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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.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There’s gonna be so many people coming in and out, just like the superintendent and board members stopping by and um I think all year we are going to feel like we are living in a fishbowl . . . But hopefully we will be some really good fish to look at.

- Carolyn¹, a veteran teacher

Carolyn, like many teachers today, functions under the gaze of school districts and state and federal accountability programs. Her quote illustrates the pressure and scrutiny teachers, students, and administrators face daily. Carolyn and other teachers at her high-poverty elementary school are participating in a reform initiative to improve low student achievement. This study examines the specific emotions of teachers like Carolyn who find themselves “living in a fishbowl” under the watch of those responsible for implementing state and federal accountability measures. In this chapter, I describe the role of teachers’ emotions in educational reform, as well as the comprehensive school reform (CSR) initiatives employed by schools like Carolyn’s. I conclude by discussing the purpose of this study and the research questions that guide this work.

Teachers’ Emotions in Educational Reform

Studies focusing on teachers’ emotions can be found in the literature on teachers’ work (Connell, 1985; Godar, 1990; Goodson, 1992; Lortie, 1977; Nias, 1989, 1996; Tobin & Tippins, 1996; Zembylas, 1998, 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Zembylas & Barker,

¹ All names are pseudonyms.
2002), teachers’ specific emotions (Acker, 1995; Graham, 1984; Jackson-Minot, 2002; King, 1998; Noddings, 1984, 1992, 1996; Ria et al., 2003; Roulston et al., 2003; Sutton & Conway, 2002; Tickle, 1991; Vogt, 2002; Webb-Dempsey et al., 1996; Wilson et al., 2003), and teachers’ emotions in educational reform (Adams, 2002; Blackmore, 1999; Golby, 1996; Hargreaves, 1998a, 1998b, 2000, 2001, 2004; Hargreaves & Development, 1997; Hargreaves et al., 2001; Jeffrey & Woods, 1996; Lasky, 2000; Woods & Jeffrey, 1998). Researchers examining teachers’ work have often sought to identify predictors of teachers’ job satisfaction and retention. The research on teachers’ work provides support for the claim that emotions play a significant role in schools, and may have a special bearing on issues of job satisfaction. The research on teachers’ specific emotions has examined the importance of caring in the classroom, identified situations that elicit anxiety in beginning teachers, and investigated the approaches teachers use in managing their anger. Studies investigating teachers’ emotions in the context of UK and Canadian reform initiatives highlight some of the particular issues provoking emotional response. This study in a U.S. context extends the research on teachers’ emotions in educational reform in other countries, with particular attention to the teachers’ specific emotions as they work under the governmental gaze of No Child Left Behind legislation.

al., 2003; Tickle, 1991); and anger (Graham, 1984; Roulston et al., 2003; Sutton & Conway, 2002; Wilson et al., 2003). In these studies the researchers report the situations that elicit the specific emotion and the approaches teachers use to manage these emotions.


The two studies on anxiety (Ria et al., 2003; Tickle, 1991) investigated beginning teachers’ experience of anxiety in relation to their work. Ria et al found that when beginning teachers needed to change their lesson plans to meet the needs of their students, they experienced an increase in anxiety. With time and experience, teachers learned to be flexible with their classroom instruction, and this decreased the anxiety they felt when they started teaching.

In studies of anger, researchers (Graham, 1984; Roulston et al., 2003; Sutton & Conway, 2002; Wilson et al., 2003) found that teachers’ anger occurred in their
interaction with students, parents and administrators over issues of power in their classrooms and schools. In both of these studies, Sutton and Conway (2002) and Roulston, Darby & Owens (2003) explored factors contributing to teachers’ anger and the way teachers managed their anger. Sutton and Conway (2002) found that teachers tend to become angry more often during the times of the day and week when the teachers needed a break. The teachers in Roulston et al.’s (2003) study dealt with their anger by asking for help, changing the setting or situation, and changing their behavior and responses to the situation that angered them (Roulston et al., 2003). This group of studies offers a depth of understanding of the circumstances in which teachers tend to become angry and identifies the means through which they manage this anger, providing further evidence of the emotional nature of teachers’ work.

ethnography to explore the emotions of female public school administrators during reform initiatives. Similarly, Jeffrey and Woods (1996) used ethnographic methods to understand teachers’ emotions during governmental oversight of classroom practices. Jeffrey and Woods (1996) found that teachers subject to such scrutiny experienced a sense of professional inadequacy; reduction of positive emotions; and loss of self, pedagogical values, and harmony. Hargreaves (1998a, 1998b) explored the freedom teachers desired in their classroom during the implementation of Canadian reform initiatives. Thus, the literature on teachers’ emotions in the UK and Canada provides a foundation for a broader understanding of the issues in reform that elicit emotions.

This study aims to expand on the literature on teachers’ emotions through the examination of specific emotions and issues involved in an educational reform initiative set within the legislation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). In an effort to explain the governing nature of schools like Carolyn’s, in the next section I outline accountability measures in NCLB and provide a sample of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) models utilized in the United States.

Reforming Poorly Performing Schools through Federal Accountability

The U.S. educational system continues to be plagued by poor academic achievement in a large number of high-poverty schools (Hunter & Brown, 2003). Although many of these high-poverty, low-performing schools are situated in our nation’s cities, these problems persist in both rural and suburban areas as well (Wolf et al., 2000). In 1965, the U.S. Congress passed the Title I legislation—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged—in hopes of addressing poverty in schools. This law states that schools must “ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and
significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state academic assessments. State Departments of Education currently allocate Title I funds to the schools with the highest percentage of students who live in poverty and who qualify for free or reduced school lunches. For example, at Carolyn’s school, 95% of the students qualify for free or reduced lunches.

As long as children living in poverty are performing poorly in school, officials will remain concerned about their circumstances. Attempting to address this situation, the federal government issued the 2002 legislation entitled No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The stated purpose of this legislation, which replaced the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, was to increase student achievement, parental involvement, and state control. The NCLB legislation states that “every child--regardless of income, gender, race, ethnicity, or disability--can learn, and that every child deserves to learn.”

To insure that every child learns, the federal government placed accountability measures on every state system of public schools, with the primary goal of 100% academic proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014. Each state designs its own processes and criteria for measuring Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), as well as the consequences for schools that fail to meet the designated standards. For example, the Department of Education in Georgia requires Title I and non-Title I schools to meet AYP or be subject to sanctions. The Georgia Department of Education mandates that for AYP schools must
1. Have 95 percent participation or above in state assessments;

2. Meet or exceed the state’s annual measurable objective for proficiency through standardized testing; and

3. Show progress on additional indicators [i.e., attendance] (Education, 2003b).

Schools that do not meet AYP goals are granted a reprieve in the first year. However, in each successive year that they fail to meet AYP guidelines, sanctions are imposed. For example, a second year of not meeting AYP places a school in the Year 1 category of “Needs Improvement.” When a school is placed in the “Needs Improvement” category, it is required to inform its students’ families in writing and in person of the school’s poor performance, and its students have the option of transferring to a higher-performing school. In addition, the school must develop a school improvement plan. Together, teachers, parents, and other consultants develop the school improvement plan with the goal of raising student achievement.

In the third year of poor performance, the state labels the school as “Needs Improvement Year 2.” A school in this category must again allow families to transfer their child or children to a higher-performing school. If families decide to stay with a low-performing Title I school, they are then offered supplemental services. Supplemental services include tutoring before and after school and remedial classes in reading, math, and language arts.

A fourth year of failing to meet AYP places a school in the “Needs Improvement Year 3” category, which still includes the option of transferring to another school and receiving supplemental services, but now requires the school to change personnel or make substantial changes in its educational approach. The Department of Education
provides suggestions for these changes, including “instituting a new curriculum,
appointing an outside expert to advise the school, [and] extending the school year or
school day for the school” (Education, 2003b).

The fifth year of not meeting AYP situates the school in the “Needs Improvement
Year 4” category, or the year to plan restructuring. During this school year, school
personnel decide whether they want to become a charter school, replace all the staff, turn
the school over to a private management company, or ask the state to take over the
school. The sixth year that AYP is not met requires the school to be restructured
according to the previous year’s plan.

Because each state defines AYP differently, states and schools may use a variety
of reform models in hopes of meeting AYP and improving student achievement.
To improve the achievement of low-performing students, many school districts and
schools use one of 29 Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) models, or they develop
their own reform model. The CSR model “incorporates decisions about every aspect of a
school, from curriculum and instruction, professional development, and parental
involvement, to assessment plans and school management” (National Clearinghouse for
School Reform, 2004, pg. 1).

Students at all schools using CSR tend to perform 55% better than students at
schools not participating in these models (Borman et al., 2003). The school in which
Carolyn works collaborated with the school district, local university, and community in
developing its own reform model called University, School District, and Community
Partnership (USDC) for Community Learning Centers (CLC). In constructing this
reform model, collaborators investigated all 29 CSR models and paid particular attention
to three models: the James Comer School Development Model, Success for All, and the Community for Learning model.

The James Comer School Development Program, developed more than 25 years ago at the Yale Child Study Center, emphasizes meeting the needs of the whole child through student, parent and family, and school collaboration (Ben-Avie, 1999; Comer, 1997; Maholmes, 1999). More than any other reform model, Comer’s model focuses on creating a positive and supportive school climate. The guiding principles in this reform initiative are no-fault, collaboration, and consensus (Comer, 1997). According to Yale School Development Program Staff (2004), the no-fault principle “maintains the focus on problem solving rather than placing blame” (p. 18). The collaboration goal necessitates the teachers’ voices being heard by the principal and the families, while incorporating the teachers’ awareness of and respect for the principal’s ultimate authority. Consensus decision-making, which is similar to child-centered decision-making, involves discussing what is best for the children and making decisions based on their needs. In consensus decision-making all aspects of the children’s lives are taken into account. The connection of these three principles increases teachers’ ability to voice their concerns and encourages respect for school principals at times when principals need to employ their power. The foundational premises of this model entail focusing on the academic and social needs of the child as well as creating a positive school climate.

Another paradigm, the Success for All model developed by Slavin, Madden, and associates from Johns Hopkins University, is designed to promote success for at-risk students (Slavin & Madden, 2001). This program is intended for grades pre-kindergarten to sixth (Borman et al., 2003). The program’s components include one-on-one tutoring,
leveled classes, smaller reading classes, family support, and a comprehensive reading program (Ross et al., 1994). Every eight weeks, teachers assess children’s reading levels. Each school that uses this model has a program facilitator to help implement each component.

Wang and associates, from the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education, developed the Community for Learning (CFL) model with the goal of improving social and academic achievement both by bringing community resources into the classroom and by referring student’s families to resources in the community (Borman et al., 2003). Unlike Success for All, CFL is applied to a wider range of grade levels (K-12). In this model, schools collaborate with families and community agencies (e.g., home, libraries, museums, universities) to meet the material and educational needs of students. An important aspect of this model is the provision of health care and social services to students through coordination with the school. The design of instruction and other aspects of CFL are tailored to the needs of individual schools.

Schools in the U.S. are faced with the challenge of meeting AYP under NCLB. This accountability measure, combined with high poverty and low achievement, has left many schools looking to CSR models for help. In addition to the pressure of NCLB, Shen (1997) found that minority students living in poverty and going to poorly performing schools encounter the further problem of low teacher retention rates; this resulting lack of continuity in instruction places students even further behind. He emphasized the difficulty in teacher retention at these schools resulting from a lack of job satisfaction (Shen, 1997a, 1997b). Meanwhile, teachers like Carolyn who remain at these
low performing schools are expected to implement these new reform initiatives in order to improve student achievement.

Two primary issues exist in these settings: 1) How to retain teachers, and 2) How to improve student achievement. The literature on teachers’ job satisfaction (Allen & Palaich, 2000; Carlyle & Woods, 2002; Cockburn, 2000; Shen, 1997a, 1997b; Tye & O'Brien, 2002) shows that when teachers’ moral purpose of teaching students for the good of society is upheld, teachers are more likely to exhibit positive emotions and to be more satisfied with their work.

Research Purpose

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is dictating the way education is structured in the United States, risking the chance of compromising teachers’ moral purposes, diminishing their job satisfaction, and thereby reducing teacher retention rates. NCLB and many other aspects of educational reform appear to neglect the emotional aspects of teachers’ work. The literature on teachers’ emotions provides a foundation for understanding teachers’ specific emotional responses during educational reform initiatives.

In examining teachers’ individual emotions, researchers have focused primarily on caring, anxiety, and anger. Researchers studying educational reform have observed that teachers experience emotions in response to issues of administrative and parental intrusion, school structure, and pedagogy. The purpose of this study is to examine teachers’ specific emotions during the implementation of a CSR reform initiative. The questions guiding this study are

1. What are the critical incidents for teachers involved in a CSR initiative?
2. What are the specific emotions teachers experience in response to these critical incidents?

This introduction has provided a brief discussion of the literature on teachers’ emotions in educational reform and CSR models. The following chapters contain an in-depth review of the literature, an overview of the methodology employed in this study, a description of the partnership model employed at Carolyn’s school, the study’s findings, and the implications of this study.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Emotions

Day in and day out, teachers are faced with meeting the needs of students, parents, colleagues, administrators, the school district, and governmental accountability officers. Research shows that teachers’ work often involves emotions (Godar, 1990; Lortie, 1977; Nias, 1989). Embedded in this emotional work are the factors that lead to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, influencing teacher retention (Carlyle & Woods, 2002; Cockburn, 2000; Evans, 1997; Shen, 1997a, 1997b). Specifically, researchers have examined why some teachers remain in the teaching profession while others leave teaching (Allen & Palaich, 2000; Shen, 1997a, 1997b).

Intrigued by the emotional aspects of teaching, researchers have investigated specific emotions (i.e. caring, anger), the situations that evoke these emotions, and the strategies teachers employ in managing these emotions. Researchers in Britain and Canada, for example, have inquired into the role of accountability legislation in those countries in influencing teachers’ emotions. These studies and other literature on teachers’ emotions provide a starting point for understanding the emotions of teachers involved in educational reform initiatives. However, with the widespread implementation of NCLB in U.S. public schools, further study is needed to understand the emotional impact of this initiative on American teachers.

Because teachers’ emotions have been linked to job satisfaction and therefore teacher retention (Shen, 2001), and because teacher retention is such a pressing problem in education today (Allen, 2002), it is crucial for the education community to explore the
emotional impact of NCLB in an effort to stem the tide of dissatisfied teachers who choose to leave their teaching positions (Tye and O’Brien, 2002). To this end, the purpose of my study is to examine teachers’ emotions during an educational reform initiative, specifically NCLB. In this chapter, I will review the literature on emotions in general and teachers’ emotions in particular to provide a context for this study.

Psychologists and sociologists disagree about the definition of emotions and the emotional elicitation process (Ekman, 1992; Izard, 1991; Kitayama & Markus, 1994; Kowalski & Westen, 2005; Lange & James, 1967; Plutchik, 1994; Strongman, 1987). Psychologists tend to attribute emotional experience to internal characteristics of individuals, and examine emotions from neurological, neurophysiological, and cognitive perspectives (Kowalski & Westen, 2005; Lange & James, 1967; Lazarus & Smith, 1988; LeDoux, 1989, 1995; McDougall, 1912; Plutchik, 1994; Roseman & Smith, 2001; Schachter, 1959; Scherer et al., 2001). Researchers in these areas share similar beliefs about the “natural” or physiological foundation of emotions; however, debate still exists about which internal systems are involved.

In contrast, sociologists ponder the aspects of nurture that provoke and foster emotions (Collins, 2004; Denzin, 1984; deRivera, 1992; Kemper, 2000; McCarthy, 1989). Sociological theorists suggest that emotions are grounded in individuals’ lived experience (Denzin, 1984), issues of power and status (Kemper, 2000), environmental rituals (Collins, 2004), and emotional climates (Barbalet, 2002; deRivera, 1992). The sociological perspective argues that people do not exist in isolation; they interact with others and/or with the environment itself. In addition, people and their emotions exist
within a broader society and culture. These interactions, along with the issues of power, status, rituals, and emotional climate may all impact emotions.

The definition of emotions employed in this study assumes that in an emotional experience individuals’ physiology changes, at which time they employ their cognitive skills to assess the situation in relation to their social interactions. The next three sections provide an overview of the literature supporting the definition of emotions employed in this study. Following these sections, I will review the foundational literature on teachers’ emotions. Finally, I conclude this chapter by restating the need for a study of teachers’ emotions during a comprehensive school reform initiative.

Nature: The Inherent Aspects of the Elicitation of Emotions

Psychologists studying the biology or nature of emotions have examined the roles of the limbic system, physiology, and cognition in the creation of emotions. Defining emotions as “feelings about a situation, person, or objects that involve changes in physiological arousal and cognition” (ALLPsych, 1999-2003), these researchers have explored the role of the brain, the central nervous system and cognition in the elicitation of emotions.

Researchers have debated about the location of emotions in the brain. Earlier theorists (Cannon, 1929; McDougall, 1912; Papez, 1937; Pribram et al., 1980) identified the role of the limbic system and hypothalamus. The limbic system regulates behavior and biological functions (Giunti, 2004). It contains areas of the forebrain such as the hippocampus, the cingulated gyrus, the rhinal cortex, the amygdale, and the orbitofrontal cortex (Plutchik, 2003). The hippocampus is the main input to the limbic system. The hypothalamus is a group of nuclei that plays a role in the secretion of hormones. The
The hypothalamus is responsible for regulating “eating, drinking, [and] sexual behavior,” as well as controlling “temperature regulation, and certain emotional expressions” (Plutchik, 2003, p. 268).

Current theories of the brain and emotion recommend studying each specific emotion to see exactly how the emotion occurs in the brain. Generally, researchers agree that parts of the limbic system become activated in emotions (LeDoux, 1989, 1995). LeDoux (1989, 1995) determined that within the limbic system the amygdala is an area activated in emotions such as anger.

Extending LeDoux’s theory, Kowalski and Westen (2005) found that emotions occur in the brain through two paths. The first path involves the thalamus sending sensory information to the amygdala while at the same time conveying messages to the cortex. The thalamus is responsible for receiving sensory information and relaying these signals. The second path involves the thalamus sending sensory information to the cortex, which then activates the amygdala (Panksepp et al., 2000). The amygdala then forwards the information to the hypothalamus for the automatic response. In identifying these paths, neurologists continue to examine specific emotions and brain activation with the foundational understanding that when people experience emotions, their limbic system is activated, and it in turn sends messages to other parts of the brain and body that allow people to indicate that they are happy, sad, angry, and so forth.

