. In this study, videos of teachers’ own classroom activities were used to foster teacher reflection on teaching and learning about multimodal composing in their classes. These videos were used to stimulate recall of
teaching and learning activities and aimed at revealing teacher attitudes, beliefs, and reflections on their teaching and student learning in multimodal composing lessons.

In each case, the collaborative team of the university research assistant and the innovative high school teacher jointly reviewed the video to better understand student and teacher activity and learning during classroom digital composing workshops. In conversation with their partner, the teachers controlled the interactions about the classroom videos by framing their comments around any issue(s) of interest to them as they viewed. The inquiry partner served as an interested interlocutor to better understand the teachers’ reflections in the context of their familiarity with ongoing DV composing activity in that class, sometimes providing point-of-need questions and multiple viewings to prompt further response/reflection.

It is important to note that the video analysis data were embedded in ongoing case studies of these teachers over time. The data were analyzed using an iterative and grounded approach that included other case-study data collected over the last two years—field notes, interviews, written accounts by the teachers. Fine-grained analysis of the teacher analysis and the peer conversations about the videotapes (Schoenfeld, Smith, & Arcavi, 1993) in light of the case study data formed the basis for the work reported on in this paper. Specifically, the videos were transcribed, and analyzed with attention to what teachers noticed, how they framed what they saw, and whether/how they evaluated the video segments as confirming beliefs and/or prompting questions. The analysis of conversation about the videos were also transcribed in order to allow a close examination of how teachers’ changing discourses about teaching and learning (within the video analysis or as compared/contrasted to earlier interviews). We were especially interested
in how these reflections fit into the larger emerging portrait of these two teachers transforming their pedagogies over time.

Findings

The findings of this research suggest that these conversations about videos of the teachers introducing multimodal composing activities and of students working on their videos in a small group present powerful opportunities for teacher reflection on multimodal literacies as student learning tools. The teacher-controlled commentary with a familiar partner seemed to provoke honest critique, promote performance of reflective stances, and, in some cases, interrupted or solidified beliefs. Transcripts from the video stimulated recall and follow up class observations provide strong evidence for the learning benefits for teachers.

Key themes from these conversations and follow-up observations and interviews include (1) growth in understanding of DV composing as an expansion of literacy practices that draw on student lifeworlds; (2) keener awareness of the gradual release of control to students as composers; (3) better attention to student thinking and multimodal designing during DV composing; (4) increased awareness of student engagement in social learning as collaborative inquiry.

In what follows, we present cases of two teachers who viewed digital video from their own classes that focused on DV composing. The selected incidents from these video reflections reveal key issues in teacher change, DV composing, and the usefulness of teacher video analysis.

Designing the New Teacher Role
Expanding literacy to include multimodal design and student lifeworlds. Keith Hughes teaches 11th grade United States History in an urban school, and he has served as lead instructor for the Digital Video project professional development Institutes for the past 7 years. The videotaped class that is the subject of this study is made up of 22 students with the majority being African American. Macintosh computers are placed on two long tables, one of which is along a side wall and the other cuts across the back of the classroom to form a kind of island, however only 5 computers of the 16 actually work dependably. Mr. Hughes has two of his own computers in front of the room by his desk, hooked up to an LCD projector. Student desks are in a horseshoe, allowing for a central space. This classroom design promotes student attention to what Keith calls “the electronic campfire” and to the place where both the teacher and the student perform.

In the video of Keith introducing a Movie Trailer DV project to his students, the video shows his expertise in engaging students, modeling the project, and directing their attention to key elements. First Keith hands out a rubric explaining the requirements for the movie project. Addressing the class as a whole, he reviews the criteria for, asking if there are any questions. Next, he shows a professional movie trailer that he has already placed on the desktop of his computer and projects on the screen through the LCD projector. Before playing the movie trailer he asks the class to count the clips as it plays. He explains that clips are different shots taken by the camera; he clicks the Quicktime icon and the film trailer begins playing. He has chosen a trailer for a horror film, and students watch attentively as it plays. Once the trailer is over, Mr. Hughes asks the students how many shots they counted. They call out numbers, 35, 37, 38, demonstrating the point that many shots comprise a 60 second movie trailer. From
that discussion, he begins talking about the various shots, reviewing them, pointing out that most were close-ups. Next, he talked about the music used in the trailer, explaining that the genre of the music has to match the mood and genre of the movie.

