

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

It's there to trigger de-learning : Toward a video pedagogy of difference

Haavisto, Camilla

Cambridge Scholars Publishing
2021-03-15

Haavisto, C 2021, It's there to trigger de-learning : Toward a video pedagogy of difference. in H Ruokamo & M Kangas (eds), Media Education on the Top. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Cambridge, pp. 73-86.

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/348144>

unspecified
acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

This text is the final version of chapter 6 (pp. 73–86) in *Media Education at the Top* edited by Heli Ruokamo and Marjaana Kangas for Cambridge Scholars Publishing and published in March 2021. There can be minor differences between this text and the printed version.

“TRIGGERING DE-LEARNING”: TOWARDS A VIDEO-CENTRED PEDAGOGY OF DIFFERENCE

CAMILLA HAAVISTO

Introduction

The Covid-19 pandemic made teaching with the help of videos no more an option but a necessity. However, already before the pandemic, there was a rapid growth in pedagogical uses of video (Carmichael, 2018) and research on video as a pedagogical tool in the fields of education and technology had also surged. Much of the writing in this field is US-based and centred around concepts such as flipped classrooms, MOOCs, and blended and ubiquitous learning (see e.g. Schneps, Griswold, Finkelstein, McLeod & Schrag, 2010; Uzunboylu & Karaözlü, 2017). To an even greater extent than before, research conducted during the pandemic in 2019 (Dhawan, 2020; Liguori & Winkler, 2020) examines various challenges and opportunities of e-learning and online teaching. The starting point of this book chapter is slightly different, however; instead of favouring the perspective of online learning, the subject is approached from the perspective of video pedagogy (Andrist, Chepp, Dean & Miller, 2014) and transformative learning (Smith, 2012), with an emphasis on the role of universities in generating equality and social consciousness (see the seminal work of Dewey, 1916; Freire, 1972; Giroux, 2008). Hence, in this book chapter, videos are seen as tools for inclusive media education.

The issue of inclusiveness in higher education is pressing. Despite recent changes in the demographics of Northern Europe in general and Finland in particular due to the sudden increase in migrants from the Middle East and elsewhere, higher education systems in this region are still predominantly homogeneous. Influenced by debates in the US, there have been sporadic attempts made by staff and students in Finland to “decolonise the curriculum”—particularly in gender studies departments, but also more broadly within the social sciences and humanities. Although affirmative action is not permitted in Finland, initiatives have allowed asylum seekers to enrol on courses without needing to pass university entrance exams (Hanken, 2016). Despite these initiatives, universities in Finland are still predominantly white, not only in terms of the pool of students enrolled (Finnish National Agency for Education, 2018) and the lecturers and professors employed (Puhakka & Rautapuro, 2016), but also in terms of the authors listed in course syllabi.

In this context, the aim of this book chapter is to discuss how university lecturers and professors in predominantly white learning environments use online videos such as documentaries, fictional films, and news features in their teaching on migration, ethnic relations, and global inequality. The chapter draws on a case study from 2014-2015 in which nine university faculty members were interviewed. Six of the participants were employed by universities in Finland, two by universities in other countries in Northern Europe, and one by a university in the US. Through the case study, this book chapter contributes to a better understanding of how the teacher-assisted use of online video in class can support students’ transformative learning on controversial issues such as migration, ethnic relations, and global inequality.

Aims and objectives

Although previous research has argued that students are showing an increased desire to be more in control of their own learning both inside and outside the lecture hall (Rasi & Poikela, 2016), research has also shown that the presence of an active teacher advances the effectiveness of video as a learning tool (e.g. Mitra, Lewin-Jones, Barrett & Williamson, 2010). Relying on the latter finding, I restricted my interest to a rather conventional setting—namely, university courses at bachelor’s or master’s level in which the teachers had selected online videos for their students to watch. While students may have watched the videos either in class or elsewhere, sense-making always took place face-to-face with teacher assistance. Within this narrowed-down context, this book chapter examines the educational functions of online video in higher education classes dealing with the controversial topics of migration, ethnic relations, and global inequality. The focus is on the participants’ own envisioned best practices for using online video when dealing with these topics.