In examining the limbic system’s activation, neurophysiologists have investigated the sensory pathways leading to and from the limbic system. Researchers have identified links between emotions and physical changes such as muscle movement, increased heart rate, and shortness of breath, finding that the central nervous system (which consists of
the brain and the spinal cord) stimulates these physical responses (Panksepp et al., 2000). Sensory information travels from the peripheral nervous system to the brain in such a way that the neurons that comprise the peripheral nervous system “notify” the central nervous system of the emotional response by signaling the brain.

When people feel physical changes in their bodies in response to an emotion, this indicates that the autonomic nervous system (ANS) has been activated. The ANS is the part of the central nervous system that is responsible for the functioning of the heart, lungs, and glands (Givens, 2005). So when the ANS is activated, the person may experience an increase in heart rate or difficulty breathing. This process serves as a warning system which allows a person to decide whether they should leave a situation (flight) or stay (fight) (Givens, 2005).

Researchers disagree on whether physiological changes result from emotions or whether physiological changes alert individuals to their emotions (Cacioppo et al., 2000). One school of thought, centered on the James-Lange theory (1884; 1967), argues that physiological changes in individuals alert them to their emotions. Caciopo, Berntson, Larson, Poehlmann, and Ito (2000), for example, stated that “investigations suggest that autonomic processes can contribute to the encoding and recall (if not the experience) of emotional information” (p. 175). Another group of researchers argued that physiological reactions and emotions happen simultaneously; this became known as the Cannon-Bard theory (1927). Neurophysiologists still debate these two theories. While these two schools of thought differ in their interpretation of the sequence of events, both theories assert that the nervous system plays a key role in the shaping the individual’s emotional experience.
Another group of psychologists studying emotions has investigated the role of cognition in emotions. At the root of all cognitive theories of emotion is the belief that emotions cannot occur without cognitive appraisals. Lazarus (2001) explained that the term *cognitive appraisal* “emphasize[s] the complex, judgmental, and conscious process that must often be involved in appraising” the event (p. 51). In this appraisal process individuals examine the relevance, implications, coping potential, and normative significance of an event by asking themselves the following:

1. How relevant is this event for me? Does it directly affect me or my social reference group? (relevance)
2. What are the implications or consequences of this event and how do these affect my well-being and my immediate or long-term goals? (implications)
3. How well can I cope with or adjust to these consequences? (coping potential)
4. What is the significance of this event with respect to my self-concept and to social norms and values? (normative significance) (Scherer, 2001, p. 94).

When individuals ask themselves these questions, their responses dictate the occurrence of a positive or negative emotion.

Cognitive theorists (Arnold, 1970; Lazarus et al., 2001; Lazarus & Smith, 1988; Roseman & Smith, 2001; Schachter, 1959; Scherer & Ekman, 1984; Scherer et al., 2001) have maintained different opinions about the processes individuals use in assessing a situation. Schere (1984) argued that individuals ask themselves the four questions above
in a fixed order with no fluctuation back and forth between the questions. Conversely, Lazarus and Smith (1988) found that individuals move back and forth between these questions in what they perceive as a flexible process. Regardless of the sequence in the cognitive appraisal, this study supports the notion that individuals use cognitive appraisals in emotion elicitation.

Psychological theories of emotion provide information on the way emotions are processed within individuals. In the process psychologists describe, the central nervous system, with the assistance of the limbic system, sends messages to the body for a physical response (i.e., increased heart rate) and to areas of the brain for cognitive appraisal. Through the cognitive appraisal process, they argue, individuals determine their emotions.

However, individuals do not exist in isolation. They participate continuously in social interactions with other individuals and with their environment, a point which few psychologists have explored in the study of emotions. In contrast to these psychological views, the sociological literature suggests that emotions are not produced by individual physiological processes, but instead are fostered by the relationships among individuals and between individuals and their environment.

Nurture: The Fostering of Emotions

In contrast to the psychological view of emotions as having a physiological basis, sociologists seek to understand the complex construct of emotions by investigating the influence of social interaction, and society itself, on emotions. Sociologists (Collins, 2004; Denzin, 1984; deRivera, 1992; Kemper, 2000; McCarthy, 1989) have theorized
about emotions by examining such issues as individuals’ lived experience, status and power, interaction rituals, and emotional climate.

*Individuals’ Lived Experience*

Denzin (1984, 1985) has argued that emotions result from the individual’s lived experience. Denzin concerned himself with how individuals see their emotions through their experiences. Setting aside concerns about the label of the emotion, he focused instead on how the participants in his study interpreted their experience. Denzin’s theory of emotions as an individual’s lived experience encompasses four modes of lived emotions: sensible feelings, feelings of the lived body, intentional value feelings, and feelings of the self and the moral person (Denzin, 1985).

*Sensible feelings* are a sensation in the body that a person does not consciously produce. For example, when a person stubs his or her toe, the physical sensation creates the pain. This sensible feeling is felt by the individual, but cannot be felt by others.

*Feelings of the lived body* refer to a sequence of events and sensations that illustrate the lived experience. In this example, when the person jumps around holding his or her toe and crying, another person in the room can identify with the individual’s pain from the stubbed toe. Feelings of the lived body differ from sensible feelings in that the emotion can be experienced by others.

Denzin (1985) labeled the evaluation of a feeling constructing another feeling as *intentional value feelings*. Denzin clarified that intentional value feelings “are felt reflections, cognitive and emotional, about feelings.” For example, the loss of a friend may trigger the emotions an individual felt when a parent died. The evaluations of these feelings are guided by values. Unlike intentional value feelings, *feelings of the self and*
the moral person “originate in the self of the subject . . . they are lodged in the inner stream of consciousness” (p. 232). The feelings of the self and the moral person come from an individual’s views of what the world should be like; when the world does not live up to these expectations, feelings are activated. These four modes work together to create a person’s emotions.

Denzin (1984) connected these four modes in his definition of emotion. “Emotion is self-feeling. Emotions are temporally embodied, situated self-feelings that arise from emotional and cognitive social acts that people direct to self or have directed toward them by others. “Emotions are lodged in social acts and interactions with others” (p. 50). By viewing emotions through the participants’ lived experience and refusing to place a label on these emotions, Denzin’s theory emphasized the importance of the individual’s perceptions of the experience.

Status and Power

Like Denzin, Kemper examined individual emotions as a function of social interaction; however, Kemper’s model explicitly defines emotions through an individual’s power and status instead of examining the whole of her or his lived experience. In his Status-Power Model, Kemper (2000) argued that generally individuals’ power and status influences their labeling of emotions. He stated that “power is understood as a relational condition in which one actor actually or potentially compels another actor to do something he or she does not wish to do” (p. 46). Status deals with “the relational condition of voluntary compliance with the wishes, interests, and desires of another person” (p. 26). Kemper illustrated the role of power and status in emotions
through four main positions: one’s own power, others’ power, one’s own status, and others’ status.

First, when a person’s “own power” increases, positive emotions occur. However, if this power becomes excessive, the person may experience fear and anxiety. For example, a teacher may be given more power in his or her school, and in receiving this power the teacher may feel happy and excited. However, if the teacher feels weighed down by too much power, he or she may start to feel fearful and anxious.

In the second component of Kemper’s (2000) model, he examined the role of “others’ power.” In this situation a teacher perceives another person’s power increasing. The increase in another person’s power leaves the teacher feeling anxious and fearful, similar to the emotions experienced in a decrease of “own power.” The continued increase in another’s power may influence the teacher’s sense of security, resulting in emotions of concern.

Kemper’s third and fourth components highlight the role of status in emotions. Kemper’s (2000) third component explores the individual teacher’s status. For example, if a teacher receives more recognition and a higher status in the school and feels deserving of this status, positive emotions occur. However, if the status is greater than the teacher thinks she/he deserves, then the teacher may feel embarrassed or ashamed. If the teacher’s status decreases because of someone else, the teacher will likely feel angry.

The fourth component of the model reflects how a person’s emotions vary in relation to another person’s status. In this situation, a teacher may see a colleague’s status increase in the school. The factor that dictates the teacher’s emotional response is how the teacher feels about that colleague. If the teacher feels a fondness for a colleague,
he or she will be happy with the colleague’s change in status. If the teacher does not care for a colleague, the increase in the colleague’s status may result in the teacher experiencing negative emotions (e.g. envy, jealousy). Ultimately a variety of circumstances will dictate the emotional response in a given situation; however, Kemper developed this model as a general template for understanding the role of power and status in teachers’ emotions.

*Interactional Rituals*

Similar to Kemper, Goffman (1967) explored the ingredients of power and status in rituals and found that emotions play a critical role. A ritual occurs when a person interacts with her or his environment and/or individuals on a specific topic or symbolic event. Within these rituals, individuals aim to protect their self-esteem and status; their success or failure in doing so leads to positive or negative emotions. Goffman observed that “societies everywhere . . . must mobilize their members as self-regulating participants in social encounters. “One way of mobilizing the individual for this purpose is through ritual” (p. 44). In this mobilization process, emotions occur on an individual and a group level.

Collins (2004) studied Goffman’s ideas about ritual, from which he developed a theory of *interactional ritual chains*. Collins clarified that interaction ritual chains “is a theory of momentary encounters among human bodies charged up with emotions and consciousness because they have gone through chains of previous encounters” (p.48). Interactional ritual chains are a series of small group and large group interactions contributing to the *emotional energy* (EE). Collins defined EE as “a feeling of
confidence and enthusiasm that is experienced after successful ritual interactions” (p. 48). Thus, the EE depends on the interactional ritual chains.

In a ritual interactional chain, three elements must be present to create EE. First, everyone in the group must have her or his attention on the ritual. Second, the group members must all experience similar emotions. Third, this common emotional experience must create a sense of solidarity among the group members. For example, a group of teachers meet to discuss school leadership concerns. As the teachers are talking about school leadership (first element), they realize that their colleagues are also feeling angry about a recent administrative decision (second element). This realization that others feel the same way unites the group of teachers (third element). When solidarity is high, EE is high; likewise, low solidarity creates low EE.

Collins stated, “What holds a society together--the “glue” of solidarity--and what mobilizes conflict--the energy of mobilized groups--are emotions” (p. 103). When the necessary emotional ingredients are present, an interactional ritual (IR) chain “does its work, it intensifies, transforms, or diminishes those emotional ingredients so that those human beings come out of the situation charged with emotional outcomes, which in turn set up what will happen in their next situations” (p. 105). This unity resulting from similar emotions in response to a particular topic provides a foundation for future rituals.

This model of interactional rituals provides the foundation for understanding stratified interactional rituals. Stratified interaction rituals happen when group members with different levels of power and status interact in a ritual. According to Collins (2004), “the focus of a power ritual is the process of giving and taking orders itself” (p. 112). Order givers are the leaders of the group and order takers are subordinates. In this type of
ritual, order givers derive EE from the interaction because they are already invested in the ritual. Order takers, however, feel less EE, making them want to look for other situations that are more rewarding for them.

In Collins’ model the group members share a similar identity, but within this identity they hold varying levels of status. For example, teachers share the same identity as teachers; however, some have been teachers for an extended period of time (i.e., veteran teachers) and others have worked only for a year or two (i.e., beginning teachers). The shared identity of these teachers can serve as the basis for EE. When the teachers come together for a ritual, the power and/or the status of group members either unites the group, increasing EE, or the group forms no sense of solidarity, decreasing EE.

There is some degree of EE that the teachers may derive from their shared position alone; however, within their rituals EE either decreases or increases depending on the similarity of the teachers’ emotions to their colleagues (forming solidarity) or the differences between their emotions (dividing the group). The group participating in the ritual has a collective EE, and individuals’ EE depends on their level of involvement and participation in the ritual. Whereas some level of EE is always present, the fluctuation of levels results from the ritual itself and the individual’s level of participation.

**Emotional Climate**

Similar to Collins, Barbalet (1998) and deRiveria (1992) investigated the impact of the environment on emotions. In critiquing the psychological perspective on emotions, Barbalet (1998) argued that emotions such as fear are not inherent biological responses; rather, we are trained to fear certain aspects of society. For example, a person is not born with a fear of snakes; on the contrary, society influences and trains the person to be afraid
of snakes. Instead of looking to biology for answers, Barbalet (1998) and deRiveria (1992) recommend that researchers investigate issues of climate to understand human emotions.

The various emotions influence the climate, atmosphere and culture. deRiveria (1992) defines *emotional climate* as “pervasive emotional phenomena that are related to the underlying social structures and political programs” (p. 197) within a society. An emotional climate remains stable over a significant length of time, while an *emotional atmosphere* pertains to the emotions surrounding a specific event and is therefore dynamic and changeable. In differentiating emotional climates and *emotional cultures*, deRiveria explains

An emotional culture is dynamically stable. It is usually held in a place by a network of socialization practices and ordinarily only changes when a culture is transformed over generations of people. Climates, on the other hand, are more dependent on political, religious, economic and educational factors and may change within the course of a single generation. (p. 198)

While deRiveria highlighted the commonality of emotions within a given emotional climate, Barbalet emphasized that not every member of a group must have the same emotions within one emotional climate; however, they must share a similar type of emotion, such as negative emotions.

deRiveria (1992) identified specific climates that may emerge under various conditions. For example, when a government or a society cultivates a state of fear, the resulting *climate of fear* tends to isolate people. A *climate of security* forms when people trust each other and the government under which they live. In contrast, a *climate of*
instability develops “whenever people of a nation cannot predict what will happen either politically or economically in the near future” (p. 204).

When the economy is thriving and people receive financial rewards, a climate of confidence is fostered. When people are not flourishing financially, expectations are not being met, and the economy dips people live in a climate of dissatisfaction. deRiveria employed this same approach to discuss climates of hostility, solidarity, and hope, emphasizing that the emotional climates come from how closely the societal ideal matches the individuals’ values. In order to further understand emotional climates, more research using the constructs described by deRiveria is needed.

Perspectives on Controlling Emotions

The literature on emotions describes affect control and emotion management as two primary frameworks for understanding the process of controlling emotions (Heise, 1979; Hochschild, 1983). Rooted in symbolic interactionism, affect control theories explain how individuals seek to manage their emotions in an effort to maintain their identity (Kemper, 2000). These theories explore formulas of evaluation, potency, and activity to understand the role of emotions in identity development. According to Heise (2001), affect control theories are based on the following propositions:

- Individuals conduct themselves to generate feelings appropriate to the situation.
- Individuals who can’t maintain appropriate feelings through actions change their views of the situation.
- Individuals’ emotions signal the relationship between their experience and their definition of the situation (p.1).
These three points illustrate how individuals respond to situations in ways that maintain their current identity. Heise argued that this desire to preserve identity is a key factor in determining an individual’s emotional response to a situation.

The term *emotion management* developed from Hochschild’s (1983) discussion of emotional labor. Hochschild (1983) wrote:

I use the term emotional labor to mean the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display; emotional labor is sold for a wage and therefore has exchange value. I use the synonymous terms emotion work or emotion management to refer to these same acts done in a private context where they have use value. (p. 7)

Hochschild (1983) inquired into the emotional system of the workplace in a Delta Airlines stewardess training program. From this research, she coined the terms *institutional emotion management* and *feeling management*. She describes institutional emotion management as a situation in which “many people and objects, arranged according to institutional rule and custom, together accomplish the act” of managing emotions (p. 49). Through this institutional structure, people find direction on how to feel within the larger context of workplaces. Feeling management occurs “when rules about how to feel and how to express feelings are set by management” (p. 89). Feeling management guidelines provide the foundation for institutional emotion management.

The type of work that calls for emotion management shares three common characteristics:

1) it requires face-to-face or voice-to-voice contact with the public,

2) it requires the worker to produce an emotional state in another person, and
3) it allows the employer, through training and supervision, to exercise a degree of control over the emotional activities of employees (p. 147). Hochschild’s concepts of emotional labor and emotion management allowed other researchers to conceptualize and discuss the process of using and controlling emotions.

Steinberg and Figart (1999) and England and Folbre (1999) enhanced Hochschild’s (1983) definition of emotional labor by establishing that emotional labor occurs in jobs other than the service occupations that Hochschild studied. England and Folbre clarified that “emotional labor involves efforts made to understand others, to have empathy with their situation, to feel their feelings as a part of one’s own” (p. 91). In this face-to-face or voice-to-voice interaction, people manage their emotions while working to genuinely understand another person’s perspective (England & Folbre, 1999; Hochschild, 1983; Steinberg & Figart, 1999).

The variety of theories reviewed above indicates the extent of disagreement that exists over the means by which emotions are elicited and controlled. While psychologists have explored evidence for the role of biology and cognitive appraisal in generating emotions, sociologists have focused on individuals’ lived experiences along with issues such as status and power, interactional rituals, and the role of climates in influencing emotions.

Seeking a more integrative approach, this study supports aspects of both the psychological and sociological perspectives on emotion with the premise that individuals interact within a societal structure. Ekman (1992) described six basic emotions of “anger, fear, sadness, enjoyment, disgust, and surprise” (p. 170). This study labels specific emotions in the way the participants describes their emotions. Individuals unquestionably
experience physiological changes and perform cognitive appraisals when emotions are elicited. However, these individual emotional responses are also undoubtedly influenced by social interactions. In the cognitive appraisal process, individuals reflect on previous experiences and consider issues of power and status in their emotional responses. The interaction between individual and environment flows back and forth, impacting the individual and influencing the emotional climate of the culture.

The research on emotions in general provides a useful context in which to begin an investigation of teachers’ responses to recent educational reform initiatives. Equally valuable, however, are studies that have focused on the emotional nature of teachers’ work, the predictors of teachers’ job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, the specific emotions teachers tend to experience on the job, and teachers’ emotional responses to educational reform initiatives in other nations. I now turn to a review of this literature.

**Teachers’ Emotions**

A number of studies of teachers’ work have sought to identify the emotional aspects of teaching (Acker, 1995; Adams, 2002; Blackmore, 1999; Golby, 1996; Graham, 1984; Hargreaves, 1998a, 1998b, 2000, 2001, 2004; Hargreaves & Development, 1997; Hargreaves et al., 2001; Jackson-Minot, 2002; Jeffrey & Woods, 1996; King, 1998; Noddings, 1984, 1992, 1996; Ria et al., 2003; Roulston et al., 2003; Sutton & Conway, 2002; Tickle, 1991; Vogt, 2002; Webb-Dempsey et al., 1996; Wilson et al., 2003; Woods & Jeffrey, 1998). These studies explore issues such as teaching as emotional work; the specific emotions of caring, anxiety, and anger in teaching; and teachers’ emotions during periods of educational reforms in the UK and Canada. Additionally, when researchers inquired into aspects of teacher job satisfaction and retention, they identified the presence
or absence of emotional support as a key variable (Allen & Palaich, 2000; Carlyle & Woods, 2002; Cockburn, 2000; Shen, 1997a, 1997b; Tye & O'Brien, 2002).

