LIVING IN A FISHBOWL: TEACHERS' EMOTIONS DURING A COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM INITIATIVE

by

ALEXANDRA N. DARBY

(Under the Direction of Kathleen deMarrais)

ABSTRACT

This ethnographic research study explores teachers' specific emotions during a comprehensive school reform initiative. Existing literature on teachers' work, teachers' specific emotions, and teachers' emotions under education reform provides a foundation for understanding teachers' emotions in circumstances of change. However, little research links these bodies of literature to show the relationship between the emotional nature of teachers' work, the support or challenge presented to teachers through educational reforms, and the specific emotions that result from such reforms.

This study focuses on a public school that was failing to meet the standards mandated by No Child Left Behind legislation. The teachers and administrators at the school collaborated with the local university, the school district, and the community in order to improve student achievement. Through observation, interviews, and archival material, this study seeks to examine teachers' specific emotions during critical incidents that occurred during the period of reform and to explore teachers' specific emotional responses to these incidents.

The findings illustrate that teachers became angry when their power decreased after the school district broke its promise to provide financial and administrative support. The teachers also experienced fear and intimidation when their professional selves were

challenged. However, with the support of a literacy coach and university faculty they reconstructed their perceptions of their professional selves, leading to improvements in student achievement and their own instructional practices. These positive changes led to emotions of pride and excitement. The study provides recommendations for state and local school administrators and highlights implications for future research.

INDEX WORDS: teachers' emotions, educational reform

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The epistemological and philosophical stance for this study has been informed by Preissle and Grant's (2004) reading of constructionism, which integrates Crotty's framework (Crotty, 1998). Crotty (1998) explained that in constructionism, "meanings are constructed by human beings as they engage with the world they are interpreting" (p. 43). As researchers and participants in research studies, we construct knowledge in our interactions with the culture. The individual reality "is seen as a construction via ongoing interaction between the self and the other (society, culture) in a physical and material world" (Preissle and Grant, 2004, p. 174).

Operating from this philosophy, symbolic interaction serves as the theoretical framework guiding this study. The theoretical framework of symbolic interaction arose out of a constructionist epistemology. Symbolic interaction emphasizes the meaning people attach to their social interactions and world around them (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984).

Symbolic interaction is divided into two schools of thought: the Iowa School and the Chicago School (Blumer, 1972, 1998; Kuhn, 1972). The Iowa School, under Kuhn's guidance, possesses a positivist orientation with the goal of developing standard measures to quantify the meaning people ascribe to their world (Kuhn, 1972).

In contrast, members of the Chicago School, guided by Blumer, believe that people are continually evolving and developing their selves, so they inquire into an evolving self that is never fully developed. This perspective resides on the premise that

the meaning people ascribe to the world cannot be standardized and that the self is continually evolving as it interacts with the world, Blumer's Chicago School definition of symbolic interaction.

In interactions, participants use symbols such as language to understand their environment. Blumer's theory of symbolic interaction rests on three guiding principles

1) Human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them;
2) The meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interactions that one has with one's fellows; and
3) These meanings are handled in and modified through an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with the things he or she encounters (Blumer, 1998, p. 2).

In all social interactions, we use objects to understand our world. Blumer explained that "an object is anything that can be indicated, anything that is pointed to or referred to" (p. 10). This category may include physical objects, social objects, and abstract objects. Although objects themselves possess no intrinsic meaning, people place meaning on these different types of objects.

In interpreting an object, human beings assign meaning to it based on previous knowledge of action taken in relation to the object. Blumer summarized action in the following way

> In order to act the individual has to identify what [he or she] wants, establish an objective or goal, map out a prospective line of behavior, and interpret the actions of others, size up his situation, check [himself or herself] at this or that point,

> figure out what to do at other points, and frequently spur [himself or herself] on in the face of dragging dispositions or discouraging settings. (pp. 536-537)

In clarifying these points, Blumer (1969) emphasized that the social construction of meaning is based on an individual's interactions with the environment and with symbols. In employing Blumer's theory of symbolic interaction, I aim to understand the meaning individual participants place on the objects that facilitate their interpretations and choice of action. Each participant ascribes meaning to her or his experiences based on her or his interactions and environment; this principle is a foundation of this study.