The definition of *video* is purposefully left broad. With *video* I refer to all sorts of genres and formats, such as clips of fiction, documentaries, memes, commercials, educational videos in all styles, and talking heads—that is, clips from keynote presentations and academic talks (Hansch et al., 2015).

Background

Uncritical technological optimism in the field of education seems to have reached a tipping point, but the current increase in online content and the evolving electronic lecture hall, among other innovations, indicate that this medium is still among the most promising instruments in the teaching toolkit (Andrist et al., 2014). Previous research has shown that video can increase learning results when the medium is used in a focused way (Whatley & Ahmad, 2007), when students are invited to relate images from video material to other situations (Cherrett, Wills, Price Maynard, & Dror, 2009), when video is used together with text (Sherwood, Kinzer, Hasselbring & Bransford, 1987), and when video is used under the instruction of a teacher who can guide students in using the content to raise questions, provoke discussion, reinforce learning, or challenge previously held conceptions (Mitra et al., 2010). In the context of migration, ethnic relations, and global inequality, the methods mentioned above can also help students sharpen critical analysis skills and challenge stereotypical thinking (Loewen, 1991).

A more profound understanding of how to bridge real-world conflicts in educational environments (e.g. using video to advance learning about global inequality) can be gained through the framework of critical pedagogy. Scholars promoting this approach suggest that the core goal for education should be to “facilitate simultaneously individual development and social transformation for a more egalitarian and just society” (Kellner & Kim, 2010, p. 3). Drawing on Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Kellner and Kim state that according to critical pedagogy, one can see education as “a form of cultural politics that is fundamental to social transformation aiming to cultivate human agency and transformative activity”. However, the great social movements of modernity, such as the workers’ movement, the anti-slavery movement, and colonial liberation, had little to do with the ivory tower of the academy (Delanty, 2001), and as Ellsworth (1989) argues, we need to also take into consideration the feminist and anti-racist critique of critical pedagogy, particularly when it comes to questioning the empowering role of dialogue and the idea that educators acknowledging power inequalities would translate directly into student empowerment or solutions (Alemanji, 2018; Bali, 2013; de Freitas & McAuley, 2008; hooks, 1994).

When approaching critical pedagogy with these critiques in mind—not fully believing in the direct impact of teacher intention on learning results and questioning the effectiveness of dialogue for social justice—and by further asking about the role of IT, in general, and video, in particular, for transformative learning experiences in this context, we find the relevant literature scattered among many different fields of inquiry. These include sociology teaching (e.g. Loewen, 1991; Misra, 2000), teacher education research (de Freitas & McAuley, 2008; Smith, 2012), and research on so-called intercultural education (Akande & Schmidt, 2006). Relevant literature for

this book chapter also includes assessments of the effectiveness of videos in education in general (Carmichael, 2018; Mitra et al., 2010), literature that surveys and typologises new genres and learning goals in the field of educational video (Andrist et al., 2014; Hansch, 2015), and literature that examines strategies for anti-racism and social awareness in predominantly White classrooms (Alemanji, 2018; de Freitas & McAuley, 2008).

Transformative learning and video

These threads are best drawn together within theorisations of the pedagogical practice of difference in which issues of mediated representation and social transformation mutually inform each other (Giroux, 2008). Giroux suggests that we need to create a new understanding of how the mechanisms of domination and exclusion work to reproduce and legitimate the entrenched nature of class, race, gender, and sexual hierarchies in higher education. He further suggests that this goal can be advanced through a study of symbolic forms (e.g. video content, although Giroux talks about film) and signifying practices (e.g. the meanings and contexts of video content) together with a reinvigorated and necessary study of the relations between culture and politics. Within this framework, Giroux argues that disruption is an important pedagogical element. When unfamiliar and unsettling ideas are introduced in class, spaces are created for voices that had previously been silenced. Such a method, Giroux argues, “would raise questions about how *Baby Boy* [a film he uses pedagogically], for instance, resonates with the ongoing social locations and conditions of racial fear that are mobilised through a wide variety of representations in the media and popular culture, as well as in a number of other institutional sites” (Giroux, 2008, p. 104).

