Level[ing] the field: Negotiating positions of power as a pre-service teacher

By: Amy Vetter, Mark Meacham, and Melissa Schieble

Abstract:

Set in an undergraduate Secondary English Education Program, this qualitative study draws on theories of power, positioning, and identity to explore how positions of power affect teacher identity construction. Drawn from a larger study, the authors examine how one preservice teacher negotiated positions of power with students in ways that enabled and prohibited him from enacting his preferred teacher identities. In addition, the authors investigated how Jay engaged in reflection about those positions of power through a video analysis project that used discourse analysis and positioning theory. Ultimately, this study contributes to research in teacher education focused on how video analysis can be used to engage students in critical reflection about how positions of power affect teacher identities.

Keywords: teacher education | English education | identity

Article:

INTRODUCTION

A few weeks into student teaching, Jay, a pseudonym for a preservice teacher in a ninth-grade English classroom, attempted to engage students in conversation about proper comma usage in a list. After asking students to read their lists, one student read his aloud. With chalk in hand, Jay began writing a series of inappropriate slang words in Spanish (e.g., *bésame culo*) that he did not understand. Although students laughed and added commentary to the list, Jasmine (a student) told Jay, "They got you cussin' and you don't even know it." These kinds of interactions were frequent for Jay, whose goal was to be a teacher who leveled "the playing field" in the classroom through dialogue and relevant curriculum. After this lesson, Jay reflected,

> I try to position my students and myself on an even field when it comes to writing, but where classroom management is concerned, I need to place myself above them as the

authority. My students need to position me as someone who should be respected and listened to.

We start with this example not as a critique of Jay, but to illustrate how he struggled, as many novice teachers do, to negotiate positions of power in ways that allowed him to be the teacher he wanted to be.

For us, Jay's story raised questions about how his negotiations of power affected how he constructed his teacher identity. As teacher educators, we are particularly interested in how preservice teachers construct teacher identities to better understand how our students learn to teach. Over the past 10 years, scholarship in teacher education has emphasized the significance of viewing learning to teach as an identity process (Alsup, 2006; Fairbanks et al., 2010; Watson, 2006). Thus, teacher development includes learning how to talk and behave in ways that gain teacher candidates' power, status, and membership within schools. Specifically, constructing a teacher identity as a student teacher includes borrowing, negotiating, and claiming ownership with a "discursive field that they did not set up" (Britzman, 1994, p. 61). From this perspective, many student teachers believe they must take on the valued identities of their cooperating teachers, facilitators, professors, and even students to succeed. If they are unable to do so or if they choose to reject those identities, they are marginalized. As a result, teachers may conform to an institution's ideologies or leave the profession. For Jay, this meant figuring out how to negotiate positions of power with students in ways that enabled him to enact critical pedagogy. Specifically, this study illustrates how video analysis (using discourse analysis and positioning theory) opened opportunities for Jay to reflect on the relationship between positions of power and identity enactment during moment-to-moment classroom interactions.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

Teacher educators play an important role in helping preservice teachers learn how to negotiate power in ways that afford them status and membership within schools while maintaining their preferred teacher identities (Britzman, 1994; Fairbanks et al., 2010). In our two teacher preparation courses, we attempted to foster that kind of examination by engaging students in a video analysis project during their student teaching semester. Below, we explore how Jay negotiated positions of power during his final year in a Secondary English Education Program. This research draws from a larger qualitative study about how preservice English Language Arts teachers constructed their teacher identities. We conducted the research at two universities in the United States. A salient finding was that that most teacher candidates had difficulty enacting their teacher identities because they were unsure about how to negotiate positions of power with students. To examine that dilemma in Jay's case, we asked the following questions: In what ways did Jay negotiate issues of power during his student teaching? How did those negotiations shape his identity constructions? In what ways did video analysis of three lessons engage Jay in reflection about his negotiations of power? Ultimately, this study contributes to research in teacher education focused on how video analysis can be used to engage students in reflection about how positions of power impact teacher identities.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This research relies on the theoretical concept that learning to teach is an identity process in which positions of power affect how teachers construct and enact teacher identities. Teacher educators must foster opportunities for preservice teachers to examine how negotiations of power affect their teaching practices. One way to foster the examination of the power positions is through discourse analysis of moment-to-moment classroom interactions. To begin our framework, we define *power*, situate that definition pedagogically, and discuss elements of power relevant to the findings of this article. Next, we discuss how identity and positioning theory can be used to examine how and why preservice teachers negotiate positions of power in ways that hinder or foster their preferred teacher identities. To close, we argue that discourse analysis, using positioning theory, is one way for teacher educators to foster reflection about positions of power and teacher identity construction that inevitably affect teaching practices.

Power

For this article, we define *power* as interpersonal and dynamic. Thus, positions of power are constituted through discourse and accepted forms of knowledge (Foucault, 1979). Furthermore, we draw from Foucault's concept that power is not only a negative or repressive tool used for coercion. In other words, individuals are also capable of being powerful and powerless at the same time (Davies & Harré, 1990) and oftentimes use power in empowering ways. Specifically, a poststructuralist view of power suggests that individuals have the ability to change themselves and the world around them (i.e., agency) (Jackson, 2001).

During student teaching, preservice teachers are expected to negotiate positions of power with several individuals, such as cooperating teachers. By *negotiate* we mean when individuals try to reach a compromise with others. These power dynamics often serve to position teacher candidates in ways that may challenge their understanding of who they are as educators. Just as teachers may position their students as passive receivers of knowledge (Freire, 2000), preservice teachers' supervisors may also position them similarly. Thus, a tension may exist between their preferred teacher identity and the one that affords their entrance into a school (Assaf, 2005).

Cummins (2009) reminds preservice teachers that they have choices about how they negotiate power, thus reifying the concept that student teachers can take up positions of power. For example, those choices are expressed through language in how they interact with students, engage them cognitively, and/or activate their prior knowledge. Power, then, is created and shared between students in varying degrees. Interactions may contribute to disempowerment, or interactions might constitute a process of empowerment that challenges power dynamics. For example, teachers might hint or justify certain rules or content to yield compliance from students in a classroom (Puvirajah, Verma, & Webb, 2012). Such use of language has the potential to create a power-share and/or power-control classroom space. Although students do not hold structural power, they can situate themselves in positions of power as individuals and collectives as seen in the opening example with Jay. Such positions might be enacted through resistance, oftentimes consisting of subtle moments, such as grumbling or sarcasm. To address those resistances and meet learning objectives, teachers must negotiate positions of power with students. Recognizing that negotiation occurs in the classroom implies that all participants have power. Thus, understanding and reflecting on reciprocal power negotiations is essential to understanding the construction and enactment of teacher identities, including current classroom

practices, and should be a part of teacher education curriculum (Jackson, 2001). This was particularly important for Jay who struggled to negotiate more leveled positions of power with students.