Methodology

Symbolic interactions guided this ethnographic study of an elementary school under reform. Wolcott (1999) defined ethnography as follows: "Ethnography means, literally, a picture of the 'way of life' of some identifiable group of people" (p. 188). Embedded in ethnography is the study of culture and figured worlds (Holland, 1998; Levinson, 2000; Preissle & Grant, 2004; Wolcott, 1999). I employ Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner and Cain (1998) discussion of figured worlds as

> Figured worlds, the politics of social positioning, and spaces of authoring are our attempts to conceptualize collective and personal phenomena in ways that match the importance of culture in contextualizing human behavior with the situating power of social positions (p. 287).

In this ethnographic study, I use critical incident interviews, participant observations, and archival data to examine the culture of the school in relation to teachers' emotions. More specifically, I did what Preissle and Grant (2004) recommended: I "enter[ed] the social world of study, the field, to observe human

interaction in that context" (p. 163). Over a three-year period, I committed myself to the school community and participated in school or community activities at their request (Weisner, 1996). The following sections describe the school and the study participants, the data collection and analysis methods, the process of ensuring quality, and the ethical considerations raised by this study.

School and Participant Selection

The present study, which used an ethnographic approach to explore teachers' emotions during a reform initiative, focuses on an elementary school, McLeod Community Learning Center (McLeod CLC), selected to be a part of a university, school district, and community partnership. The McLeod CLC Partnership for Community Learning Centers decided to use components of the Comer, Success for All, and Community for Learning models of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR).

The Comer School Development Program provided Urban Community School District (UCSD) collaborators with the knowledge required to meet the needs of the whole child through a positive school climate. Success for All provided an emphasis on literacy support. The Community for Learning reform model suggested integrating health care and social services and providing instruction specific to the needs of the school. UCSD partners identified literacy and mathematics skills as areas of need for their students, and health care and social services as areas of need for students' families. The school was selected for the initiative based on the high number of its students living in poverty and their low achievement scores, in conjunction with its geographical location within the community.

I examined all of the teachers at the school on four categories[2]: teacher's ethnic background, committee involvement, years of teaching experience at UCSD, and education level. Teachers completed a demographic profile sheet requesting information across the four categories (Appendix A). Of the 36 teachers at the school, 19 completed the demographic information form. Table 1 illustrates the teachers' responses to these categories.

Since the school has only 36 teachers, they are expected to participate on a number of committees. None of the teachers participated on one committee, five participants were involved in two committees, and fourteen of the participants were involved in three or more committees. The participants' teaching experiences included six teachers who had taught for 1 to 5 years, three who had taught for 6 to 10 years, and ten who had taught for 15 or more years. The teachers' education levels ranged from four-year certification to doctoral degree. Specifically, 11 of the teachers held four-year certification, five held masters degrees, two teachers had educational specialist degrees and one person held a doctoral degree.

---

[2] Adapted from Willard Brandt's dissertation, University of Georgia, 2004.

Participant Number	Ethnicity	Participation on ___ Major Committees[3]	Years of Teaching Experience at UCSD	Education Level
1.	European American	3 or more	1-5	Four-year certification
2.	European American	2	1-5	Four-year certificate
3.	European American	3 or more	1-5	Four-year certification
4.	African American	2	1-5	Masters degree
5.	European American	2	1-5	Master's degree
6.	European American	2	1-5	Doctoral degree
7.	European American	3 or more	6-10	Four- year certification
8.	European American	3 or more	6-10	Four-year certification
9.	Asian American	3 or more	6-10	Masters Degree
10.	European American	2	Over 15	Four-year certification
11.	European American	3 or more	Over 15	Four-year certification
12.	European American	3 or more	Over 15	Four-year certification
13.	European American	3 or more	Over 15	Four-year certification
14.	African American	3 or more	Over 15	Four-year certification
15.	European American	3 or more	Over 15	Four-year certification
16.	European American	3 or more	Over 15	Masters degree
17.	European American	3 or more	Over 15	Masters degree
18.	European American	3 or more	Over 15	Specialist degree
19.	European American	3 or more	Over 15	Specialist degree

[3] All participants were involved in at least one major committee.