The introduction of accountability standards in the UK, Canada, and now the U.S. has added another factor that may influence emotional responses, satisfaction, and retention among teachers. Researchers (Adams, 2002; Golby, 1996; Hargreaves, 1998a, 1998b, 2000, 2001, 2004; Hargreaves & Development, 1997; Hargreaves et al., 2001; Jeffrey & Woods, 1996; Lasky, 2000; Woods & Jeffrey, 1998) have identified the issues in school reform that evoke emotions, but little research has investigated the specific emotions teachers experience and the issues that elicit them during periods of increased accountability and reform.

As the research on teachers’ work and teachers’ job satisfaction illustrates, emotions are an important aspect of teaching, one which in turn impacts their job satisfaction. Shen (1997) emphasized that teachers working at high poverty and high minority schools were more likely to leave teaching or change schools. The schools that are performing poorly under NCLB are categorically high poverty, high minority schools which already have difficulty with teacher attrition (Hunter & Brown, 2003; Shen, 1997).

The implementation of accountability measures like NCLB adds a level of pressure to teachers’ work which may positively or negatively affect their emotions and job satisfaction. If teachers become dissatisfied with their work due to restrictions imposed by accountability measures, their negative emotions may influence which ones choose to remain in the profession and which choose to leave. Inquiry into teachers’ emotions serves as a preventative measure to understand the emotional nature of teachers’ work in schools governed by NCLB. It is critical that teachers’ emotions in
educational reform be studied before talented teachers leave the profession. Situating my study in this context, this section contains a review of the literature on the impact of emotions in teachers’ work, teachers’ specific emotions, and teachers’ emotions during UK and Canadian educational reform.

The Emotional Nature of Teachers’ Work

Since the 1970’s, researchers have argued that teaching involves more than knowing one’s content area. Good teachers know their content areas and emotionally engage with their students. This emotional engagement with students involves controlling those emotions which may be considered inappropriate in an educational setting and accentuating positive emotions such as caring. Literature on teachers’ work has clustered around teachers’ work in general, teacher satisfaction, and teacher emotions in science teaching.

Teachers’ work in general. One of the earliest studies of teachers’ work was an interview study conducted by Lortie (1977). Lortie interviewed 94 teachers in New England from 13 schools ranging from elementary to high school. He found that teachers chose that profession for five main reasons. First, teaching involves interpersonal contact with young people, which teachers found appealing. Second, teachers came to their profession in response to a moral commitment to serve children and the greater society. Third, many of the teachers liked being students themselves, and that attachment to school brought them back. Fourth, Lortie found that there were material benefits to teaching, including money, prestige, and job security. The fifth theme relates to the desirability of the work schedule, such as having summers off.
When Lortie examined teachers’ purposes in choosing their profession, he stated, “Their purposes, in fact, seem to be relatively traditional; they want to produce ‘good’ people--students who like learning--and they hope they will attain such goals with all their students” (p. 132). Teachers desire to contribute to the lives of their students so that students will contribute to the good of the greater society. In the process of meeting their primary, student-centered, long-term goal, teachers also want to be recognized for their work. In describing a good day in the life of a teacher, Lortie stated:

Positive events and outcomes are linked to two sets of actors--the teacher and the student . . . but all other persons, without exception, were connected with undesirable occurrences. Negative allusions were made to parents, the principal, the school nurse, colleagues--in fact, to anyone and everyone who “intrudes” on classroom events. (p. 169)

The challenges in teaching come from others’ lack of understanding about the time and energy needed to focus on instruction. All other aspects of school were seen as intrusions interfering with their moral purpose for teaching. Lortie’s interview study provides a solid foundation for further research on the emotional aspects of teachers’ work.

In a more recent study on teachers’ work, Nias (1989) conducted 150 interviews, reviewed 22 diaries, and studied several letters over 10 years from teachers who trained in one-year Post-Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) courses. The purpose of her research was to explore the experiences of teachers who had been trained in a specific one-year graduate certificate program. The interview questions focused on “motivation; job satisfaction and dissatisfaction; professional, personal and career development; personal experience of and reflection upon teaching; and the place of work in life and
future career plans” (p. 8). Teachers also kept diaries to expand on ideas from their interviews.

Nias found three main themes related to the teachers’ work: sense of self, task of teaching, and school culture and environment. In discussing sense of self, Nias argued that while much her work focused on the management of emotions,

[teachers’] own description of their feelings about pupils, and their relationships with them and with their colleagues, reminds us that regressive, passionate and unruly aspects of human nature are always present in the classroom and may sometimes escape from rational control (p. 203).

The extremely demanding work of teaching, teachers reported, requires an advanced ability to balance cognitive, interpersonal, and practical skills.

Nias explained that the task of teaching often leaves teachers feeling mentally and emotionally exhausted; however, teaching can also lead to high rewards. The rewards involve “warmth, acceptance, exhilaration, self-extension, fulfillment, and the satisfactions which come from a difficult job done well and, sometimes, superbly” (p. 205). In discussing their schools, teachers emphasized the draining or rewarding factors of the physical environment, school routines, school decision-making and communication, and procedures affecting the children.

Specifically, Nias reported that teachers’ work needs to be understood within the larger context of the school and society. Within this context, she concluded that teachers need to feel that they can do their work with integrity and continue to receive the rewards in teaching to remain motivated. Nias stated, “In other words, if they cannot satisfy the needs which they are daily made aware of in their work in classrooms and schools (i.e., if
they are not rewarded), then the effort that they make through their heavy investment of self in work will eventually decline” (p. 214). She concluded that we cannot afford to have teachers remove themselves from their work. Through interviews, observations, and teacher diary reflections, the work of Lortie and Nias paints a picture of the factors impacting teacher job satisfaction.

Similarly, Godar (1990) interviewed 282 teachers from 10 different states and 30 school districts about their work. Before undertaking this research, Godar himself was employed as an English teacher for 12 years. In his research he described the experiences of first, second year and veteran teachers and teachers who left the profession. Godar explained aspects of teaching that involve caring and factors that led to teacher fatigue.

In discussing teachers who care, Godar reflected, “What makes a good teacher? They have to know their material and then have the ability to communicate it to the level of their students. But most important, they have to care” (p. 1). Moreover, Godar argued that one cannot be a good teacher without being a tired teacher. When Godar averaged out the extra hours he put into his high school English teaching position, he found that he had worked 75 extra hours per year. Godar found in his research that good teachers put in many extra hours beyond the 40-hour a week requirement, which in turn led many of these teachers to become fatigued and burned out.

In his conversations with teachers about education, Godar found many similarities among them in their views of society and education. Even those who identified themselves as conservatives or liberals were closer in their views about education than they thought. Both groups of teachers identified “the greatest problems as the changes in society, and class size and administrators” (p. 53). Godar identified the difference
between these two groups as the fact that the conservatives wanted to return to the past while the liberals were bracing for the future, in the hope of making it better. Both groups of teachers agreed on aspects of education that needed to be changed; where they differed was in their perspectives on the best way to bring about those changes.

In discussing the teaching profession, Godar stated, “People don’t seem to realize a good teacher is an artist . . . and you can’t regiment artistry” (p. 79). The first- and second-year teachers he interviewed described what they liked about teaching and identified one task they didn’t like as babysitting children. When discussing desirable and undesirable aspects of teaching, one first-year teacher reported, “It is not the work, though; it’s the pressure. I love what I do; I love the kids. But I have more work. I have so much paper-pushing work. I spend more time on paperwork than I do actually teaching” (p. 82). Godar reported that one teacher “repeated several times that she didn’t know if she had the emotional stamina to put up with it every day” (p. 83). In the first and second years of teaching, Godar’s participants enjoyed the teaching aspects of their work, but disliked all the paperwork and the times they felt like they were just babysitting.

In a conversation with a veteran teacher about to retire, Godar said that he could see why she lasted so long in teaching. The teacher stated that she had made it this long “with a great deal of tears, laughter, a few children along the way who have made it worthwhile, a very patient, forbearing husband, wonderful friends, and after twenty years of saying ‘Well, I’ve gone this far,’ I might as well go the rest of the way” (p.85). Godar found that the teachers who quit teaching left because they felt they were not being
treated professionally. Godar’s interview study supports the findings of Nias and Lortie, but Godar’s research also provides a more holistic perspective on teachers’ lives.

The work of Lortie and Nias identified the emotional nature of teaching, while Godar’s study illustrated the role of tears and laughter in the lives of beginning and veteran teachers. All three researchers described the importance to teachers of their interpersonal relationships with colleagues and students. The rewards of teaching are clearly linked to these interpersonal relationships, which provide support and generate positive emotions leading to job satisfaction.

*Teachers’ job satisfaction and retention.* Research on teachers’ job satisfaction and dissatisfaction has emphasized the importance of teacher-student relationships, relationships with colleagues, and student progress in determining teacher satisfaction and retention (Allen & Palaich, 2000; Carlyle & Woods, 2002; Cockburn, 2000; Shen, 1997a, 1997b; Tye & O’Brien, 2002). Cockburn (2000) interviewed 12 primary school teachers about the factors that contributed to their enjoyment of their jobs. The three factors most strongly influencing their job satisfaction were their relationships with students, the students’ progress, and teacher relationships with colleagues. Eight of the 12 teachers described the enjoyment they experienced in the development of teacher-student relationships and in observing the academic progress made by students over the course of the school year. When teachers connect with their fellow teachers, it adds enjoyment and satisfaction to their teaching because they feel they have additional support.

The primary obstacles to teacher satisfaction were standardized testing, governmental intrusions like accountability measures, and classroom management
problems. Whereas teachers’ enjoyment of their work came from their interpersonal relationships with students and colleagues, their negative emotions resulted from the imposition of governmental mandates and from students interfering with the classroom learning environment. This research illustrates that teachers’ job satisfaction is heavily influenced by the emotions that result from their relationships with their students and from variables in their work environment.

Carlyle and Woods (2002) conducted semi-structured interviews with 21 secondary teachers from different schools on the relationship between stress and emotions. They found that negative emotions came from teachers having to confront crisis situations which the schools were not equipped to handle. In addition, they found that poor school communication between teachers and administration caused negative emotions and stress. A dictatorial decision-making process and a bullying approach to management likewise created an increase in negative emotions and stress.

When teachers discussed the management styles in their schools that created negative emotions, they characterized them as “repressive regimes” or “fascist regime[s]”, identifying a “Judas mentality” in which staff felt “threatened”. The teachers discussed the emotional climates of the schools, identifying the unhappiness caused by “climates of fear,” “climates of low trust,” “climates of blame,” “climates of disrespect,” and “climates of chronic anxiety” (pp. 8-12). One teacher described the unpredictability of his school climate: “like the swing of a thermostat . . . a bit too hot, then too cold, then too hot again.” Another teacher noted how the stress created by such climates influenced teachers’ emotional states, observing, “When you are stressed, things go out of balance.”
Carlyle and Woods (2002) concluded that within the school context, “Teachers experienced emotional turbulence” (p. 61). The researchers explained that under the pressure of such turbulence, “Our teachers had lost their professional identities” (p. 78). In the past they were able to balance all the demands placed on them; however, as their stress levels increased and emotions intensified, they were no longer able to handle all the demands and manage their emotions.

In another case study on elementary school teachers’ job satisfaction, Evans (1997) conducted interviews and observations and asked teachers to complete questionnaires. She concluded that teachers’ morale and job satisfaction were impacted by contextual factors such as circumstances and events related to school leadership, school climate, and realistic vs. unrealistic expectations placed on teachers. Evans found that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were so contextually-based in each school that it was hard to make generalizations. Evans urged that the next step in the research should be to explore what has been learned about teachers’ job satisfaction and use it to improve schools.

In a study of teacher job satisfaction, Shen (1997) received completed surveys on teacher retention and job satisfaction from a stratified sample of 3,612 teachers in the public school system who stayed at their school, transferred schools or left the teaching profession. The results clustered around personal characteristics, school characteristics, and teachers’ perceptions. The personal characteristic factors increasing teacher retention included higher salaries and more experience. Among the school factors, Shen found that teachers in schools with a high percentage of teachers who had fewer than three years of teaching experience were more likely to change schools or leave the profession.
Similarly, teachers working in schools with high percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunches and large numbers of minority students had a greater tendency to leave teaching or transfer schools.

In examining teachers’ perceptions, Shen found that teachers who remained in the profession felt that the benefits outweighed the disadvantages. These teachers discussed having power and ownership in teaching and a voice in shaping school policy as factors that contributed to their choice to remain at the school and in the profession. Shen indicated

The importance of paying attention to schools where there are more free-lunch students and a higher percentage of minority students, both of which are indicators of students’ low-income backgrounds. Those students are disadvantaged. Their situation is exacerbated by teacher attrition, which not only disrupts the teaching-learning process but also weakens the bond between the teacher and student (p. 87).

The potential for improving school quality and enhancing student learning through the results of this research provides powerful support for the need to study educational reform and its impact on teachers’ emotions.

*Emotions in teaching science.* Interestingly, while research on teachers’ emotions has rarely been conducted in relation to particular subject areas, one field that has been studied is emotions in the teaching of science due to the need to recruit and retain science teachers. Whereas the stereotype of the scientist reflects an image of objectivity and a lack of emotional engagement, this research shows that the teaching of science is, like other teaching fields, an emotional as well as intellectual endeavor.
Situated in the context of science classrooms, Zembylas (1998) and Zembylas and Barker (2002) argued in their research that science teaching cannot be reduced to the mastery of technical standards. Zembylas (1998) used narratives, classroom observation, and documents from two science teachers to study the role of teachers’ emotions in the development of their beliefs and pedagogy in teaching science. Teachers’ early experiences of teaching, both positive and negative, influenced their philosophy of teaching science classes.

One of the teachers described how she welcomes her emotional responses because they help her assess her teaching and identify what she needs to do to refine the instruction. The second teacher emphasized that her excitement and love for learning science served her well in her teaching. From his findings, Zembylas argued that to understand teachers’ work, teachers and researchers need to explore the whole teacher, including their emotions. He explained that although teachers may be unaware of their emotions, they may nevertheless serve as an unacknowledged basis for classroom decision-making. According to Zembylas, increasing awareness of emotions would allow teachers to see the values they hold, values which may impact their instruction and interactions with students.

Similarly, Zembylas and Barker (2002) conducted in-depth case studies with two pre-service teachers in a science methods class. The case studies involved journal entries, three interviews, and observations. In their inductive analysis the researchers found that for one of the participants, excitement about and enjoyment of the science material contributed to her learning and teaching, spurring her to investigate ways to improve her understanding and her students’ understanding of the material. The second
participant explained that he had been placed in a gifted and talented program in science and even attended a magnet school in science; however, after second grade he did not have positive science experiences.

These participants were encouraged by their instructors to identify their emotions in relation to science, and the atmosphere of the course allowed them to challenge these views and emotions. In activities connecting art, science, and poetry, the participants were allowed to freely share their experiences in and beliefs about science. The dialogue embedded in the activities helped one teacher to develop more positive emotions about teaching science. While the other teacher already held positive views of science, this class enabled her to reflect on and deepen her pedagogical beliefs about teaching science.

The participants’ transformed attitudes emphasized the researchers’ assertion that “science pedagogy is more than finding curriculum materials and using the right methods. Their responses indicated the importance of feeling excited to teach science” (p. 345). Zembylas and Barker emphasized the importance of providing an emotionally safe classroom for pre-service teachers to reflect on their experiences and views about science.

The research on emotions in teaching science illustrates the importance of emotions on teachers’ attitudes, quality of instruction, and their beliefs about teaching science. While these researchers focus on science instruction, other pre-service teacher training programs may benefit from the study of emotions as well. Further research that investigates other content areas and includes a greater number of participants would provide additional information about the benefits of addressing teachers’ emotions during pre-service training.
Research on teachers’ work generally, teachers’ job satisfaction, and the emotional nature of teaching science demonstrates the centrality of emotions to teachers’ work. The emotional nature of teaching makes a difference in the success and quality of classroom instruction. Since educational reform initiatives are specifically geared toward improving both teaching and learning, the study of teachers’ emotions as they impact the quality of instruction provides crucial information for the success of such initiatives. The literature on teachers’ emotions discussed thus far has unveiled general information about the positive and negative emotions in teaching. However, the literature on specific emotions in teaching provides key answers to questions about the impact of various reform strategies on teachers’ emotions.

Specific Emotions in Teaching

Researchers have investigated a variety of specific emotions among teachers; in particular, they have focused on caring, anxiety, and anger. The research on teachers’ work demonstrated the importance of teachers’ caring, but this work led to further questions regarding the definition of caring and the gendered nature of caring. In addition to caring, studies identified anxiety as an emotion that particularly affected beginning teachers. Finally, a group of researchers questioned how teachers deal with the emotion of anger and what role anger plays in racial incidents that occur on school grounds. The literature on these specific emotions is the focus of this section.

relationship between two people and the act of “attending to objects and ideas” (p. 18). Based on the work of Carol Gilligan, Noddings (1992) found women to have the characteristics necessary to care for someone. She explained:

Women, perhaps the majority of women, prefer to discuss moral problems in terms of concrete situations. They approach moral problems not as intellectual problems to be solved by abstract reasoning but as concrete human problems to be lived and to be solved in living . . . It should be clear that my description of an ethic of caring as a feminine ethic does not imply a claim to speak for all women nor to exclude men . . . there is reason to believe that women are somewhat better equipped for caring than men are. This is partly a result of the construction of psychological deep structures in mother-child relationships. A girl can identify with the one caring for her and thus maintain relation while establishing identity. A boy must, however, find his identity with the absent one--father--and thus disengage himself from the intimate relation of caring. (p. 97)

Noddings’ perspective comes from her research in mathematics and science classrooms. Other researchers have also examined the definition of caring and the gendered nature of caring (Acker, 1995; Jackson-Minot, 2002; King, 1996, 1998; Vogt, 2002; Webb-Dempsey et al., 1996; Weinstein, 1998).

Acker’s (1995) ethnographic study focused on illuminating the connections between caring and the maternal role. Acker interviewed and observed teachers and examined documents pertaining to teachers’ work at Hillview Elementary School. Over the three-year period she observed at Hillview, she witnessed the dedication of the
teachers. Acker explained, “Like real mothers, teachers struggled with ‘their’ children” (p. 27).

