

To appear in:

Finn, M. & Finn, P. (Eds.) (In press). *Teacher education with an attitude*. State University of New York Press.

New Literacies with an Attitude:  
Transformative Teacher Education through Digital Video Learning  
Tools

Suzanne M. Miller and Suzanne Borowicz  
University at Buffalo, State University of New York

Correspondence:

Dr. Suzanne Miller  
Graduate School of Education  
University at Buffalo  
568 Baldy Hall  
Buffalo, NY 14260

Tel: 716-645-2455, ext. 1122

[smiller@acsu.buffalo.edu](mailto:smiller@acsu.buffalo.edu)

## Introduction

Over the past decade an emerging line of research has suggested that innovative uses of digital video arts and communication technologies can provide powerful tools for learning. These new technologies bring multiple forms of “new literacies<sup>1</sup>” for negotiating meaning within and against the backdrop of a digital world. (Alvermann, 2002) Understanding and incorporating this broadening of literacy to meaning-making systems beyond printed text is essential for 21<sup>st</sup> century teacher education.

Reality for the “Millennial Generation” (Hagood, Stevens & Reinking, 2002) includes new literacies embedded in new technologies--such as Internet instant messaging, electronic interactive games, computer dating--and multiple new capacities, such as copying recorded music, enhancing or changing photo images, immediately accessing digital information once housed only in physical libraries, and creating state-of- the-art films from home video footage. As a significant part of youth culture, these everyday tools and artifacts bind adolescents together in a social culture through communication and meaning making.

Instead of drawing on these literacies in learning, however, the school “preference for print may preclude teachers from even noticing their students’ competence with multi- and digital literacies” (King & O’Brien, 2002, p.41). Print bias, recitation as performance, the structured essay, textbooks and the student practice of scanning for textbook answers are the elements that constitute restricted school literacy. Its narrow range of opportunities and focus on correctness limit literacy learning for some students. As Finn (1999) argues, it is

---

<sup>1</sup> The concept of “New Literacies” represents a critical broadening of the term literacies to include multiple forms of representation (e.g., poem, painting, play, piano concerto, political ad) (Eisner, 1997, p. 353; Kist, 2002)--that is, the “performative, visual, aural, and semiotic understandings necessary for constructing and reconstructing print- and non-print-based texts” in the context of social, institutional, and cultural discourses, relationships, and inquiries (Alvermann, 2002, viii).

particularly poor, working class students who receive such instruction for domesticating literacy rather than empowering “literacy with an attitude”.

With its many opportunities for symbolic expression, digital video (DV) production is a tangible and potent meaning making system and mediator for empowering literacy. As students plan and make DV productions of poems, political ads, editorials, and neighborhood inquiries as part of the curriculum, they create images to develop meanings and distill experience into visual concepts, central to what Eisner (1998) calls “visual learning”—a vital means of making sense of the world, with images often preceding language as a means of coming to understand. Yet teachers have few opportunities for professional development that prepare them to integrate such 21<sup>st</sup> century technologies effectively into academic classes. Teachers and students in poor urban and working-class school districts, especially, are often arts and technology poor—thereby lacking access to these tools which can promote powerful literacy *and* level the achievement playing field (Deasy, 2002; Rohde & Shapiro et al., 2000).

The question addressed in this chapter is, “How, if at all, can infusing digital video technologies into teacher education classes transform teachers’ attitudes towards powerful literacy teaching and learning for *all* students?” After an overview of a teacher education course devoted to DV integration, we focus on a descriptive analysis of the work and our activity based professional development experience.