To provide even more of what he often called “modeling,” Keith then narrates his thinking processes in creating a DV movie trailer on the Elastic Clause of the U.S. Constitution. He kneels down on one knee to show how he would get close to the picture of the Elastic Clause text printed in the book. As he develops the movie trailer as he would do it, shot by shot, he illustrates how live footage and voice over (“coming to a theatre near you”) drive the genre and embed the curricular concept.

After finishing this discussion, he explained the process for working in groups for the project. He tells them that each group has to develop an oral “pitch” to him to convince him that their idea is a good one. Once approved, they can begin writing the script. He makes clear that there is no filming without the writing. Finally, he apologizes acknowledging that making groups is his least favorite activity, as he puts them into groups of three people to begin their storyboarding and planning.

Without a doubt, this video of introducing a DV genre to students could be used as a model of how to engage students and direct their attention productively toward multimodal design. From our analysis of enactments of DV composing as a student learning tool in the classrooms of 50 project teachers (including Keith), we have developed a research-based model of Multimodal Literacy Pedagogy that has 4 major interactive principles evident in Keith’s class (Miller, 2008 a,b; in press). Teachers who have been able to transform themselves and their classrooms to enact student multimodal composing on curricular concepts, have these principles in common: (1) design of social
spaces for mediating composing activities; (2) co-construction with students of authentic purposes for these composing activities; (3) focusing explicit attention to multimodal design and critique of texts mixed with print; and (4) persistently opening opportunities for students to draw on their identities and lifeworlds. These transacting principles are visible in classrooms of teachers who have been successful in using student multimodal composing to learn and communicate curricular concepts. Taken together, the principles are signs that teachers have critically reframed their classrooms to transform teaching and learning. All of these principles appear in this video lesson that Keith reviewed.

In his view of that DV class, however, he first was unhappy with how loud his voice was: “‘I know I’m going to be overly critical. That’s the way I operate.’” Although most teachers might be satisfied with the level of energy and student engagement evident in the video, Keith looked beyond that to what he wanted to change. Interestingly, he “read” the video as a drama of his intentions for students (not content). For example, as he viewed the segment he said, “I’m trying to show them that they have tacit knowledge about DV. Recognizing move-trailer lead-ins creates comfort for them.” This drawing on students’ knowledge of popular culture is a key principle in the project, and Keith is demonstrating how it is the teacher’s role to make that knowledge explicit, so students can “see something in the current world.” He is reaffirming his belief in connecting the classroom to the world, rather than being “the teacher of the old, cloistered classroom” (Kalantzis and Cope, 2008, p. 39).

What is also evident is Keith’s ability to see and believe in his design of the classroom and the lesson to make multimodal design of texts explicit. Although he says he doesn’t “think too much” while he is in the “flow” of teaching, his further comments
suggest something slightly different. He narrates his goals for bringing the “layers of meaning” to students’ attention. He wants them to understand that in DV they hear music, see images and get carried along by a voiceover. When he explains his classroom talk about the movie trailer example, he rattles off the heuristic that he uses: “Why is the music the way it is? How’s he speaking—what’s the tone of saying the words? They count the clips, notice the shots are short, swift, framed.” In this segment, Keith is confident in his ability to make explicit the modes for composing students are familiar with, and that they will be using. His deep belief in the importance of multimodal literacy seems evident, an internalized understanding that has become an automatic routine for him, requiring less active consciousness.

Transitions to Social Learning--Sharing Agency: However, in the segment where he was thinking aloud for the class, imagining a movie trailer on the Elastic Clause of the Constitution, he immediately saw a problem: “I’m in flow, creating a scenario, but I should have stopped at critical moments and let them fill in the [creative] blanks …I should have looked for more interaction.” This foregrounding of a missed opportunity for mediating student composing illustrates the level of nuance in his construction of a multimodal composing pedagogy. With humor, a key to his classroom persona, he concluded, “Me not thrilled with it.” Although Keith was the project teacher with the greatest success with DV composing as a student learning tool, he was still working on the difficult move from teacher as presenter to student as composer—the key hand-off of sharing agency in the classroom. That is, he suggests that the transition from teacher to student should begin by sharing the composing during what was in the video the “presentational” introduction to the DV task.
What seems apparent is that Keith’s guiding principle of sharing agency with students to create a social space for their composing was violated by what he saw in the video. By re-living the moment-to-moment unfolding of the class, he saw and felt a problem that perhaps only he would have noted. His innovations were much more salient to other viewers of the video—focusing on popular media, beginning a high-interest curriculum-based project, preparing to hand over the composing to students in groups. But as a teacher committed to transforming his classroom along a specific social trajectory, the discrepancy was glaring. Reaching after innovation, integrating it into the routines of his class, Keith had to re-see almost everything about his teaching. Seeing himself fall short by his own assessment, helped him to re-see this particular piece of teaching and plan for future changes.