When focusing more directly on cognition, and not on public pedagogy and social transformation at large as Giroux does, we notice that there is a research gap regarding if and how video can facilitate critical thinking and transformative learning (Carmichael, 2018; Kirkwood & Price, 2013). Educational evaluation is a complex topic (Shephard, 2003), but there may be several reasons why a Girouxian video-centred method of disruption within a pedagogy of difference may not fully work in practice. There may be, for example, a generational gap between the technological capabilities of the lecturer and those of his or her students (Palfrey & Gasser, 2008), over-excitement and a strong belief in the pedagogical benefits of technology (on online learning but still relevant for this claim, see Hansch et al., 2015), student difficulties relating to the material in ways other than for entertainment (Mitra et al., 2010), and a mismatch between the video resources and the face-to-face-teaching (Shephard, 2003). Hence, despite the great potential of video-centred learning to contribute to social change and the critical inquiry of anti-democratic forces, the dynamics of racially exclusive practices, and policing forces in society (Kellner & Kim, 2010), we should also take into consideration what may go wrong when educators with limited skills in media theory and the analysis of moving pictures increasingly start to incorporate video into their teaching. Both in this study and in Giroux (2008), the focus is on successes to the exclusion of failures, which hopefully, future research will repair.

Methods

The participants in this study consisted of senior lecturers in the social sciences and affiliated fields. As academic titles vary, I use *senior lecturers* in the broadest possible way, encompassing participants who range from postdoctoral scholars to full professors. No teaching assistants or junior scholars were interviewed. A pilot study (Haavisto, 2015) was conducted beforehand to test the interview questions, and after some adjustments to the interview guide, the participants were recruited from a list of scholars who had taken part in a pre-conference session on media and migration at the European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA) conference in Lisbon in 2014. Two educators were recruited from elsewhere as their long experience in teaching with video was known to the author. The goal was to enrol participants who were highly likely to share experiences that could be developed into best practices. The participants were interviewed by Skype or face-to-face. The interviews were about 45 minutes long and followed a semi-structured model in which the participants were first asked how they integrate video into their teaching of the topics concerned. As the interview proceeded, the

participants were guided towards a deeper level of analysis where they could feel safe to critically scrutinise their own methods of teaching with video and the collective learning experiences of their students.

Close reading (DuBois, 2003) was used to make sense of the interview transcripts. The method is commonly used in linguistics and particularly within critical linguistics (CL). As the disciplinary perspective of this book chapter can be described as sociologically informed media education, close reading was applied in such a way that an intra-textual reading of lexical units was combined with a more contextual analysis, taking into consideration the theoretical and sociopolitical framework presented in this book chapter. The software ATLAS.ti was used for the analysis.

Results

On a general level, and much in line with Giroux (2008), the motivations given by the nine lecturers for including video in their teaching centre around providing pedagogical opportunities for students to engage with complex institutional frameworks, distant times and places, and public and academic discourses that may be oppositional to what they have previously learned in formal or informal educational settings. Close reading of the interview transcripts revealed five main functions suggested by the participants for how video can facilitate the teaching of controversial issues—in this case, migration, ethnic relations, and global inequality. I have named these five motivations External Referent, Novelty, Affect Awareness, Conjuncture, and Evidence. As shown below in Table 1, these functions can be linked to instructor intentions and learning goals. The column in the middle, *Primary intention of the teacher*, summarises the answers teachers gave to a question like “Why did you choose to show that particular clip in relation to that particular discussion?” The column to the right, *Ultimate learning goal*, summarises more profound teacher reflections articulated in answers to follow-up questions such as “What did you want to achieve by doing so?”