Identity and Positioning Theory

Positions of power, then, affect how preservice teachers construct and enact teacher identities. As teacher educators, we are interested in how preservice teachers construct teacher identities because it reveals how preservice teachers learn to "be" teachers. To define identity, we draw from two notable definitions: "to be recognized as a certain kind of person by others" (Gee, 2011, p. 99) and a "collection of stories about persons, or more specifically, those narratives about individuals that are reifying, endorsable, and significant" (Sfard & Prusak, 2005, p. 16). Unlike an essentialist view of identity (i.e., identity as a fixed, inherent attribute), identity is viewed as fluid and dynamic (Holland, Skinner, Lachicotte, & Cain, 1998). Teacher identities emerge during moment-to-moment discursive interactions that occur daily, such as classroom conversations, hallway chats, and parent/teacher conferences (Juzwik & Ives, 2010).

Positioning theory is one way to uncover how individuals construct and enact identities during moment-to-moment interactions. Specifically, the act of positioning involves how rights and obligations are appropriated and refused during interactions (Davies & Harré, 1990). Thus, individuals situate themselves and others in positions of power (Holland et al., 1998) through discursive interactions, nonverbal communication, and curriculum choices. Specifically, this theory suggests that first-order positionings occur when people position themselves (reflexive positioning) and others (interactive positioning) discursively along jointly produced storylines (i.e., cultural narratives) in which they feel comfortable (Davies & Harré, 1990). For example, teachers position their students as readers or writers in the classroom. Such positionings affect how students situate themselves as learners within that community (Vetter, 2010).

First-order positions can be challenged in two ways: either within the conversation as it is taking place (second-order positioning), or within another discussion about the first conversation (third-order positioning). Thus, second-order positioning occurs when a person resists being positioned by the other. As in the opening transcript, students resisted academic positionings by situating Jay as a nonauthority through the use of inappropriate language. Third-order positionings are likely to occur in the video analysis reflections and during informal conversations that account for first- or second-order positionings. For example, in his discussion with his supervisor, Jay might position certain students interactively as being disruptive and himself as a disciplinarian. Identifying how such positions occur during moment-to-moment interactions can be especially helpful to preservice educators because it opens opportunities for them to identify how power affects their identity enactments over time. In other words, positioning and identity theory can help preservice teachers think critically and purposefully about how to "become" the kind of teachers they want to become.

Discourse Analysis in Teacher Education

To involve preservice teachers in this kind of reflective thought, we asked our student teachers to complete a video analysis project that engaged them in discourse analysis, using positioning

theory, of three transcribed lessons. We created this assignment because it is one way to guide preservice teachers into reflection about power negotiation and teacher identity construction through discourse analysis of their classroom interactions (Rex & Schiller, 2009). Discourse analysis is a method for studying language in use as a form of social action and as a tool that communicants use to perform desired identities in particular contexts. Because classroom interactions are mediated by language and filled with ideology, teachers must have the ability to navigate spontaneous social interactions in ways that situate themselves as the kind of teacher they desire to be (Rex & Schiller, 2009). Because talk is essential to classroom learning, tools of discourse analysis can uncover how that talk builds knowledge through social engagement and creates classroom spaces that promote equitable learning opportunities. For us, discourse analysis framed around positioning theory became a useful tool for fostering reflection about what it means to use power in ways that enhance instruction and promote learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Negotiating Power in the Classroom

Several noteworthy studies (e.g., Agee, 2004; Alsup, 2006; Assaf, 2005; Handsfield, Crumpler, & Dean, 2010) have addressed how power affects the construction of teacher identities. In particular, these studies highlight the multiple and dynamic negotiations that preservice teachers deal with daily. For example, Agee (2004) explored how one teacher attempted to negotiate the power structure of high-stakes teaching as an early-career teacher and how those negotiations shaped her identity as a culturally relevant teacher. The study suggested that the teacher would have benefitted from a teacher education program that prepared her for how to navigate the constraints of the power structures related to high-stakes exams that are prominent in today's schools. Other studies (e.g., Jackson, 2001; Smagorinsky, Cook, Moore, Jackson, & Fry, 2004) point to power dynamics between cooperating teachers and student teachers and illustrate how frustrating tensions take a toll on feelings of control during the student teaching experience.

Teachers also negotiate power with students during classroom interactions. For example, Juzwik's (2006) concept of authoritative teacher suggests that such teachers continually negotiate positions with students in a dialogic way rather than presenting authoritarian static positions with which students must comply. An authoritative teacher, then, is one who was able "to persuade students to trust, respect, and learn from one's voice" without abusing the power of their authority (p. 490). Similarly, Buzzelli and Johnston (2001) found that one teacher used a "soft power" approach rather than a heavy-handed approach when responding to inappropriate subject matter. This approach created a dialogic classroom community. Overall, teachers constantly negotiate positions of power during moment-to-moment interactions. Those negotiations affect how teachers and students enact their identities over time.

Teachers who focus on maintaining power over what counts as knowledge, however, are likely to meet resistance from students (Brooke, 1987; Linehan & McCarthy, 2000). With this approach, teachers situate themselves as knowledgeable, and student's learning takes on the game of guessing the right answer. Such positionings maintain traditional teacher and student power hierarchies. For example, Gutierrez, Rymes, and Larson (1995) called the teacher talk in their study a "primary script" and student talk a "counterscript." Students sometimes asserted local

popular knowledge (i.e., music) that was not taken up by the teacher script that undercut the roles expected of students. When this local knowledge was explicitly connected with the primary script, dialogic talk occurred in which teacher and students coconstructed knowledge in the classroom.

Preservice teachers also negotiate positions of power in ways that enable them to construct preferred teacher identities. Studies suggest several ways of promoting those opportunities, such as interviewing teachers about practice and developing learning communities between cooperating teachers, student teachers, and supervisors (Ritchie, Rigano, & Lowry, 2000). Within these communities, positions of power can be problematized and members feel more comfortable engaging in constructive conversations. Other suggestions include the telling of stories and dialogic narratives within a community of practice (Rogers, Marshall, & Tyson, 2006; Watson, 2006), using specific types of language to create power-share interactions (Puvirajah et al., 2012), and recontextualizing discourses across various school spaces to make changes within schools and teacher identities (Handsfield et al., 2010). Less research has examined how video analysis could be used as a tool for preservice teachers to reflect on positions of power during interactions.

Video Analysis in Teacher Education

Teacher educators have used video analysis, however, to provide opportunities for teachers to take "notice" of interactions that were not easily observed while teaching (Sherin & van Es, 2009) and make connections between theory and practice (Mosley, 2010). In particular, power relations can be examined through a close investigation of a teacher's reflexive and interactive positionings (Cummins, 2009). Alexander (2008) defined this kind of work as dialogic pedagogy or teaching "that exploits the power of talk to engage and shape children's thinking and learning" (p. 92). This is a difficult task, especially as a preservice teacher in another person's classroom. At the same time, challenging teacher candidates to analyze their own talk and nonverbal behavior is a significant exercise in recognizing moments when their identity enactments do not match with their teaching philosophies. Furthermore, Juzwik and Ives (2010) found that a microanalytic approach illuminates how identities are performed within a setting. This study, then, offers insight into how positioning theory and discourse analysis can be used to help student teachers examine how and why they took on positions of power during classroom interactions and the implications those positions had on teaching practices.