The teachers taught in poor conditions under stressful situations, but cared for their students and their fellow teachers. The close relationships teachers formed with their students illustrated what Acker called “women’s caring” (p. 32); however, the teachers reported feeling more comfortable in their relationships with colleagues than in their relationships with students. Since teachers are responsible for student learning, when students are not achieving to their highest potential the teacher may be blamed and held responsible, just as a mother may be blamed for her child’s failures. Acker emphasized, “Such explanations are reductionist, avoiding analysis of the context in which mothering or teaching is conducted” (p. 32). Acker accepted the view that aspects of teaching are similar to the role of mothering; however, she disagreed with the argument that teaching is the same as being a mother (Noddings, 1984). She objected to this categorization because it negates the complexity of being a mother and ignores the specific context of teacher-student relationships.

Other scholars found Noddings’ view of caring as feminine to be problematic. Vogt’s (2002) photo elicitation and semi-structured interviews with 32 Swiss and English primary school teachers found that both male and female teachers discussed the importance of caring in teaching. In their drawings and photographs, all the teachers talked about their work in relation to their students. When interviewed about their views of caring, the teachers defined caring in relationship to students: being committed to students, needing to provide physical care for younger students, and at times being a “parent” to students. While there are feminine qualities to caring, Vogt argued,
“Defining a caring teacher as one committed to teaching and to professional relationships with pupils would allow one to value this very important aspect of teaching without perpetuating patriarchal discourses which link caring to femininity” (p. 262). Vogt’s research illustrated that teachers who care share certain characteristics; however, she argued that referring to caring as “feminine work” perpetuates a narrow and inaccurate view of caring.

Echoing Vogt’s view, King (1996, 1998) elaborated on the problematic view of caring as feminine, noting, “These associations, construed negatively by the culture, are being used to control the number of men who choose to enter primary education and to manipulate those men who do teach young children” (p. 53). King’s study consisted of eight male elementary school teachers who participated in interviews and focus groups and wrote about their views of teaching. Initially, King was interested in why so few men were working in elementary education. However, over time the focus of his study shifted to examining gender roles in elementary education. King found that gender was not as important as behavior in being a caring teacher.

The male teachers King studied expressed a need to establish themselves as different from the females teachers so they would be not be seen as feminine. King discovered that the male teachers’ behaviors with students were not different from those of female teachers. However, in male teachers’ interactions with their fellow teachers, they highlighted their differing views on discipline and noted that male teachers are task-focused in meetings while women tend to discuss relationships. In conversations with both male and female colleagues, these male teachers used female teachers’ approach to discipline as sources for devaluing female teachers’ work.
King attributed this need to establish difference to the fact that if male teachers are seen as too nurturing, parents and administrators may think that they are sexually involved with their students. King’s research highlights the need for caution in recommending that teachers care for students. The teachers quotes showed that male teachers do exhibit caring traits with their students; however, around their colleagues they manage their caring as a way of protecting themselves from false accusations.

In investigating what it means to be a caring teacher, Weinstein (1998) examined teacher education students’ perspectives on caring, with the purpose of identifying pre-service teachers’ perceptions of how teachers enact caring and order in their classrooms. In a survey of 141 teacher education students, Weinstein found that they viewed caring as involving interpersonal skills, not pedagogy or management. Elementary pre-service teachers described caring as being there for their students and establishing rapport with them. Secondary education students likewise identified interpersonal aspects as important in caring for students, but they also discussed classroom management strategies. Weinstein reflected, “Interestingly, studies of children’s conception of teaching suggest that children recognize that caring includes concern about learning, curriculum and community” (p. 162). Whereas children perceived caring as multidimensional, the elementary pre-service teachers in this study described caring as involving only interpersonal relationships.

Weinstein argued that teacher education programs need to work with their pre-service teachers in understanding that caring for students involves more than interpersonal relationships. Caring involves providing a safe environment with well thought-out instruction contributing to the productivity of the classroom. Weinstein
acknowledged that her use of questionnaires was a limitation to the study. She explained that this methodology allowed her to sample a larger number of pre-service teachers, but the responses were ambiguous. Weinstein clearly explained her findings and identified the need for pre-service teachers to look at caring with a broader lens; however, she did not provide any suggestions for how this broader perspective might be achieved.

Building on the knowledge gained from Weinstein’s study, Goldstein and Lake (2000) further inquired into pre-service teachers’ definition of caring. They asked 17 pre-service teachers to write in electronic journals about their views on caring. Goldstein and Lake defined caring as follows: “Caring takes the shape of encouraging dialogue, exhibiting sensitivity to students’ needs and interests, and providing engaging, rich and meaningful materials and activities” (p. 862). They found that when teachers make decisions, caring is often involved.

Goldstein and Lake found that their group of pre-service teachers tended to express essentialist, oversimplified, and idealized notions of caring. The pre-service teachers’ views were essentialist in that they viewed caring as a personality trait which is instinctual, and believed that a teacher either has or does not have the ability to care. The researchers were surprised at this finding because the participants in the study were undergoing training to be teachers; therefore, the researchers had hypothesized that the pre-service teachers would believe the skill of caring could be taught. To the researchers’ surprise, the participants stated that if teachers don’t have the instinctual ability to care for students then they need to find another profession.

In this view, the pre-service teachers defined caring as having a love for children and as being nice. The researchers attributed this oversimplified view of caring to the
influence of popular culture, which commonly portrays female teachers being nice to their students. Since Goldstein and Lake define caring in terms of decision-making, meeting students’ individual needs, and choosing instructional approaches, they expressed concern that the pre-service teachers thought all they had to do to care for students was to be nice.

These unrealistic views of the challenges involved in caring for students were further supported in Goldstein and Lake’s third finding that the pre-service teachers held idealized notions of caring, such as “This teacher should be available for the child in any capacity and should never turn a deaf ear on a child’s problem or concern” (p. 868). They discussed pre-service teachers’ romanticized view of caring for students, which would be shattered quickly once they started teaching. Goldstein and Lake explained that by understanding this idealism, teacher educators can take responsibility for helping pre-service teachers to critically examine their views before they have a chance to cause burnout and job dissatisfaction. The researchers recommended having pre-service teachers critique the media’s portrayal of caring, and having them interview in-service teachers to get a more realistic sense of how caring occurs in the classroom.

Views of caring as involving interpersonal skills, pedagogy, and classroom management were further explored by Jackson-Minot (2002). In this study, the researcher administered surveys and conducted phenomenological interviews to investigate racial differences in pre-service teachers’ perceptions of caring. He inquired into what it means to be a caring teacher and how teachers demonstrate caring. He found that both black and white pre-service teachers described a caring teacher as someone who is “available, accessible, and approachable” (p. 88).
The differences in perspective between black and white pre-service teachers emerged when Jackson-Minot asked students to talk about their least effective teachers. The white students shared examples of teachers with poor interpersonal skills, perceiving caring as a function of interpersonal skills. However, the black students discussed teachers who had interpersonal skills which they appreciated, but who did not teach them content or challenge them intellectually. Jackson-Minot recommended that future research investigate caring in teaching students with diverse backgrounds.

Researchers agree that caring is a crucial aspect of teaching; however, debate continues over the definition of caring and the characterization of caring as a feminine quality. The literature shows that men and women both play caring roles in classrooms and schools. This research provides a starting point for further research that examines how caring is impacted--or not impacted--by external pressures to improve standardized test scores.

**Anxiety in teaching.** The relationship between teachers’ teaching status (i.e., beginner, veteran) and their level of anxiety has been a topic of exploration for researchers such as Tickle (1991) and Ria, Seve, Saury, Theureau, and Durand (2003). Tickle (1991) audio taped discussions with five beginning elementary, middle, and high school teachers and found anxiety to be common among these teachers. He described this anxiety as a natural part of being a beginning teacher. Tickle explained, “The emotional explorations were directly related to the experience of being ‘halfway there’ as learner teachers, and to ‘going through it’ as they acquired what they saw as the necessary experience to emerge from novicehood” (p. 323). Part of the process of “going through it” involves learning how to manage one’s anxiety and emotional responses.
Similar to Tickle’s study, Ria, Seve, Saury, Theureau, and Durand (2003) investigated the anxiety of eight beginning physical education teachers. The researchers observed the teachers in 13 physical education classes. They explained the importance of using observation as their method of data collection: “To date, teachers’ emotions have been described from questionnaires, interviews and personal journals. A major shortcoming of these methods, however, is that emotions become detached from the actual teaching activity and the context in which they appear” (p. 220).

The researchers found that beginning teachers’ emotions were strongly linked to their view of their lesson plans. The beginning teachers in this study equated classroom success with adherence to their well thought-out lesson plans. Successful execution of the lesson plan led to positive emotions. However, when teachers had to deviate from their lesson plans due to classroom realities such as students needing more time to work on an activity, they felt helpless, causing anxiety. Ria et al. stated, “An essential need at the beginning of the teaching career is to learn to recognize one’s own emotions so they can be appropriately and relevantly dissimulated to give the impression of controlling events even when one has partially lost control” (p. 229). The researchers recommended that beginning teachers learn to recognize and classify their emotions by listening to other teachers discuss their experience. The authors believe this approach will help beginning teachers identify situations that elicit negative emotions, which will help them deal with these emotions when they occur in the future.

In these two studies, researchers connected the teachers’ anxiety level to their beginning or veteran status. Beginning teachers’ levels of anxiety increased when the needs of their students made them deviate from their lesson plans. Over time, most
beginning teachers learn to control their anxiety. Both beginning and veteran teachers experience some degree of anxiety; however, the level of the anxiety differs in relation to the length of time they have been teaching. These researchers recommend further research that focuses specifically on the emotion of anxiety as it relates to teachers’ status.

The importance of teachers’ emotions in schools has been highlighted by research focusing on the issues that evoke specific responses of caring (Acker, 1995; Eaker-Rich & Van Galen, 1996; Jackson-Minot, 2002; King, 1998; Noddings, 1984, 1992, 1996; Vogt, 2002; Webb-Dempsey et al., 1996; Weinstein, 1998); anxiety (Ria et al., 2003; Tickle, 1991); and anger (Graham, 1984; Roulston et al., 2003; Sutton & Conway, 2002; Wilson et al., 2003).

*Teachers’ anger.* The third specific emotion researchers have investigated among teachers is anger. Anger is an emotion that tends not to be perceived as a professional response (Graham, 1984; Roulston et al., 2003; Sutton & Conway, 2002; Wilson et al., 2003). Researchers have investigated the process teachers use to manage their emotions in situations that make them angry. Such studies focus on identifying the kinds of issues that elicit teachers’ anger and the ways that teachers manage or control their anger.

Graham (1984) examined the relationship between anger and sympathy. In this study, children and adults were asked to recall incidents in which they experienced anger and incidents in which they experienced sympathy. The study showed the impact teachers’ sympathy or anger may have on their students’ academic success. This study revealed a link between anger and controllable situations and between sympathy and uncontrollable situations.
Sutton and Conway (2002) used 56 teachers’ diaries to explore the role of anger in the teaching profession, seeking to identify patterns in the timing of anger incidents and the types of situations that elicit anger. The diary method of data collection was comprised of three parts. The first part contained “personal demographics and classroom context” (p. 3). The second part consisted of daily questionnaires that asked about the frequency and nature of feelings of anger and frustration. Teachers completed the third part of the diaries at the end of the week. This section involved their reflections on being a part of the diary research.

Sutton and Conway found that teachers experienced more “anger and frustration at the beginning and end of the school week” (p. 4) and at the beginning and end of the day. The researchers indicated that teachers’ lunch breaks may account for fewer anger incidents in the middle of the day. Teachers described 466 incidents of frustration and 128 incidents of anger in a week. There was no statistical significance between the number of years teaching; teachers’ age, gender, or race; and the number of incidents. Their frustration and anger in response to others, but the intensity did not vary between parental and administrative triggers. When teachers were frustrated, the reaction dissipated an hour sooner than did feelings of anger.

Sutton and Conway observed that when teachers are angry and/or frustrated they tend to talk more, display a facial response, and employ disciplinary strategies. They found that 55 percent of teachers’ frustration incidents and 66 percent of their anger incidents came from students. They found that administrators and parents were less likely to trigger anger and frustration, which may be a result of the amount of time teachers spend with students in comparison to time spent with administrators or parents.
Wilson, Williams, and deMarrais’ (2003) interview study of teachers’ anger used critical race theory to explore the language of race in teachers’ experiences. Wilson et al. explained, “Primarily, critical race theorists strive to understand the creation and maintenance of white supremacy as the subordinator of oppressed peoples” (p. 7). The researchers asked, “Within stories of their anger, how do teachers use language to describe issues related to race?” (p. 10). The researchers described three themes that emerged in relation to the research question

1. teachers’ use [and receipt] of stereotypic language to describe particular people or groups of people…and teachers’ receipt of stereotypic language and actions by members of the school community;
2. teachers’ presentation of themselves and their professional roles (as an understanding of the culture of power) along different power positions within contexts where race is the primary influence; and
3. teachers’ denial of, lack of, and avoidance from situations of conflict and power (p. 11).

These themes serve as the umbrella for their results.

In discussing stereotypical language, the researchers focused on the culture of power in the classroom and on sources of power. The researchers defined the culture of power as codes, rules, and ideas imposed by dominant culture (Delpit, 1995). When European American teachers shared stories that “othered” individuals different from them, they justified or rationalized their decision based on professional judgment. When a person “others” another person they “hold on to their worldview with great tenacity,
insisting that all of the others are wrong, peculiar, undeveloped, heathened, or uncivilized” (Delpit, 1995, p. 74).

The African American teachers discussed being othered at school due to their race and the culture of power in their school. Wilson et al. identified the rules and traditions (i.e., culture of power) in social institutions as the causes of institutionalized racism in schools. In exploring the language used in these incidents, the researchers found that teachers “used labels such as ‘urban community,’ ‘that population,’ ‘that population of kids,’ ‘those people,’ ‘minority,’ ‘that community,’ and ‘high risk’--terms that contribute to categorizations based on race” (p. 15). These labels reinforced the divide in the school between the individuals in the dominant culture and those outside of it. Stereotypical language supports the views and reinforces the power of the dominant culture.

The second theme dealt with the approaches teachers employ to preserve their professional self and professional roles in difficult situations. In the presentation of self, one teacher described an incident in which she was angry with her African American teaching assistant. She justified her belief that the teaching assistant had acted inappropriately by stating that she was responsible for the activity in her classroom. This responsibility for her classroom connected to her perception of her professional self. A second teacher reflected on her professional self when she became angry at one of her students. She realized that she needed to apologize to the student because she had not responded professionally in a difficult situation.

This theme highlighted the fact that when teachers get angry they evaluate their response based on their ability to uphold their professional identity. When the teachers
discussed challenges to their professional image and role, they described becoming “livid” and “furious” and experiencing “hot flashes of sweat, crying, even sympathy for the parties involved” in the incident (p. 21). When they experienced this range of emotions, they looked to the culture of power for guidance on the appropriate way to act. Wilson et al. explained that teachers gave up their professional identities in an effort to conform to school policies and procedures (i.e., the culture of power). The researchers noted, “We found that teachers assessed the context and made decisions about how and when to act on the power of their positions as teachers and their beliefs of themselves as professionals” (p. 25). When teachers had to decide whether to uphold their professional views of themselves or conform to the views of the culture of power, they chose to align themselves with the culture of power.

In the third theme, the researchers identified “teachers’ denial of, lack of, and avoidance from the situations of conflict and power” (p.11). Lack of acknowledgement of the culture of power allows teachers to deny or avoid difficult situations that might otherwise illustrate their racism. Wilson et al. stated, “We found little evidence in the data that teachers reflected on their stereotypic notions of the other in the narratives they told” (p. 27). To the contrary, teachers denied the occurrence of racist acts in their schools.

The researchers emphasized that power in schools needs to be addressed because by ignoring it we perpetuate passive racism. They explained that teachers’ experience of anger connects to concerns about power in their classrooms and schools. The implications of this research centered on the need for pre-service and in-service teachers
to challenge their beliefs about race in relationship to anger incidents, creating a critical reflective practice.

The research on teachers’ anger shows that teachers become angry in response to a perceived lack of control. The teachers in Sutton and Conway’s study described specific emotions of anger and frustration. Frustration dissipated quickly, but anger stayed with the teachers longer. Wilson et al.’s research showed that teachers justify their racist actions in situations of anger through the culture of power in schools. Teachers avoid acknowledging that in aligning themselves with the culture of power they are perpetuating “othering” and racist practices.

Strategies for managing anger. In all of the studies on teachers’ anger, the researchers noted that teachers need to manage their anger in order to maintain their professionalism (Roulston et al., 2003). The process of managing anger is explored in the teachers’ anger literature.

Roulston, Darby, and Owens (2003) inquired into beginning teachers’ experiences of anger. In this interview study, the researchers found three themes related to beginning teachers’ management of anger. The first theme dealt with the “messiness of anger events,” in which “emotions ranged from shock, rage, fear, nervousness and embarrassment during the event to guilt, despair, betrayal, hurt disappointment, discouragement, violation and frustration after the event” (p. 8). In this theme, some of the teachers had difficulty controlling their emotions in public and others described stopping themselves from sharing their feelings.

The second theme uncovered the strategies teachers used to deal with their emotions. Teachers identified the following strategies: needing and asking for help;
“changing the setting or situation” (p. 15); “changing one’s behavior and responses” (p. 17), and avoiding situations that elicit anger. Beginning teachers identified their need for help from reflecting on the situation and in some situations colleagues recommended that the teachers request help. In requesting help, the beginning teachers went to colleagues and/or administration to get support. In the approach of “changing the setting or situation,” teachers described leaving the location of the interaction that made them angry. This could be as small an act as leaving the classroom or as large an act as leaving the teaching profession. Teachers described “changing one’s behavior and responses” as choosing to use different classroom management strategies to avoid situations that had previously provoked anger. When teachers avoided the situations that elicit anger for them, they would purposely stay in their classroom during the school day and leave as soon as the school day was over.

The third theme identified by the researchers dealt with teachers’ ability to learn from their anger. In some incidents, teachers learned about their capacity to control their anger through a reflection process conducted at the time of incident. However, it took other teachers years to learn from such interactions, and still other teachers never learned from the situation that made them angry.

Roulston et al.’s research indicates that teachers become angry in situations they cannot control. Such situations can occur in the classroom or in interactions with administrators or parents. In dealing with the anger at the time of the incident, some teachers asked for help, others left the situation, and some lost control. Some of the teachers in Roulston et al.’s study used the anger incidents to determine the process they
needed to use to manage their emotions in the future, while others never reflected on their role in the anger incident.