Data Collection Methods

The primary sources of data used in this study are critical incident interviews, participant observations, and archival data. Table 2 provides a summary of the number of interviews, participant observations, and archival materials used. The data collection methods used in this study facilitated my understanding of the culture of the school and the specific emotions teachers experienced during this CSR reform.

Data Collection Method	Number
Critical incident interviews	19
Participant observations	34
Archival materials	19

Table 2. Inventory of data collection

Critical Incident Technique (CIT)

Although the critical incident research technique originated in the positivist framework, it has been adapted to other fields and research questions (Fivars, 1980; Flanagan, 1954; Kain, 2004). Kain (2004) stated that "The premise of critical incident research . . . is that in seeking the unique experiences of meanings of individuals, we can illuminate patterns that may apply to other persons and contexts" (p. 82). Originating in army aviation, the critical incident technique has been applied to many other fields including education, psychology, and nursing. In 1954, Flanagan published one of the first papers explaining the methodology involved in the technique. As this approach grew in popularity, Fivars (1980) compiled a bibliography of the critical incident technique, citing more than 700 studies.

Flanagan (1954) divided the critical incident technique into different steps. The participant begins the description of the activity by identifying the goal of the activity. Then the participant explains the incident and how his/her response relates to his/her goal of the activity. This final reflection on his/her response in relation to the goal determines the critical nature of the event

In summarizing critical incidents, Kain (2004) explained, “the critical incident interview invites the respondents to tell a story and explain why it is significant for a given context” (p. 74). For example, Kain asked his participants to “think of a time when you and your team members were especially effective in working together to create an integrated or interdisciplinary unit or activity for your students, and then tell me about it” (2004, p. 83). I examined this approach in the development of my interview guide because it seemed like an appropriate technique to assist teachers in identifying the events that were emotional for them.

Researchers disagree over how many incidents need to be collected. Flanagan (1954) recommends 100 while Kain (2004) recommends collection until no new behaviors are described. The number of interviews used in this study represented the various views of the teachers at McLeod CLC. The critical incident technique allowed me to explore the emotional meaning teachers gave to the events they labeled critical.

Before each interview, teachers received a packet of information (Appendix B) defining what a critical incident is, which allowed them to think of the critical incidents ahead of time. During the audio-taped, semi-structured interviews, I referred to the interview guide and asked probes (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2002). Critical incident interviews involve “asking a number of respondents to identify events or experiences that were

critical for some purpose" (Kain, 2004, p. 71). I asked participants the following interview questions

1. Think of one critical incident during the partnership that stands out for you. In as much detail as possible, describe the context of the situation and what happened.

   Areas to probe:
   What led up to the situation?

   How did you handle the situation?

   What was the outcome?

   What facilitated or prevented you from handling the situation the way you would have liked to?

   When you reflect back on the incident, what would you have done differently?

   What made this a "critical incident" for you?

2. You described an incident that has been positive (or not so positive). Can you think of a time when an incident went a different way? Tell me about it.

3. Can you think of a time during the partnership that was particularly emotional for you and tell me about it?

   Areas to probe:
   How would you describe your emotions at that time?

   What did you learn from this critical incident?

Each interview lasted approximately 75 minutes; 19 critical incident interviews were conducted.

Participant Observations

Over 34 participant observations were conducted from August 2002 to December 2004. Observations were carried out at faculty meetings, grade-level meetings, committee meetings, and special events. Each observation lasted 60 to 90 minutes, with

the exception of six occasions when the observations averaged five hours (shared governance training, professional development workshops, and three all-day conversations). The day-long conversations, conducted by the university representative, the district representative, and the school principal, provided substantial information about teachers' perceptions of the partnership. I used Spradley's (1980) framework to examine issues of space, object, activity, event, time, actor, goal, and feeling.

Each day I carried my laptop into the field. After taking field notes on the computer, I expanded them at home. While my on-site field notes described the situation, my expanded field notes provided more detail for the outside reader. Periodically, I created in-process memos. In-process memos are form of analytic writing from field notes (Emerson *et al.*, 1995) which contained my hunches for categories and themes. The participant observations served as a tool for understanding the reforms at McLeod CLC from fall 2002 through fall 2004.