### **A Teacher Education Course on DV as Literacy Tool**

Since 2000, the University at Buffalo’s Graduate School of Education has been working in collaboration with the Buffalo Public Schools to help bring new literacies to teachers and students through the project, “City Voices, City Visions” (CVCV)

(<http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/cityvoices/home.html>). CVCV offers intensive, summer Professional Development institutes that prepare urban teachers to use digital video (DV) as a literacy and learning tool for students in grades 5-12. The project places multimedia and digital technology in classrooms for ongoing use by teachers and students, and provides teachers with ongoing technical support and professional development activities. Our research on the project found that by combining visualization with composing narrative and identifying thematic music, digital video production can provide a three-in-one mediational tool, a “supertool” that boosts student attention and conceptual learning (Miller & Borowicz, in press).

Out of these experiences we developed the teacher education course—Digital Video as a Literacy Learning Tool—that we have taught to 36 teachers seeking their master’s degree and professional certification. The course explores the uses of specific genres of digital video production to meet learning standards in the secondary literacy classroom (Grades 5-12). We are both long-time teachers and teacher-educators who believe that the changing landscape of communication (Kress, 1999) demands that the teacher education discipline must change, expand, broaden its scope. This class was our effort to develop new literacy dispositions in teachers who may be in the classroom into the mid-21<sup>st</sup> century. As co-teachers of the class, our project was an inquiry into if and how these teachers might transform their notions of literacy and learn to infuse digital video production into curriculum and instruction so that their students could draw on multiple, engaging modes of learning.

Specifically, through the mediation of iMovie production in the class we aimed to expand the notion of literacy by engaging in moving-making activities that approached digital video as a technological art form that includes textual readings, creative writing,

visual arts, performing arts, and music. To these ends, pre-service and in-service teachers worked individually and collaboratively on digital video projects related to English and social studies curricula. At the same time, they read relevant theory and practical application literature about new media integration and critical media literacy to examine in discussion and writing their relationships to literacy learning, student achievement, and society (e.g., Alvermann, 2002; Goodman, 2003).

Students planned and produced digital videos in five progressively more complex genres--iMovie in an hour (visualizing a quotation), poetry videos, *un*commercials (selling a concept/idea), video editorials, and multi-genre DV inquiry. The final project in the first class required teachers to engage in an action research project in middle and high school classrooms to examine the influence of digital video production on teaching and learning. In the second (summer) class, teachers surveyed students to better understand the literacy practices of their “millennial generation” students. In both classes, teachers wrote reflective pieces aimed at teasing out the complexities of theory and practice and personal beliefs about knowledge and literacy. Through our recursive analysis of the written and DV work, we identified key themes that portray how teachers--and then their students--transformed their notions of literacy from reading the word to “reading the world” (Freire, 1970).

### **Transforming Notions of Literacy through DV Technology**

Somewhat surprisingly, many of the twenty-something pre-service and in-service teachers were caught in the traditional notion of reading and writing printed text as the only legitimate form of school literacy. Most said they took the class to become more proficient with technology, to “keep up” with their students’ knowledge, or to learn something technologically new. No one spoke of a connection or relationship between technology and

empowering literacy. Initially their interests were in utilitarian benefits: “It’s so much better to have students type their papers instead of struggling through their handwriting,” or they liked “the ease of finding information for research through the Internet.”

From the beginning of each class teachers raised concerns about what should count as English. Cory who was on the job market explained: “As an English teacher a year ago, I thought I would never use multimedia texts to study. After all, is that English? That’s not the way I remember it.” The idea of print literature as an almost sacred text emerged. Terry, a first year teacher in an urban private boys college prep high school spoke of her worries about technology in her first class reflection:

The English classroom was, in my eyes, supposed to be a haven devoid of modernity, save the modern relevance of classical literature that we would broach in thoughtful *discussion*, certainly not in any technological forum. I perceived technology to be a degradation and reduction of the sanctity of classical literature and the critical thinking requisite to understanding and enjoying it.

Loss of control as knowledge expert in the classroom was another issue teachers faced. Some, like Dora, an 8<sup>th</sup> grade teacher in a suburban school, were afraid. She put up both hands defensively and said, “I can’t do this” during the first class and later reflected, “Initially I had to overcome my own neurosis and understand that this facet of my education might cause me to relinquish some of my normally, tightly guarded control...Perhaps I was a technophobe.” Roseanne, a first year middle school teacher, wrote, “I truly believe that it is a marvelous tool but at the same time I feel that it is a tool that I do not currently have enough experience using to claim mastery with.”