Table 1. The five functions of video within applied pedagogies of difference

Function	Primary intention of teacher	Ultimate learning goal
External Referent	Release tension in the group	Allow individual students to represent only themselves
Novelty	Introduce new ideas presumably contradictory to what the students already know from formal or informal learning settings	Help students unlearn counterproductive and harmful conceptions
Affect Awareness	Facilitate reasoning through pinpointing emotions	Make visible the connections between emotions and politics
Conjuncture	Transgress time and space	Historise and globalise students’ everyday experiences
Evidence	Distinguish opinions from facts	Support core academic skills and evidence-based worldviews and improve students’ competencies in social interaction and ethical listening

In the interviews, educators often discussed video in relation to the group dynamics of the class. As the videos shown in class usually depict people—whether actual or fictional—these characters can be referred to in group discussions, which at least to a certain extent, redirects unwanted attention away from minority/minoritised students. Hence, the video, along with its stories, events, and characters, functions as an *External Referent* that can be used to create more distance between the subject (the student who talks) and the object (what or whom is

being talked about). This kind of “pedagogy of distantiation” can to a certain extent be contrasted with the theory of discomfort (Boler, 1999), which holds that transformative learning is likely to occur when students go through a crisis, even suggesting that discomfort is necessary when working against oppression (Kumashiro, 2002). However, in my reading of the empirical material, the External Referent method has more to do with inviting students to gaze beyond the Self and the Immediate Other than with avoiding discomfort. Educators stated that certain immediate benefits come with this method, such as freeing visibly minority/minoritised students from the expectation that they self-reflect, and preventing others in the group from ethically violating personal boundaries (cf. Zembylas, 2015).

Second, much in line with what Mitra et al. (2010) underline, the lecturers tend to hold that video can help students to link new ideas to existing knowledge. There was not much elaboration in the material on why the teachers prioritise video over other texts when aiming for *Novelty*. The choice may be primarily practical—namely, when the publishing process for academic research is so slow, educators need to use other formats to introduce up-and-coming ideas. However, there may be other, less pragmatic reasons, as well. When educators talk about “new knowledge”, they are often not, in fact, referring to new in an academic sense, but rather to what is new for students, who may possess misconceptions on that particular matter due to what they have previously learned in informal learning environments, such as at home or from popular culture. Hence, when it comes to the controversial topics concerned here, learning something new may actually be de-learning something old, according to the educators.

Third, in the midst of a growing pool of research examining the links between audiovisual media, affect theories, and migration (e.g. Nikunen, 2019), it is interesting to note that the educators use video in order to generate strong sentiments in the students, which can then be academically examined in relation to power and culture. In other words, in a time when emotions and facts tend to blur together in public discourses, the educators seem to use the emotion-triggering function of audiovisual media in order to then create a learning moment in which the manipulative tendencies of the media can be critically scrutinised. I call this kind of in-class experience-based learning *Affect Awareness*. On the one hand, this exercise is thought to facilitate in-class discussion, as students are encouraged to distantiate themselves from their immediate emotional reactions, somewhat in line with what scholars in the growing field of deliberative pedagogy (Manosevitch, 2019) attempt to do. On the other hand, the goal is to create connections between classroom events and the processes in society that work both for and against democracy, inclusion, and social justice, much in line with Giroux (2008).