Archival Materials

The third type of data used in this study involved the collection of archival materials, documents, and records (LeCompte *et al.*, 1993; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The archival material collected include the partnership vision statement, e-mail correspondence from teachers, publicity statements about McLeod CLC and the partnership, and documents from meetings (deMarrais *et al.*, 2003). The archival materials facilitated my understanding of the various initiatives and decisions made in the school. The archival material, in conjunction with the participant observations, were used to construct the description of McLeod CLC.

Data Analysis

After I completed the transcription of the audio-taped interviews, I imported the transcriptions and observations into the NVIVO data analysis software. Once they were merged into NVIVO, I analyzed them using inductive analysis. Inductive analysis "involves scanning the data for categories of phenomena and for relationships among such categories, developing working typologies and hypotheses on an examination of initial cases and then modifying and refining them on the basis of subsequent cases" (LeCompte et al., 1993, p. 254). The following section provides a detailed description of the inductive analysis approach I used in the critical incident interviews.

In the initial review of the data, I went through each of the critical incident interviews, reducing them to codes related to critical incidents. Such data reduction involves "a form of analysis that sharpens, sorts, focuses, discards, and organizes data in such a way that final conclusions can be drawn and verified" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 11). The question I asked myself in this read for data reduction was, "What are the critical incidents that elicited emotions?" The response to this question served as the code for the critical incident.

Next, I created a summary sheet (Miles & Huberman, 1994) with each of these critical incidents. The summary sheet contained the participant's name, the critical incident, a summary of the critical incident, and two analysis questions. In reading the incident, I asked myself, "Why is this incident critical?" Then I asked, "What are the emotions elicited in this incident?" Finally, I categorized the summary sheets according to issues. I created an issue data summary chart (Miles & Huberman, 1994), as illustrated in Table 3. The completed table can be seen in Appendix C. Critical incidents serve as

the headings for each column. Names of all participants who cited a specific incident are placed in the column for the common critical incident. The specific emotions identified by participants for the critical incident are placed in the next column. Each issue (category) deemed critical has its own table.

Common Critical Incident	Specific Emotions
Participant name	Type of specific emotions
Participant name	Type of specific emotions

Table 3: Common critical incidents to multiple participants data summary chart

The purpose of the chart was to provide a visual representation of the number of participants discussing each critical incident and the specific emotions they identified, in order to see patterns and to generate categories and then themes. After completing the chart, I used Miles and Huberman's (1994) approach of reflecting on "What is going on here?" In addition, I looked down the columns and across the rows to find patterns (Miles & Huberman, 1994). I then looked across the summary sheet and recorded my hunches in a memo.

When I noticed patterns in power and control, I created the fourth table, labeled the "Increase or decrease in power and control chart." The complete chart can been seen in Appendix D. The column headings were event, participant, increase or decrease in power, increase or decrease in control, and source of emotions.

Table 4. Increase or decrease of power and control chart

Event	Participant	Increase or decrease in power	Increase or decrease in control	Source of emotions

Once again, I looked across and down the chart to see patterns. I recorded my hunches in another memo. From these memos I was able to examine emerging categories and themes. Finally, I constructed three figures representing the larger theme and the two sub-themes. In the next section, I discuss the safeguards I put in place to ensure the quality and trustworthiness of this study.

Ensuring Quality

When my observations and analysis were concluded, I conducted informal conversations and member checks with the teachers to fill in the gaps and elicit further feedback (Warren, 2002). Besides conducting informal member checks with the teachers at McLeod CLC, I also shared the findings of the study with all faculty members at their faculty meeting on March 2, 2005. This meeting allowed not only the participants but also those teachers who did not participate to provide me with feedback.

For a study to be trustworthy, it must be credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Guba and Lincoln (1985) argued that credibility "is to some extent a function of the amount of time and effort that a naturalistic inquirer invests in repeated and continuous observation" (p. 109). The techniques I used in my study to ensure credibility were prolonged engagement, persistent observation, peer

debriefing, member checks, and triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Because I attended school meetings and school events and assisted in classrooms over a three-year period, I had prolonged engagement and persistent observation. My data collection methods of critical incident interviews, participant observations, and archival material facilitated triangulation through multiple perspectives. The peer debriefings gave me an opportunity to test my interpretations and findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Finally, the credibility of my study was enhanced by member checks that took place throughout the data collection, analysis, and dissemination of the findings.