As Roseanne's notions of literacy began to expand, her anxiety to "claim mastery" began to subside. In creating a visual response to a reading, Roseanne enlisted the help of her seventh graders, who "sat her right down" and drew her chart explaining their email shortcuts and definitions. Roseanne was surprised and pleased at her students' eagerness to "teach" her something about their literacy. She felt that her own questioning of literacy led her to better understand her students' world and accept their role as teachers and her role as student to a younger generation. In her midterm reflection Roseanne wrote, "Technology and literacy are intertwined. In fact, I believe that technology improves literacy. Technology, in all forms from the most rudimentary to the most complex, makes literacy more accessible to people. Technology is the human attempt to bridge the gaps that exist in human communication." Roseanne moved from the anxiety-filled teacher who felt she must be a "master" of anything she brought to her classroom to the teacher/learner, willing and eager to learn with and through her students.

Dora changed, too. As she read, responded, discussed, and created her movies on high-stakes testing, female body images, and sexual pressures in teens, she reframed her vision of possibilities for literacy based in students' experiences and needs. She began to see computers as a "social activity" responsible for students' "shared micro culture," constituted as they talked to each other every night through IM, "using computers and asking questions of digital friends and sources." When she took the newly discovered school DV camera out of the case, students gathered around and one said, "Sweet, you have night vision." Then, she reported, they showed her more about the camera than she had learned. Once her 8<sup>th</sup> graders planned, filmed and edited their own poetry videos, Dora was hooked: "Expanding the notions of literacy has been the undercurrent of every response journal I've written for

this course....Education fails if it is stagnant or silenced...I want more than anything to teach my students to think; I have to adjust as they adjust...I think we, as teachers, need to invite computers to help us.” As she came to see DV production as active, social learning that would keep students “thinking, moving, doing,” Dora saw it as the means for educators to “teach to the eyes, body, artistic input and digital savvy of our students, not just to their ears—how well they listen.”

Cory collaborated with Dora in her 8<sup>th</sup> grade class as a co-inquirer when her students created poetry videos. The process footage from that class shows both of them circulating, teaching at points of need, in an energized DV workshop. Cory’s portfolio introduction showed his changing notions, too:

Why was I so bent on becoming a traditional English, pen and paper instructor to begin with? ....This digital video story is yet another in a growing library that redefines what we are doing in English classes everywhere, what is possible, and how “perspective” is a term that must be constantly redefined within the society that changes so rapidly.

The potential for DV production as a literacy tool emerged most profoundly as teachers began to see it as a composing activity, similar to but often more engaging than writing text. Dora explained how editing her movie was a very familiar *process*:

I needed an introduction, body and conclusion. I had to proofread and spellcheck, speed up some footage, slow down some other. My process of creating a final product, asked me to use a critical lens on myself, scrutinize my work, spatially, musically, socially, emotionally, and technically....[I remember] the absolute rapture, eyes fixated to our computer screens.....The



process of DV production is the same one we teach year after year in its shadowy paper version.

Through the DV production experiences, novice teachers ( and then their students) created new images of themselves and broadened their notions of school literacy *from only* reading and writing *to* producing visual and auditory “texts” that also incorporated the voices and visions of adolescents’ worlds outside of school to address issues ranging from family and friendship to teen pregnancy and violence.

### **Transforming notions of knowing to/through Knowledge-in-Action**

A key goal of the DV class was to help create connections between the teachers’ newly formed knowledge/beliefs and their pedagogical actions. This was the aim of the teachers’ action research DV project in their classrooms. Findings from the study of our class dynamics and learning were paralleled by the findings of our students’ studies of their own teaching; in both sets of contexts, students became more active, inquiring readers and composers as they pursued their own understanding through digital video. The notion of knowledge changed from a commodity students consume and display to knowledge as dynamic, evolving, and composed in context. During DV production, curriculum concepts became knowledge-in-action (Applebee, 1996); teachers and their students participating in their own knowledge creation saw purpose and agency in their work. How does such focus happen in DV production?