The research on teachers’ specific emotions investigates the process beginning teachers go through to manage their anger and anxiety. Similarly, teachers must manage their caring; male teachers in particular have a need to monitor their caring behavior. In these studies, researchers describe the beneficial aspects of caring and even of anxiety, whereas the benefits of anger are yet to be identified.

Emotions are an important part of teachers’ work that influence their job satisfaction and their social interactions in school. Teachers face the challenge of figuring out how to foster desirable emotions while managing or suppressing those deemed undesirable. The literature on teachers’ specific emotions helps researchers better understand teachers’ experiences of caring, anxiety, and anger, knowledge which can then be applied to research on governmental oversight in schools and its impact on teachers’ emotions.

*Teachers’ Emotions in UK and Canadian Educational Reform*

Researchers in the UK and Canada have long recognized the importance of understanding emotions in educational settings. During the 1980s and early 1990s, the government in the UK established an accountability system to change and monitor the educational system (Jeffrey & Woods, 1996; Woods & Jeffrey, 1998). At the same time, Canada also instituted programs for standards-based reform. Standards-based reform places the government in charge of making sure that teachers are effectively teaching students certain types of knowledge and skills.
Great Britain’s reform initiative required personnel from the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) to conduct school inspections every four years (OFSTED, 2003) in which they spent a week to two weeks at each school. According to OFSTED (2003), inspectors report on

a) the quality of the education provided by the school

b) the educational standards achieved in the school

c) the quality of the leadership in, and management of, the school, including whether the financial resources made available to the school are managed efficiently

d) the spiritual, moral, social, and cultural development of pupils at the school (OSTED, 2003, p. 8).

The inspectors send a completed report of their visit to the school and Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector (HMCI) within six weeks of the event.

As accountability measures were implemented in schools, researchers began to question teachers about their emotions during these reforms. Such research has brought to light factors of governmental and parental intrusion and issues in structure and pedagogy that influence teachers’ emotions.

*Intrusions.* The theme of classroom intrusions exists throughout the literature on teachers’ emotions during periods of reform. These intrusions vary in emotional intensity, but they focus on OFSTED inspections, governmental and school structures, and parent and family issues that exasperate teachers and disrupt classroom learning.

Hargreaves (1998a), Golby (1996), and Lasky (2000) conducted interview studies that explored teachers’ emotions during educational reform. In the Canadian reform initiatives, Hargreaves stated, “Classroom emotions are seen to intrude from the outside--
from the family, home, and personal life” (p. 822). Teachers’ emotions come from their interactions in the school environment as well as their personal lives; however, Hargreaves (1997) argued “most reforms designed to strengthen relationships between the school and the community, such as site based councils or school choice, ignore [the emotional] dimension and focus on market relationships or managerial structures instead (p. xiii).

During this same reform initiative, Lasky’s (2000) interview study examined “how power, culture and sense of purpose impact the emotions teachers report experiencing in their interactions with parents” (p. 856). Lasky found that although elementary, middle, and high school teachers experienced different levels of engagement with parents, teachers in general expressed dismay when parents inquired into their expertise. Teachers believed the parents’ questioning of their knowledge and status diminished their authority over their classrooms. The combination of parents and government accountability intensified teachers’ emotions in response to what they perceived as intrusions into their instruction and classrooms.

Also set in the context of Great Britain’s reform initiative, Golby’s (1996) interview study focused on the emotions of two teachers during their interactions with parents. Both teachers had trouble maintaining a focus on their purpose in teaching students when they were distracted from their work by parent visits or OFSTED inspections. Both the OFSTED inspectors and parents challenged the “teachers’ sense of their central mission” (Golby, 1996, p. 432) of teaching students.

Similar to Golby’s (1996) study, Adams (2002) explored the role of the OFSTED inspections on teachers’ emotions. Fourteen teachers completed questionnaires that
examined “what happens to the inner lives of teachers and children in a context of rapid educational reform and work-related stress” (p. 183). Adams explained that “twelve people reported anxiety dreams, which were based in a school setting” (p. 187). The themes in these dreams centered on not having control in the classroom when being observed by the OFSTED inspector. This inability to keep things under control in their dreams led to feelings of frustration and anxiety. Adams asked, “Might the demands for perfection from managers, to achieve high scores in national tests and OFSTED inspections, be creating imperfections in the inner world? Might the greater degree of control in the waking world be creating greater havoc in the internal world?” (p. 190).

Situated in a similar context of OFSTED inspections, Jeffrey and Woods (1996) conducted an ethnographic study of “the effects of OFSTED inspections on primary teachers and their work” (p. 327). The inspection elicited teachers’ emotions of “fear, anguish, anger, despair, depression, humiliation, grief, and guilt” (p. 340). The results showed that specific feelings of confusion and anxiety accompanied feelings of professional uncertainty in response to the OFSTED inspections. This professional uncertainty contributed to a multitude of negative feelings and emotions: professional inadequacy, marginalized positive emotions, and loss of self. The latter emotion produced feelings of personal and professional diminishment, dehumanization, loss of pedagogic values, and loss of harmony. The degree of damage caused to individual teachers cannot be overestimated; the researchers stated that “the inspection induces a trauma which penetrates to the innermost being of the teacher” (Jeffrey & Woods, 1996, p. 340).
Jeffrey and Wood’s (1996) and Adams’ (2002) research on the role of intrusions on teachers’ emotions provides the foundation for this study. Their work investigates why teachers view the inspections as intrusive and how they disrupt the teachers’ purpose in teaching students. Their research raises further questions about how other aspects of reform support or challenge teachers’ purposes in teaching children, and which specific emotions are elicited by these reform elements.

Structure and Pedagogy. Hargreaves’ (1998a, 1998b, 2000) interview studies focused on educational reform in Ontario, Canada, investigating nine teachers in grades seven and eight in four school districts. The findings showed that teachers’ opinions about changes in school structure depended on the impact the changes had on their students. If the changes seemed to improve the classroom experience for students, then teachers experienced positive emotions as a result. Conversely, if structural changes such as alterations in scheduling impacted the students negatively, then negative emotions were elicited from the teachers. Hargreaves, Earl, Moore, and Manning’s (2001) interview study with 29 teachers who taught grades 7 and 8 on explained the significance of their research, noting that, “By focusing on teachers’ emotional responses, we were able to rethink what is important about educational change and what its purpose should be” (p. 144). They add, “One important way in which teachers interpreted the educational changes that were imposed on them, as well as the ones they developed themselves, was in terms of their own emotional goals and relationships. . . . Without attention to emotions, educational reform efforts may ignore and even damage some of the most fundamental aspects of what teachers do” (p.156). Teachers’ emotional goals and relationships are a major foundation of teachers’ work.
In a narrative study, Day and Leitch (2001) presented six narratives from a sample of 22 teachers in England and 19 teachers in Northern Ireland. They assert, “Reforms imposed by a series of government policy decisions are continuing to challenge [teachers’] ability to continue to provide the high levels of emotional commitment so necessary to good teaching” (p. 407). Findings from the English narratives illustrate the tension between having a personal vision and dealing with the demands placed on teachers by the government reform process.

The teachers from Northern Ireland participated in a mask-making activity which provided Day and Leitch with indications that the teachers felt “disappointment, resentment, hurt, rage, fear, and shame” in the seen and unseen aspects of their professional lives (p. 410). Day and Leitch advocated for teachers to examine how their personal experiences intersected with their professional selves. In this examination teachers could see how their views of self intersected with context of their teaching. Day and Leitch argued that understanding the impact of reform processes on teachers must begin with an examination of the emotions surrounding the personal/professional self as it interacts with the school and governmental context.

Hargreaves (1998a, 1998b, 2000), Day and Leitch (2001), and Jeffrey and Woods (1996) provide a starting point for research on teachers’ emotions in educational reform. Parental and governmental intrusion into teachers’ classrooms challenges teachers’ views of self, evoking a variety of emotions. This surveillance and questioning of their teaching poses a challenge to the teachers’ maintenance of their professional identity.
Discussion


While the literature on teachers’ work, teachers’ specific emotions, and teachers’ emotions in education reform provides a foundation for understanding teachers’ emotions in circumstances of change, 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 aims to illustrate the impact of a specific educational reform initiative, guided by NCLB, on teachers’ work. The importance of this study resides in the emotional connection to instruction and teachers’ job satisfaction. If policymakers want to reform education, they must look at the emotional aspects of teaching that improve or impede instruction. With the exception of studies by Hargreaves (1997, 1998a, 1998b, 2000) and Jeffrey and Woods (1996), educational reform research has largely ignored this critical area of investigation. Emotions are a crucial aspect of teaching that must be investigated further if we are to have any hope of improving schools and enhancing student achievement.

In my examination of teachers’ specific emotions during a CSR initiative, I define emotions from an integrated perspective. This perspective draws on aspects of psychology and sociology. When individuals interact with other people, their environment, and the larger culture, they experience individual emotions. Individuals’ emotions activate areas of the brain and the central nervous system. Once physiological processes are in motion, individuals appraise a situation to determine their emotional response and decide on a course of action. Individuals draw their emotions from the environmental climate, but at the same time the environmental climate is constructed from the collection of individual emotions. This study defines emotions through the cycle of interactions between individual interpretation and response with the emotional climate. In sum, individuals experience emotions with cognitive appraisals and
physiological changes, which influence and are influenced by their participation in the larger emotional climate.

This integrated definition of emotions guides this study of teachers’ emotions during an educational reform initiative. The purpose of this study is to examine teachers’ specific emotions during the implementation of a comprehensive school reform initiative. The research questions guiding this study are

1. What are the teachers’ critical incidents within a comprehensive school reform initiative?

2. What specific emotions do teachers experience within the critical incidents?

The next five chapters contain the study’s methodology, two chapters of findings, and my conclusions.
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
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: 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Participation on Major Committees[^3]</th>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience at UCSD</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Four-year certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Four-year certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Four-year certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Masters degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Master's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Four-year certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Four-year certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>Four-year certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>Four-year certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>Four-year certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>Four-year certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>Four-year certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>Four-year certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>Masters degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>Masters degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>Specialist degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>Specialist degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical incident interviews</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant observations</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival materials</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Critical Incident</th>
<th>Specific Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant name</td>
<td>Type of specific emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant name</td>
<td>Type of specific emotions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 be 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Increase or decrease in power</th>
<th>Increase or decrease in control</th>
<th>Source of emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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
deb briefing, 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.”
CHAPTER 4

SETTING THE CONTEXT

In 2001, McLeod CLC experienced its second consecutive year of low standardized test scores. These poor results and the student demographics drew attention to the fact that the teachers and students at McLeod CLC were struggling and headed for state takeover under the regulations of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). From spring 2002 until the end of fall 2004, McLeod CLC initiated significant changes which sparked emotional peaks and valleys for students, faculty, and administrators. These emotional highs and lows resulted in an often turbulent school climate as McLeod CLC struggled to transform itself from a school in “corrective action” to a “distinguished school.” This chapter provides a foundation for understanding teachers’ emotions during school reform by providing contextual information that illuminates the “water” in the fishbowl of school life.

This story begins with the development of the university, school district, and community partnership that later chose McLeod CLC to be one of its two pilot schools. This partnership ultimately served as a support system and the catalyst for change at McLeod CLC. In this chapter I provide a brief history of the partnership’s development and present a physical description of the McLeod CLC campus in order to paint a picture of the site in which these efforts took place. To assist the readers the following table displays the sequence of events in the development of the partnership.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 2001</td>
<td>Public announcement of partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 2001</td>
<td>Design Team approved action teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2002</td>
<td>Partnership Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal resigns from McLeod CLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| August 2002-June 2003 | Tucker hired as McLeod CLC principal  
McLeod CLC started school on extended calendar  
Literacy program changed to a modified Cunningham’s Four Blocks model  
Family Resource Coordinator introduced at faculty meeting  
Partnership coordinator and university faculty member from League of Professional Schools presented shared governance models  
McLeod CLC leadership team presented proposed shared governance charter  
Janice hired as McLeod CLC assistant principal  
McLeod CLC faculty collaborate with University Departments of Language Arts, Cell Biology, Mathematics Education and Recreation and Leisure Studies, and the county’s Department of Leisure Services  
McLeod CLC faculty, administration, university professors and community members develop the School Improvement Plan  
Janice, AP resigns from McLeod CLC  
Cunningham’s Four Blocks professional Development  
McLeod CLC faculty participates in university’s writing project  
August 2003-June 2004 | McLeod CLC standardized test scores improve placing them in “needs improvement”  
Ronald hired as new AP  
Hired literacy coach  
Hired professional development associates (PDAs)  
Literacy coach modeled instructional approaches and observed teachers  
Reading Celebration  
McLeod CLC faculty collaborate with University Departments of Language Arts, Art Department, Mathematics Education, Science Education and Recreation and Leisure Studies and the county’s Department of Leisure Services  
McLeod CLC faculty notified that funding for extended calendar cut so McLeod CLC revised to balanced calendar  
Tucker, principal informs McLeod CLC faculty and staff of his plan to retire at the end of school year  
Ronald AP, transferred to another school in district  
McLeod CLC faculty discussed their concerns with school |
Table 5. Sequence of events in development of the McLeod CLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 2004-January 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>district board of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry Picnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod CLC faculty hear that superintendent plans to cut schools AP position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod CLC faculty, university faculty, parents and community member present concerns to school district board of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald approved as McLeod principal for 2004-2005 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School district board of education approved half time assistant principal position for McLeod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired part-time math coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired part-time assistant principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod CLC identified as a “distinguished school” under NCLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-visioning the partnership retreat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction to the Partnership for Community Learning Centers

During the 2000-2001 school year, the dean of the College of Education at the local university and the superintendent of the local school district discussed the value of forming a partnership between these two entities. The superintendent needed to find a way to address the 53 percent high school dropout rate and to improve the quality of low achieving schools. Because of pressure from state and federal accountability offices, and in light of recent legislation mandating educational progress standards, it was clear that the schools under his supervision needed to take steps toward change.

The dean of the College of Education was interested in providing hands-on training for university students in the teacher preparation program. The dean also recognized that the availability of quality public schools serving the university area was essential for attracting faculty members and for providing undergraduate and graduate students with authentic learning experiences in public school classrooms. The dean and
the superintendent agreed on a collaborative project, with the goal of improving student achievement in the county’s public school system. On February 1, 2001, the dean and the superintendent announced publicly their commitment to undertake this reform initiative.

*Nuts and Bolts Team*

The dean and the superintendent identified seven people to lead this initiative. This group of seven, who were charged with providing leadership for the partnership, became known as the “Nuts and Bolts Team.” The group consisted of two university faculty members, two elementary school principals, and three school district administrators: the Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction, the Director of Gifted Assessment, and the Coordinator for Educational Technology. The group’s two top priorities included creating a Partnership Design Team and establishing action teams to research and provide recommendations on proposed initiatives (January 12, 2001 Design Team Minutes).

*Design Team*

One of the Nuts and Bolts Team’s first projects was to create a Design Team and develop its agenda. The Design Team served as the larger resource for decision-making. This 17-member team developed the partnership vision statement, rationale, and goals. The Design Team included three teachers, three principals, three school district administrators, three parents and community members, and five university faculty members. On January 19, 2001, a kick-off retreat was held for Nuts and Bolts Team and Design Team members, along with the dean of the College of Education. The purpose of
the retreat was to encourage team members to be creative with their vision and plans for the partnership.

Throughout the spring semester, members of the Nuts and Bolts and Design Teams researched and brainstormed reform initiatives for the two pilot schools. The Nuts and Bolts Team- and Design Team-approved versions of the partnership vision, rationale, and goals follow.

**Partnership vision.**

Through this partnership, the community, [school district], and the [university] agreed to share the goal and responsibility of improving educational experiences, options and outcomes for all of [county] students. Through the sharing of leadership responsibilities, resources, and accountability, partnership stakeholders will be focused toward the creation of schools that are community learning centers designed to meet the intellectual, social, and cultural needs of all students. In these community-learning centers, effective culturally responsive teaching will be developed, assessed and refined. Students will have equal opportunities to engage in the present and prepare for the future as productive contributing citizens. In addition, all personnel in the community learning centers will use practices that promote the growth and well-being of the whole child (Partnership Vision Statement, April 30, 2001).

**Partnership rationale.**

The community, [school district], and [the university] share the goal as well as responsibility for improving educational experiences, options, and outcomes for
all [county] students. Our missions converge in the public schools; therefore, we may achieve this goal and further our missions through collecting and focusing our many resources through this dynamic and systematic collaboration (Partnership Vision Statement, April 30, 2001).

**Partnership goals.**

- To reconceptualize the schools as community learning centers designed to be responsive to the needs of the community by providing integrated services for students and families with the goal of improving student learning and development
- To create a mutually beneficial partnership where leadership, resources and accountability are shared across the school district, university, students, parents, and the community and its various agencies and organizations (Partnership Vision Statement, April 30, 2001).

With the foundation of this vision and these goals, the Design Team members divided into action teams to research and recommend initiatives for the community learning centers.

**Action Teams**

Design Team members formed eight separate action teams to recommend initiatives, research activities, and propose budgets. On August 2, 2001, the Design Team approved eight action teams. The action teams included: Calendar/Modified Time; Community and Parent Involvement; Educator Preparation; Curriculum, Instruction, and
In this planning stage, the Calendar/Modified Time action team was one of the first to begin work on its assignment. The research agenda for the Calendar/Modified Time action team included: 1) conduct research on modified calendars; 2) identify schools already using modified calendars; 3) conduct focus groups with teachers, parents, and the community to explore local issues and needs; 4) identify specific calendar modifications for implementation in the pilot schools; and 5) examine the impact and implications for the community (Design Team Summary Notes, June 6, 2001). This committee recommended to the Board of Education an extended calendar, increasing the number of teaching days from 180 to 195. In addition, the extended school year included three two-week breaks in mid-October, December to January, and late March.

The Community and Parent Involvement action team researched community learning centers. This action team was impressed with Yale University’s 21st Century Family Resource Centers, especially the health services component, and they shared information about Yale’s centers with the Design Team. In this CSR model, families receive home visits, attend parenting workshops, and have access to play groups and health services. The health services component of this model involves “health, nutrition and fitness education, physical health services, care for children with special needs, developmental assessments and mental health services” (School of the 21st Century, 2002, p. 5). In the 2001-2002 planning stages, this action team drafted a proposal for family resource centers. In developing their proposal, the team held focus groups with families to learn about their needs.
The Professional/Staff Development action team recommended four measures. The first was to create a professional development model detailing the areas in which teachers could learn different instructional approaches. The second was to determine a structure and process that would support teachers’ professional development. Third, the action team recommended prioritizing the areas of professional development. The fourth recommendation involved developing a process of Design Team and administration monitoring of the teachers’ professional development.