METHOD

This research stems from a broader teacher research study (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) involving two university professors interested in learning more about how a video analysis project shaped the teacher identities of preservice teachers (52 participants). Because we view learning as an identity process, we were particularly interested in how we, as teacher educators, could facilitate critical reflection in our courses about how preservice teachers constructed and enacted teacher identities. As stated, we recognized that power negotiations affected teacher identity construction, thus we wanted to learn more about these negotiations in hopes of better educating our students about how to negotiate power in classrooms. This study used grounded theory method (Corbin & Strauss, 2007) and discourse analysis (Gee, 2011) framed around

positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990) to explore the following questions: In what ways did Jay negotiate power? How did those negotiations shape his teacher identities? What role did video analysis have in reflection about those negotiations?

Jay

Out of our 52 participants, we chose Jay for this article because of his unique case. Although all of our students struggled to negotiate power to some degree, Jay struggled the most because of his desire to implement critical pedagogy in a school focused on skill-and-drill test practice. We believe that his case study could offer insight into how one preservice teacher put theory into practice within the context of an urban school.

Jay, a White middle-class male in his early twenties, positioned himself as a lover of popular culture and a poet/writer. In several of his blog posts (completed for a course assignment), he shared his own poems and commented on his desire to write creatively. For a project that required students to present on a professional text, he chose to read *Getting the Knack* by Stephen Dunning and William Stafford and stated that, "I would really like for poetry to be a major part of my classroom, including providing the opportunity for students to write it." This is important because it is through his positioning of himself and his students as poet/writers that he seeks to, as he said, "level the field" within the classroom.

Jay also positioned himself as a teacher who hoped to implement aspects of critical pedagogy, such as facilitating dialogue that questioned power relations (Kellner, 2000). Jay reflected this perspective in his teaching philosophy when he stated, "I want to instill tolerance. … When critical thinkers are questioned they do not simply regurgitate what has been fed them, but offer a better question and possible solution." He wanted to "level the field" by taking on a dialogic approach that sought to rebalance preexisting power structures (Freire, 2000) and valued a perspective that pushed against viewing students as passive learners (Giroux, 2000).

Context

Jay attended an urban university in the southeast with more than 17,500 students. Most students in the English Education Program were White, middle-class females. In particular, we highlight data collected from two courses (Teaching Practices and Curriculum in English Education and Student Teaching Seminar) that were taken during Jay's senior year. In both courses, Jay wrote unit plans, taught minilessons, engaged in discussions about pedagogy, and recorded reflections in a teacher daybook. He completed 50 hours of internship and 12 weeks of student teaching over the year at Carter High School (CHS).

Carter High School is located in a city 20 miles from the university; this city has a population of 51,577. The total enrollment of CHS during the Jay's preservice teaching experience was 795. Sixty-four percent of the students at this school were eligible for free and reduced lunch compared to 34% in the state as a whole. The ethnicity of students at CHS in 2011 was 53% African American, 35% Latina/o, and 11% White. Fifty-three percent of students passed the comprehensive English exam (reading and writing skills) for the state (state average: 70%). Jay's preservice teaching experience took place in a ninth-grade English classroom with students

between ages 14 and 17. Jay's students were predominantly Latino/a and spoke Spanish and English. His cooperating teacher was a young, White female who had been teaching fewer than 10 years. She typically took a teacher-centered approach in a school that highly emphasized success on high-stakes testing.

The Assignment

For the video assignment (Table 1), students were expected to record themselves 3 times throughout their student-teaching experience and engage in discourse analysis based on positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Gee, 2011). Students transcribed the videos, completed an analysis chart (Table 1), and composed a reflection that specifically asked them to analyze how they enacted their preferred teaching identities and what they would do to continue their progress. The point of this assignment, including the transcription and discourse analysis, was to challenge students to examine how they used language in daily interactions to situate themselves as teachers and their students as readers, writers, and members of a classroom. Our intention was to help preservice teachers uncover moments when they struggled to enact their preferred teacher identities and to reflect about the power structures that shaped that struggle. We discussed these analyses in our 2-hour student teaching seminar in small and large groups.

TABLE 1. Video Analysis Assignment

Videotape an entire lesson during your student teaching. This can include a lecture, minilesson, discussion, and/or reading instruction. Transcribe 5 to 10 minutes of instruction, including teacher and student talk. Complete the chart below and include evidence from your transcribed interactions to help you think about teacher identity enactments and how they compare to your teacher vision.

- In a 2- to 3-page analysis, answer the following questions:
- Who does the most talking?
- What kinds of questions are posed? What kinds of answers are facilitated?
- How do you talk to students? What is your tone? Do you use directives? Questions? Praises? Criticisms?
- How do you think your words positioned your students as readers and writers? How do you think your students positioned you as a teacher? How did you position yourself as a teacher?
- How might these positionings be shaped by how you were taught? By the kind of school you attended? By your race, class, gender, and/or sexuality?
- What are the strengths? What will you do different?
- How do these practices match up with the kind of teacher you want to become? How do they contradict?

Evidence from video	How did you position yourself as a teacher?	How did students position you as a teacher?	How did you position your students as readers, writers, and students?
Example one (transcription)			

To prepare them for this assignment, students read and discussed several articles related to the power of teacher talk, including excerpts from *Choice Words* by Peter Johnston and *Using Discourse Analysis to Improve Classroom Interaction* by Lesley Rex and Laura Schiller. After discussion, we viewed a video from The Teacher Channel and examined the following questions: How did the teacher position herself? How did students position the teacher? How did the teacher position students? In what ways do you think the teacher's race, class, gender, and so on shaped these positionings? Small groups focused on one question and presented their analysis. As a whole group, we discussed the advantages and disadvantages to this kind of analysis and

the ways in which power and status shaped these interactions. As teacher educators engaged in this teacher research project, we hoped this video analysis would open opportunities for students to engage in reflection about how positions of power affected how they enacted their teacher identities over time and to create goals for how to change unwanted behavior and language.

Researchers

Amy and Melissa are White middle-class female professors in teacher education at different universities. Amy served as the university instructor for Jay in both courses and subsequently as his supervisor during his student teaching experience at CHS. She observed Jay during his 50-hour internship and spent considerable time talking about how to build relationships with students who were from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Amy and Jay had a positive relationship, and he often stayed after class to discuss his assignments and/or internship. These conversations included positive and negative experiences. To minimize coercion, Amy did not know which students agreed to be in the study until after grades were posted. Because all collected data was a normal part of the students' responsibilities, switching between researcher and teacher positions was not as obvious. We recognize, however, that the power structures imbedded in a teacher/student relationship certainly shaped Jay's responses to Amy. For example, Jay most likely did not share everything with Amy because she was his professor. In particular, he might have felt like he needed to submit what would earn him a high grade or portray him as a competent teacher. We believe, however, that the sustained and consistent reflective conversations and responses, the multiple forms of data, and personal observations over an extended time period (one year), provided us with a rich corpus of data to confirm patterns. That data, along with implementing measures of trustworthiness discussed below, broadened interpretations. Furthermore, we did not examine how Jay negotiated power structures with Amy because data did not reveal evidence related to that dilemma.

Mark, a White, middle-class male pursuing a doctorate in teacher education at the same institution, became involved in the study after all data were collected and during Phase 2 of data analysis. Mark was never Jay's teacher and only knew Jay from the collected data. He was an English in-service teacher at a high school within the school system where CHS is located and had16 years of experience. His position as a cooperating teacher for nine different preservice teachers from two nearby universities provided a mentor perspective to the interpretations. Furthermore, because he shared with Jay the position of being a male in a system dominated by female teachers, Mark provided specific insight into this gendered experience.