Fourth, the educators interviewed use video to connect events and phenomena over time and space. I call this function *Conjuncture*, drawing on Andrist et al.’s typology of educational video (2014). In the context of the topics considered in this study, the educators seem to favour moments in history where social cohesion has been ruptured, as in the quote below:

For example, I will show a documentary about the Holocaust to them, and it is about that really in America they knew that the Holocaust was happening, but the American foreign policy did not allow the American government to react. . . So, I will tie it to the Israel and Palestine conflict today. Like, do the students know? I usually do a questionnaire and ask them very, very basic questions and they don’t know, and then I ask them if they have an opinion—they do. So, one, I ask them how they can have an opinion if they don’t even know the most basic things.
(Participant F)

Conjuncture videos tend to illustrate the temporal intersection of distinct social and historical processes evident at various levels of social reality. As in the previous three points, the educators tended to underline their own role as facilitators who create teachable moments through the interplay of the videos shown in class, exercises intended to generate self-reflection, and teacher-assisted discussion sessions. The participants claimed that as educators, they are the ones who link these elements together, thereby advancing a deeper understanding of the phenomena.

Fifth, the somewhat old-fashioned idea, in today’s technological landscape, that pictures carry value as *Evidence* seems to live on in pedagogical contexts, at least to some extent. Here, one can find links to Andrist et al.’s category of “testimony videos” (2014), although what is referred to in that case are videos featuring people who

testify and have special insight into a given phenomenon. Participants in this study mean something broader, however; they are bringing authentic dilemmas, processes, and places to the awareness of their students. However, simply bringing evidence from broader society or remote regions into the classroom does not count as a pedagogically motivated activity, the educators claim. Rather, the contrary is true, as the quote below indicates:

Nowadays . . . everybody's seen the National Geographic pictures. . . It was much more before that . . . it was part of the expertise to just hunt down books or videos that would be something that people wouldn't have found other ways. But now it's more like trying to produce coherent narrative and argument out of those. (Participant E)

Implications

Despite the fact that the educators interviewed work in different academic fields and geographical regions and have different official learning goals for their courses, the study shows that their motives for integrating video into their teaching are quite similar. With the use of video, they aim to direct classroom discussion away from the individual and towards collectives, structures, and society at large. Video is a method for introducing new knowledge to students and triggering de-learning of misconceptions, which the educators stated is a difficult process. The findings indicate that despite the challenges of using video, educators strongly believe that when integrated into classroom teaching, video helps them combine theoretical rigour with social relevance. They also trust that video facilitates the creation of a space for critical thinking that simultaneously provides safety when it comes to protecting a student's right to a certain level of privacy. A student with a family history of migration may not want his or her experiences to be turned into a teachable moment. Introducing other narratives on screen may help direct attention away from him or her.

Possible Applications

The five functions of video that have been put forward in this study form a preliminary sketch for a video-centred pedagogy of difference. Particularly when explicitly or implicitly striving to make visible the links between culture and power in society and when seeking to have students collectively rethink those links, progressive educators may find it useful to further develop the typology introduced in this study and test it in different kinds of learning contexts. The typology can be particularly useful at this particular moment in time, which is marked by a rapid and global transformation of higher education to online learning due to Covid-19, and a simultaneous upsurge in anti-racist protests in the US, and also elsewhere in the world.

Conclusions

In this book chapter, I have examined how senior lecturers in predominantly homogeneous learning environments in the so-called Global North use online video in their in-class teaching on migration, ethnic relations, and global inequality. To contextualise the study, I have discussed various types of video pedagogies—from the more sociologically oriented (Andrist et al., 2014) to the more cognitively oriented (Clark & Mayer, 2016)—and their links to Freirean critical pedagogy. Concerning the latter, I have in line with Ellsworth (1989) argued that the prominent role given to dialogue and teacher intention in the original writings of Freire (1972) be downplayed. The in-depth qualitative interviews with nine lecturers who within a variety of disciplines teach controversial topics such as migration, ethnic relations, and global inequality to groups of students who are predominantly white show that educators use video in their teaching for a variety of reasons. The three most prominent motivations for using video as a pedagogical tool in this context are (a) to alleviate the pressure on individual students to publicly claim a position that is supposedly representative of their groups, (b) to generate de-learning of misconceptions from informal learning environments, and (c) to make students aware of how emotions are intertwined with both