The Educator Preparation action team met and developed its goals, and met several times. The Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; Leadership, Governance and Policy; and Community and Parent Involvement action teams merged into school level committees. The Technology action team never convened. Ultimately, the Calendar/Modified Time, Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, Community and Parent Involvement, and Professional/Staff Development action teams carried out their goals of making recommendations to the Design Team.

Identification of Pilot Schools

While the action teams worked diligently in framing their proposals, the Nuts and Bolts Team and the Design Team identified criteria for choosing two pilot schools. The criteria for selecting the pilot schools included low standardized test scores; second language issues; a school on the east and another on the west side of town; ability for students to access technology from home; issues in transportation; lack of health insurance; lack of pre-K experience; increase in mobility rate due to families moving in and out of the school; involvement with Department of Family and Child Services (DFACS); referrals to student support services (SST); family/parent/guardian
involvement; low retention; socioeconomic status/poverty/free and reduced lunch; out-of-school suspensions; relationship to middle school; number of referrals to counselor or social worker; student grades; and attendance (Design team minutes, 2001). The teams decided to select high poverty schools with high minority enrollment and high need. Mixed in with the academic needs, the Nuts and Bolts Team and Design Team wanted to identify schools in which the families of students evidenced a need for health care and social services. Many elementary schools in the county fit this profile.

With these criteria in mind, the design team selected one school on the east side of town, Booker T. Washington, and one school on the west side of town, the McLeod Community Learning Center (McLeod CLC). To help evaluate this reform effort, the Design Team’s evaluation team placed an ethnographer in each of these schools. This study emerged from my experience as an ethnographer at McLeod CLC from spring 2002 to the end of fall 2004. In the course of this evaluation work, I became interested in the emotions teachers shared in response to the knowledge that they were part of a failing school that was in the process of undertaking substantial reform.

McLeod Community Learning Center

When the McLeod Community Learning Center (McLeod CLC) was identified by the state as a failing school, McLeod CLC faculty and administrators realized they needed to improve student achievement. As a group, they agreed to join the partnership for community learning centers. Each faculty member made a five-year commitment to participating in this reform initiative.

McLeod CLC is located in a college town in the southeast region of the United States. Of its 295 students, 50% are African American, 40% are Hispanic, 4% are Native
American, 4% are European American, and 2% are Asian American. Of this student population, 90-95% of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch, compared to 74% for the school district as a whole. McLeod CLC has 38 teachers, 22 of whom have advanced degrees. The ethnicity of the faculty are 16% African American, 3% Asian American and 31% Caucasian. On average, the teachers at McLeod CLC had been teaching for 13 years at this time.

McLeod CLC, located in a historical structure built in the first quarter of the 20th century, is nestled behind three large oak trees. The school is surrounded by a medical building, a gas station, a poultry plant, and a historic neighborhood with a combination of mill houses and large white plantation-style homes. As seen in Figure 1, students arriving at the school by car are dropped off at a circular drive on the south side of the building. In front of the circular drive is a breezeway that leads to two brick buildings, forming a rectangle around a courtyard containing scattered gardens interspersed with round outdoor tables and benches.

The left side entrance leads to the front office and classrooms for the younger grades, while the right side entrance leads to the front of the school that houses the fourth and fifth grade along with English as a Second Language, the (Early Intervention Program (EIP) teacher, the school counselor, and special education classrooms. This hallway along the north end of the building connects with the speech therapist’s office, a first grade classroom, and the computer lab. The computer lab contains 24 desktop computers. At the end of the hallway to the right is the exit to the teachers’ parking lot, bus pick-up area, and activities building. A left turn from this hallway leads to two pre-K classrooms, two first grade classrooms, the gifted students’ classroom, and the parent
liaison office. Directly ahead is the main office where the nurse’s clinic and the offices of the principal and assistant principal are located.
Figure 1. McLeod CLC school map.
Jutting out from the hallway that intersects with the main office is another corridor leading to the cafeteria, the media center, three kindergarten classrooms, the art classroom, and the music classroom. Two glass doors on the south side of the building lead to the butterfly garden and nine rusted portable trailers. On rainy days, the metal breezeway over the walkway to the portables and playground leaks on students and teachers going to the cafeteria.

The playground contains four sets of brightly colored playground equipment. The children swing on the swings, run across the bridges, jump on the tires, and hang from the jungle gym. While the children are playing, teachers and paraprofessionals sit on the benches that weave through the playground landscape. The grassy area behind the cafeteria hosts soccer and football games at recess. At the back of the playground sits the Girl Scout log cabin, which McLeod CLC hopes will become a new family resource center. The chain link fence around this playground separates the school from the road and neighborhood but allows passers-by to see the hustle and bustle of this changing school.

**Partnership Retreat**

At the conclusion of the 2001-2002 school year, the McLeod CLC faculty, staff, and administration participated in the first partnership retreat along with Booker T. Washington teachers, staff, and administrators; university administrators and faculty; and school district representatives. The three-day retreat, held in May 2002, involved presentations and discussion about shared governance, school discipline, curricula, and service learning, with the goal of establishing a vision for each of the pilot schools.
At the retreat, faculty from the university’s League of Professional Schools presented the research on shared governance in schools and on “Schools for the 21st century,” a set of comprehensive school reform initiatives for the development of community learning centers. These community learning centers developed their own shared governance models with the goal of creating a school that addressed the specific needs of local families and communities (Schools of the 21st Century, 2002). In discussing shared governance models, representatives from the League of Professional Schools talked with McLeod CLC faculty and administration about their current school decision-making structure.

Guided by a representative of the League of Professional Schools, McLeod CLC faculty and administrators brainstormed a list of the competencies all children should have when they left McLeod CLC. They decided that all children should have individual ownership in their learning, reading skills, writing skills and math skills. They should possess a love of learning, confidence in their ability to learn, and the ability to socialize with other students. These goals served as the foundation for developing McLeod CLC’s mission statement.

The following day McLeod CLC faculty met with two professors from the university’s Special Education Department and a partnership coordinator. In the same small conference room, teachers continued to reflect on the competencies they wanted their students to have when they left McLeod CLC. The group identified five core competencies:

- Recognizing they [students] can be everything they want to be through setting personal goals and making choices
• Understanding the value of diversity
• Taking responsibility for their own learning and behavior
• Mastering basic skills in reading, writing and mathematics
• Developing respect for self/others/authority

In this session, they drafted the following statement of core values:

We can be everything we want to be at [McLeod CLC] because:

We understand and value our differences
We are responsible for our learning and our behavior
We can reach goals by making good choices
We respect ourselves and others.

After a lunch break, the group reconvened to examine how they could use the core value statement to revise the school’s discipline policy. The university faculty emphasized that in order to develop a discipline plan; they must explore what behavior should look like in the classroom, the cafeteria, the playground, the bathroom, and other places on school grounds. This group identified a subgroup to work on revising the core values and then revising the discipline plan. The goal of this subgroup was to refine the core values statement, which would be posted in the hallways and in every classroom.

The third day of the retreat included a presentation on curriculum and instruction issues and a brainstorming session on ideas for service learning projects, and ended with the partnership send-off. In the curriculum and instruction presentation, the university professors serving as speakers provided examples of theme immersion topics for study and a professor from the university’s reading department demonstrated ways to incorporate science into literacy instruction. In addition, another group of university
faculty and school district administrators presented a panel discussion on diversity issues. In the group’s brainstorming session, recommended service learning projects included improving school grounds, creating a butterfly sanctuary, building a wildlife habitat, and working with the homeless shelter.

Finally, in the partnership send-off faculty from McLeod CLC performed a skit that focused the book entitled *Who Moved My Cheese* (Johnson, 1998). In this book, the authors illustrate different ways people deal with change through the metaphor of three different mice in a maze trying to get to the cheese. In the performance, two McLeod CLC teachers played the mice and two of them played people, and they highlighted the many different ways they could handle the change process. Next, one teacher read a poem she had written about the three-day workshop. Some of the group members then performed what became known as the “Partnership Rap,” and others presented a puppet show on the partnership. At the end of the wrap-up, the principals from the two partnership schools led the group in singing the song, “Lean on Me.” The group left for their summer break excited about the upcoming school year but aware that many changes needed to occur to get them out of corrective action.

The 2002-2003 School Year: Implementing Corrective Action

In August 2002, McLeod CLC opened its doors to students as a partnership school working with an extended calendar of 195 days per year. McLeod CLC faculty knew that their students’ poor literacy and mathematics skills were causing them to perform poorly on standardized testing. During the fall 2002 semester, faculty and administrators learned that among the spring 2002 scores for the Criterion Reference Curriculum Test (CRCT), “only 47% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders at [McLeod CLC] met
standards in reading, and only 4% met standards in math” (February 12, 2003 Letter to McLeod CLC Families). These low scores caused McLeod CLC to be removed from the category of needs improvement and placed under corrective action under NCLB.

As a result of their failure to meet standards, McLeod CLC administration and faculty risked having their school taken over by the state unless their standardized test scores improved. Therefore, during the 2002-2003 school year, McLeod CLC faculty and administrators implemented several school-specific reforms in the hope of improving student achievement and getting out of corrective action. The new initiative at McLeod CLC included a revision of the literacy program; the addition of a part-time Family Resource Center coordinator; the development of a shared governance charter; a review of the school’s discipline plan; collaborations with university faculty in mathematics, science, and language arts; the creation of an intersession; a revision of the school calendar; and the development of a school improvement plan.

When McLeod CLC faculty and administration discussed students’ literacy skills, they realized that the students’ word recognition skills had increased, but the students still had tremendous difficulty with reading comprehension. At a faculty meeting, Principal Tucker addressed his concerns about the SRA Corrective Reading program because of the previous principal had not ordered the SRA Corrective Reading program for the current school year. In response, the faculty explained Cunningham’s Four Blocks model, which they had studied at the partnership retreat. Tucker offered the teachers the option of ordering the SRA program or adopting another program like Cunningham’s Four Blocks. After a long discussion, they decided to switch to a modified version of Cunningham’s Four Blocks.
Cunningham’s Four Blocks consist of self-selected reading, working with words, guided reading, and writing (Cunningham & Hall, 1997; Cunningham et al., 1999). Each of these components makes up a block of instructional time. *Self-selected reading* involves the teacher reading a higher-level book to the class. The purpose of reading aloud is to develop students’ oral language skills. The goal of *working with words* is to enhance phonics and vocabulary. Teachers review the words from previous weeks on the word wall, which is pocket chart hung on the wall, and then engage students in activities such as making words, which allows students to see patterns in words. Students are introduced to five new words a week.

In *guided reading*, the class divides up into small groups according to instructional level. In these groups, the teacher provides an introduction to the book, reviews previously learned concepts, and explains any new concepts. The purpose of guided reading is to expose students to a variety of literature and different approaches to these types of literature. The *writing* block involves mini-lessons and publishing conferences. Although the McLeod CLC faculty employed this framework during the 2002-2003 school year, they did not receive training on Cunningham’s Four Blocks until May/June 2003, leaving them confused about the correct way to implement this program.

Along with changing their literacy program, McLeod CLC hired a part-time Family Resource Center (FRC) coordinator who had previously started the first FRC in the school district. The principal and partnership coordinators introduced the new FRC coordinator on September 2, 2002, at a faculty meeting. The FRC coordinator focused on ways to develop stronger relationships between the school and families by identifying the needs of McLeod CLC families. The FRC coordinator put together a brochure,
conducted focus groups, and utilized surveys to identify family needs and provide information and referrals. During the Thanksgiving holiday, she arranged holiday assistance (i.e., meals) for 11 families, and during the December holiday season she arranged food and presents for 66 McLeod CLC families. The FRC coordinator also organized classes for families entitled “Beginning Computer Class for Adults,” “How to Start Your Own Business,” and “Helping Your Child.” Throughout the school year, the FRC coordinator worked to meet the various needs of the families at McLeod CLC.

While the FRC coordinator worked to establish a Family Resource Center, the McLeod CLC leadership team and faculty collaborated with the university’s League of Professional Schools to develop a shared governance leadership plan (i.e., charter). The discussion of a new shared governance model at McLeod CLC had started at the May 2002 retreat and continued into the fall of 2002. In September 2002, representatives from the League of Professional Schools met with the entire McLeod CLC faculty to discuss the idea of adopting a shared governance charter.

The discussion lasted for about an hour, after which the partnership coordinator and a representative from the university’s League of Professional Schools gave a presentation to the McLeod CLC leadership team on different shared governance models. They discussed which model would best represent the needs of the McLeod CLC and decided who would write the various sections of the charter. On November 20, 2002, the leadership team presented the shared governance charter to McLeod CLC faculty, administration, and staff. This group approved the charter with minor revisions.

During this same school year, McLeod CLC faculty collaborated with university language arts, science, and mathematics departments. The collaboration with a faculty
member in the Language Arts Department originated in a study abroad trip to Xalapa, Mexico attended by six McLeod CLC teachers. During the year following their return from the trip, the teachers met individually and as a group with the faculty member to discuss ways to address the needs of second language learners at McLeod CLC.

A faculty member from the university’s Cell Biology Department also collaborated with a fifth grade teacher. The university faculty member and one of his students brought books and microscopes to McLeod CLC to illustrate different types of cells to the fifth grade class. In teaching this lesson, they worked with the classroom teacher and divided the classroom into different stations. At one station the students read books about cells, while at another station the students looked at different types of cells through the microscopes.

During the year before the partnership began, two faculty members from the university’s Department of Mathematics Education had already collaborated with McLeod CLC teachers and administrators. Under the direction of these faculty members, Project SIPsII (Support and Ideas for Planning and Sharing in Mathematics Education II) implemented the second year of an Eisenhower Higher Education Grant at McLeod CLC. This collaboration continued for three years, the cycle of the grant. The goal of Project SIPsII was to work with teachers to enhance their mathematics instruction and create a math education community at McLeod CLC. In an effort to enhance this community, the project utilized a Mathematics Leadership Team, monthly mathematics work sessions, mathematics faculty meetings, university faculty serving as math resource specialists at the school, peer observations, and collaborative teaching with math educators. Over the fall semester, the team met five times, attending two 2-hour in-service work sessions and
three after-school faculty meetings. Some teachers at McLeod CLC had the opportunity to co-plan and co-teach with the SIPsII coordinators.

This interest in enriching student learning through collaboration between the university, the school, and the community also served as a catalyst for developing two intersessions during fall and spring breaks. The goal of these intersessions was to improve student achievement by providing students with opportunities to learn through outdoor activities and by visiting new places. The university’s Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies and the county’s Department of Leisure Services collaborated with the community in developing intersession activities. The fall 2002 intersession, held at Booker T. Washington Community Learning Center, and the spring 2003 intersession held at McLeod CLC each averaged 170 students. The fall 2002 intersession focused on teaching students about a variety of areas within the arts, including dance. Students visited local museums and dance studios. During the spring 2003 intersession, students connected science and recreational activities by learning about water conservation, ocean life, cell growth, and forestry.

Although the school had already implemented an extended calendar to improve student achievement, faculty and administrators realized that they needed to adjust the extended year calendar. They had hoped to have more instructional days before they began standardized testing, but with the two-week fall break McLeod CLC students actually had fewer instructional days before testing. The calendar was therefore adjusted to make fall break only one week. In addition, in order to minimize confusion, McLeod CLC’s planning days and holidays were adjusted so they would be somewhat similar to
those of the rest of the district. Faculties at both pilot schools and the Board of Education approved the revised extended calendar for the 2003-2004 school year.

McLeod CLC faculty and administrators expected the initiatives developed through the partnership to constitute their complete school improvement plan. However, while they were working with the partnership to reform their own school, the school district decided to implement a formal school improvement plan for the entire school district. In establishing this Title I school improvement plan process, the school district decided that rather than focusing only on the schools that did not succeed, all schools in the county would be required to develop school improvement plans. In late fall 2002, the school district administration told McLeod CLC faculty and administrators that they needed to develop their own school improvement plan (SIP) using the school district guidelines.

To create this SIP plan, study groups were established for mathematics, reading, and writing. In this plan, McLeod CLC faculty and administration described their shared mission as “work together, learn together, and succeed together.” By the end of fall 2002, the math, reading, and writing groups had refined their goals and objectives and brainstormed their action steps, including the need for professional development and parental involvement.

The reading study group recommended a number of initiatives for enhancing the literacy skills of students and the teaching proficiency of faculty at McLeod CLC. They identified the need for teachers and administrators to have extensive training in the Four Blocks model. McLeod CLC faculty discussed the idea of hiring a literacy coach to provide ongoing training and to monitor literacy instruction across the schools.
In developing the writing portion of the SIP, the McLeod CLC community requested that a professor of language education serve on the committee. This collaboration of school and university personnel brainstormed ways to integrate writing across the curriculum, as well as to increase family involvement and enhance professional development. The Writing Project, a collaboration between the university and outstanding northeast Georgia educators, sponsored twenty classroom teachers from different school districts to attend a summer institute. At the institute, teachers shared their current approaches to writing and literacy instruction, discussed issues in literacy instruction, and worked on improving their own writing skills. After attending this intensive 18-day writing and literacy workshop, these twenty teachers were able to serve as consultants in literacy professional development for their schools. The university provided McLeod CLC with the opportunity to send two teachers to this summer institute. Due to scheduling conflicts, only one McLeod CLC teacher was able to attend the institute, and when she returned she began providing guidance for teachers on writing.

The mathematics study group included the university partners in the Department of Mathematics Education and SIPsII grant who had fostered a math community at McLeod CLC, now in its second year of existence. They used the SIPsII coordinators feedback in formulating the math portion of the School Improvement Plan. This process allowed McLeod CLC faculty and administrators to exchange ideas with their university partners about the future of mathematics instruction at the school. The math study group refined the instructional goals of the school and helped unite the school, school district, and university partners on the best instructional techniques.
Each of the teams shared their proposed plans with the larger group and invited other McLeod CLC faculty to provide feedback and suggest revisions. The school ultimately approved a version of the school improvement plan that outlined goals, objectives, and action steps calling for professional development, increased parental involvement, and assessment through formative and summative evaluations. The thirteen-page document provided timelines and identified resources and individuals responsible for completing particular steps. It established the following two broad goals:

1. By spring of 2006, 95 percent of third, fourth, and fifth grade students will meet or exceed reading/language arts standards on the CRCT as set forth by the state.

2. By the end of the year 2006, a minimum of 80 percent of all students in third, fourth, and fifth grade will meet or exceed mathematics standards as set forth by the state ([McLeod CLC] School Improvement Plan, May 19, 2003).