Melissa taught a course equivalent to the seminar at a different university in the northeast United States. She engaged her student teachers in the same video analysis project and collected data using the same procedures. Her involvement in Jay's case study began during Phase 1 of data analysis, in which she and Amy reviewed data and compared/contrasted interpretations. Melissa added a third, outsider perspective to the analysis because she worked at a separate university and did not know Jay or the schools.

Data Collection and Analysis

TABLE 3. Discourse Analysis

Utterance	Building Task	Secondary Code	Discursive resource	Context
Jay: [interrupts] that he saw Tom Robinson, he saw Tom Robinson raping May Ella, right? This is what we learned Mr. Gilbert [trails off]. That's what you should write in that little block. In the little block [tells them what to write] "We learned from Mr. Gilbert that Bob Ewell saw Tom Robinson … chased him off, but he saw him committing the act. He saw him raping May Ella."	The identities building tool What socially recognizable identity or identities is the speaker trying to enact or to get others to recognize? What identities is the speaker inviting others to take up?	Jay situates himself as the leader of the classroom conversation and agenda. He invites students to follow his lead.	Interruption Closed-ended question. Directive	Whole-class instruction about *To Kill A Mockingbird*
Jay: [interrupts] that he saw Tom Robinson, he saw Tom Robinson raping May Ella, right? This is what we learned Mr. Gilbert [trails off]. That's what you should write in that little block. In the little block [tells them what to write] "We learned from Mr. Gilbert that Bob Ewell saw Tom Robinson … chased him off, but he saw him committing the act. He saw him raping May Ella."	The politics building tool How are words and grammatical devices being used to construct what counts? To build a viewpoint on how social goods should be distributed in society?	The important part of this lesson seems to be writing down the correct answer in the correct section of the worksheet.	Directives about what to write and where to write	Whole-class instruction about *To Kill A Mockingbird*
Jay: [interrupts] that he saw Tom Robinson, he saw Tom Robinson raping May Ella, right? This is what we learned Mr. Gilbert [trails off]. That's what you should write in that little block. In the little block [tells them what to write] "We learned from Mr. Gilbert that Bob Ewell saw Tom Robinson … chased him off, but he saw him committing the act. He saw him raping May Ella."	The big "D" discourse tool What sorts of actions, interactions, values, beliefs, and objects, tools, technologies, and environments are associated with this sort of language within a particular Discourse?	It appears that Jay wants to be in control of the classroom.	Interruption Directive Closed-ended questions	Whole-class instruction about *To Kill A Mockingbird*
Jay: [interrupts] that he saw Tom Robinson, he saw Tom Robinson raping May Ella, right? This is what we learned Mr. Gilbert [trails off]. That's what you should write in that little block. In the little block [tells them what to write] "We learned from Mr. Gilbert that Bob Ewell saw Tom Robinson … chased him off, but he saw him committing the act. He saw him raping May Ella."	The sign systems and knowledge-building tool How are words and grammar being used to privilege or de-privilege specific sign systems or different ways of knowing and believing?	Privileging teacher talk and academic script	Interruption Directives Closed-ended questions	Whole-class instruction about *To Kill A Mockingbird*

Source. Gee (2011).

We used grounded theory analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 2007) and discourse analysis (Gee, 2011) to examine the following data collected by Amy over a period of one year: (1) teacher beliefs, (2) unit plans, (3) video analysis assignment, (4) field notes from seminar discussions, and (5) informal conversations with Jay. Teacher vision statements, assigned by Amy, were written at the beginning of Jay's senior year in his English methods course and posted on a blog. These vision statements included descriptions about the kind of teacher Jay wanted to become. Jay also created a unit plan in the English methods course, which he taught during a 6-week period of full-time teaching. This data highlighted how he planned to enact his identities during his student teaching. Field notes were taken during the seminar course and extended after class to focus on specific challenges and successes of student teaching. The central focus for data collection and analysis was a video assignment for English methods, explained above. We focused on this data because we were interested in examining how this analysis project facilitated identity work, specifically related to positions of power. We used other data sources from the larger data set to provide context and verify interpretations.

Data analysis was inductive, using a grounded theory approach (Corbin & Strauss, 2007), and occurred throughout data collection. Following data collection, analysis occurred in three phases. In Phase 1, all three researchers independently read and open-coded all data with the following categories in mind based on Davies and Harré's (1990) interactive and reflective positioning theory: (1) how positioned self, (2) how position students, and (3) how positioned by others (Table 2). Preliminary codes were discussed in research meetings and compiled into categories and emergent themes. One prominent code that emerged with each participant was the impact that positions of power had on teacher identity construction.

TABLE 2. Reflexive and Interactive Positioning: Researcher's Interpretations

Data	Position Self	Position Others	Positioned by Others
Utterance from video-taped lesson Jay interrupts student response. Jay: That's what he said to Mr. Gilbert, in the first block, that's what you should write.	Jay positioned himself as a facilitator of traditional Initiate, Respond, and Evaluate interactions that reflected a banking model rather than a critically conscious model.	Jay positioned his students as listeners and notetakers.	Jay was positioned as the knowledge keeper. Students looked to him as the expert and as the one with the "right" answers in regards to the book.

In Phase 2 of analysis, we chose six case studies based on their unique experiences in the field. Jay was one of those cases. Thus, we reviewed the data to examine instances of Jay attempting to negotiate power structures. In particular, we engaged in discourse analysis (Gee, 2011) of the reflections and videos to uncover how his negotiations of power affected his teacher identity constructions. Gee argues that when members of a language community speak, write, or use symbol systems (i.e., when they take part in discourse), they are taking part in constructing a certain reality about themselves and the world around them. Specifically, we used the following four tools of discourse analysis (Gee, 2011): The identities building tool, the politics building tool, the big "D" Discourse tool, and the sign systems and knowledge-building tool. As described in Table 3, we chose these tools because they specifically posed questions that related to identity construction and power dynamics. As a result, this level of analysis helped us better understand how and why he negotiated power in multiple ways. The analysis process during this phase was recursive and iterative as we moved between the analytic categories, the field note data, the video assignments, and the artifacts to determine categories and themes grounded in the data and

triangulate findings. In our final phase, we conceptualized how these categories fit together into overarching themes, as discussed in the Findings, and we pulled selected excerpts from the data to check the credibility of our categories and themes.

A discourse analysis approach offers important insights to classroom interactions, but there are limitations to this kind of analysis. First, as researchers, we are never completely certain of the purpose and intention behind the speaker's words (Gee, 2011). Because we bring assumptions to the analysis, there is also increasing possibility for misrepresentations. Specifically, we recognize that our race, class, past experiences in education, and our current position as teacher–educators shaped how we interpreted this data. For example, we came to this study with the belief that discourse analysis of classroom interactions would foster reflective thought about the relationship between positions of power and identity construction and enactment. To challenge these assumptions, we checked interpretations with Jay through informal conversations. Several colleagues in teacher education also reviewed analysis, provided multiple perspectives, and challenged interpretations that we considered in analysis. We do not consider this data to be generalizable but instead constructed a case study to provide snapshots for discussion about how we can better prepare future teachers to negotiate power structures in ways that enable them to construct their desired teacher identities.

