

i.e.: inquiry in education

Volume 11 | Issue 1

Article 9

2019

Posing for the Camera: An Analysis of Pre-service Teachers' Discursive Practices During a Video Analysis Session

Meghan Barnes

University of North Carolina at Charlotte, mbarne56@uncc.edu

Michelle Falter

North Carolina State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie>

Recommended Citation

Barnes, Meghan and Falter, Michelle. (2019). Posing for the Camera: An Analysis of Pre-service Teachers' Discursive Practices During a Video Analysis Session. *i.e.: inquiry in education: Vol. 11: Iss. 1, Article 9*.

Retrieved from: <https://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie/vol11/iss1/9>

Copyright © 2019 by the author(s)

i.e.: inquiry in education is published by the Center for Practitioner Research at the National College of Education, National-Louis University, Chicago, IL.

Posing for the Camera:

An Analysis of Preservice Teachers' Discursive Practices During a Video Analysis Session

Meghan Barnes

University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, USA

Michelle Falter

North Carolina State University, Raleigh, USA

In our daily lives we often *pose*. We *pose* questions to our friends and colleagues. We *compose* emails, and we *propose* solutions. We might *oppose* another's ideas or *impose* our ideas on others. We could even stop and *pose* for pictures or *compose* ourselves before a big date. We might even hold a yoga *pose* or strike a *pose* on the dance floor. We sometimes even *pose* a threat or become a *poser* to those who find us fake, phony, or insincere. We also accept new job *positions* at our work while others *position* themselves to get a raise.

One might not first associate teaching and educators with the notion of *posing*, but posing and positioning are very much built into the fabric of the job. Etymologically speaking, the origin of *posing* comes both from the Old French word *poser*, meaning to "pause" and the Latin word *ponere*, meaning "to put, place, or set" (Oxford English Dictionary). Teachers regularly engage in both types of *posing*.

For example, educators often *pose* questions, or "pause" and "put" ideas forth, to their students as they engage in the curriculum, or to themselves in order to reflect upon and improve their own practice. Teachers also might *compose* themselves, or "pause," in response to all the responsibilities, expectations, and stress they face on a daily basis. *Posing*, in the form of modeling ideas for students, is a typical part of a well-crafted lesson plan. At other times, teachers might feel like they are *posers*, or as the axiom states, "faking it, till they make it," as they figure out how to teach new content or pretend to be excited by a new district mandate.

Posing and positioning oneself is a part of the teaching practice. As Garcia and O'Donnell-Allen (2015) state, "like yoga practitioners, teachers who are committed to professional growth . . . take up stances (or poses) toward their practice" (p. 3). To pose, then, means to intentionally take up a stance or mindset as one reflects upon one's own teaching. Which stances or poses teachers take up or put into place is largely dependent upon how they were taught. This is why providing opportunities to practice taking on different

poses or stances is an important part of the reflective process in preservice teachers' teacher education training.

In the study presented here, we were interested in the potential that the collective analysis of teaching via a Video Analysis Session (VAS) might serve as an opportunity for preservice teachers (PSTs) to not only *pose* questions about their own practice, but to take on a critical stance, or *pose*, toward their craft. Specifically, we analyze the experiences of preservice English Language Arts teachers in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) as they plan for, participate in, and collectively reflect on video clips of their own teaching in a VAS preceding student teaching. Video analysis was incorporated into this teacher education program to foreground the contexts within which the PSTs were learning to teach as they 1) reflected on their own teaching experiences, 2) reflected on the teaching of others, and 3) considered the ways that diverse contextual factors shape teaching. We draw on positioning theory (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) and the tools of Conversation Analysis (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997; Sacks, 1984; ten Have, 2007) to examine the nature of the interactions among PSTs as they provided feedback to one another during the VAS and to consider the effectiveness of the VAS as a tool for taking up a critical reflective stance. Specifically, we asked:

1. In what ways did context (both the context of the VAS and the contexts of the schools within which the PSTs were teaching) contribute to or hinder opportunities for critical reflection during the Video Analysis Session?
2. What acts of positioning did PSTs engage in as they participated in video analysis of their own and peers' teaching?

Literature Review

The focus of our research is grounded in literature on reflection, specifically video reflection, in teacher education. Dewey (1933) described reflection as beginning at “a *forked road* situation, a situation which is ambiguous, which presents a dilemma, which proposes alternatives” (p. 3), that forces the individual to pause (i.e., *pose*) and to seek out solutions. In other words, reflection entails a combination of discovery and hesitation, as the individual seeks a solution to a perceived problem or question. Although reflection has been theorized and operationalized in different ways over time, reflection remains a common practice in teacher education (Lee & Moon, 2013; Oner & Adadan, 2011; Stevenson & Cain, 2013. Zeichner & Liston, 2013).

Opportunities for reflection have been incorporated into teacher education programs for a variety of purposes and in a variety of ways. Extending from literature on culturally-relevant pedagogy (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994), many teacher educators have developed opportunities for PSTs to reflect on their racial and cultural identities and how these identities might shape their approaches to teaching and interactions with diverse students (Allen, Hancock, Lewis, & Starker-Glass, 2017; Howard, 2003; Whitaker & Valtierra, 2018). Similarly, recognizing the overwhelming Whiteness of the US preservice teaching population, teacher educators have drawn on various techniques—e.g., digital storytelling (Matias & Grosland, 2016), race-based caucuses (Varghese, Daniels, & Park, 2019), and dialogue circles (Laughter, 2011)—to encourage PSTs to reflect on the ways that their Whiteness may function when teaching students of color. Relatedly, teacher educators have considered various approaches to developing PSTs' ongoing reflective practices, including portfolios (Oner & Adadan, 2011), action research

(Hagevik, Aydeniz, & Rowell, 2012), and analysis of video case studies (Harlow & Swanson, 2009; Masats & Dooly, 2011).

In this paper, we inquire into the reflective potential of a video analysis session, which provided an opportunity for PSTs to analyze videos of their own teaching within a group of their PST-peers and university-based supervisor, and pose questions and take up different positions. Unlike other forms of reflection (like those reviewed above), the analysis of one's own teaching through video allows PSTs to analyze concrete examples of classroom practice (Hatch & Grossman, 2009), to observe the complexity of classroom life (Hiebert, Gallimore, & Stigler, 2002), and to gain a better understanding of the relationship between students, content, and teachers' pedagogical choices (Castro, Clark, Jacobs, & Givvin, 2005). PSTs' analysis of videos of their own teaching has been identified as an effective reflective tool in teacher education (Beck, King, & Marshall, 2002; Brophy, 2004; Christ, Arya, & Chiu, 2012; Harlow & Swanson, 2009; van Es, Tunney, Goldsmith, & Seago, 2014), and even as a tool for critical reflection (Schieble, Vetter, & Meacham, 2015; Vetter, Meacham, & Schieble, 2013), which we review in the Conceptual Framework.

In their research, Christ, Arya, and Chiu (2012) were primarily concerned with PSTs' reasons for selecting particular videos of their teaching to analyze more closely. Others have looked to video as a tool to bridge perceived gaps between the schools and the university. For instance, Cegelka, Fitch, and Alvarado (2000) paired individual PSTs with a university supervisor to view and evaluate their teaching practices in an effort to bridge the physical challenges of teaching in rural areas. Finally, van Es et. al. (2014) inquired into the ways that university supervisors facilitated analysis and reflection via video analysis with PSTs. Although reflection and, increasingly, video reflection are common pedagogical tools in teacher education, we find that the potential for group, or collective, video analysis to serve as a tool for critical reflection remains under-researched.