politics and the media. Each of these three points addresses pressing issues in contemporary societies and confirms that universities are not ivory towers—rather, the opposite is true.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank my research assistant Simon Granroth for skilfully assisting me with the interviews. I also want to thank Professor Renee Hobbs and Professor Fausto Colombo, who after my initial presentation of this book chapter at the 2019 Media Education Conference in Sallatunturi gave me crucial advice on how to proceed with my writing. This book chapter has been written under the generous grant of the Academy of Finland for the project Anti-Racism Under Pressure: Social movements, NGOs and their mediated claims- making in Finland, PI Camilla Haavisto (2013–2016/2018).

References

- Akande, Y. S., & Schmidt, J. (2006). Using Color of Fear and Color of Fear 2 with class profiles as an instructional tool in interpersonal communication. *Communication Teacher*, 20(3), 77–81.
doi:10.1080/14704620600823459
- Alemanji, A. A. (Ed.). (2018). *Antiracism education in and out of schools*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Andrist, L., Chepp, V., Dean, P., & Miller, M. V. (2014). Toward a video pedagogy: A teaching typology with learning goals. *Teaching Sociology*, 42. doi:10.1177/0092055X14524962
- Bali, M. (2014). Why doesn't this feel empowering? The challenges of web-based intercultural dialogue. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(2), 208–215. doi:10.1080/13562517.2014.867620
- Boler, M. (Ed.). (1999). *Feeling power: Emotions and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Carmichael, M., Read, A.-K., & Karpicke, J. D., (2018). Assessing the impact of educational video on student engagement, critical thinking and learning: The current state of play. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Retrieved from <https://us.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/hevideolearning.pdf>
- Cherrett, T., Wills, G., Price, J., Maynard, S., & Dror, I. E. (2009). Making training more cognitively effective: Making videos interactive. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 40, 1124–34.
- Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). *e-Learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cortés, E. C. (2004). [Chap. 11]. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dhawan, S. (2020). Online Learning: A Panacea in the Time of COVID-19 Crisis. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 49(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239520934018>
- de Freitas, E., & McAuley, A. (2008). Teaching for diversity by troubling whiteness: Strategies for classrooms in isolated white communities. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 11(4), 429–442.
doi:10.1080/13613320802479018

- Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging knowledge*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916/2014). *Democracy and education*. Mineola, NY: Dover.
- DuBois, A. (2003). Introduction. In F. Lentricchia & A. DuBois (Eds.), *Close reading: The reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297–325. doi:10.17763/haer.59.3.058342114k266250
- Finnish National Agency for Education. (2018). Tilastoja ulkomaalaisista tutkinto-opiskelijoista Suomen korkeakouluissa 2017 [Statistics on foreign degree students in Finnish universities 2017]. (Faktaa Express 9A/2018). Retrieved from https://www.oph.fi/download/195299_FaktaaExpress9A_2018.pdf
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Herder and Herder.
- Giroux, H. (2008). Pedagogies of difference, race, and representation: Film as a site of translation and politics. In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (2010). Lessons from Paulo Freire. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 57(9).
- Haavisto, C. (2015). Video som lärmätod: Universitetslärarens reflektioner kring användningen av audiovisuella medier i sin undervisning [Video as a learning method: Teacher reflections on audiovisual media in HE teaching]. In M. Lindén, Å. Mickwitz, & S. Tiihonen (Eds.), *Nordica Helsingiensia, no. 41: Hur svårt kan det vara? En antologi om hur lärare inom den högre utbildningen förnyar undervisningen*. Helsinki, Finland: University of Helsinki. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10138/157590>
- Hanken. (2016). *Hanken & SSE Executive Education kicks off integration programme for educated asylum seekers with company partners* de Freitas & McAuley, 2008; Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.hanken.fi/en/news/hanken-sse-executive-education-kicks-integration-programme-educated-asylum-seekers-company>
- Hansch, A., Hillers, L., McConachie, K., Newman, C., Schildhauer, T., & Schmidt, J. P. (2015). Video and online learning: Critical reflections and findings from the field. (HIIG Discussion Paper Series No. 2015-02). Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2577882
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kellner, D., & Kim, G. (2010). YouTube, critical pedagogy, and media activism. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 32, 3–36.
- Kirkwood, A., & Price, L. (2013). Examining some assumptions and limitations of research on the effects of emerging technologies for teaching and learning in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(4), 536–543.
- Kumashiro, K. (2002). Against repetition: Addressing resistance to anti-oppressive change in the practices of learning, teaching, supervising, and researching. *Harvard Educational Review* 72(1), 67–92.