FINDINGS

Because the video project occurred in the classroom, data illustrated significant examples of power negotiations between teacher and student. Specifically, Jay negotiated positions of power with students in ways that enabled and prohibited his ability to construct and enact his preferred teacher identities. To illustrate those negotiations, we organize our findings in two major sections. First, we analyze a transcribed classroom interaction from the video assignment that portrays how Jay negotiated positions of power in ways that enabled him to situate himself as a critical pedagogue (i.e., power-share identity). Within that same section, we examine how he negotiated positions of power in his written analysis about the transcription to illustrate how the assignment did or did not help him negotiate positions of power. Second, we follow the same organization as above to highlight a transcribed classroom interaction and written analysis to illustrate how Jay attempted to negotiate positions of power in ways that prohibited him from situating himself as his desired identity (i.e., power-control identity).

Power-Share Identity

Classroom interaction

Jay hoped to enact a teacher identity informed by critical pedagogy, but when attempting to put it into practice he found he had to negotiate power in ways that allowed him to assert his authority while also "leveling the field." This was evident in Jay's first video analysis assignment, in which he filmed the 11th-grade honors class responding to a journal topic about their favorite poem they read during the poetry unit. Jay stood at the front of the room and students sat in rows, an arrangement preferred by his cooperating teacher. He described this group to be "very quiet" and "well-behaved" and noted that with this group of students he was able to successfully negotiate power in ways that enabled him to construct his preferred teacher identity. At the beginning of

the lesson, Jay explained that they were going to review their poetry unit by discussing their favorite poems so far. At first, students wrote responses and then Jay opened it up for a whole-group discussion. While discussing poems, such as "Favorite Color" or "Jabberwocky" a student directed the discussion towards his journal:

Wayne: Can we *read* our journals?

Jay: Yea.

Wayne: My favorite poem we have read so far is Mr. Terrell's poem about the writer. Mostly, I liked Mr. Terrell's imagination while writing it. It spoke to me because I could imagine his poem in my mind and in my imagination. It gave me a cool feeling because I would have thought and said some of the same things Mr. Terrell had mentioned.

Jay: Thank you, I appreciate that very much. I read my poem because I didn't want you guys to feel like, *who is this guy asking us to read our poetry in front of the whole class*? I thought it would be fair if I read something too. I always feel like it when if I ever take a creative writing class, I took one in college, and our teacher was a writer trying to get published and he would bring his stuff in and read it to the class. I found it inspiring and it was enjoyable because he was a really good writer. Does anyone else want to share?

At the beginning of this transcript, Wayne asked Jay if he could read rather than talk about his journal entry. By asking Jay if he could do this, Wayne situated Jay as the teacher and himself as a student by abiding by Jay's rules. By asking a question rather than throwing out an answer, Wayne complied with the typical storyline of how an academic conversation works (i.e., teacher is in charge and student complies). Jay informally answered "Yea" and took up a position of authority. By using informal language, however, he privileged informal discourse and attempted to "level the field." This positioned him as a power-sharing teacher by negotiating how the classroom conversation worked. Next, Wayne stated that he preferred Mr. Terrell's poem, thus situating Jay as teacher and writer. By using *Mr. Terrell*, he illustrated his belief that Jay is a teacher, a position he respected. Next, Wayne stated that he liked the poem because of Mr. Terrell's imagination and he could relate to what Jay wrote. In this scenario, Wayne constructed his reading and writing identities by giving specific examples related to why he liked Jay's poem (e.g., "I could imagine his poem"). Also, his use of the words *thought* and *said* indicated that Wayne wrote about similar topics or in similar structures, thus aligning himself with the teacher.

Jay's response attempted to construct a socially recognized identity of a democratic teacher. By using polite discourse (e.g., "Thank you") to negotiate power with the student, he illustrated his belief that student feedback was important and welcomed. Thus, Jay attempted to construct the politics of the classroom by portraying what kinds of interactions (democratic) were valued. Next, he elaborated by explaining that he wrote and read aloud his own poetry to them because he did not want them asking, "Who is this guy asking us to read our poetry in front of the whole class?" In this example, Jay followed the reading of his work with a discussion of his experience as a college student. He used the words *fair, inspiring*, and *enjoyable* to describe his ideal classroom. In this instance Jay's use of the words *this guy* positioned himself as less of an authority and as more of an everyday person who needed to earn his authority, despite his teacher position. He then explained to students that he believed it was only "fair" if he "read

something too." By explaining his rationale, Jay attempted to situate himself as a former student and a writer. Jay's narrative about his personal experience explicitly discussed his positions as teacher, student, and writer with students, thus enacting a socially recognized power-share identity. Rather than stopping the conversation with the spotlight on Jay, he asked students if they wanted to continue sharing. As a result, the dialogue about poetry continued.

Jay's reflection

To help us understand the role that video analysis had in Jay's negotiations of positions of power, we examined an excerpt of his video analysis:

> I feel that I positioned students on an even playing field with their writing. I have encouraged all of them to write and have shown them that writing is messy and it takes time to develop. I have let them critique my own poems so they feel like we are all working together. I have noticed with this class they give me a lot of respect as a teacher and authority figure … they seem to desire and value my feedback on their creative works. I have tried to be as validating as possible and give positive criticism of their work. For instance, when Will talked about a comment I gave him on his poem, he said I "tore it apart." I explained to him my comments and what I was trying to do. I also told him that he had the power over my comments by choosing to ignore them or use them.

Jay began this analysis with a third-order positioning of himself as a teacher using writing instruction to create "an even playing field." To do this, he used "teacher talk" ("writing is messy," "value my feedback") to construct a socially recognized identity as a knowledgeable and experienced writing teacher. He also used "writer talk" ("critique my own poems") to position himself as a writer who valued feedback from his students. By using the words *give positive criticism* and *working together* he engaged in discourses that illustrated his ideological belief that teachers should situate themselves as writers and encourage student feedback in an attempt to create a student-centered curriculum and a writing community. By doing this, he attempted to construct a teacher identity that promoted a democratic classroom and build classroom politics that valued the negotiation of power with students in ways that created a community of writers.

He also stated that students positioned him with respect because of his "teacher" actions, such as critical feedback and validation. To elaborate, Jay offered an example of student interaction with Will who told Jay that he tore apart his work. At first, this statement appeared to contradict his earlier discussion about validation and positive criticism. However, Jay attempted to situate Will as writer on an even playing field by discussing power dynamics between writer and teacher/editor. In other words, he explicitly described the typical storyline of a writer/editor relationship while reassuring Will that he has the power to make whatever changes he sees fit. We recognize that Will may not take up this position, especially because his grade is dependent on Jay's feedback. We applaud Jay's attempt, however, to not only provide feedback to Will, as many teachers do, but also explain it in a way that relates to real-world interactions.

To further explain his approach, he stated:

> I position my students in the same way I have been positioned in college. I can position them in a more equal field because I do not worry about discipline problems. … I feel that students learn more when they are part of the discussion, working through their thinking with guidance, rather than just empty containers being "filled" by the teacher.