Conceptual Framework

We approach this research with the understanding that "learning to teach is a highly complex process that is very personalized and contextualized" (Mayer, 1999, p. 20). We are particularly concerned with the ways that multiple temporal-spatial contexts shape PSTs' developing conceptions of teaching (Barnes & Smagorinsky, 2016). Among those contexts we believe to be most influential are PSTs' personal learning experiences prior to teacher education (i.e., Lortie's [1975] apprenticeship of observation), the courses, faculty, and peers that make up the university-based teacher education program, and the K-12 school placements that constitute all clinical experiences including tutoring, service-learning work, practicum, and formal student teaching. We draw on critical reflection and positioning theory to frame our inquiry into the role that context played during PSTs' collective analysis of teaching videos, as well as the acts of posing and positioning they engaged in within the context of the video analysis session.

Critical Reflection

For Dewey (1933), the "*Demand for the solution of a perplexity*" (p. 4, italics in original) was essential to the process of reflection. Furthermore, Dewey (1916) considered teaching and reflection to be so intertwined with one another that attempts to divide them would be futile. Critical reflection extends Dewey's conception of reflection, to also consider the "moral, political, and ethical contexts of teaching" (Howard, 2003, p. 197) and provides a means of addressing issues of equity, access, and justice in teaching (Calderhead, 1989; Gore, 1987; Howard, 2003). For Sams and Dyches (2016), critical reflection is aimed at exploring one's own sociocultural positions in an effort to disrupt power structures. Critical reflection, then, extends beyond introspection to consider the ways that individuals are shaped by and

actively construct the contexts within which they are embedded. Thus, for the benefits of critical reflection to be realized, reflective practices must be attached to actual teaching experiences (as alluded to in Dewey's early work) and followed by reflective action (Howard, 2003). In teacher education, then, school-based clinical experiences provide ripe spaces for PSTs to systematically evaluate a range of contextual factors and to make decisions about how best to respond (Watts & Lawson, 2009).

Although practicum school placement plays an important role, it is essential that PSTs regularly address, analyze, and discuss the multiple contexts that shape novice teachers' developing conceptions of teaching (e.g., the university teacher education program, the apprenticeship of observation, community-based memberships) when engaging in critical reflection. Specifically, critical reflection should encourage PSTs to consider how the diverse contexts they experience shape and influence one another so that PSTs might "see how their positionality influences their students in either positive or negative ways" (Howard, 2003, p. 197). It is widely recognized that teacher education programs should support PSTs as they develop strategies to identify and analyze their own histories and experiences as learners, with some even positing that identifying and disrupting one's own beliefs about teaching and learning is a necessary first step in critical reflection (Heydon & Hibbert, 2010).

However, it is equally as important that PSTs consider how their own poses, positionings, and experiences might inform their work as teachers (e.g., their dispositions toward teaching and learning, their expectations for students, and their expectations of learning) (Heydon & Hibbert, 2010). Balancing considerations of personal, university-, and school-based contexts has proven challenging in teacher education, as PSTs often attach greater value to what is learned and experienced in their K–12 school placements than to what is learned at the university (Massey, 2002). The role of the university is further diminished when one considers Handsfield's (2006) findings that PSTs often view the K–12 school context through the lens of their own K–12 learning experiences. The challenge, then, is to engage PSTs in critical reflection that spans the multiple contexts to which they belong, including the personal, K–12 school, and university.

To support novices as they learn about and practice critical reflection, Smyth (1989) devised a four-step process that includes (1) describing, (2) informing, (3) confronting, and (4) reconstructing. These steps align well with Dewey's (1916, 1933) interpretation of reflection as first identifying and understanding a perplexity (describing) and then engaging in discovery and exploration (informing and confronting), in search of a solution and changed action (reconstructing). Additionally, although Smyth described these as steps, we see these as a scaffolding structure for the poses that PSTs take as they examine their own practices and those of others. Perhaps most challenging are steps three and four: confronting and reconstructing. These final steps require PSTs to consider the myriad contextual factors that shape the ways they see the world and others, and then revise their teaching practices accordingly (e.g., interactions with students, curricular choices, pedagogical strategies, etc.). Smyth's four-step framework, although beginning with the *individual*, could be extended to instances of *collective* critical reflection like the VAS. For instance, as they observe the video-recorded teaching perplexities experienced by their peers, PSTs might pose the following: (1) What do they do?, (2) What does this mean?, (3) How did they come to be like this?, and (4) How might they do things differently?

Although early research questioned whether PSTs were developmentally ready to practice critical reflection (Berliner, 1988; Cochran-Smith, 1991; Kagan, 1992), Dinkelman (2000) found that the PSTs in his study were capable of understanding and articulating what critical reflection entailed and engaging in

critical reflection as part of teacher education. Specifically, Dinkelman found that PSTs were more likely to engage in critical reflection as they moved into student teaching when they were explicitly and regularly directed to engage in critical reflection by a university-based supervisor or school-based mentor. However, although Dinkelman found evidence of PSTs engaging in Smyth's first three steps of critical reflection during teacher education, it was less clear that PSTs were addressing step four: drawing on their critical reflections to reconstruct teaching practices.

In this study, we inquired into the effectiveness of a VAS, aimed at foregrounding and bringing together two of the contexts that shape PSTs' conceptions of what it means to teach (the university and practicum school), to achieve all four steps (or poses) of Smyth's critical reflection framework. We also drew on positioning theory to help us analyze the interactions between the PSTs during the VAS.

Positioning Theory

At the heart of positioning theory is an attention to relationships and interconnection. Specifically, positioning theory provides insight into the ways that relationships form and shift over time and how individuals understand those relationships (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). Acts of positioning are interrelated as "positioning of self always involves positioning of others and positioning of others always involves positioning of self" (Bullough & Draper, 2004, p. 408). Positioning is also dynamic, as the ways that individuals actively pose and position themselves and others shift as needs, perceptions, and goals change (van Langenhove & Harré, 1999). These shifts in position can effectively "open or constrict the range of possible ways of making sense of interaction and relationship" (Bullough & Draper, 2004, p. 408). Thus, as PSTs begin to make sense of their new role as an educator, they do so by making shifts in their position of self in relation to others, such as their fellow classmates, their cooperating teacher, their former teachers, and their students.

In their work with video analysis, Vetter, Meacham, and Schieble (2013) drew from Davies and Harré (2000), to argue that "the act of positioning involves how rights and obligations are appropriated and refused during interactions" (p. 233). In other words, individuals may position themselves and others in ways that either validate or silence their contributions to an interaction. In the study we present here, positioning theory allowed us to gain insight into the ways that the PSTs understood themselves in relation to one another. Ultimately, by examining PSTs' acts of positioning, we were able to consider the extent to which the VAS permitted PSTs to engage in critical reflections of their and their peers' teaching. We draw on the tenets of critical reflection and positioning theory to consider the influence that various contextual factors might have on the effectiveness of a VAS in supporting PSTs in engaging in critical reflections of their teaching.