**When action and awareness merge.** In our DV class the teachers engaged in digital video production first in teams and then alone, and in the process learning much more than how to use the camera and editing program and/or to better understand their topic. Their “intent participation” (Rogoff, 2003) in DV production that Dora mentions above was

pervasive among the teachers and their students. We believe that this “flow” learning experience, focusing on a “coherent future whole” (Csikszentmihalya, 1997), is part of what led to teacher transformations. Bringing their intense attention to making meaning and communicating effectively, DV producers learned deeply--both consciously and through more tacit “incidental learning” which is characteristic of all arts production (Heath, 2004).

For example, Cory suggested what he calls the “authentic practice” of composing through DV with a special kind of teacher’s attention during non-required weekend editing sessions:

We became filthy with editing on Saturdays in the computer labs. The garbage can was often times full with empty bags of chips and bottles of Pepsi, evidence of the work being done, the time it took to sculpt our projects into something that would resemble what we saw in our minds. Every step of the way towards a finished--though beautifully imperfect--video production was cause for constant awareness of what we were actually *doing*. After all, we were not just training to be users of digital video, but instructors of it, teachers of literacy through the digital video processes.

This “sustained visual focus” (Heath, 2004) helps to explain how knowledge is created through the mental action of those involved in the high-demand work of all the arts; its creators engage by “looking and thinking, seeing and planning, viewing and responding....they review (often quite literally re-viewing)...they also reflect (sometimes trying to re-create what they have seen) on past observations and project ahead to their planned performance or production” (Heath, 2004, p. 339).

These teachers in the same way “think into the future” not only through the DV process of segmenting the DV project into pieces (shots, scenes) and composing them into the “coming [DV] whole,” but also by developing understanding (both consciously and tacitly) of the mental and physical habits their students will need to produce their own knowledge-in- action through DV. Their reflective writings about these experiences demonstrated their attention to their thinking in strong active verbs. “I decided; I opted; I wanted; images I chose; control of my project.” These phrases and concepts were used repeatedly as the language of their creative thinking process grounded in the commitment to the end product. As they came to understand the intense attention that DV/knowledge production promotes/requires, they examined the strategies and processes to understand what literacies were involved.

Dora captures the metacognitive monitoring that her DV production required from her:

I was being asked to create a project, operate a camera, import and export using a firewire, be creative, and be analytical and mathematical and cognizant of the entire process as the goal....My video would require planning: I had to draw and sketch, formulate text with pictures and think critically about the stages of development that my project would demand.... *I would have to think like someone was watching!* I would have to understand how images often have their own appeal and do not need to be drowned out by the music or audio clips I originally thought I needed.

Notice her awareness of audience, visuals, sounds--of her thinking/action moving the project forward toward a future, personally meaningful communication. Teacher education classes

must provide this kind of powerful literacy experience and opportunities for reflection so that teachers can acquire their felt knowledge-in-action (Applebee, 1999) and draw on it to make powerful literacy work in their teaching.

For instance, based on her DV experiences, Dora was able to communicate effectively to parents in writing about how having her students produce digital video fits into English class:

As an educator, the merits of this program are exciting and inspiring to me. I have already spent hours and weekends working on my own projects, enthralled that upon completion of planning, writing, scripting, selecting footage and images, applying soundtracks and editing, I have a final piece to show for myself. My students, I am certain, would share this sentiment.