To begin, Jay used reflective language to state that his recent college experiences as a learner ("equal field") shaped how he constructed his teacher identity. He attributed this position to no behavior problems in the classroom. Through phrases, such as "learn more" and "part of," Jay privileged discussion over direct teaching and illustrated his preference to situate himself as a guide. Thus, Jay took up discourses that alluded to his belief in negotiating power with students to create a democratic classroom in which students are active participants.

With that said, Jay's phrase *even playing field* uncovers several dilemmas related to power negotiations. First, this phrase most likely illustrates Jay's attempt to construct classroom politics that even out barriers so that students can accomplish the same thing without being jeopardized by the limitations of the field (i.e., classroom). These discourses aligned with his vision statement about his desire to practice critical pedagogy and relates to a power-share perspective. His use of that phrase also privileges knowledge about how education is a great equalizer, uncovering room for learning more about how disadvantaged backgrounds affect the success of students. We wondered about his thoughts in relation to student/teacher relationships, student needs, and student backgrounds. If Jay does not think about those aspects of pedagogy, he could possibly create a power-control space, despite his intentions to do the opposite.

Power-Control Identity

Classroom interaction

Although Jay was able to enact his preferred identity as a power-share teacher, he tended to take on power-control positions when he met resistance from students. For example, in each of the three video segments, Jay positioned himself physically at the front and engaged in a traditional discourse pattern that initiated student responses, evaluated those responses (sometimes answering his own question), and then evaluated that response. During these sequences, very few students were engaged (i.e. lack of verbal and nonverbal participation) and little to no higher-level thinking was occurring (i.e., recalling characters and events from literature). Although reviewing factual information can be a useful part of lessons, Jay was not enacting the teacher identity described in his blogs. For example, in Jay's second video transcription, he positioned himself as the knowledge-keeper when he and students discussed the novel *To Kill a Mockingbird*. Jay provided a chart in which the students were instructed to record short passages that demonstrated certain characters' personality traits.

> Jay: In your chart, what did we learn from Bob Ewell when Mr. Gilbert is talking?
> Juan: That he said that he saw, uh …
> Jay: [interrupts] that he saw Tom Robinson, he saw Tom Robinson raping May Ella, right? This is what we learned Mr. Gilbert [trails off]. That's what you should write in that little block … "We learned from Mr. Gilbert that Bob Ewell saw Tom Robinson … chased him off, but he saw him committing the act … he saw him raping May Ella."

Damien: Naw, that's what he said to Mr. Gilbert.

Jay: That's what he said to Mr. Gilbert, in the first block, that's what you should write.

In this example, Jay attempted to assess student comprehension of the chapter. He began with an open-ended question ("What did we learn") and used the pronoun *we* to construct classroom politics that situated students as part of a reading community. The exchange shifted, however, when the Juan appeared to have difficulty answering the question. Like many novice teachers, Jay answered his own question and interrupted the students' comment, rather than posing more questions or practicing a longer wait time, thus privileging teacher knowledge. As a result, students wrote down Jay's interpretation rather than their own. In the last few sentences, Damien contributed by saying, "Naw, that's what he said to Mr. Gilbert," potentially taking on the identity of a reader and participant. Jay then validated the comment by restating it and directing students to write down that statement. Despite Jay's desire to situate himself as a teacher who facilitated dialogue, Jay used a traditional Initiate, Respond, and Evaluate interaction, thus reflecting a power-control identity. At this point, Jay had difficulty negotiating positions of power with students when they did not follow his expected storyline of how a classroom should work (e.g., student participation).

As the lesson progressed, students and teacher continued to take on power-control positions resulting in an unsuccessful lesson. In the following segment, Jay taught a minilesson on comma usage and asked students to create a sentence that used commas to set off a list. Students remained in their seats and Jay stood at the front. Josue volunteered his answer.

Josue:	Chapa likes long, hard … [*His voice falls when he says this word. He smiles.*]
Jay:	Who wants to share their journal, one sentence?
Josue:	[*Raises his hand.*] I got one mister. [*Jay erases the board, then turns around.*]
Jay:	Sure
Josue:	[*Reads*] "Today, Jumax, Chapa, and playboy went to Manny's house." [*Laughter.*]
Jay:	[*Writes on board*] "Today, Humax." [*He points to Humax and looks at Josue.*]
Josue:	[*Making a J form in the air with his finger*] Jumax. Like the juice.
Jay:	Like the juice, what? [*Puts his hands down to his sides palms outward*]
Josue:	J, the j.
Jasmine:	I seen that word be on that can don't it?
Jay:	[*Writes and says*] Chapa [*Many students laugh*]
Jasmine:	They got you cussin' and you don't even know it.
Student off camera:	And puto! [*Students laugh. Jay catches on and erases the board.*]
Jasmine:	Say, besamé culo! Put besamé culo up there. [*Jay asks for more examples. Note:* "Besame culo" *is a common phrase in Spanish that generally means,* "Kiss my ass."]
Jasmine:	Ooo, oo, I got one. Yesterday, I went to go put fish food in my fish tank. [*Note: this is a slang expression that references sexual intercourse. Students laugh.*]

Second student off camera:	That's not funny. That's nowhere near funny.
Jasmine:	Then why are they laughing?
Second student off camera:	They laughing at you they're not laughing at …
Third student off camera:	I got a big fish tank. You know you got to lay on your side.
Jay [*Stops writing the sentence*]:	Stop it. Guuuys! I do not care about the fish.

This transcript begins with Josue taking on the identity of a class comedian ("Chapa likes long, hard …") by using inappropriate language that resists "school talk" and elicits laughter from classmates. For us, non-Spanish speakers, the word *chapa* was difficult to define because it has different meanings within different cultural contexts. In these instances when we could not determine the meaning of specific words, we went back to the videotape to capture the speaker's inflection and how other students reacted to its usage. Two Spanish-speaking colleagues from Cuba and Guyana, and three of Mark's Spanish speaking students from Mexico and El Salvador could not pinpoint the slang usage of *chapa*. Two urban dictionaries defined the word differently (i.e., a male prostitute or a lock on a door). Regardless of the exact meaning, it was clear that Josue implied a negative connotation that was inappropriate within traditionally defined teacher-student discourse. Jay's choice to ignore Josue's comments can be interpreted multiple ways. Based on his status as a novice teacher, however, Jay most likely did not know how to deal with Josue's inappropriate comment. He attempted to redirect the conversation back to an academic conversation by asking students to share their journals. This open-ended question could be interpreted as his attempt to open dialogue that facilitated a power-share interaction.

Josue's response ("I got one, Mister") at first glance illustrated his attempt to situate himself as a participant of the academic conversation. Perhaps Jay's redirection worked. However, Josue's use of *Mister*, rather than Jay's name, indicated how Josue distances himself from Jay. It appeared that to Josue, Jay was just another teacher that he does not trust. In response, Jay answered, "Sure" to facilitate more responses. Josue then reads an inappropriate sentence ("Jumax, Chapa, and Playboy …") to elicit laughter, construct solidarity between classmates, and disrupt academic norms. Thus, Josue attempts to resist privileged ways of knowing and behaving in the classroom by engaging in an inappropriate interaction.