Further, continued video shot in one teacher’s classroom over time (as we do in the larger project) provides opportunities to sample teachers’ discourse and trace what might appear to be micro-processes that may index conceptual changes for teachers. In the case of Keith Hughes, he has continued to adapt his pedagogy in a way that seems to be directly related to his video reflection on student interaction and agency. This year he has begun a new DV series—“Old Dead Warren Cases” and “Old Dead Americans”. These videos are different from those done in the past since Hughes has students create video clips to represent historical points while he conducts his lectures. This tendency to include students even during history lectures began as Hughes asked students to demonstrate historical facts using props, rather that doing it himself. His inclusion of these “mini” digital events within lecture time have allowed him to reconstruct history, and review how to design movies using the video software at the same time. He wrote the script and engaged the students in acting it out with props, filmed it, and uploaded the footage directly into the computer. The “Dead Americans”
video lead-in has a kitschy zombie segment that students love—then on to embodying the concept of the day in a multimodal scene. This innovation provides one answer to Keith’s critique of himself in the video as talking too long without interacting with students—even in his lectures. Over time every aspect of his teaching moves toward sharing agency and multimodality.

Teacher educators need to develop 21st century teachers as “adaptive experts” (Bransford, Derry, Berliner, Hammerness, 2005) who can balance routine efficiency and innovation as an essential stance for initiating and sustaining change. Having “adaptive experts” like Keith (Knips, 2009) reflect on videos of their classes has several distinct outcomes. Not only does Keith continue his transformation by seeing what he wants to change and solidify his beliefs about what is important in his teaching, but he also provides a narration of the critical junctures in his trajectory of transforming himself and his classroom. Adding the teacher video analysis component to our ongoing classroom research on DV composing, therefore, contributes to the development of the model for Multimodal Composing in schools: these analyses help us to trace teacher progress—struggles and successes—to create a more nuanced representation of how changes actually have happened in schools. Such knowledge is critical for developing teachers for multimodal 21st century teaching and learning.

*Noticing and Valuing Collaborative Talk as Inquiry*

*Aiming for Social Inquiry.* The experience of Jackson Garvey (pseudonym) in his urban vocational school illustrates how he worked to reframe literacy practices in his English class. Jackson started with a problem he saw: “I have trouble getting [students] to be persuasive and authentic…..Persuasive essays written by students reflect the fact-starved news reports of twenty-four hour cable news stations. They are more style than substance.” For his action research project for the DV Composing class at the university,
Jackson chose to introduce the Uncommercial genre to his students to address what he saw as two neglected and “essential elements of savvy citizenry—media literacy and political/social awareness.” His 12th grade English class read short stories, studied the film *Bowling for Columbine*, and discussed issues and problems in society. They analyzed commercials, attending to the unifying concepts, persuasive techniques, and characteristics of the genre. In production teams his students brainstormed, story boarded and “pitched” their concept to their teacher as producer. He was very pleased with the results: “I have never seen the level of involvement that I saw with this project.” He analyzed what had happened:

Simply put, students work harder and are more engaged working with iMovie than when working with a more traditional literacy medium….This increased motivation manifests itself in such a way that only can be described as inquiry. Both their time commitment and their resourcefulness in their quest to capture their point of view become critical attributes in this quest of inquiry.

What Jackson named “inquiry” seemed to be a strong sense of purpose for the video product that resulted in an intense social experience in the process of DV design. Jackson noted that while “writing was individual, iMovie was community oriented.” The digital video inquiry required students to become collaborative problem solvers for “how best to get the point across,” to conceptualize their ideas.

*Noticing Social Talk as Evidence of Inquiry.* Jackson’s video analysis focused on students discussing potential titles for a group DV project in a 12th grade English class. This class project was a culmination of a student book group Unit, in which groups of 4-5
students picked a specific genre of young adult literature. Each group member read a
different book related to that genre and discussed their book and genre on a group blog,
noting the genre similarities. Each group then made a 1 minute movie trailer to create a
hypothetical movie from the genre they studied. In this report, we focus on a group of
students who read books from the mystery genre. As Jackson viewed the group talking
about a possible title for their movie trailer in a three-phase review protocol, he began to
reframe student talk as inquiry, an important move in his development towards a
Multimodal Literacy Pedagogy.