Methodology and Method

Given our conceptual frameworks and research questions, we approached the data collected from an ethnomethodological standpoint, which seeks to understand how participants produce and understand behaviors in a particular setting (Garfinkel, 1967). The goals of ethnomethodological research are not to tabulate frequencies, identify themes, or generalize findings, but to develop richer understandings of phenomena within particular settings. Because we are particularly interested in participants' interactions within a conversational setting, we draw on the tools of Conversation Analysis (CA) to look more specifically at the "technology of conversation" (Sacks, 1984, p. 413) that members use to produce social order via acts of positioning (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997; ten Have, 2007). Of the exiguous literature found on the role of collective video analysis in teacher development, we found no researchers employing CA

explicitly to analyze their data. Using the tools of CA to analyze talk during the VAS allowed us to simultaneously consider the context of talk and the “discursive opportunities and possibilities at work in talk and social interaction” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 496). By closely analyzing turns in talk and individual utterances, we could analyze how such actions “implicate certain identities, roles and/or relationships for the interactants” during the VAS (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997, p. 74), and how these positioning acts functioned to either silence or validate experiences and reflections during the VAS.

We also draw from Drew and Heritage (1992) to understand that the meanings attached to actions are dependent on both the local context within which the action is produced (here, the VAS) and the larger institutional context(s) surrounding the talk (e.g., the university, school placements, etc.). Within this study, CA allowed us to inquire into what was relevant to those involved in the VAS, to pay attention to the sequential organization of interactions and action, and to view participants as operating within a set of context-specific rules or standards, rather than a set of universal principles (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997). Ultimately, this methodological approach allowed us to consider how PSTs positioned themselves and others during the VAS and the potential for the VAS to serve as a form of critical reflection

Context and Participants

This study analyzes the experiences of five PSTs enrolled in an English teacher education program at a large public university in the Southeast region of the United States as they participated in and reflected on a VAS as part of their required coursework. All five consenting participants were a part of the same PLC that Meghan led, as their university supervisor.

As we explain later, two PSTs, Ellen and Susan, were selected as the focus of our data analysis. The PLC that Ellen and Susan were a part of consisted of four undergraduate PSTs and one graduate-level PST. Information regarding the names (all pseudonyms), ages, level of schooling, and field placements of all PLC members is further delineated in Table 1.

Table 1

Participants

Name	Age	Level of School	Field Placement
Ellen	45	Masters	Middle School
Ginger	21	Undergraduate	Middle School
Elizabeth	21	Undergraduate	Middle School
Susan	21	Undergraduate	High School

Joshua	21	Undergraduate	High School
--------	----	---------------	-------------

Ellen was the only master's degree student in the group and so did not take any courses with her peers in the PLC. At the time of this study Ellen was in her mid-40s and her only interactions with the undergraduates was during the monthly PLC meetings. Ellen's field placement was a middle school language arts class. Susan, on the other hand, was an undergraduate student in her early 20s. She spent almost 16 hours each week with the other undergraduates in the PLC during class time alone, in addition to other, social times they may have spent together, and the monthly PLC meetings. Susan's field placement was in a high school English classroom.

Finally, we note that Meghan was also a participant in this study, as she interacted with both Susan and Ellen during the VAS and the individual follow-up interviews. During the time of data collection Meghan served both as a university supervisor and as the instructor of a course on lesson planning and assessment. Michelle, although not a part of the PLC, served as an instructor of the Young Adult Literature course, and thus, was familiar with the students.

Data Collection

The data corpus for this study include the audio-recorded and transcribed VAS and one-on-one interviews. Specifically, data for this study were collected across three sites: excerpts from the VAS, the individual interview with Susan, and the individual interview with Ellen.

Video Analysis Session. The PLC groups consisted of five to six PSTs who met together on a monthly basis to discuss their classroom experiences, professional goals, and questions. PSTs were organized into PLCs by the director of the English Education program, who tried to put PSTs from the same and nearby schools together into a PLC. To build a sense of community and trust among the PSTs, these PLC groups remained together through both the practicum and student teaching semesters.

The VAS took place late in the fall semester when PSTs were completing their practicum and taking classes. Prior to data collection, PSTs participated in a November Unit, a two-week block during which PSTs were expected to plan for and teach one class every day in their field placement. For many PSTs this was the first opportunity they had to plan for and lead instruction in a middle or high school setting. Much of the university-based coursework, as well as many of the discussions that took place within the PLC up to this point, were done in preparation for the November Unit. Thus, by the time of the VAS, PLC members were familiar with their peers' teaching contexts and the topics and texts taught during their respective November Units and, subsequently, the general context of the recordings they would share during the VAS.

To prepare for the VAS, PSTs selected a 10-minute clip of their teaching that they would like to discuss further with their PLC. After transcribing the clip, each PST developed a guiding question that they

would present to the group before sharing their video. During the VAS, each PLC member was given 20 minutes to present the context of their teaching, to ask their guiding question, and then to share their video. Following the video, each PLC member provided feedback for the presenter—commenting on something the presenting PST did well and then making recommendations for improvement. Thus, each step of the VAS was structured so as to encourage critical reflection: identifying and explaining a perplexity (Dewey, 1933; Smyth, 1989), situating the perplexity within the broader context of the school and classroom (Smyth, 1989), and ultimately making recommendations for improved and changed practice (Smyth, 1989). There was no written journal or autobiography to accompany the VAS. Instead, the work done to prepare for the VAS and the discussion during the session itself served as the reflection.

The VAS was organized to encourage PSTs to see themselves and one another as knowledgeable about teaching. During the VAS, Meghan intentionally reserved her comments until the end of each PST's turn, to encourage the rest of the PLC to offer guidance and feedback to one another. Thus, Meghan viewed herself primarily as a facilitator, keeping time and guiding the group through the protocol, rather than a participant in the VAS. Although the entire VAS was recorded as part of the data-collection process, only sections of the recording were selected for transcription (which we review in the Data Analysis section).

Individual Interviews. Follow-up interviews took place in February of the semester following the VAS, when participants had been student teaching for approximately one month. All interviews followed a semistructured format (Seidman, 2013) and were approximately one hour in length. Although interviews were amenable to change, based on each participants' talk and experiences, each interview was guided by the following prompts:

- Tell me about the experience of recording and transcribing your teaching.
- Tell me about the experience of sharing your video in the video analysis session (VAS).
- What feedback from the VAS stands out/stood out to you?
- What lasting impact has the VAS had on you?

Each interview was audio-recorded and transcribed, with portions of select interviews transcribed using Jefferson's Conventions (reviewed next).

Data Analysis

Meghan collected the data for this study and then collaborated with Michelle to analyze the data and organize the findings. Data analysis was aimed at developing richer understandings of the poses and positions PSTs took during the VAS and was guided by our research questions:

1. In what ways did context (both the context of the VAS and the contexts of the schools within which the PSTs were teaching) contribute to or hinder opportunities for critical reflection during the Video Analysis Session?

2. What acts of positioning did PSTs engage in as they participated in video analysis of their own and peers' teaching?

We began by individually reading through the entire transcript of the audio-recorded VAS to look for patterns of talk across the entire transcript, making notes and asking questions as we read. When we reconvened to discuss our initial impressions of the data, we noticed that with one exception, all PSTs received approximately equal amounts of feedback from all PLC members, following the presentation of their video. The exception to this occurred after Ellen shared her video with the group. Rather than a whole-group dialogue, the discussion following Ellen's video was primarily led by Susan and took on the form of a dialogue between Susan and Ellen alone. For this reason, we chose to focus on an excerpt from the exchange between Susan and Ellen from the VAS in this study. We then drew on excerpts from Susan's and Ellen's individual interviews to triangulate the data. In approaching the interview transcripts, we chose sections where Ellen and Susan recollected and shared their experiences of the VAS discussion.