Next, Jay attempted to write the sentence on the board, illustrating his lack of knowledge behind the meaning of Josue's sentence. We recognize Jay's attempt to situate Josue as a socially recognized participant of the academic conversation by writing his comment on the board. He also situated Josue as an expert by asking him how to spell the Spanish word. By doing this, Jay attempted to build classroom politics that encouraged students to be authorities. Josue responded by verbally and nonverbally telling Jay how to spell the word. He also said "like a fish" to provide context for Jay and perhaps build on background knowledge that Jay does not have. Jay illustrated his ignorance about Jumax verbally and nonverbally by asking, "Like the juice, what?" and making gestures with his palms. Josue made it simple, by stating, "J" and Jasmine

aligned herself with Josue by saying, "I seen that on that word be on that can don't it." Her sentence could be interpreted as an attempt to help Jay understand the word. At the same time, her (an African American female) sentence aligned herself with Josue and other Spanish speaking students in the room. In a sense, Josue and Jasmine's comments created even more of a barrier between Jay and his students. They appear to be taking up discourses that say, "See how much you don't know about us or we are not convinced that you are our teacher."

Jay then wrote *Chapa* on the board, which elicited laughter from students and situated Jay as a nonauthority. Jasmine attempted to disrupt this kind of talk by interpreting the situation for Jay ("They got you cussin' and you don't even know it"). At the same time, her humorous tone indicated that she also wanted her classmates to know that she understood what they were doing. Again, she aligned herself with her classmates and joined in, further distancing herself from Jay. Thus, Jasmine used discourse that attempted to build and deconstruct accepted notions of what counts in a classroom. At this point, Jay appeared to catch on and erased *Chapa* from the board. Jasmine, however, continued to use slang ("fish food") in ways that situated herself as a socially recognized comedian and elicited laughter from her classmates. At this point, Jay caught on and attempted to stop the inappropriate and disruptive talk with demanding statements. Jay's command ("Stop it") and exclamatory tone ("Guuuys!") situated students' comments as inappropriate, alluding to privileged types of interactions in the classroom, and illustrated his desire to redirect the conversation in another direction. By doing this, Jay continued to take on a socially recognized power-control identity that contrasted with his desired teacher identity and constructed classroom politics that discounted student participation.

Jay's reflection

To explore how the video analysis affected his negotiations of power, we examined his response to the classroom interaction above. Jay wrote the following:

> I want to use discussion as much as possible in my teaching. I try to be as inclusive as possible. … One of the biggest issues I face is the language barrier. For most of my students English is their second language… . I try to make the environment as safe and uncritical as possible. I include discussing journals as part of a way to help them. Once they have their thoughts organized on paper they can more easily verbalize them to the class. … I have found some students resistant and defiant to my presence. Sometimes when I am up front speaking they will try to compete for the attention of the class. Josue is one of the most prominent students to do this… . He often tries to get everyone laughing, usually at the expense of another student … . I would like to handle off-topic conversations and critical comments towards each other better.

In this excerpt, Jay expressed his desire to facilitate more discussion in his classroom. Jay took up discourses that attempted to construct a socially recognized teacher identity that was "as inclusive as possible" and who tried "to make the environment as safe and uncritical as possible." To Jay, in this sense, leveling the field meant remaining open to student differences. At this point, he used reflective language and third order positionings ("figure out," "biggest issues I face") to examine his privileged notions of what inclusive, safe, and uncritical looks like in this context with students who have different cultural and linguistic backgrounds than his. He

uncovered the possibility that the "language barrier" could be one reason why discussion was not successful and used teacher discourses to describe how he modified for second language learners ("thoughts organized on paper"). In the second paragraph, Jay recognized that some students, particularly Josue, resisted his position as a teacher by taking on comedic positions that disrupted the order of the classroom. Jay, then, used reflective teacher talk ("handle off-topic conversations") to list areas of improvement for the future.

In the same reflection, Jay continued:

> I try to position my students and myself on an even field when it comes to writing, but where classroom management is concerned, I need to place myself above them as the authority. My students need to position me as someone who should be respected to and listened to. I feel they do not see my as a "real" teacher because I am a "student teacher." I feel that in order for me to be the teacher that I plan to be, I need to get my classroom management under control so I can accomplish all of the things I want to do.

Jay stated that he needed to get his "classroom management under control" so he could "accomplish all of the things [he] want[ed] to do." He uses reflective language about interactive positionings ("students need to position me as someone who should be respected...") to raise questions and alternative discourses about how to navigate these positions of power. He appears to be asking, "How can I take on a power-share position when students resist that position?" As a result, he stated that his students did not recognize his identity as a "real teacher." This reflection is important because Jay recognizes how students position him and he wrestles with ideas about how to change that positioning so that he can construct his preferred teaching identities.

Jay, however, had difficulty identifying the various layers of power structures and developing solutions to negotiate them in ways that favored his goals. Despite the inappropriate comments spoken in his classroom, Jay's only mention of this kind of interaction in his reflection was one sentence saying, "I do not speak Spanish so I cannot understand them." His reflection focused on how he should modify his actions to manage his classroom better rather than asking questions about why students resisted. Perhaps students resisted because Jay implemented a lesson that did not connect to their lives. This could be a result of the cultural and linguistic differences that exist between students and teacher. Jay, and most of the other students in his education class, did not discuss how his identity and culture (e.g., language and race) shaped interactive positionings and constructed identities in the classroom, even though he was asked to do so. His hesitation to recognize these broader issues is typical of novice teachers and can relate to what Larson and Irvine (1999) called reciprocal distancing in which teachers do not take up students' linguistic and cultural knowledge as resources in literacy learning. Although it was Jay's intent to be inclusive, he did not know how to gain respect from students when he was clearly not a member of their world. We recognize that as a novice teacher, Jay is most likely focused on reaching the goal of his lesson and understandably has a difficult time engaging in a critical analysis of how his culture and language shaped negotiations of power. For us, this signals an area in which Jay needed more support. With that support, such reflections could lead to a revision of what counts in a classroom, including the kinds of knowledge that are privileged.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Jay's blog referenced a phrase from Walt Whitman's *Song of Myself*, "Behold I do not give lectures or a little charity, When I give I give myself," to illustrate his desire to be true to himself in the classroom. This desire was what he struggled with the most. For Jay, his ability to take on his preferred teacher identity depended on how he negotiated positions of power with students. This study illustrated how the video analysis assignment opened opportunities for Jay to reflect on the relationship between those positions of power and identity enactment during moment-to-moment classroom interactions. By combining Sherin and van Es's (2009) notion of taking notice through video analysis and Rex and Schiller's (2009) challenge to reflect about power and identity through discourse analysis of classroom interactions, this study makes a significant impact on research about how teacher education programs can use video analysis to help preservice teachers analyze issues of power, positioning, and identity.

Specifically, the analysis challenged Jay to study how he positioned himself as a teacher, how students positioned him, and how he positioned students during classroom interactions. In addition, the close analysis of transcripts expected that Jay compare those enactments to his teacher vision and to critically think about how positions of power affected those enactments, including how he practiced critical pedagogy. As stated in the findings, Jay examined the impact of his interactions at a local level. For example, Jay justified how his talk and behavior aligned with his preferred teaching identity in the first section in findings. He discussed specific examples related to how he leveled the field ("I let them critique my poems") and explained his response to a student's comment ("tore it apart"). Clearly, Jay examined how he enacted his preferred teacher identity by referencing specific moments within the transcripts and videos. Having a transcript to go back to, as suggested by Rex and Schiller (2009), provided Jay with specific evidence rather than abstract talk about putting theory (critical pedagogy) into practice (Mosley, 2010).