The protocol for this Teacher Video Analysis was emergent, based on the topic of
the classroom video and the responses of Jackson. To begin, the teacher (Jackson) and
familiar peer (Jim Cercone, an experienced English teacher working as a graduate
assistant in the project) watched the video together, with the suggestion that Jim wanted
to “get your thoughts” about it. Jim had selected the segment as a critical incident
demonstrating student talk during DV composing. As he consulted with all of the groups,
Jackson did not have access in real time to these lengthy segments of student
collaboration.

After his first viewing, Jackson expressed surprise that this group which had been
struggling the week before were working together. Earlier he had talked to them, listened
to each of their concerns, and helped them to find a way to proceed together. This
respectful social intervention apparently was successful. In the video he saw their
conversation as natural talk that he liked to see. In short, he thought it was “cool.”

Jackson had been doing DV composing in his classroom for several years and he
knew that teacher and students roles changed during these activities and he saw that as
positive: he had been reading about how jobs of the future would be require more group creativity and problem solving; he knew students would change jobs and professions many times--in ways that his Gen X group has not done. Jackson then talked at some length, working out how DV composing was more social than written composing—which he saw as individual, with sentences even containing “the writer’s DNA.”

At this point in his analysis, Jackson stopped and wondered if he were off topic, or maybe had lost track of what he was saying. Jackson had clearly been shaping his thinking at the point of utterance. That is, he was not delivering completed thought, but thinking it through as he said it. His partner Jim said we’re “just talking.” When Jim’s next turn was an extended one, though, Jackson got lost and asked, “What’s the big question?” Jackson seemed to be more familiar with the interview format we had done earlier with distinct Q and A. The dialogue that we intended around the video segment was not familiar and/or comfortable, it seemed. Asking for “the big question” was a way of seeking more solid ground after Jackson had been thinking out loud a relatively new thought that he did not yet fully understand.

Here the role of the peer conversationalist became very important. Jim reduced the complexity of the question to make it a compare/contrast question (similar to what Jackson had just done with print and DV composing). Jackson was able to respond right away to how his class doing DV was different from what his class used to be.

At this point, once again. Jackson seemed to trust that he could think aloud with Jim and launched into an account of how his class used to be “quieter,” when students were working individually on writing--and talk was “a distraction.” He tried to explain how DV required different roles that students played (camera person, audio person,
editor), but that they all had to consult with each other in order to make sure there was “coherence” in the plan and the product. While he attributed inclinations to these roles as individual personalities, he also knew that constant consultation was also part of the process. He eventually decided that DV composing promoted a “creative space” that was a necessary part of the process. In this formulation he was taking up Jim’s earlier concept of developing classroom “space” and was, it seems, still working out the role of the social in DV composing.

The peer interlocutor made an important responsive move at this point. He asked the teacher to play the video again (Jackson controlling the playback). This time, he asked Jackson to say if anything going on in the clip related to traditional English. Cercone maintained his peer stance of consulting the teacher about something he was trying to figure out.

Before answering that question, though, Jackson noticed something he had never noticed before. The student who was not talking was moving his eyes back and forth—the way Jackson’s had seen his 3 year old son do when he’s thinking. At this crucial moment, Jackson became aware in a visceral way that students were “thinking and visualizing” during this talk, not just making jokes about popular cultural references. The fact that he “saw” Louis actively thinking even when he was not speaking seemed to be a revelation. Jackson’s respect for their social interaction had been clear; at this point, his respect for their social cognition emerged. Here was compelling evidence that talk could be thinking and interpreting—-for the individual and the group.

Then Jackson returned to Jim’s question and provided a laundry list of how DV composing IS like traditional English: DV is “writing a story,” meeting ELA standards,
talking about the characteristics of print genre and movie trailers, and dramatizing roles. In the framework of traditional English DV was an alternative “assessment,” in which students can do something with the knowledge and understanding they had been developing through reading, writing, and research. As he explained,

[Students] have got these years of experience with the things that they read, and the things that they watch, and they are developing kind of like perceptions of the story and so what do they do with their understanding of the story? They tell new stories or tell variations on the story and so that is what they are doing, that is what my students are doing. They are telling variations of the story, taking all of this gathered knowledge and understanding of this stuff and doing something new with it.

This last point that Jackson seems to come to as he speaks about “doing something new with it” is the very essence of multimodal design—orchestrating multiple modes to communicate something new.