All 120 students returned signed parental permissions; some of the parents came to help out, and students did share her sentiment. Her student Emily re-envisioned poetry: "I learned a lot from this project, It further developed my knowledge of poetry terms. I learned how to make a movie....Poetry doesn't have to be boring. It is everywhere." Dora created such a buzz in her school that, as a second year teacher, she was asked to give the faculty a presentation on using DV production as a learning tool in the classroom. We believe that engaging in the collaborative flow experience of DV production and recursive reflection on its processes promotes a professional attitude in teachers--a possible step to creating teachers who can become "transformative intellectuals" in schools (Giroux, 1985).

**Shifting roles and stances.** The degree of involvement of teachers and students varied throughout their class experiences, but in every class evidence of "meaningful role shifts" (Heath, 1994) occurred. As they saw themselves as members of a learning

community-- as film makers creating meaning--they engaged with peers and with the DV tools in order to communicate to others. First, in our DV class with its production team process, the teachers evolved a collaborative stance. Dora noted the impact: “We were reconfiguring how it felt to be part of a group, in charge of a common product.” Jackson, a high school English teacher with some DV experience in the class, found it “empowering” to “assist other students [teachers] in their time of need.” Learning directly through collaboration led all of the teachers to take that stance when they attempted to integrate DV into their own teaching and curriculum. All appropriated production teams for use in their own grade 5-12 classes.

Once in their classrooms teachers also shifted to a more collaborative instructional role. In video shot during their own students’ DV production for their research, their changing role was striking. After teachers planned, set the task and production teams, their classes unfolded in a studio atmosphere where some students edited, some went out to film, others fine-tuned storyboards. Teachers assisted where needed; Dora “circulated the room offering advice and camera angles.” In his senior class, Jackson acted as a “technical troubleshooter, [and] on the producer side, I traveled throughout the groups and questioned aspects of their projects in order to push them towards more sophisticated thinking.”

In the study of her classroom, Dora found that, “These already good students had flourished in their new roles. They were cinematographers, planners and directors.” As in our prior research, these teachers also found that students who were “not your typical good students find a voice with video production because there are many roles to fill... [DV can] turn kids into archeologists, have them figure out what their peers want.” One of Dora’s students “had been floundering all year,” but DV sparked a change: “What I saw happen to

Justin was transformational. He was involved, initiated direction and wrote the entire script for his group's movie."

Manny, a 5<sup>th</sup> year high school social studies teacher, concluded in his teacher research that "integration of DV validates the often marginalized 'voice' of the student, particularly and especially the urban student....As a tool of validation, DV allows students to be both creative and reflective in what they are producing."

Traditional notions of schooling for domesticating literacy do not portray students as active, creative, reflective members of a community of learners. In their classroom research our teachers found that through DV production students shifted to active engagement in production teams and developed a sense of agency and community. Dora explained why: "Kids have decision-making, footage-finding, sound and filming capabilities....They need to edit and reap the rewards of seeing a project through to completion." DV production can "make students *directors* of their own learning." This agency happened in groups, in most cases, and that was what made the difference, according to Manny:

DV is a true community builder within the classroom....To complete this project, the students had to be *committed* to the task; they had to *trust* the advice of others; they had to be *accepting* of each other's strengths and weaknesses; and, most of all, they had to be *mindful* of each others' contributions. As a tool to bring students together for a common purpose, to have an entire class work as one organism, DV passes the test. What this project accomplished in the end, was simple but profound—"Yes, we do exist, and yes, our contributions matter."

To orchestrate such a learning environment in schools, teachers *must* have these experiences themselves in their teacher education classes.

Remarkably, once in their schools, teachers approached DV production as a completely social activity--whether they had approached teaching this way beforehand or not--*from* planning, searching out equipment, asking parents' permission and support *to* seeking assistance from other people in the building who were more tech savvy, satisfying the curiosities of other teachers and administrators about the excitement in the building, sharing and changing roles with students, and culminating with the social pleasure of joint viewing and commentary. In all, through powerful literacy experiences in this teacher education class, these teachers learned what could not be *directly* taught, but had to be learned through reflection on direct experience—the *felt*, the *tacit* knowledge-in-action of the importance of community, collaboration, of flow and agency, of new roles and stances, of the validation from “seeing a project through to completion.”