Liguori, E., & Winkler, C. (2020). From Offline to Online: Challenges and Opportunities for Entrepreneurship Education Following the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 3(4), 346–351. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420916738>

Loewen, J. (1991). Teaching race relations from feature films. *Teaching Sociology*, 19(1): 82–86.

Manosevich, I. (2019). Deliberative pedagogy in conflicted society: Cultivating deliberative attitudes among Israeli college students. *Higher Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1007/s10734-019-00368-6

Mayer, R. E. (2014). Multimedia instruction. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Elen, & M. J. Bishop (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology*, 385–399. New York, NY: Springer.

Misra, J. (2000). Integrating “The Real World” into Introduction to Sociology: Making sociological concepts real. *Teaching Sociology*, 28(4), 346–363. doi:10.2307/1318584

Mitra, B., Lewin-Jones, J., Barrett, H., & Williamson, S. (2010). The use of video to enable deep learning. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 15(4), 405–414. doi:10.1080/13596748.2010.526802

Nikunen, K. (2019). *Media solidarities: Emotions, power and justice in the digital age*. London, UK: Sage.

Palfrey, J., & Gasser, U. (2008). *Born digital: Understanding the first generation of digital natives*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Puhakka, A., & Rautopuro, J. (2016). Kauas urat karkaavat. Tieteentekijöiden liiton jäsenkysely 2016 [Far-flung careers: The Finnish Union of University Researchers and Teachers member survey 2016]. Retrieved from https://tieteentekijoidenliitto.fi/files/2031/Ja_senkysely2016.pdf

Rasi, P., & Poikela, S. (2016). A review of video triggers and video production in higher education and continuing education PBL settings. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 10(1).

Schneps, M. H., Griswold, A., Finkelstein, N., McLeod, M., & Schrag, D. P. (2010). Using video to build learning contexts online. *Science* (328)5982, 1119–1120.

Schreiber, B. E., Fukutua, J., & Gordon, F. (2010). Live lecture versus video podcast in undergraduate medical education: A randomised controlled trial. *BMC Medical Education* 10(1), 68.

Sherwood, R. D., Kinzer, C. K., Hasselbring, T. S., & Bransford, J. D. (1987). Macro-contexts for learning: Initial findings and issues. *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 1, 93–108. ^[1]_{SEP}

Smith, H. (2012). Emotional responses to documentary viewing and the potential for transformative teaching. *Teaching Education*, 25(2), 217–238. doi:10.1080/10476210.2012.762351

Uzunboylu, H., & Karaözlü, D. (2017). The emerging trend of the flipped classroom: A content analysis of published articles between 2010 and 2015. *Revista de Educación a Distancia, RED*, 54, 1–13.

Whatley, J., & Ahmad, A. (2007). Using Video to Record Summary Lectures to Aid Students’ Revision. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects*, 3(1), 185–196.

Zembylas, M. (2015). ‘Pedagogy of discomfort’ and its ethical implications: The tensions of ethical violence in social justice education. *Ethics and Education*, 10(2), 16–174. doi:10.1080/17449642.2015.1039274