This last point about “doing something” with the knowledge was key for him here, and Jim took advantage of that to move on to the last task of the protocol—to read the verbatim transcript of the group interaction. In essence, he asked what they were “doing,” to focus Jackson’s attention on the content of the talk. He had scaffolded Jackson to this point to focus him on the work being done by the student talk. Here Jackson attended closely in his reading and saw that the group was tackling “a creative problem” of what to name the video. He noted that they were concerned with persuasion—one of the original problems that had drawn Jackson to digital video for a solution.
Then he saw—it seems for the first time—that the students’ self-appointed question of creating the best title was engaged in a “subtle” way. Their thinking was “pretty high up there” (in the cognitive taxonomy, we assume). This was the end of the video analysis. Jim told Jackson that he agreed—that there was “some deep literary thinking gong on.” He asked if Jackson would look at the group’s completed video in a subsequent session in light of this conversation and Jackson agreed. This move to ask Jackson to link the students’ social problem-solving to their DV product was a clear bit of mediation. It may serve to help Jackson solidify this new knowledge.

This three-part video analysis protocol, enacted responsively as Jackson’s thinking emerged, prompted him to begin to unpack the role of social mediation and co-designing in DV composing. Perhaps it gave him eyes to see the subtlety of student thinking in their social interactions. Although Jackson had provided a social space, his focus on individualist notions of thinking and literacy were a negative drag on his seeing the social mediation and thinking what were going on. He had already understood the new roles he and students played in DV composing and helped with their social interactions as a means of getting the individual roles done. Still, the jump to thinking about the deep importance of the social mediation that supported the coherence of the project had not yet occurred. Understanding thinking as not just in the head, but also in the social space, is a move to a new paradigm. It was the Digital Video Analysis and the responsive social support of Jim Cercone that promoted Jackson’s emergent new framework for understanding.

Another next step will be to ask Jackson to do another Digital Video Analysis with a student group collaboratively planning. If he has internalized this new frame for
multimodal composing in his classroom, we would expect a new kind of discourse from
Jackson representing his new more socially based view of knowing and thinking. [Jim,
I think we need to look at either a new Video Analysis from Jackson of group process
and/or his analysis of the group’s created video. Or both. Just speculating that this was a
change in his thinking based on his changing discourse is not persuasive enough.]

Discussion and Implications

MLP as presented in this chapter provides an explanatory framework for a critical
reframing of teaching and learning, to transform classrooms and literacy practices in
schools. The use of teacher video analysis provided a powerful tool for both capturing
and prompting teacher change toward Multimodal Literacy Pedagogy, highlighting the
dynamics of teachers in the process of transforming their teaching. In addition, teacher
video analysis among adaptive experts prompts changes in the model of MLP and,
especially, an understanding of the moment-to-moment moves of teachers as they work
to design new roles, social spaces, and pedagogies in their classrooms. That nuanced
understanding can play a useful role in helping in-service and pre-service teachers make
the cultural jump to multimodal pedagogies.

In this study we have illustrated that examining teachers’ video analysis within
the context of their over-time intentions to transform their teaching can provide portrayals
of teachers working at the edge of their competence, in the process of becoming. Video
analysis, sometimes in conversation with a familiar (yet theoretically sophisticated ) peer,
can mediate the changes teachers are reaching towards, aiding in conceptual reframing.
Thus, the conversations around video of their classrooms provided external tools for
supporting their continuing development. Teacher video analysis, then, follows
Vygotsky’s genetic method (e.g., 1987) of tracing the development of higher order thinking, but, here, related to teacher change. These moves are most useful and enlightening, though, when each video analysis session can be situated in a larger study of the teacher changing over time.

Another issue emerging in these cases appears to be the importance of ongoing conversations with practicing teachers as they attempt pedagogical innovation. Both Keith and Jackson had completed the CVCV professional development (28 hours) and afterwards attended almost all of the project reunions and roundtables. Each had subsequently taken a course at the university that focused on multimodal literacies. And both had developed collaborative relationships with their university assistants (Hughes with Knips and Garvey with Cercone) in their classrooms over time, making their analysis of their own classroom videos a low-stress event.

In short, the video analyses prompted teacher reflection, but the meaning of those reflections emerged in the long term cases of the teachers. This over-time perspective also provides us with the opportunity to create trajectories of change, bolstered by video analysis snapshots. In our continuing studies, we plan to use this method for developing a number of individual trajectories. The cross-case analysis may reveal a clearer path that teachers travel in their movement towards being new teachers for New Learning (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008).
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