The school improvement plan provided McLeod CLC faculty and administrators an opportunity to identify their vision for change and use it in developing steps to meet their goals. In the development of the university, school district, and community partnership, the Nuts and Bolts Team and the Design Team emphasized that McLeod CLC faculty and administrators would guide the specifics of the reform initiative. The pressure from the school district to develop a SIP plan brought the McLeod CLC faculty together to discuss with parents and university faculty members how they could improve students’ literacy and math skills as well as increase family involvement.

During the development of the SIP, the school district and McLeod CLC administration reminded McLeod CLC faculty that if they did not get their school out of
corrective action then the state could take over the school. Stake takeover could involve replacing all of McLeod CLC’s faculty or closing McLeod CLC and reopening it as a charter school. With this information at the forefront of their minds, McLeod CLC faculty and administrators completed their SIP plan, implemented an extended calendar, developed two intersessions, collaborated with university faculty, and prepared their students for the upcoming standardized tests. The subsequent school year provided an opportunity for McLeod CLC faculty, administrators, and staff to begin to see the effects of the plans they had started implementing in 2002-2003 in hopes of improving student achievement and moving out of the NCLB category of corrective action to the next higher category of “needs improvement.”

The 2003-2004 School Year: From Corrective Action to Needs Improvement

During the 2003-2004 school year, McLeod CLC faculty and administrators found out that they had met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for 2002-2003 under NCLB. The results of the spring 2003 CRCT testing indicated improvement in fourth grade reading and math scores. The improved standardized test scores removed McLeod CLC from corrective action and placed them in “needs improvement” for the 2003-2004 school year. Aware that the school could be placed under corrective action again if test scores did not continue to improve, McLeod CLC implemented additional initiatives from their SIP. These included hiring a literacy coach, working with professional development associates, planning intersession activities, and undertaking further collaborations with the university in art and science.

In hiring a literacy coach, McLeod CLC faculty and administrators observed that their students’ literacy skills had improved; however, the majority of students were still
McLeod CLC hired a literacy coach specializing in reading, writing, and language arts to start in August 2003. The literacy coach provided mentoring and coaching for the faculty in Four Blocks teaching and literacy development. She assessed the literacy skills of McLeod CLC students and met weekly with grade-level teams to discuss instruction and assessment. McLeod CLC faculty and the literacy coach noticed the students’ improved reading skills, but the gains made by the entire McLeod CLC student body became evident to McLeod CLC faculty in the reading celebration held the following February.

On February 24, 2004, McLeod CLC faculty proceeded to their regular Wednesday faculty meeting. However, when they entered the media center they saw that draped across the front bookcase was a lace tablecloth, and on this makeshift table were a large bowl of punch, a plate of Girl Scout cookies, and plates of cheese and pastries donated by local bakeries. Taking their seats, teachers speculated about the topic of the day’s meeting. After gaining the teachers’ attention, Tucker told them that after speaking with the literacy coach, Victoria, and reviewing student reading scores, he became aware of significant improvement in the fall 2003 scores. Tucker praised the teachers for their accomplishment: “I was so pleased to see the growth the children made and you made. That is what today is about. This is a celebration.”

While teachers enjoyed the party, Pamela, the literacy consultant providing the professional development in Cunningham’s Four Blocks, observed, “I may cry . . . I am so proud of the good work [happening at this school].” Pamela proceeded to read a piece she had written for the staff earlier that day:

*The way you are*
It’s partly the guided reading—matching the books to the reader, supporting readers, coaching, prompting and cheering as they become more and more independent. You’ve coached them from reading *A Bird Can Fly, a Butterfly Can Fly*, *a Bat Can Fly* to *The Adventures of Frog and Toad, Anansi* and *The Mess-covered Rock* to *Sadoko and the Thousand Paper Cranes*. It’s partly the literature circles and book clubs and making connections, asking the hard questions and reading between the lines. It’s partly the time you’ve spent writing—all over the school there are stories that record the children’s lives. I’ve heard stories about playing marbles, about traveling to Mexico, about snakes and roaches and all kinds of varmints. I’ve even heard the story about the kid who was born in the ambulance on the way to the hospital.

It’s partly the way you’ve led the students to read on their own, for points, for prizes, for pleasure, or for a ride in a limousine. We find time for that which we value—and you’ve made sure that there is time for students to read and to enjoy reading.

But it’s mostly the way you work together, support each other, and believe that all children can learn. It’s the way you never say, “But OUR children can’t do that!” It’s the way you find ways every day for every child to be successful, to achieve something meaningful, and to feel SMART!! It’s the way your face lights up when a child moves to a new level, uses a new strategy, and solves problems without help. You make me proud to be a teacher. Your work here is exemplary and should be an example for others of what happens in schools that work!
Wiping the tears from their eyes, the teachers turned their attention to their literacy coach, Victoria. She explained, “Bad news first. One hundred and seventy four students have been with us performing poorly; [however, now] we only have 16 students who did not make growth [or increase in reading level].” Victoria then shared that the remaining 158 students improved from half a year’s growth to three years growth in six months’ time, with over 50 percent of McLeod CLC students improving more than one reading level in six months.

After sharing the improvements in students’ reading levels, Victoria gave a PowerPoint presentation showing students’ pictures along with their starting reading level and their current, increased reading level. At the end of the presentation, the teachers applauded and Tucker thanked them for their hard work. They left the media center proud of their students’ success and hopeful that their students’ improvement would continue on upcoming standardized tests.

Professional Development Associates

In addition to hiring a literacy coach, McLeod CLC faculty realized in developing their SIP plan that they needed more opportunities for professional development. Therefore, in the SIP plan they advocated hiring four professional development associates (PDAs). In fall of 2003 the PDAs came to the school every other week for 16 hours each. Each PDA was assigned to a particular McLeod CLC teacher, and the PDAs covered the teachers’ classes, freeing the teachers to attend professional development sessions in literacy and math and to attend grade-level meetings. The PDAs provided McLeod CLC faculty with the time they needed to learn how to improve their instruction, as a means of
avoiding state takeover under NCLB and of improving students’ literacy and mathematics skills.

*Collaborations in Art, Science, and Language Arts*

The 2003-2004 school year was a time for teachers to implement the ideas from the school improvement plan. The school had hired a new literacy coach and professional development associates to facilitate the consistency and improvement of the academic program. Collaborations with university departments continued to provide students with enrichment in the arts, environment, science, and language arts. In this year McLeod CLC faculty, staff, and administration marveled at the success of their students.

Faculty and students from the Art Education Department at the university brought a unit on the power of words to the students at McLeod CLC. Twenty-two classrooms from pre-K to fifth grade participated in this collaboration. The lessons were based on the artwork of Joseph Norman, a local artist and professor at the university. Pre-service teachers conducted lessons that used the arts to teach students about the power of words and the importance of being respectful to each other.

On February 5, 2004, McLeod CLC students and pre-service teachers posted the projects that were produced through this collaboration on the walls of the gymnasium. In addition to seeing others’ work, the students met Joseph Norman, the inspiration for the unit. Sitting in a semicircle on the gymnasium floor with their artwork covering the walls, students watched and listened as Professor Norman presented a skit on the power of words, specifically happy and sad words. At the conclusion of the presentation, Professor Norman sketched the portrait of a student. This inspirational presentation
reinforced the lessons the students had learned about the power of words in the previous five weeks with their pre-service teacher.

During the same period of time that the art collaboration took place, McLeod CLC faculty collaborated with the Science Education Department at the university in the Fostering our Community Understandings of Science (FOCUS) project (Project FOCUS handout). The FOCUS project involves university students from the College of Education and the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences teaching in elementary school classrooms. The university students have little or no training in elementary education other than an orientation program. Students spend a minimum of three hours a week at McLeod CLC. The university student and McLeod CLC teacher work as a team in science instruction.

Another collaboration occurred between two faculty members from the Department of Language Education and McLeod CLC teachers and students. One Language Education faculty member collaborated on poetry and writing instruction with classroom teachers. The other faculty member collaborated with McLeod CLC teachers to understand the demands faced by families who had recently moved from Mexico or other countries to the area. In the Finding Unity-in-Diversity (FUND) project, a group of teachers and university professors visited local organizations serving these families, as well as the local factory and plants where the parents in these families may be working (FUND handout, March 17, 2004).

Faculty members from the Department of Language Education also collaborated with classroom teachers on a poetry project. In this project, undergraduates and graduates in a university poetry class collaborated with classroom teachers to teach the
students about poetry. As the culmination of the project, McLeod CLC students shared their poetry in a book published by the school and presented at a poetry picnic held at McLeod CLC. The poetry picnic was organized by McLeod CLC, the community, and the university and was open to McLeod CLC families and community members. Upon arriving at the poetry picnic, students, families, faculty, and administrators took their places on blankets spread out across the school’s front lawn. While listening to each class share their poems, the audience enjoyed a light dinner served to them. In this poetry celebration, a well-known rapper also shared his poetry. McLeod CLC faculty remarked that they had never recognized the poetic talent of their students.

In fall 2004, the school district’s Assessment Specialist gave a presentation to McLeod CLC faculty, administration, and students. In this presentation, she reported that McLeod CLC students’ test scores improved from 46% to 64% in reading/language arts, 45% to 65% in mathematics. These improved test scores and improved school attendance over a three-year period placed the school in the Distinguished School Category under NCLB. McLeod CLC moved from a school in corrective action to a distinguished status in three years. McLeod CLC faculty and administrators acknowledged their success, at the same time highlighting their dream for even greater student improvement by re-visionsing the partnership retreat.

Re-Visioning the Partnership

Eighteen months after the first partnership retreat, the Nuts and Bolts Team, Design Team, and McLeod CLC leadership decided it was time to bring the two pilot schools back together to share in each other’s successes and communicate the lessons each had learned. On November 1, 2004, teachers from Booker T. Washington and
McLeod CLC came back from their fall break to a retreat called “Re-Visioning the Partnership.” The agenda for the day included opening remarks with the new partnership video; concurrent sessions on mathematical teaching and learning, literacy teaching and learning, family engagement, and teaching English language learners; the sharing of findings from each evaluation team; and table discussions on the next step for the partnership.

The opening remarks included a montage/partnership video produced by the school district. In the video, partnership team members discussed the meaning of the partnership and reviewed university/school collaborations, student achievement gains, intersession activities, and changes to the calendar. Interspersed with individuals speaking about each of these areas were snapshots taken from the schools. The song running through the video was “Shiny Happy People” by REM, a group that has provided financial support to McLeod CLC.

Following the opening session, McLeod CLC and Booker T. Washington faculty attended workshops on mathematics, literacy, family engagement, and the needs of second language learners. The session on mathematical teaching and learning, led by the math coaches at both pilot schools, began with the McLeod CLC math coach welcoming everyone and asking, “If you were a math term, what math term would you be and why?” After concluding this exercise, the session leaders told the audience that this activity could be done with students to see what mathematical terms they know.

Next, the math coaches asked the group to think about the positive things happening in their classrooms. After members of the group shared their successes, the dialogue then moved to discussing how to assess mathematics learning. The McLeod
CLC math coach asked the teachers at Booker T. Washington whether they had started a learning community (a group of teachers who come together to discuss their current instructional practices and the research on mathematics). The teachers and math coach said that learning communities had not yet been a focus, but that they hoped to implement them in the future. The McLeod CLC math coach reported that the learning community was just getting started at McLeod CLC, and that the mathematics leadership team was responsible for reading the research and observing each other’s classrooms, as well as classrooms in other schools, in order to develop an effective learning community.

A literacy teaching and learning session was offered concurrently with the mathematics teaching and learning session. Similar to the mathematics session, three literacy coaches (one from McLeod CLC and two from Booker T. Washington) facilitated the session. They opened by asking each person to write on a sticky note, “What is working in our reading and writing instruction? Why?” After writing their individual answers, participants shared their responses in pairs. The pairs then combined to form larger discussion groups, which combined their responses to share with the whole group. The coaches concluded by thanking the group for coming to the session and for the incredible work they were doing in the schools.

The third concurrent session involved family engagement. The Family Resource Center coordinators from both partnership schools began by introducing themselves along with a social worker from the school district. The session began with audience members sharing how they defined poverty and the social worker providing an official definition. With the latter definition in mind, the participants divided into small groups and each group was given a scenario with a dilemma related to the needs of families.
living in poverty. After reading the scenario, the group discussed these questions: “What are our strengths, what are we doing, and what can we try in order to implement change?” The session concluded with a discussion of possible solutions to the scenarios, the ways the schools were currently meeting the needs of families, and additional ways they could support families in each of these scenarios.

The fourth concurrent session focused on teaching English Language Learners (ELLs). In this session the audience was presented with teaching strategies such as previewing, paired reading, and books on tape. Next, participants were asked to apply the strategies they had learned to student scenarios. At the end of the session the group discussed how they could use these strategies with ELLs in their classroom.

The concurrent sessions were offered in three consecutive time slots so everyone could participate in three of the four sessions. Afterwards all participants returned to the ballroom for lunch. Following lunch, the evaluation team presented its findings from the past two years to the entire group. In addition, an evaluation team member discussed the results of the “My School and Me” study. The purpose of this study was to investigate students’ perceptions of their school over a two year period. In this study, students in grades K-5 drew pictures of their school and wrote essays describing how they saw their school. The presenter showed students’ drawings and essays representing themes pertaining to the school’s physical environment, teacher, friends and family.

Next, the partnership coordinators discussed the next steps for the partnership and the partnership schools. In this discussion, McLeod CLC and Booker T. Washington faculty moved from table to table during specified times to provide their vision for family engagement; professional development; mathematics, reading, and writing instruction;
balancing the calendar; developing connections with the university and the community; implementing initiatives not yet realized from the original vision; and creating new celebrations. The action steps or concerns regarding the balanced calendar centered on the partnership schools being on a different calendar than the rest of the district. The calendar remained an issue because families with children attending different schools in the district were having trouble balancing the various schedules, which was negatively impacting attendance at Booker T. Washington and McLeod CLC. The teachers emphasized the importance of being on the same calendar across the district to meet the demands of the families in the district. Some people suggested that the whole school district should be on the same calendar as Booker T. Washington and McLeod CLC.

The family engagement group recommended providing transportation for students and families to school events. They also recommended giving parents a greater role in the planning and implementation of school events and activities. The group of teachers identifying the health care needs of students recommended utilizing nurse interns from the local university. Another suggestion from the family engagement group included, “On staff development days, encourage staff members to make home visits, go to football and basketball games, etc.” Other ideas involved asking university journalism students to design a campaign around family engagement, and making a video of teachers teaching for parents to view. At the end of this session each group shared with the larger assembly what they had discussed. The retreat ended with the principal of Booker T. Washington leading the group in a song.
Summary

This chapter has provided a context for understanding McLeod CLC teachers’ specific emotions during a comprehensive reform initiative. The McLeod CLC faculty and administration made a significant effort to upgrade their standing under NCLB and to improve students’ literacy and mathematics skills. During this improvement process, McLeod CLC faculty experienced a variety of emotions in response to their interactions with students, colleagues, school district administrators, university faculty and students, and community members.

In the next two chapters, I explain the findings of the critical incident interviews, which are situated within the context of the initiatives described in this chapter. Chapter 5 analyzes the finding that teachers experience a power and anger cycle, and Chapter 6 examines the finding that teachers respond with fear and excitement to the reconstruction of their professional selves. The final chapter of this document includes a discussion of these findings and the implications for research and practice.
CHAPTER 5
POWER AND ANGER CYCLE

Introduction

Figure 2. Teachers’ emotions within critical incidents during a CSR initiative

In the 45 of the 51 incidents shared by McLeod CLC faculty, two themes emerge regarding teachers’ specific emotions during this educational reform initiative. The first theme identifies an anger and power cycle. The second theme relates to teachers’ fear and excitement in the reconstruction of their professional selves. Figure 2 illustrates the relationship between these two themes, which are discussed in detail in this chapter and the following chapter.

---

4 Kemper (2000) stated that “power is understood as a relational condition in which one actor actually or potentially compels another actor to do something he or she does not wish to do” (p. 46).
This chapter presents the subthemes and categories related to the power and anger cycle. The categories evolved from 25 critical incidents. The subthemes and categories emerge from the two research analysis questions: 1) Why is each incident critical? and 2) What are the teachers’ specific emotions in response to these incidents? In this chapter, I describe three subthemes in the anger and power cycle. The subthemes include: 1) teachers’ loss of power due to the school district’s broken promise to support the partnership; 2) teachers’ efforts to regain their power; and 3) gaining power: teachers’ excitement in response to the school board’s supportive decision.

When the school district broke its promise to support the extended calendar, and McLeod CLC administrative needs, the teachers experienced a decrease in power, causing them to be angry. From this anger, they fought to regain their power by speaking to the school board. When the school board supported the teachers’ recommendations, the faculty experienced an increase in power and felt they had won by having their views upheld. Figure 3 shows the interaction of these subthemes, which is the focal point of this chapter.
In discussing the subtheme of loss of teacher power resulting from the school district administration’s broken promises, the faculty described 21 incidents forming five categories. The five categories include: 1) perceived loss of power in the sudden resignation of the initial partnership principal; 2) loss of power from the District Office administration’s broken promise to provide financial and administrative support; 3) sudden action by the assistant principal (AP), Janice, to remove faculty power by establishing new expectations; 4) sudden action by the superintendent to decrease faculty power through the transfer of the AP and the unexpected elimination of the AP position; and 5) teachers’ anger at the university and school district administration for taking credit for faculty work.
Perceived Loss of Power Resulting from the Sudden Resignation of the Initial Partnership Principal

Two faculty members described the impact of the resignation of their school partnership principal. Faculty knew about the principal’s dissatisfaction with the superintendent; however, during the development of the partnership initiative they looked to her for leadership and guidance. So when she announced her resignation less than a month before 2002-2003 school year started, faculty experienced a loss of control, making them feel betrayed and angry that she gave such short notice. The critical incidents below illustrate the feelings of betrayal and anger precipitated by the principal’s departure.

Bertha, a veteran teacher, reported that she had known the principal was looking for a position in another district. One day the principal, who was also her friend, called her to say that she had accepted a position in another district. Bertha found herself angry with the principal for backing out of her commitment to the school and for giving such short notice of her resignation. Bertha explained:

I was very angry at her. She knew it. Not the fact we all have personal problems but . . . we had to make serious decisions to become a partnership school. And we knew that it was very time consuming and it had to be a matter of dedication. She knew it too and when she presented [the partnership] to us this is the utter most dreamed thing in the world even though it was very difficult and very hard to do . . . but then she walked away like it was nothing.
In describing this incident, Bertha revealed the importance of fulfilling commitments. When commitments are broken by others, teachers feel a loss of control and power, resulting in an emotional response of anger.