### **Empowering teachers and students with DV attention-creation**

DV production allows communicating self/community/cultural perspectives in an attention-getting form that has rich cultural capital among youth and in the world at large. The urge for DV publication (primarily screenings in a group) emerged repeatedly in our classes and in the classes our students taught. Jackson said he never shares his academic papers with friends who stop over for a beer, but frequently shares his movies with his friends—including his video poem about homelessness and his video editorial about the senselessness of SUVs. Another teacher noted the unusual “intimacy” of sharing her vision of the limited views of females in high-school literature through her multi-genre video

inquiry. The desire to share their DV inquiries, spotlighting their voices and visions, was a profound motivator.

**Attention to voices/visions.** When struggling students produce digital videos in their school contexts, they are sometimes re-positioned as “experts”—those whose attention is needed by other students and teachers to solve problems—thus challenging their school positioning as failures. Typically schools withhold all of these forms of attention-seeking in favor of compliant behaviors of showing up and *paying* attention. Dora saw empowerment of her students exactly as providing opportunity to have these adolescents focus on their readings of the world and have others pay attention. Among her students she found that DV production helps

...develop a better link between a kid’s life and his education....For the first time, the struggles they face on a day to day basis were suddenly commentaries that adults wanted to pay attention to....[As] students make meaning and create understanding on their own, they turn the cameras on themselves. They tell their own stories, bear witness to other stories, talk to strangers and learn how to research.

With a hand-sized mini-DV camera and movie making computer software, and the support of their teacher and their peers, youth voices and visions become part of school. As Dora put it, they “feel like experts in the process.”

**Attention to inquiry.** A key genre in literacy education is persuasion, which in DV production (e.g., video editorials, uncommercials, political commercials) becomes a socially powerful practice from which attention flows and from which student producers feel re-positioned as competent. The experience of Jackson’s urban vocational class illustrates



the DV hook. He started with a problem: “I have trouble getting them to be persuasive and authentic. . . . Persuasive essays written by students reflect the fact-starved news reports of twenty-four hour cable news stations. They are more style than substance.” He turned to the Uncommercial as a DV class activity, to address what he saw as two neglected and “essential elements of savvy citizenry—media literacy and political/social awareness.” The senior class read short stories, studied the film *Bowling for Columbine*, and discussed issues and problems in society. They analyzed commercials, attending to unifying concept, persuasive techniques, and characteristics of the genre. Jackson also shared his powerful Uncommercial on negative impacts of ads on female body image.

In production teams students brainstormed, storyboarded and “pitched” their concept to their teacher as producer. He was very pleased with the results: “I have never seen the level of involvement that I saw with this project.” He analyzed what had happened:

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

Jackson noted, too, that while “writing was individual, iMovie was community oriented.” The inquiry required students to become collaborative problem solvers for “how best to get the point across,” including conceptualizing their theme. They used “advanced problem solving methods of meaning making” such as montage, skits, and statistics.

Another group dealing with the issue of suicide took the beginning of a music video, cut it up, and interspersed somber paintings by Salvador Dali and bleak

lines from poems found in a poetry anthology....Another group used toy army figures and positioned them to represent gang violence.

These visually persuasive methods took students way beyond “their standard five-paragraph essays.” Students dissatisfied with shots they could take in school met outside of school and filmed gravesites and streets signs in Buffalo’s most violent neighborhoods. In school they recruited students from other classes who were dressed in black and white and filmed them standing up against the wall:

In the first shot, there were roughly fifteen students. In the second shot, there were eight. In the third, there were four. In the fourth shot, only one male student remained. When they got this footage back on the computer, they juxtaposed the shots of the decreasing male population with shots of the street signs and shots of the graves. The final product is somber, mesmerizing, and thought-provoking.