We then transcribed all three excerpts using Jefferson's (2004) conventions for Conversation Analysis (CA) (see Table 2 for a Convention Key). CA afforded us greater insight into the discursive moves and poses that participants made as they interacted with one another during the VAS and allowed us to analyze the acts of positioning that participants engaged in both during and after the VAS. By attending to the contextual factors that shaped the interactions, we are able to gain a greater sense of the ways that multiple contexts could have influenced participants' critical reflections on their own and their peers' teaching.

Table 2

Jefferson Conventions

Symbol	Meaning
(.)	Micro-pause
(2.0)	Timed pause
[Indicates start of overlapping talk
]	Indicates end of overlapping talk
<text>	Fast pace of talk
<u>text</u>	Emphasis
=	Latch (no pause in talk)
te::xt	Drawn out talk
↑ ↓	Upward/downward intonation
°	Quiet/soft talk

As we analyzed the transcribed data, we returned to our research questions to inquire into the roles that context and positioning played in participants’ talk during and following the VAS. We looked, specifically, at the ways that participants used language to position themselves and their peers within the context of the VAS.

Findings

We organize our findings by the three data-collection sites: the VAS transcript, Susan’s interview transcript, and Ellen’s interview transcript. As we discuss our analysis of each data source, we consider our research questions and draw on Smyth’s (1989) framework for critical reflection (i.e. describing, informing, confronting, and reconstructing) to consider the ways that the VAS did and did not function as a tool to support PSTs’ critical reflections on teaching.

Video Analysis Session Transcript: PLC #1, Excerpt #1

In the excerpt that follows, Ellen had just shared the 10-minute clip of her video, along with the transcription and guiding question. Ellen’s video featured her leading students in an analysis of the persuasive and rhetorical devices in Martin Luther King, Jr.’s (1963) *I Have a Dream* speech. She had already received positive feedback from the group and Meghan had just asked the group to provide recommendations for Ellen’s teaching. After an almost 6-second pause, another PST, Susan, offered a response. Two phenomena became evident through the analysis of the following excerpt: deference to a perceived authority and a desire for shared experience.

VAS Excerpt

Table 3

Excerpt from Video Analysis Session

Turn	Speaker	Line	Talk
1	M	1	.hhh Alright (.) recommendations?
		2	(5.9)
2	S	3	Um this one thing that I- you know, going
		4	along with the question that you have (.) so
		5	um (2.0) maybe to facilitate more discussion
		6	<u>before</u> the video you could (.) um (.) prompt

		7	them with questions like "What <u>do</u> you know
		8	about MLK?" Um and I think that might be a
		9	good way to- to see where they are, <to see
		10	<u>if</u> they can even <u>compare</u> him> (.) to
		11	somebody (.) so what do they know currently
		12	cause, you know, they're middle schoolers,
		13	their level of .hhh understanding will
		14	probably (.) .hhh um (.) differ. And then
		15	also (.) I like the questions that you ask
		16	so thir- lines thirty-nine - so "what did
		17	the speech remind you of being at church,?"
		18	um I think just a suggestion I would make is
		19	to allow time for them to respond (.) I know
		20	that's a- that was a big weakness for me (.)
		21	↑during the November unit is (0.4) over-
		22	explaining everything or <u>not</u> allowing them
		23	to like <u>respond</u> to my ↑questions=
3	E	24	=Yeah and that's the thing I have to work on
		25	the <u>most</u> =
4	S	26	=↓Yeah just like the fear of (.) like I
		27	talked to Meghan about like the awkward
		28	↑silence (.) but=
5	E	29	= <u>Yes</u> ((laughter))
6	S	30	I think that you=
7	E	31	=Were like ((makes a noise to indicate
		32	confusion and craziness))
8	S	33	↓Yeah. <and I think that you pose like
		34	really good questions.> like what is- what
		35	did his speech sound like. Like let em

		36	really reflect and discuss before they go
		37	into the ↑assignment um and you ask the
		38	questions but I think just giving em that
		39	time to, to think about your question (.) um
		40	(.) would be my recommendation and- and
		41	that's something that I (.) myself [am]
9	E	42	[Tha]t
		43	was <u>really</u> good feedback cause I feel
		44	like- you know, you get nervous when you're
		45	up th[ere]
10	S	46	[Yeah]
11	E	47	and you're like- like ↑I do move along too
		48	fast (.) and I noticed even like from the
		49	first hour to the fifth hour I get better at
		50	↓that (.) like- because I lose my nerves=
12	S	51	=yeah=
13	E	52	=because things are going ok so=
14	S	53	=Yeah. So just offering em a little time to-
		54	to think about it (.) at least=
15	E	45	=Yeah that's good=
16	S	46	=Would be good.
17	E	47	(6.1) I uh- I wanna know what you guys
		48	thought about (.) during the quiet part,
		49	during the speech- if I should have stopped
		50	it <u>more</u> and asked questions <u>during</u> ? Or
		51	should I just let them absorb it?= =
18	S	52	=Yeah. See I wrote that down. Uh- but I
		53	don't know about that because you know if-
		54	the problem with like breaking it (.)

		55	breaking it ↑up (.) is does the speech lose
		56	momentum,? And lose that power of like his
		57	voice and <you know the diction so> .hhh I
		58	put ↑that and I don't ↓know. Lik[e]
19	E	59	[I]
		60	wonder what do you think Meghan?

Even though the VAS was organized (both explicitly and implicitly) to position PSTs as knowledgeable about the pedagogical and discipline-specific content, the supervisor, Meghan, was invited into discussion in ways that positioned her, rather than the PSTs, as the knowledge source. The first reference to Meghan was made in Turn 4 by Susan. Preceding this reference, Susan offered a recommendation to Ellen that she “allow time for them [her students] to respond.” Susan followed this recommendation with an immediate reference to her own weakness during the November Unit, saying “I know that’s a- that was a big weakness for me (.) ↑during the November Unit is (0.4) over-explaining everything or not allowing them to like respond to my ↑questions=.” Although Susan did offer an idea for a *reconstruction* to Ellen’s teaching, Susan’s reference to her own weakness served to hedge her critique of Ellen’s teaching—potentially indicating that she was not altogether comfortable making a recommendation. Even after Ellen confirmed Susan’s recommendation in Turn 3, Susan latched on to Ellen’s final word “most” to make another reference to her own situation. This was when Susan invoked Meghan’s name, to again illustrate how she, like Ellen, did not provide appropriate wait time for fear of “awkward silence.”

Susan again included references to herself and her own weaknesses alongside her recommendations to Ellen in turn 8. Susan said to Ellen “to think about your question (.) um (.) would be my recommendation” and then continues “and- and that’s something that I (.) myself [am]” before Ellen interjects. By positioning her own weaknesses alongside Ellen’s, Susan not only hedged her criticism of Ellen’s teaching, but also subtly suggested that because she had experienced something similar to Ellen, she was in a position to offer feedback and recommendations about how to improve. In other words, Susan could have felt that she needed to have something in common with Ellen in order to offer her a valid *reconstruction* of her teaching.