Transferability, dependability, and confirmability were upheld in my study through techniques recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985). The transferability of my study will be evident in the thick descriptions which illustrate the context of the events. As recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985), dependability should be reached through overlap methods and an audit trail. I did rely on an audit trail and overlapping methods of participant observations, interviews, and documents so that I did not rely on information from a single technique. By employing multiple data collection techniques, I was able to make the results dependable. All of these techniques were used to produce a quality and trustworthy research study.

Ethical Considerations Involving Researcher Subjectivities

Over the past two and half years, I have read about and reflected on the ethical issues involving my participants and the role of my subjectivity in my ethical considerations. The university partnership project managers, in conjunction with the pilot school ethnographers (Chris Brandt and myself), applied for and received permission to undertake the study from the University of Georgia's Institutional Review

Board at the beginning of the evaluation project. In this data collection process, I continually thought about the purpose, procedures, risks, benefits, confidentiality procedures, and participants' right to withdraw from the study at any time (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2002; Deyhl & Hess, 1992; Deyhl *et al.*, 1992; Patton, 2002; Punch, 1998). In my discussion of ethical considerations, I draw on my experiences during this study set within the context of the larger evaluation project.

In August 2002, at the outset of the study, I started the ongoing process of sharing the purpose, procedures, risks, benefits, confidentiality procedures, and participant rights with teachers, administrators, and staff at McLeod CLC. In these discussions I stated that, to ensure confidentiality, I would remove all identifying characteristics on tapes, transcripts, and other forms of data and label the data with pseudonyms. The materials would be stored in a locked cabinet for the duration of the project. I told participants that the law mandates disclosure of any information received about the participants' desire to hurt themselves or others (Patton, 2002). When I discussed the risks and benefits with participants, I explained that my major professor and I were the only people who would have access to the transcripts and expanded field notes (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2002; Deyhl & Hess, 1992; Deyhl *et al.*, 1992; Patton, 2002; Punch, 1998).

The teachers and I remained concerned about who had access to the materials. Teachers explained that, prior to my work at the school, their supervisor took punitive action against them when they expressed their opinions. I have always been extremely cautious about confidentiality, but knowing some of the teachers' concerns helped me understand their perspectives. After I assured them of the measures I was taking to ensure confidentiality, I explained that their participation provided the partnership with

an honest, formative feedback on areas that were working and areas that needed improvement (Murphy & Dingwall, 2003). I emphasized that any participant could withdraw from the study at any time. By explaining the participants' rights, I continued to address the four ethical principles of beneficence, non-malfeasance, respect, and justice (Murphy & Dingwall, 2003). After the first few months of data collection at the school, I realized that the four ethical principles were not as straightforward as I had thought as is described in the following paragraphs. The ethical implications for my long-term fieldwork related to issues of boundary spanning, confidentiality, building and maintaining rapport, and saying goodbye.

Boundary Spanning

When a new administrator started at the school, many teachers shared their frustration with this new person. Conversely, the new administrator informed me of some of her concerns. Although I did not always agree with the teachers or the administrator, I had to learn how to "span boundaries" (Deyhl & Hess, 1992; Deyhl et al., 1992) and not take sides. I learned to listen to each teacher and administrator and not share my opinions or try to fix the problems. Many days, I came home and wrote in my journal about my need to fix the communication problems, but I reminded myself that this was not my role. In spanning boundaries, I remained aligned with all the various perspectives throughout the school.

Confidentiality

Toward the end of the semester, the leadership team at the school decided to form a group of teachers that included those who were pleased and those who were not pleased

with the administrator. An official from the district office served as the facilitator, and the teachers shared their views with the administrator. As at other meetings, I sat there with my computer and typed away. The teachers and the administrator were talking openly with tears in their eyes. After the meeting, some teachers expressed to me that they felt a little better, but the administrator told me that she felt attacked and no longer wanted to work at the school. I left the school that day thinking, “Why are people so critical of each other?” and “How did I get myself into this mess?” After journaling my emotions, I felt better and reminded myself that I was not at the school to “fix” its problems.