The grade average of the group that produced this DV had been 52% the previous quarter. During the DV unit, though, “They were the hardest working group in all of my classes. They developed and pitched a solid concept, kept a tight film schedule, and feverishly edited their product together. After two weeks, they had produced a superbly performed *Stop the Violence* commercial.”

As Jackson exported the films, he had a moment of doubt, wondering why violence was so pervasive in their DV products—why not pollution or drug abuse? He knew why: “They see violence all over. Our country invades Iraq. A former student is killed in action. A cousin is killed as a result of gang warfare. So is a brother. So is a friend.” And he knows that he succeeded in his goal of helping “give students the power to express themselves in a

powerful medium about a societal issue *that was important to them.*” In the end, he saw that students used digital video inquiry just as he had hoped:

I wanted to have them manipulate the power utilized by corporations and government and raise their voice about something that concerned them. And that’s what democracy is about. It’s about raising your voice when you see something is wrong. It’s about having the power and means to do so.

This re-envisioning of literacy as powerful and political would not have been possible without the teachers’ experiences of knowledge creation through their own DV inquiries. In the final DV project of the class, the teachers, individually, created a multi-genre, multi-source video inquiry. Using every available source, they researched a topic of their choice and produced a video that melded at least three video genres to demonstrate their point of view and new understanding of that topic. Teachers chose academic topics such as the making of stories and standardized testing. They also chose social problems they had encountered in their teaching experience, such as anorexia and self-mutilation among high school students. But Roseanne chose to deal with the topic the class had been struggling with throughout the summer semester--the question of what is knowledge.

Her inquiry begins historically with printed quotations about the importance and nature of knowledge from Sophocles, Leonardo da Vinci, Oscar Wilde, and a Celtic proverb dynamically moving against portraits and the music of a mellow, dialogic Italian opera, ending with Albert Einstein’s, “The only source of knowledge is experience.” Not satisfied only with these sources of wisdom, she pursues further sources in current experience, “Hmmm, What is knowledge?” With a split to driving rock music she uses a fast-paced montage that visually questions-- traditional or representational art? Ballet or breakdancing?

Photography or advertising logos? She more directly enters the conversation by writing and reading a poem she sets against engrossing visuals, inquiring further as to whether knowledge is in our hands, in our feet, in our eyes, ears, mouths, the crook of an arm, the tip of our heads, fingertips, the blood that courses through us—or maybe in “the spaces in between.” She concludes, that knowledge is “not the parts but the sum” and “Knowledge is power. (Sir Francis Bacon).” In this deep, multi-vocal personal and compelling inquiry performance, Roseanne sums up much of what she and we learned and much of what teachers need to grapple with in teacher education.

### **Conclusion**

Many argue that “the way we are educating is based on 19<sup>th</sup> century ideas and methods” (Daly, 2004). Whatever term we use for the “new literacies” (Alvermann, 2002), the important thing is that we channel teacher education dialogues toward understanding the fundamental changes that must occur in the educational system to accommodate the literacy needs of the Millennial Generation and the interconnected world in which they live and grow. If we are to teach with an eye on the future--a highly wired and visually sophisticated world--we must understand the growing need for new stances toward knowledge--an epistemology of new literacies. And we must reconceptualize teacher education experiences to promote deep understanding and uses of these new literacies as knowledge- and literacy-production tools in schools.

In our work, we have found that digital video production is a new literacies example of providing teachers with the experience of powerful literacy and the means of transforming their own classrooms from domesticating literacy to literacy with an attitude. Such teacher-education-with-an-attitude benefits from both guided teacher research and, as in

the CVCV project that generated the DV class, partnerships with public schools, including urban ones (see also Miller et al., 2003). In the current climate for literacy, where “recent educational policy making has eroded the autonomy and the level of professional responsibility that teachers must have in order to teach well” (Allington, p. 35), teacher educators must provide professionalizing tools that teachers need in order to become agents of change not only in their classrooms but in their schools and larger educational communities. The eloquence of the teachers quoted here demonstrates the possibilities for creating such transformative intellectuals.