Like Susan earlier, Ellen also sought direct answers from the perceived authority in the room, rather than engaging in collective reflection with her peers. By stating “Uh- but I don’t know” and “I put -that and I don’t ↓know. Lik[e]” Susan suggested that she didn’t have a clear answer to Ellen’s question. When it became clear to Ellen that Susan did not have a fully-formed response to her question, which is shown in Susan’s combination of up and down intonations as well as her use of the term “Like” to indicate her continued thinking on the subject as she attempts to hold the floor, Ellen interrupted Susan to name a respondent: Meghan, the supervisor in the room.

Meghan was explicitly invoked again in the last turn when Ellen attempted to have Meghan provide an answer for her question by asking “I wonder what do you think Meghan?” By beginning her question with “I wonder,” Ellen was able to transition the focus away from Susan in a way that did not disregard her entirely, but did clearly signify her interest in Meghan’s opinion. By soliciting Meghan’s opinion and even interrupting Susan to pose her question, Ellen devalued the knowledge and opinions of her peers, thus limiting potential for collective critical reflection. Further, Ellen evaded either *confronting* or *reconstructing* her teaching practice and instead looked to Meghan to do this work for her.

Finally, Susan invoked an authority (either Meghan or the protocol for the discussion) when she attempted to make it seem that she was giving recommendations to Ellen out of a sense of obligation, rather than at her own will. For instance, in Turn 2, before providing a recommendation to Ellen, Susan said “going along with the question that you have” to indicate that her recommendation was in some way being solicited by Ellen. Similarly, in Turn 17, Ellen asked a specific question regarding the stopping and starting of audio during her teaching. In Turn 18 Susan took up Ellen’s question by stating “=Yeah. See I wrote that down.” By starting out with “Yeah” Susan suggested that she knew this was a topic that called for a recommendation but that she was waiting for an invitation to share it. She followed up by stating that she even wrote it down. However, by waiting for Ellen to specifically ask the question, rather than offering a recommendation unsolicited, Susan signified her discomfort in offering Ellen critical feedback.

Across this excerpt, participants regularly deferred to an authority and expressed desires for shared experience. Ellen and Susan could clearly *describe* the perplexities that they experienced in their teaching and could even see commonalities across their experiences. However, when the perplexity was not easily resolved by their peers in the VAS, Ellen and Susan both turned to Meghan for support with the fourth step/pose of critical reflection: *reconstruction*. Rather than engaging in prolonged discussions that would allow them to *confront* their perplexities (i.e., considering how they came to be like this), both PSTs turned to an authority for a clear answer. Similarly, by not asking questions about Ellen’s context (e.g., her Mentor Teacher, the students, the community, etc.) in order to learn how it might be different from her own, Susan evaded the third step/pose of critical reflection (*confront*) whereby she might consider how differing contextual factors shape teaching.

Thus, the behaviors by both PSTs could be suggestive of their views that “good” teaching is universal and monolithic—a question to be answered, rather than strategies to be explored and questioned. Such a view of teaching is also bolstered by the PSTs’ tendencies to jump from *describing* to *reconstructing*, and disregarding considerations of contextual factors that may have contributed to their own or their peers’ teaching experiences. These behaviors could also indicate PSTs’ discomfort with providing critical feedback to one another. Regardless of the reason, these behaviors effectively limited the potential for critical reflection during the VAS. We now turn to an analysis of the interview transcripts to gain a deeper understanding of the discursive moves and poses that Ellen and Susan made during the VAS.

Interview Transcript Excerpt 1: Ellen

The excerpt in Table 4 is from a one-on-one interview between Ellen and Meghan when she is responding to the initial prompt: “As you were sharing and the feedback that you were getting from the rest of the group, what was that like?”

Table 4

Excerpt from Ellen’s Interview

Turn	Speaker	Line	Talk
1	E	1	Like with the girl who was doing the
		2	play- I think we had a couple
2	M	3	Susan
3	E	4	Susan. We had a couple ways that ma::ybe
		5	it wouldn’t be- take up so much time <where
		6	we would have- you would have um somebody do
		7	the> do the prince, do the-
4	M	8	Yep
5	E	9	you know. Each group has a pr[ince] (.)
6	M	10	[Yep]
7	E	11	or something like that. So we gave her some
		12	ideas like that .hhh but I did feel like in
		13	that video analysis because <u>maybe</u> the kids
		14	(.) all have class together and they’re
		15	↑friends
8	M	16	Mhmm
9	E	17	I felt sorta like I was giving a lot of that
		18	((laughter)) kind of advice and then
		19	afterwards I felt like they probably just
		20	think (.) I’m mean ((laughter))
10	M	21	Oh no
11	E	22	Like I was really trying to go like “well

		23	<u>maybe</u> you could do this and <u>maybe</u> you could
		24	do this" but I feel like (.) ↑ <u>maybe</u> (.) in
		25	the future each- to really put pressure on
		26	each person to say a- a thing=
12	M	27	=Ye[ah]
13	E	28	[tha]t they maybe could a::dd
14	M	29	Yeah I think tha[t's a great idea]
15	E	30	[Just to expand the]
		31	person's idea frame ↑even=
16	M	32	=Ye[ah]
17	E	33	[<Even] if it was great> but (.)
		34	[another way- another way]
18	M	35	[There's always other things]
19	E	36	[Yeah]
20	M	37	[to think about (.) doing]
21	E	38	And then just maybe in the um (.) <u>paper</u> that
		39	you hand out, each person will be requi::red
		40	to say a positive thing and then a new idea,
		41	or whatever=
22	M	42	=Yeah
23	E	43	however you wanna phrase it.
24	M	44	That's a <u>fabulous</u> idea=
25	E	45	=Cause sometimes that discussion gets off
		46	and then everybody- then the same person's
		47	talking a ↑lot
26	M	48	Yeah. Yeah.
27	E	49	Yeah
28	M	50	Yeah. Oh I think that's a really great idea.

In Turn 9, Ellen stated that “I felt sorta like I was giving a lot of that ((laughter)) kind of advice and then afterwards I felt like they probably just think (.) I’m mean.” While she didn’t explicitly state what “kind of advice” she is referring to, it can be gathered from the rest of this excerpt that she was referring to critical feedback on others’ teaching, in this case Susan’s teaching. This concern about being perceived as “mean” directly followed Ellen’s admission that “the kids (.) all have class together and they’re ↑friends”—a statement that seems to position Ellen outside of the group because of her status as a master’s student, enrolled in different courses than the rest of the PLC. Ellen’s perceived position as an outsider, as well as her fear of coming across as “mean,” could also contribute to a hesitancy to give critical feedback during the VAS. Ellen signaled her hesitancy to provide recommendations to Susan during the VAS through the use of various hedges. In recalling the interaction between Susan and herself during the VAS, Ellen repeatedly used the word “maybe”—drawing it out in Turn 3 and emphasizing it in Turns 7 and 11.

Ellen was also hesitant to provide recommendations to Meghan for how the VAS could be improved in the future. In Turn 21, for instance, Ellen made a very specific recommendation to Meghan, saying “And then just maybe in the um (.) paper that you hand out, each person will be requi::red to say a positive thing and then a new idea, or whatever=.” By stating “just maybe” before making her recommendation, Ellen hedged her statement. By ending with “or whatever” Ellen downplayed her idea even further. Finally, in Turn 23, Ellen again deferred to Meghan by ending her discussion with “however you wanna phrase it.” Meghan followed by saying “That’s a fabulous idea,” thereby both affirming the quality of Ellen’s idea and also trying to build Ellen’s confidence.