The day after the meeting, I was approached by teachers and university collaborators asking for a copy of the notes I had recorded. I told them that I would be happy to show them what they had said, but I would need to get the administrator’s and teachers’ permission to share what the others had said. When I checked with the administrator, she said that she did not want the notes to be shared. I respected this wish and told the participants once again that I could show them their own words, but that not everyone else had provided consent, preventing me from being able to share the field notes. The teachers understood my perspective that I was not there to become involved in school battles.

From that point on, when the teachers, administrators, or university officials asked for my notes, I usually typed up meeting minutes or summaries without names, direct quotes, or other identifying features. I believed this was one way that I could reciprocate for all the help they had given me (Deyhl & Hess, 1992; Deyhl et al., 1992). While this was challenging, the teachers, administrators, and university collaborators learned to trust

me and began to understand that my notes were field notes, not meeting minutes. The teachers and school administrators realized that I was not able to give my field notes to anyone.

Building and Maintaining Rapport

The example above illustrates one of the challenges I experienced in building and maintaining rapport with the participants in the study. From the beginning of the study to the present, I have pondered on how friendly to become with the participants. I have come to enjoy my interactions with the teachers, administrators, and university collaborators. During the first year I did not participate in out-of-school functions. I told all the teachers that if they invited me to events and I was available, then I would attend. However, in the first year I kept turning down invitations and felt as though I was not being genuine. I struggled with what to do, but decided that if I was open to going out to lunch and such with all the teachers, then that was acceptable. I found that this approach has helped me feel comfortable with my position while respecting the teachers, administrators, and university representatives.

In my third year of fieldwork at the McLeod CLC, I knew that many ethical and moral issues would surface. Unlike an interview study where one shares the code of ethics at the beginning, I continually shared and reminded new and old teachers at the school of their rights, just as I had during the first few days of the project. Although many teachers agreed to participate in my study, I realized that sometimes my role was confusing to participants. I continued to remind them of the purpose of the study and stated that I would be looking at emotions. In addition, I reminded them about issues of informed consent, confidentiality, risk, benefits, and procedures of the study. To

maintain the teachers' trust, I conducted many member checks to ensure the accuracy of the information, while also making sure that the participants were comfortable with the approach I used to ensure confidentiality.

Saying Goodbye

At the conclusion of my data collection, I reminded myself of the ethics of saying goodbye to my research participants. I wanted to make sure that I was not a transitory element in their world, present for just long enough to complete my research. The research brought me to the teachers, but I will try to remain a part of their lives. For example, in spring 2004 I was no longer collecting data at McLeod CLC, but I asked the teachers if my undergraduate students and I could offer them any help. Some of the students enrolled in my Introduction to Educational Psychology class tutored McLeod CLC students once or twice a week. Other students helped teachers in their classrooms. I continued to attend school events and thank the teachers, as I had throughout the study.

On March 2, 2005 I presented the findings of this study to the faculty and administrators at McLeod CLC. At the end of the presentation I shared with the faculty the impact they had on my life. With tears in my eyes, I said:

> I just wanted to thank you all for welcoming me into your community. You didn't have to do that and I am eternally grateful. You all have had to deal with a lot and I know it hasn't been easy. I am impressed and thankful for all you have done for me and for the children. I have to tell you all that when I recently traveled to different parts of the country and heard what school districts are doing I kept finding myself saying, "You need to see that amazing work at McLeod CLC." My views of education have changed. You all have taught me that education at

> all levels involves a collaboration between the school district, the university, and the community. You all need to be proud of everything you have done. The improvements we have seen are a result of your hard work. So thank you for the difference you have made in my life and in the lives of the children.

While I knew that I would keep in touch with the faculty and administration at McLeod CLC, I still felt very sad that I wouldn't be able to just stop by the school and see everyone. Saying goodbye turned out to be much more difficult then I had imagined it would be. I continue to remind myself that saying goodbye involved finishing the research, not ending my relationship with the faculty.

In thinking about the reasons for continuing my relationship with the teachers, I remembered Carolyn's quote. One reason I felt so close to these teachers is that I have been in the fishbowl with them. I am not the same species of fish, but I recognize the pleasure and difficulties in being a part of their community. I believe that the faculty at McLeod CLC are and will continue to be "some really good fish to look at."