With new literacies/technologies we potentially put powerful tools of inquiry and attention-getting communication into the hands of diverse students, teachers, and teacher educators for creating democratic schooling. Such approaches can change significantly the educational ecology of schools and help prepare teachers and *all* students to participate critically in an increasingly *digital* democracy.

### References

- Alvermann, D. E. (2002). (Ed.) *Adolescents and Literacies in Digital World*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Applebee, A. (1996). *Curriculum as conversation: Transforming traditions of teaching and learning*. NCTE & University of Chicago Press.
- Allington, R. (2002). *Big Brother and the National Reading Curriculum : How Ideology Trumped Evidence*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bruce, B. C. (2002). In D. E. Alvermann (Ed.) *Adolescents and Literacies in a Digital World*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Daly, J. (2004, September). Life on the screen. *Edutopia Magazine*. Retrieved online September 16, 2004, <http://www.edutopia.org/magazine/1/1160>
- Deasy, R. L. (2002). *Critical links: Learning in the arts and student academic and social development*. Washington, D.C.: Arts Education Partnership.
- Eisner, W. E. (1998). *The kind of schools we need: Personal essays*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Falling through the Net: Defining the Digital Divide: A Report on the Telecommunications and Information technology gap in America*. (Revised, 1999). Washington, DC: National Telecommunicatgions and Information Administration. (ED 440 200)

- Finn, P. (1999) *Literacy with an attitude: Educating working-class children in their own self-interest*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Fiske, E.B. (Ed.). (2001). *Champions of change: the impact of the arts on learning*. Washington D.C.: Arts Education Partnership.
- Friere, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: New Seabury Press.
- Giroux, H. (1988). *Teacher as Intellectual: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Bergin & Garvey.
- Goodman, S. (2003). *Teaching youth media: A Critical Guide to Literacy, Video Production*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hagood, M. C., Stevens, L. P. & Reinking, D. (2002). What do THEY have to teach US? Talkin' 'cross generations! In D.E. Alvermann (Ed.) *Adolescents and Literacies in Digital World*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Heath, S.B. (2004). Learning language and strategic thinking through the arts, *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(3), 338-342.
- King, J. R. & O'Brien, D.G. (2002). Adolescents' multiliteracies and their teachers' needs to know: Toward a digital détente. In D.E. Alvermann (Ed.) *Adolescents and Literacies in Digital World*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kress, G. (1999). "English" at the crossroads: Rethinking curricula of communication in the context of the turn to the visual. G. E. Hawisher & Cynthia, L. Selfe (Eds.) *Passions, pedagogies & 21<sup>st</sup> century technologies*. Urbana-Champaign, IL: NCTE
- Kist, W. (2002). Finding "new literacy" in action: An interdisciplinary high school western civilization class. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 45(5), 368-377.
- Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. (2003). *New Literacies: Changing knowledge and classroom learning*. Open University Press.
- Miller, S.M. & Borowicz, S. (In press). City Voices, City Visions: Digital Video as Literacy/Learning Supertool in Urban Classrooms. In L. Johnson, M. Finn & R. Lewis (Eds.) *Urban Education with an attitude*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Miller, S., Meier, E., Payne-Bourcy, L., Shablak, S., Newman, D. L., Wan, T. Y., Casler, E. & Pack, G. (2003, October 20). Technology as a Catalyst for Change: A Leadership Model for Transforming Urban Teacher Preparation. *The International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*. Volume 7, Number 12. Available online at <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~iejll/volume7/miller.htm> (ISSN 1206-9620). [also see [www.pt3ny.org](http://www.pt3ny.org)]
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rohde, G.L., Shapiro, R.J. et al. (October, 2000). *Falling through the net: Toward digital inclusion*. A Report on Americans' Access to Technology Tools by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, & National Telecommunications and Information Administration. [Available online at <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/fttn00/contents00.html>]