Ellen shared that in the next VAS she would prefer if Meghan could in some way “really put pressure on each person to say a- a thing=.” Here, Ellen suggested that she would rather be placed in a position where critical feedback was explicitly required and solicited. Based on Ellen’s previous hesitancy to offer criticism to her peers and to Meghan, this request seemed to be in response to Ellen’s fear of coming across as overly critical. Although Ellen’s contributions during the interview and her behavior during the VAS both suggested that she wanted to improve her teaching, she struggled to move past the first two steps/poses of critical reflection (*describe* and *inform*) to consider what contextual factors shaped her teaching (*confront*) and how she might revise future teaching (*reconstruct*). In other words, Ellen seemingly disregarded *confronting* entirely and turned to the perceived authority for direct answers about how she might *reconstruct* her teaching. Thus, Ellen struggled to engage in individual critical reflection of her own teaching, as well as collective critical reflection of her peers’ teaching.

Interview Transcript Excerpt 2: Susan

The excerpt in Table 5 is from Meghan’s interview with Susan, which followed the same protocol as Ellen’s interview. Susan’s remarks below were in response to the initial prompt: “So how did you feel before you went into the video analysis session and then while you shared and then after when like people were talking about your video?”

Table 5

Excerpt from Susan's Interview

Turn	Speaker	Line	Talk
1	S	1	But <u>during</u> it, like (.) <I felt pretty good>
		2	Cause I saw some other ones and ° <u>not</u> that I
		3	was like comparing mine against theirs°
2	M	4	Ye[ah]
3	S	5	[but] in terms of like <u>video</u> qua::lity
		6	and like what was going on in the classroom
		7	like I felt comfortable and like I was
		8	excited to=
4	M	9	=Share what yo[u]
5	S	10	[sh]ow mine. And then also
		11	Having <u>Josh</u> in there (.) we did
		12	this- kind of a similar ↑thing
6	M	13	Uh huh
7	S	14	Or similar lesson but um took two completely
		15	different routes so it was like good to have
		16	his feedback <u>too</u>
8	M	17	Mmhmm
9	S	18	Cause he knows, you know more of like °what
		19	I'm doing°
10	M	20	And he knows the ki::ds=
11	S	21	=Yeah. And I <u>thi::nk</u> that (.) it was also
		22	nice to be in there with people that just
		23	weren't you know us five. There were others,
		24	right?
12	M	25	No. It was just us five.

13	S	26	Oh it was? Wh[at am I thinking of?]
14	M	27	[You're thinking of-] um you're
		28	thinking of the defense at the <u>end</u> of the
		29	semester. And that's when it was me and
		30	[xxx]=
15	S	31	=Oh ok. So it was just us five? Ok. Well (.)
		32	I feel li::ke (.3) it was nice to have Josh
		33	in there because the other three are in
		34	<u>middle</u> ↑school
16	M	35	Mhmm yeah
17	S	36	So like it's different and like <u>their</u>
		37	feedback, while you know I do <u>appreciate</u> it,
		38	it's just different.
18	M	39	Yeah=
19	S	40	=Cause it's hard. And like <u>I</u> , you know, it's
		41	hard for me to give feedback in that <u>middle</u>
		42	school setting=
20	M	43	=Cause it's different=
21	S	44	=Yeah. Because I don't really kno::w (.) I
		45	don't know that kind of environment
22	M	46	Yeah
23	S	47	cause I haven't been in it. Um so it's nice
		48	to have like that- you know Josh's
		49	perspective but also those other <u>three</u> . Um
		50	so during, yeah. That was- I know this is
		51	gonna be horrible to type up ((laughter))
24	M	52	((laughter)) it's fine. Don't worry.

Susan made an initial link between her comfort level and the perceived quality of her video and teaching. In answer to Meghan's prompt, Susan was clear that she "felt pretty good" (Turn 1) and then continued to

compare her own video to that of her fellow PLC members (even though she explicitly purports not to do this). In Turn 3, Susan shared that not only was she comfortable sharing her video with the group, but that she was actually excited to do so. In the remainder of this excerpt, Susan focused on the other people within the PLC group—Josh, in particular. Susan offered three reasons why she was happy that Josh was part of the PLC group. In Turns 5 and 7 Susan said that because she and Josh were teaching similar lessons (in their videos) yet took “two completely different routes” (Turn 7) that “it was like good to have feedback too” (Turn 7). Susan continued to reiterate the idea that “he knows, you know more of like what I’m doing” (Turn 9). Susan’s lowered voice at the end of the phrase suggested that she was saying something she wouldn’t want others (i.e., the other PLC members) to hear (even though we were in a coffee shop physically removed from the university campus). This could also signify Susan’s belief that Josh knew what she was doing in the classroom but that the other PLC members did not and could not understand, because their contexts were different.

In Turn 15, Susan provided a second reason for appreciating Josh’s presence in the PLC: “because the other three are in middle ↑school.” For Susan, receiving feedback from another PST placed in a high school practicum was preferable to those placed in middle schools. She elaborated on this idea in turn 17, when she said that while she did “appreciate” the others’ feedback, “it’s just different.” Susan’s talk here reiterates that of the VAS, when Susan questioned Ellen’s students’ knowledge of Martin Luther King, Jr., saying “they’re middle schoolers, their level of .hhh understanding will probably (.) .hhh um (.) differ.” Both this statement and her preference for Josh’s feedback over the other (middle school level) PSTs suggest that Susan viewed teachers at these different levels in different ways.

It is also noteworthy that Susan, regardless of their different teaching contexts, offered a number of reconstructions to Ellen during the actual VAS. However, these reconstructions were typically offered alongside hedges that indicated Susan’s discomfort in providing recommendations to Ellen. Related, in Turn 19 Susan offered a repair to her earlier talk by stating that “it’s hard for me to give feedback in that middle school setting.” Presumably not wanting to come across as downgrading the teaching of middle school teachers, Susan positioned herself as lacking knowledge of how to teach middle school—a point she made explicitly in Turn 21 by saying “I don’t know that kind of environment.” In Turn 23 Susan returned to the topic of Josh but this time she stated that “it’s nice to have like that- you know Josh’s perspective but also those other three.” Susan drew from Josh’s shared context to position him as knowledgeable about teaching and able to provide her with useful feedback, as opposed to “those other three” who were positioned as outsiders since they didn’t share her teaching context. Across the transcript, Susan referred to her fellow PLC members (with the exception of Josh) as a collective rather than as individuals: “their’s” (Turn 1), “the other three” (Turn 15), “their feedback” (Turn 17), and “those other three” (turn 23). She did, however, use Josh’s name and aligned herself with him on multiple occasions because of their shared experience at the high school. This juxtaposition (naming Josh, and *not* naming the others) further solidified the division Susan saw between middle and high school within the PLC.

Across both her interview talk and her contributions during the VAS, it seemed that Susan understood context to be valuable to consider in teaching. Thus, Susan at least acknowledged the third step/pose of critical reflection: *confronting*. However, past acknowledging that context plays a part in teaching, Susan

did not name specific contextual factors that either contributed to her teaching or allowed Josh to provide her with valuable feedback.