In addition, Jay also reflected about his difficulty negotiating positions of power impacted his ability to construct preferred teacher identities. Specifically, Jay highlighted how students, especially Josue, resisted his "presence" or positions of authority by "derailing" the academic conversation to off-topic laughter. At the end of his reflection, he stated that he wanted to handle those kinds of episodes better and realized that if he could do that, he might be able to situate himself and students in a student-centered classroom. This kind of reflective thinking is different than typical video analysis projects (Sherin & van Es, 2009) because it challenged Jay to examine a specific interaction and write about how his language and behavior reflected his desired identities. From this, Jay learned that teaching is about more than content or a set of strategies. Pedagogy is also about the ability to negotiate positions of power in ways that provide compromise for students and teacher within a classroom. If a teacher struggles to do that, they will have difficulty sharing content and strategies with students.

At the same time, it is evident that Jay needed more support from his teacher education program to help him understand the power structures that existed and how to develop solutions. For Jay, this relates to the dilemma of enacting critical pedagogy practices during his student teaching. We could offer support by providing successful case studies about how teachers negotiate positions of power in ways that allow them to enact their preferred teacher identities. Small-group conversations about the video analysis assignments might also foster richer discussions

compared to whole group conversations during our seminar course. More research about how to extend and support this kind of video analysis would benefit teacher educators.

Throughout this project, we asked ourselves how much analysis could we expect from student teachers? Obviously Jay, an inexperienced teacher, was trying to figure out how to survive and become a better teacher. Is it "too much" to ask him to analyze how his identities shape learning and instruction? If so, is there a place for this kind of identity work in a teacher education program? At the beginning of this piece, we quoted one of Jay's students, whose comment helped us answer this question. In other words, if Jay, and other preservice teachers like him, wish to "level the field" then we must help them to develop the necessary tools so that if "they got [him] cussin' … [he would come to] know it." Thus, we believe that despite the difficulty, this kind of video and discourse analysis is significant in teacher education because it opens dialogue about how language is used by teacher and students as a negotiating tool for power-share identities to enhance learning (Boling, 2007; Van Es & Sherin, 2004).

REFERENCES

Agee, J. 2004. Negotiating a teacher identity: An African American teacher's struggle to teach in test driven contexts. *Teachers College Record*, 106(4): 747–774.

Alexander, R. 2008. *Essays on pedagogy*, London, UK: Routledge.

Alsup, J. 2006. *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Assaf, L. 2005. Exploring identities in a reading specialization program. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 37(2): 201–236.

Boling, E. C. 2007. Linking technology, learning, and stories: Implications from research on hypermedia video-cases. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23: 189–200.

Britzman, D. P. 1994. "Is there a problem with knowing thyself? Toward a poststructuralist view of teacher identity". In *Teachers thinking, teachers knowing: Reflections on literacy and language education*, Edited by: Shanahan, T. 53–75. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Brooke, R. 1987. Underlife and writing instruction. *College Composition and Communication*, 38: 141–152.

Buzzelli, C. and Johnston, B. 2001. Authority, power, and morality in classroom discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17: 873–884.

Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. 2009. *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation*, New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. 2007. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*, 3rd, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cummins, J. 2009. Pedagogies of choice: Challenging coercive relations of power in classrooms and communities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(3): 261–271.

Davies, B. and Harré, R. 1990. "Positionings: The discursive production of selves". In *A body of writing*, Edited by: Davies, B. 87–106. New York, NY: AltaMira Press.

Fairbanks, C. M., Duffy, G. G., Faircloth, B., He, Y., Levin, B., Rohr, J. and Stein, C. 2010. Beyond knowledge: Exploring why some teachers are more thoughtfully adaptive than others. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61: 161–171.

Foucault, M. 1979. *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*, New York, NY: Vintage.

Freire, P. 2000. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, 30th, New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Gee, J. P. 2011. *Tools for discourse analysis*, London, UK: Routledge.

Giroux, H. 2000. *Stealing innocence: Corporate culture's war on children*, New York, NY: Palgrave.

Gutierrez, K., Rymes, B. and Larson, J. 1995. Script, counterscript and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. The Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3): 445–471.

Handsfield, L. J., Crumpler, T. P. and Dean, T. R. 2010. Tactical negotiations and creative adaptations: The discursive production of literacy curriculum and teacher identities across space-times. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 45(4): 405–431.

Holland, D., Skinner, D., Lachicotte, W. and Cain, C. 1998. *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jackson, A. Y. 2001. Multiple Annies: Feminist poststructural theory and the making of a teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(5): 386–397.

Juzwik, M. 2006. Performing curriculum: Building ethos through narratives in pedagogical discourse. *Teachers College Record*, 108(4): 489–528.

Juzwik, M. M. and Ives, D. 2010. Small stories as resources for performing teacher identity. *Narrative Inquiry*, 20(1): 37–61.

Kellner, D. 2000. "Multiple literacies and critical pedagogies". In *Revolutionary pedagogies – Cultural politics, instituting education, and the discourse of theory*, Edited by: Trifonas, P. P. 362–408. New York, NY: Routledge.

Larson, J. and Irvine, P. 1999. "We call him Dr. King": Reciprocal distancing in urban classrooms. *Language Arts*, 65(5): 393–400.

Linehan, C. and McCarthy, J. 2000. Positioning in practice: Understanding participation in the social world. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 30: 435–453.

Mosley, M. 2010. Becoming a literacy teacher: Approximations in critical literacy teaching. *Teaching Education*, 21(4): 403–426.

Puvirajah, A., Verma, G. and Webb, H. 2012. Examining the mediation of power in a collaborative community: Engaging in informal science as authentic practice. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 7: 375–408.

Rex, L. and Schiller, L. 2009. *Using discourse analysis to improve classroom interaction*, New York, NY: Routledge.

Ritchie, S., Rigano, D. and Lowry, J. 2000. "Shifting power relations in the "getting of wisdom.". In *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16* 165–177.

Rogers, T., Marshall, E. and Tyson, C. A. 2006. Dialogic narratives of literacy, teaching, and schooling: Preparing literacy teachers for diverse settings. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(2): 202–224. doi:10.1598/RRQ.41.2.3.

Sfard, A. and Prusak, A. 2005. Telling identities: In search of an analytic tool for investigating learning as a culturally shaped activity. *Educational Researcher*, 34(4): 14–22.

Sherin, M. and van Es, E. 2009. Effects of video club participation on teacher's professional vision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(1): 20–37.

Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L.S., Moore, C., Jackson, A. Y. and Fry, P. G. 2004. Tensions in learning to teach: Accommodation and the development of a teaching identity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(1): 8–24.

Van Es, E. and Sherin, M. G. 2002. Learning to notice: Scaffolding new teachers interpretations of classroom interactions. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 10(4): 571–596.

Vetter, A. 2010. Positioning students as readers and writers: An examination of teacher's improvised responses in a high school English classroom. *English Education*, 43(1): 33–64.

Watson, C. 2006. Narratives of practice and the construction of identity in teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 12(5): 509–526.