Discussion

In this study, we inquired into (1) the ways that context factored into PSTs' experiences during the VAS and (2) PSTs' acts of positioning to consider the effectiveness of the VAS to engage PSTs in critical reflections of teaching. Unlike opportunities for reflection that rely on recall alone, the VAS allowed PSTs to see examples of their own and their peers' teaching and to comment about specific interactions, discussions, and activities viewed in the videos. The VAS did allow the PSTs to pose questions, to position themselves in relation to and in opposition to others' values, skills, and beliefs, and to take up poses about their own teaching practices. In addition to reflecting on instances of teaching in actual classrooms (Dewey, 1916), the VAS encouraged PSTs to consider how they (and their peers) might revise and improve future actions (Howard, 2003).

Another challenge of critical reflection that the VAS aimed to address was the perceived division between university and school settings (Heydon & Hibbert, 2010). By analyzing videos from actual school placements within the university space and alongside university-based peers and supervisors, the VAS could conceivably bridge the gap between university and schools.

Regardless of the structure and intentions of the VAS, our findings suggest that although the PSTs were able to engage in generative discussions about their peers' teaching during the VAS, PSTs' responsiveness to their peers' recommendations as well as the nature of the feedback they gave to their peers were shaped by a singular contextual factor: age. Ultimately, the ways PSTs posed and positioned themselves and others during the VAS, based on the ages of their fellow PSTs and the student populations with whom they were working, limited potential to engage in critical reflection.

At no point across the transcripts did PSTs pose questions about their peers' contexts. The closest they got to inquiring into the contextual factors shaping teaching occurred in Turn 2 (Lines 11 and 12) of the VAS transcript when Susan assumed that because Ellen's students were middle schoolers, they wouldn't know much about Martin Luther King, Jr. Not only did Susan not recommend methods that Ellen could use to learn more about her students' prior knowledge of Dr. King, but she also made assumptions about their knowledge, based solely on age. Age is certainly a part of context and the sociocultural positioning that should factor into critical reflection, but in this study, attention to and awareness of age (of PSTs and secondary students) overshadowed all other contextual factors, such as demographic information about student race, gender, and sexual identity.

Further, PSTs' assumptions about others based on age played heavily in their interactions with and perceptions and posing of one another. At no point across the data did either Susan or Ellen ask one another for details regarding their student populations, beyond their grade levels. Instead, both Susan and Ellen drew on their assumptions about these age groups as they discussed the video clips and made recommendations to one another during the VAS. In effect, neither Susan nor Ellen regularly engaged in steps/poses two or three of Smyth's (1989) framework, wherein they might ask one another questions about what was informing student behaviors or how the students came to behave or understand information in particular ways. Thus, when assumptions were made, both Ellen and Susan felt that each

other, in effect, were posturing or posing, in a negative sense, and thus would have little of value to add to the conversation.

The participants in this study also seemed to experience discomfort in offering feedback to peers who were either (a) a different age or (b) were working with a student population from a different school-level (i.e., middle or high school). The PSTs employed a variety of strategies aimed at evading discomfort during the VAS. One way that Susan and Ellen mitigated their discomfort during the VAS was to turn to Meghan for answers. Soliciting the guidance of the supervisor allowed the PSTs to further evade discussions about context, where they might ask their peers about the school culture, role of their Mentor Teacher, student demographics, or community influence, among other contextual factors. By turning to Meghan, rather than engaging in discussions with one another, Susan and Ellen skipped step/pose three of Smyth's (1989) framework for critical reflection, where they might have inquired into the varied contextual factors that shape student and teacher behaviors.

Another method of evading discomfort was to seek consensus with their peers. For instance, Susan's and Ellen's contributions during the VAS and the follow-up individual interviews suggested that they believed they must be positioned similarly to their peers (e.g., same age, same school) in order to offer and accept meaningful feedback. Both Susan and Ellen suggested that they felt uncomfortable offering critical feedback to peers who had different teaching contexts and experiences from them. Thus, Susan and Ellen drew on age to engage in acts of positioning that either silenced or validated the feedback they gave to or received from peers during the VAS. We have seen in another VAS group the importance of comfort to PSTs in their abilities to pose meaningful questions and accept feedback from peers (Falter & Barnes, in press).

We contend that the VAS did have some positive qualities—it allowed PSTs to observe diverse contexts for teaching and to engage in in-depth and specific reflections on teaching. However, in this study we found that contextual factors related to the ages of the PSTs and their students, and the resultant acts of positioning the PSTs engaged in to either validate or silence their peers' feedback, stood in the way of PSTs critically reflecting on their own and their peers' teaching. Instead, the PSTs almost became statuesque in their posing, and were unable to really move beyond or outside of initial beliefs about their or others' teaching practices. The tools of CA allowed us to attend not just to what participants said explicitly, but to also consider the discursive moves and poses they made as they interacted with and positioned one another. The findings from this study could be significant as we consider how these PSTs might engage in ongoing reflection and collaboration as they move into classrooms as teachers.

Significance and Implications

If PSTs feel that they must have common ground with others to provide or accept feedback, then this could present challenges as they begin working in schools where they will inevitably be surrounded by people (teachers and students) who are different from them. Those PSTs who struggle to develop critical reflective practices during teacher education may engage in reflective practices and take on particular stances or poses that evade the uncomfortable or unfamiliar, rather than recognizing that “perplexity, hesitation, doubt” (Dewey, 1933, p. 3) are necessary components of improved practice.

In attempting to avoid discomfort, these novice teachers may be unwilling to hear the recommendations of teachers who have taught for longer, who come from different types of schools, or who have divergent teaching philosophies. Thus, without engaging regularly in critical reflection, these novice teachers may view differences among teachers as a deficit, rather than as an asset. This view of difference could also trickle down to the ways that teachers view differences between themselves and their students. By disregarding (or, at least, downplaying) the context of their teaching—namely students’ personal, cultural, and community experiences—these teachers may struggle to develop culturally-relevant pedagogies (Ladson-Billings, 1994).

We draw from our findings to make the following recommendations to teacher educators as they construct opportunities for PSTs to engage in collective critical reflection during teacher education. First, collective critical reflection requires scaffolding. Teacher educators should explicitly teach and provide opportunities for PSTs to practice providing criticism and feedback to others. Teacher educators could also engage PSTs in critical analysis of written lesson plans, before moving to analysis of teaching videos. Teacher educators could model critical reflection of teaching videos, *before* expecting PSTs to reflect. Preceding the video analysis session, PSTs could follow Smyth’s (1989) four steps of critical reflection to analyze their teaching. These same four steps could also be used to guide the video analysis session, with particular attention to step three and the role of contextual factors.

During the VAS, the supervisor should serve primarily as a facilitator and should reserve their own feedback for one-on-one conversations with PSTs following the session. In declining to provide insight or feedback and encouraging increased interaction, discussion, and problem-solving among PSTs, the supervisor could challenge perceptions that universal, correct ways of teaching exist, further encouraging PSTs to see their peers as knowledgeable. However, this does not mean that the supervisor should remain silent during the VAS. In their role as facilitator, the supervisor should both model and direct PSTs to ask questions about their peers’ teaching contexts—helping them to engage in both *informing* and *confronting*, before moving to *reconstructing*, teaching practices. Thus, through modeling, the teacher educators can demonstrate and live the poses that they want the students to acquire themselves.

Conclusion

The VAS provides a unique, collective, space where PSTs can analyze examples of actual teaching, practice posing questions about various contextual elements, and provide critical feedback to their peers. However, as the findings from this study suggest, simply placing PSTs into a VAS does not necessarily mean they will engage in critical reflections of their own and their peer’s teaching. Instead, PSTs need support and guidance as they move through all four steps/poses of critical reflection. Otherwise, as we saw within our VAS, PSTs may continue to make decisions based on assumptions about a single contextual factor, like age, rather than learning about and building on the complex, lived experiences that students bring with them to classrooms.

Meghan E. Barnes is assistant professor of English education at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte, where she teaches undergraduate and graduate-level courses on teaching English to secondary learners, the politics of language and writing, teacher research, and young adult literature. In

her research, Meghan draws on sociocultural theory to consider preservice teachers' developing conceptual understandings of teaching and literacy, as well as community-engaged approaches to both teaching and research. Meghan's recent work has been published in *Teaching and Teacher Education*, the *Journal of Teacher Education*, *English Education*, the *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, and *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*. Contact her at: mbarne56@uncc.edu.

Michelle M. Falter, PhD, is currently an assistant professor of English education at North Carolina State University. Michelle's scholarship focuses on dialogic, critical, and feminist pedagogies, English teacher education, adolescent literature, and emotion in the teaching of literature and writing in secondary classrooms. Michelle's work has been published in numerous peer-reviewed journals, including *Gender and Education*, the *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacies*, *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, and *The ALAN Review*. In 2018, she published two coedited books about how to discuss death through literature in middle and high school ELA classrooms with Rowman & Littlefield.

References

- Allen, A., Hancock, S. D., Lewis, C. W., Starker-Glass, T. (2017). Mapping culturally relevant pedagogy into teacher education programs: A critical framework. *Teachers College Record*, 119(1), pp. 1–26.
- Barnes, M. E., & Smagorinsky, P. (2016). What English/Language Arts teacher candidates learn during coursework and practica: A study of three teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(4), 338–355.
- Beck, R. J., King, A., & Marshall, S. K. (2002). Effects of videocase construction on preservice teachers' observations of teaching. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 70(4), 345–361.
- Berliner, D. C. (1988). *The development of expertise in pedagogy*. Washington, DC: AACTE Publications.
- Brophy, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Using video in teacher education*. San Francisco, CA: Elsevier.
- Bullough, R. V., & Draper, R. J. (2004). Making sense of a failed triad: Mentors, university supervisors, and positioning theory. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(5), 407–420.
- Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5(1), 43–51.
- Castro, A., Clark, K., Jacobs, J., & Givvin, K. (2005). Response to theory & practice question: Using video to support teacher learning. *Association of Mathematics Teacher Educators Connections*, 14(3), 8–12.

- Cegelka, P. T., Fitch, S., & Alvarado, J. L. (2000). The coach-of-coaches model for preparing rural special education teachers. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 19(3–4), 15–29.
- Christ, T., Arya, P., & Chiu, M. M. (2012). Collaborative peer video analysis: Insights about literacy assessment and instruction. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 44(2), 171–199.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(3), 279–311.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (2000). Positionings: The discursive production of selves. In B. Davies (Ed.), *A body of writing, 1990–1999* (pp. 87–106). New York, NY: AltaMira.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. New York, NY: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Dinkelman, T. (2000). An inquiry into the development of critical reflection in secondary student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(2), 195–222.
- Drew, P. J., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Falter, M. M., & Barnes, M. E. (In press). The importance of the ‘comfort zone’ in preservice teachers’ evaluation of video analysis sessions as a tool for enhanced reflection. *Teacher Education Quarterly*.
- Garcia, A., & O’Donnell-Allen, C. (2015). *Pose, wobble, flow: A culturally proactive approach to literacy instruction*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gay, G. 2000. *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gore, J. (1987). Reflecting on reflective teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(2), 33–39.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2000). Analyzing interpretive practice. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 487–508). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hagevik, R., Aydeniz, M., & Rowell, C. G. (2012). Using action research in middle level teacher education to evaluate and deepen reflective practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(5), 675–684.
- Harlow, D. B., & Swanson, L. H. (2009). Positioning ideas: Creating and relating physics identities through video analysis. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 1179(1), 157–160.

- Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Positioning theory*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Hatch, T., & Grossman, P. (2009). Learning to look beyond the boundaries of representation: Using technology to examine teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(1), 70–85.
- Heydon, R., & Hibbert, K. (2010). “Relocating the personal” to engender critically reflective practice in pre-service literacy teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 796–804.
- Hiebert, J., Gallimore, R., & Stigler, J. W. (2002). A knowledge base for the teaching profession: What would it look like and how can we get one? *Educational Researcher*, 31(5), 3–15.
- Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into Practice*, 42(3), 195–202.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–23). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), 129–169.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African American Children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Laughter, J. C. (2011). Rethinking assumptions of demographic privilege: Diversity among White preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 43–50.
- Lee, S., & Moon, S. (2013). Teacher reflection in literacy education— Borrowing from Bakhtin. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 2(4), 157–164.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Masats, D., & Dooly, M. (2011). Rethinking the use of video in teacher education: A holistic approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(7), 1151–1162.
- Massey, D. D. (2002). Personal journeys: teaching teachers to teach literacy. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 41(2), 103–125.
- Matias, C. E., & Grosland, T. J. (2016). Digital storytelling as racial justice: Digital hopes for deconstructing Whiteness in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(2), 152–164.
- Mayer, D. (1999). *Building teaching identities: implications for preservice teacher education*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Melbourne, Australia.

- Oner, D., & Adadan, E. (2011). Use of web-based portfolios as tools for reflection in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(5), 477–492.
- Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B. J. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2, pp. 64–91). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sacks, H. (1984). On doing ‘being ordinary’. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 413–429). Cambridge UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Sams, B. L., & Dyches, J. (2016). Is this reflection? Examining reflective discourse in teacher education standards and performance assessments. *The SoJo Journal: Educational Foundations and Social Justice Education*, 2(1), 75–85.
- Schieble, M., Vetter, A., & Meacham, M. (2015). A discourse analytic approach to video analysis of teaching: Aligning desired identities with practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(3), 245–260.
- Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Smyth, J. (1989). Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(2), 2–9.
- Stevenson, H. J., & Cain, K. J. (2013). Talking to paper doesn’t work: Factors that facilitate preservice teacher reflection. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 40(2), 78–88.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van Es, E. A., Tunney, J., Goldsmith, L. T., & Seago, N. (2014). A framework for the facilitation of teachers’ analysis of video. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(4), 340–356.
- van Langenhove, L., & Harré, R. (1999). Introducing positioning theory. In R. Harre & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory* (pp. 14–31). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Varghese, M., Daniels, J., & Park, C. (2019). Structuring disruption within university-based teacher education programs: Possibilities and challenges of race-based caucuses. *Teachers College Record*, 121(4), 1–34.
- Vetter, A., Meacham, M., & Schieble, M. (2013). Leveling the field: Negotiating positions of power as a preservice teacher. *Action in Teacher Education*, 35(4), 230–251.
- Watts, M., & Lawson, M. (2009). Using a meta-analysis activity to make critical reflection explicit in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 609–616.

Whitaker, M. C., & Valtierra, K. M. (2018). Enhancing preservice teachers' motivation to teach diverse learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 73*(1), pp. 171–182.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (2013). *Reflective teaching: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.