Another veteran teacher, Jane, also described feeling betrayed when she learned of the principal’s resignation. Prior to the partnership retreat Jane had already had difficulty trusting the principal because of prior school experiences. At the partnership retreat held in May 2002, when the principals of the pilot schools sang “Lean on Me,” Jane decided that maybe she should give her principal another chance and trust her. Jane recalled this incident:

[The pilot school principals] stood up in front of the group and they were singing “Lean on Me” . . . and you know very emotional woohoo here we go. And at that time I already had concerns and doubts and problems with [McLeod CLC principal]. I knew that presentation’s everything and not necessarily follow through. . . . But still you stand here and look at these two principals singing “Lean on Me” together and you think “Oh maybe I am wrong (laugh) . . . maybe it will be fine.”

However, three weeks later, when she found out about the principal’s resignation, she felt both relieved that the principal was leaving and betrayed after she had decided to give the principal a second chance. Jane observed that when the McLeod CLC principal resigned only three weeks later, “I was relieved but it was again a sense of real betrayal. How can you stand up in front of people do[ing] this big uplifting song and dance routine and then all the while I’m out of here?”
Like Bertha, Jane felt angry that the principal had painted the picture that she was going to stay at McLeod CLC when all along she was interviewing for other positions. Jane experienced feelings of betrayal because she had told herself to give the principal another chance. Jane relinquished her distrust of the principal, and in doing so gave back some power to the principal. At the same time, because the principal planned to leave and did not share this plan with Jane, the principal had power over Jane.

In contrast, Bertha knew that the principal intended to leave, but since the school district did not have the principal’s resignation there was nothing Bertha or the school district could do. The power of the decision to resign lay in the hands of the principal. Bertha’s anger came from not having control over the timing of the principal’s resignation. In both Jane’s and Bertha’s discussion of the principal’s resignation, they described their anger as a response to the principal’s betrayal in her use of power.

Loss of Power Resulting from the District Office Administration’s Broken Promise to Provide Financial and Administrative Support

Echoing the loss of power resulting from the principal’s abrupt departure, faculty described the anger they experienced as a result of the District Office administration’s continual confusion about McLeod CLC’s calendar. The District Office administration scheduled professional development sessions on dates when McLeod CLC was in session and failed to provide McLeod CLC with the materials needed for the start of school. Faculty felt a loss of control and power as the District Office continued to ignore their different schedule and the needs of the McLeod CLC faculty.

During this same period of time, McLeod CLC faculty learned that the school district would no longer be able to fund their extended calendar cutting the teachers
salaries and diminishing the extra 15 instructional days. The faculty was especially angry because they had asked about funding before the extended calendar was approved. At that time, the school district’s superintendent told the McLeod CLC faculty to leave that matter up to the school district administration. These incidents strengthened the faculty’s belief that the District Office administration did not support the partnership, leaving the faculty powerless to influence the future of their school. The faculty’s anger about this broken promise came from the lack of acknowledgement from the superintendent or the School Board of Education about the gravity of their decisions; faculty felt that the District did not try to find outside funding to support the partnership, and that the money the District did have was ineffectively distributed among district schools.

Jane described feeling powerless over the District Office’s continual confusion about McLeod CLC’s calendar. McLeod CLC faculty relied heavily on the school district administration to support them by providing supplies (i.e., paperwork, books), offering district-wide professional development opportunities, and disseminating school information to parents and the community. In one case faculty were not provided with supplies at the start of the school year because McLeod CLC began earlier than other schools in the district; more recently, the District Office scheduled a phonics training class for all faculty in the district during the time that McLeod CLC was in session. Jane explained:

I am still steamed about that because the District Office has been confused frequently about the schedule. They have sent things to the newspaper saying we had a day off when we don’t. . . . They weren’t able to get our supplies to us by the time we started in the first year of the partnership because they weren’t at
work yet until August 1, but we were supposed to be teaching by then... [The superintendent] said oh no don’t worry about that it is our deal to worry about and it has been continually and repeatedly an issue: the schedule, the confusion, not knowing what day you’re supposed to be there for children and for parents and for the District Office. They schedule meetings for curriculum and forget that we have children... they scheduled training for the phonics program last year at a time when we still had children in class. We were supposed to go to the phonics training.

In describing these incidents, Jane illustrated additional ways that the school district administration continued to break its promises to support McLeod CLC. The school district had the power in scheduling meetings as well as getting supplies to the school. Jane’s anger stemmed from the fact that the school district had the power and control to be aware of McLeod CLC’s needs, yet they remained unaware of the school’s needs and of how their power was impacting the school. Through this lack of recognition, the school district administration reminded faculty like Jane of their lack of power.

Beyond not having supplies and facing mistakes in scheduling, faculty described feeling powerless in response to the decision of the superintendent and the school board to cut the 15 extra days from their school schedule. Faculty expressed anger at the assumed lack of effort made by the superintendent and school board to find additional funding. The lack of effort ignited faculty anger because they perceived the school district as having some control over this cut. Faculty acknowledged that the school district could not predict the cuts education systems would experience in future years, which was frustrating. However, the fact that the school district promised funding
through the school district funds or grants and did not use its resources to find alternate sources of funding angered faculty.

Upon hearing about the funding cut for the 15 extra days, Jane remembered asking the superintendent how the 15 days would be paid for. He told her to leave that up to them. A year and half later, when the school district had the ability to find funding and had made no extra efforts toward that end, Jane was angered. She reported:

When I heard they had decided the extended year was going to be canceled I was really angry . . . That they said oh they don’t have the money this year because it is a rough budget year . . . I was really angry because it was the first thing cut and there was no discussion about it; there was almost nothing in the newspaper. . . . I just really didn’t feel there was any acknowledgment that it was a huge decision. I saw it in the newspaper you know just a one line on the Board… That was cut early maybe November [or] December and I read the newspaper every day and it was just in the you know how they do a little brief blurb about the board. . . . It was an easy cut to make . . . I thought that school superintendent should get his pay cut that much . . . Nobody saw it as backing out on a commitment that was made.

Jane had trusted the superintendent’s word that he would find the funding for an extended calendar. When he broke this promise, Jane wanted him to acknowledge this fact and take responsibility for backing out of his commitment. His failure to acknowledge the gravity of this decision made her angry.

Another McLeod CLC teacher, Carolyn, agreed with Jane’s conclusions and expressed frustration with the school district administration’s inability to fund the 15
extra days. Carolyn found this decision to be a critical one because it revealed the school
district’s lack of willingness or effort to use their resources to find the necessary funding
to support this initiative. She stated:

    We were promised support from the school district, the school board and the
    superintendent since this was [the school district’s and the university’s] dream. . . .
The superintendent has not done more to find the funding or done anything to find
the funding for the extra fifteen days that we felt were so important and really
struggled to get. So for two years we have had an extra fifteen days and it looks
like from here on out we won’t get the extra fifteen days. . . . So we’ve had to
rework the calendar yet again to accommodate the loss of those days. . . . So I
guess that it really is frustrating to know that you were promised something but I
also know that they did not know there were going to be budget cuts coming
down the road and things happen to the economy. But I feel with grants and other
things out there at least if we had seen them at least making some effort at
backing their words we would feel better about it.

Carolyn described her frustration at not having control over the poor economy, but the
anger she described came from the school district’s lack of effort in finding other sources
of funding; in her perception, the district hadn’t even tried to find funding for the extra 15
days.

    Marissa, a beginning teacher, agreed with Carolyn’s perspective and emotions.
Marissa heard about the funding issues in a faculty meeting with the Title I representative
from the District Office. In this meeting, the Title I representative explained that the
funding for the extra 15 days could no longer come from the Title I funds because it
would take funds away from other Title I schools in the district. She also reported that
the district did not have enough money to approve funding for the 15 additional days.

Marissa found herself questioning the district administration’s priorities and use
of funds. Marissa described her feelings of powerlessness:

So you are looking at it . . . saying how come they can find money for this [school
district office positions] but they can’t find for money for something that is
worthwhile? And it just ticks you off and it makes you wonder why we start
something if we are never going to finish it. So I just felt like . . . there was
suppose to be an agreement between . . . the superintendent the partnership and
the two schools that were involved and that the superintendent and the
administrators . . . would work to maintain the promises and commitment that
were made between the schools and the partnership. And I feel like that was not in
any way the case.

I felt like here’s your tap shoes, you do a little tap dance and you can tap
dance all day but you’re still not fulfilling your obligations to our schools and our
partnership. And that just makes you mad because what can you do about it? I
mean there is really nothing that we can do it doesn’t feel like anyway. You know
it’s like they say and we do kind of have that dictatorship where you feel like the
power you had once as a teacher is now just slowly and slowly being pulled away
and it pretty soon it is just going to be scripted.

When Marissa heard that the funds for 15 extra days had been coming from the
school’s Title I funds and not district funds, and that the Title I funds could no longer
support the cost of the extended calendar, she became angry. Her anger was caused by
the spending decisions of the superintendent and other administrators, which resulted in unfulfilled commitments made to McLeod CLC. Marissa described her feeling of powerlessness and her perception that the faculty’s power was gradually diminishing.

All three faculty members discussed the process of losing control and power to the school district. In losing this power, the faculty felt frustrated and angry that the school district had broken their promise to provide McLeod CLC financial and administrative support. Their broken promises reinforced to McLeod CLC faculty that they had little power in the funding of this reform initiative and made them question whether the school district would use its resources to uphold its commitment to the partnership.

*Teachers’ Loss of Power with the New Assistant Principal*

While the school district was slowly diminishing the power of the faculty, McLeod CLC hired a new assistant principal, Janice. Before Janice started McLeod CLC went for six months with out having an AP. Upon her arrival, Janice further reduced the faculty’s influence in shaping the future of their school. As a result of these changes, the faculty became angrier still.

Janice, the McLeod CLC AP, received directives from the superintendent and the McLeod CLC principal to do whatever she needed to get the school out of “needs improvement.” Since the school was in “needs improvement” under NCLB, there was a risk that the state would take over their school and fire all of them. Therefore, Janice required faculty to turn in weekly lesson plans and work with their students on practice problems for the CRCT.
When Janice started her job as the new AP, she was not introduced to the entire staff. The teachers’ astonishment at her arrival quickly turned to shock when she instituted new and unexpected demands they had to meet. Brittany, a beginning teacher, explained that she first learned of Janice’s arrival when she showed up in the doorway of Brittany’s classroom. Brittany remarked:

It changed things around the school when we suddenly had this person come in that we didn’t get introduced to who just suddenly showed up on our doorsteps staring in the room that we had no idea who it was. And everything had been going so smoothly and we thought you know things are really going well this year, we have the new principal and brand new staff members and uh then this new Assistant Principal came along and morale just went to nothing. And people just got unhappy and kind of meaner with each other and I think people got divided.

Brittany was not angry that they had an AP, but rather that they suddenly had an AP who had new expectations of them. As a result of these expectations, faculty felt helpless in their classrooms and school. This decrease in control led Brittany to feel angry.

A veteran teacher, Tiffany, discussed the new requirement that faculty turn in lesson plans each week. She found the expectations placed on teachers to be unclear and felt it took an unreasonable amount of time to construct the plans. Tiffany approached the principal with her concern. She described this encounter:

This came of course when we had a new AP coming on board after our year had started. So directives to the staff were maybe a little ambiguous as far as lesson plans and submitting them and so I know there were hurt feelings. I know there
was lots of anger. I know that some of that was not resolved in a manner that the faculty would have liked because it was clearly an administrative decision.

I can remember trying to go to [Tucker, the principal] and saying, “You know, Tucker; I just want to let you know what’s going on. If I was required to do this I would be a little irritated that this is an extra paperwork kind of thing and really and truly I could write the best lessons in the world down on a piece of paper and that doesn’t mean that it is happening in my classroom.” While he saw my point I guess we needed a little bit of structure and accountability and we did not you know get our way.

Tiffany approached the principal with her concerns, but in the end, he supported Janice’s requirements. Tiffany and the rest of the faculty had lost the influence they previously had with the principal, Tucker. Tiffany rationalized that this was an administrative decision that they had to carry out, but she was still angry.

Two other faculty members described critical incidents in which they were intimidated and afraid as a result of their loss of power to the AP. This loss of power made the faculty feel unsupported. Elizabeth mentioned a time when Janice came to observe her class, and Janice felt that Elizabeth was not following the submitted lesson plan. Elizabeth stated:

I was afraid because I couldn’t get her to believe what I’d say. And she would she’d come in my room and then go tell something different from what was really happening or not believe that I was doing what my lesson plans said. . . . Because she did not see it at the moment . . . It’s like I taught something for a half hour and
I had gone to the next topic. And she thought I had not taught such and such.

Well I did but you weren’t here then.

Elizabeth’s fear came from not feeling believed by the AP, which left her feeling vulnerable.

Like Elizabeth, Brittany did not feel supported by the AP, and therefore felt defenseless. Brittany described an occasion when she sent one of her students to the main office because of the student’s bad behavior. Brittany was not pleased with the action taken by Janice, so she approached Janice after school to talk about the situation. Brittany remarked:

I went to speak to the Assistant Principal after school, and this is when . . . I think she may have had some program going. So she was in the cafeteria and there were a lot of people around and so I talked to her there. . . . But she was just very demeaning, like . . . “You can’t tell me what to do. I decide what the consequence is,” and just a lot of stuff . . . that she was accusing me of doing something wrong, but I didn’t do anything wrong. And it was just so out of line, and I mean, I left crying, I was so upset. And I mean, I [thought], “I need out of this school. I can’t work here.”

In Brittany’s interaction with Janice, Brittany was told that Janice held the authority to make disciplinary decisions. In recognizing her lack of power and status in relation to Janice, Brittany felt devalued and accused of doing something wrong. Brittany’s perceived loss of power was so profound that she wanted to transfer to another school.

All three faculty members describe interactions with the AP and the principal that left them feeling powerless about their classroom instruction and about school decisions.
Tiffany felt angry but accepted the principal’s decision to support the AP. Elizabeth feared for her job in the face of the AP’s power to report what she thought was going on in Elizabeth’s classroom. Brittany also felt powerless in the face of the AP’s decisions, but instead of accepting them, Brittany sought to transfer to another school.

*Administrators Taking Credit for McLeod CLC Faculty’s Work*

In the previous sections faculty described the anger that resulted from the broken promises and lack of support from administrators both within the school and at the district level. In the third theme, faculty expressed anger and frustration stemming from the administrators’ insistence on taking credit for faculty work. Faculty members shared two incidents in which administrators received recognition for the faculty’s efforts: one in which administration took credit for the improved standardized test scores, and the other in which the superintendent publicized the partnership to the public while providing little support for the McLeod CLC.

Sally, her fellow teachers, and their students spent a significant amount of time preparing for the CRCT. Sally remembered reading a newspaper article on the school’s improved test scores which reported the progress to be a result of the partnership. Sally experienced anger as a result of the lack of recognition given to the faculty and the students. Sally stated:

Well when we passed the CRCT we were quite happy . . . That first year we became very excited that all our work had paid off. And then this past year we also made adequately yearly progress . . . This time the partnership put their two cents in and said it was probably because of them . . . We kind of figured that was going to happen . . . We also felt like they didn’t give any credit for all the hard
work that we had put in and all the kids had put in . . . I knew that [would]
happen . . . cause they are trying to make the partnership look really good. So if
we are making adequate yearly progress then that’s gonna make the partnership
look good. And is it really the partnership that is causing this or is it just the hard
work that all of us are doing. That is the kind of thing that I feel like is coming up
over and over again.

Sally became angry when she read in the newspaper that McLeod CLC students’
improved standardized test scores came from the partnership. Identifying the partnership
as the source of this success took away the teachers’ and students’ power by failing to
acknowledge their roles in the improved test scores. Sally expected that the partnership
would receive the credit but she still believed the teachers and students should have
received the credit they deserved.

Carolyn’s continued frustration and anger with the superintendent’s lack of
commitment was only heightened when she saw him take credit for the success of the
partnership. Carolyn discussed how the superintendent used the teachers’ and students’
success for his own benefit while giving very little back to McLeod CLC. She explained:

I think a good example of that would be when either [university representative] or
[dean of the college of education] is able to go out in the educational world
conferences and present something new and exciting and look what the university
is doing. And then we have people coming here to [town] to view what we are
doing and how fabulous it is . . . I guess what I find most frustrating is that when
it is convenient the superintendent will talk about this wonderful partnership. And
show us off like some fabulous piece of jewelry and not put anything back into us.

And not give us the support that he initially stated he would.

Carolyn’s anger grew as the superintendent described his commitment publicly but in practice failed to follow through on his promises to McLeod CLC.

The tension at McLeod CLC continued through the school year until Janice decided to take another position in the school district. The following year, McLeod CLC hired another AP, Ronald, who worked at bringing the divided school back together. The McLeod CLC faculty liked Ronald’s democratic management style. They felt they had more power and choice in their school and their classrooms. The faculty came to school one day to find that the superintendent had transferred Ronald to the position of interim principal at another school in the county. He would not be back for the remainder of the school year.

*Decreasing Faculty Power by Manipulating, Then Eliminating the AP Position*

Many teachers expressed frustration and anger over the superintendent’s decision to transfer Ronald in the middle of the school year. Four faculty members mentioned this transfer as a critical incident for them. McLeod CLC principal, Tucker, informed the faculty that the superintendent made the decision to transfer Ronald. Tucker emphasized the lack of control he had in this decision by asking the superintendent to meet with the McLeod faculty to discuss the faculty concerns. The sudden nature of this decision showed the faculty that ultimately the superintendent has the power. They perceived that he used his authority to serve the needs of the school district at the expense of the McLeod CLC faculty.
Reflecting on these events, Mary, a veteran teacher, explained the devastation she felt when she walked into McLeod CLC one Wednesday morning and learned that Ronald would not be with them for the rest of the school year. Mary explained:

We just came and he was gone. There wasn’t any preparation from the superintendent or from anybody. . . . We were all quite devastated because he kind of brought hope with him. And so you know and everyone had gotten quite fond of him . . . We were all very upset that he was gone, particularly so suddenly . . . I just remember feeling a sickening feeling, almost like you have been punched in the stomach. When he was so abruptly gone, I was just really disheartened, sad, very sad. I didn’t want to come back in . . . it just seemed like there was a lot of junk.

The loss of control and power brought about by Ronald’s departure from McLeod CLC left Mary feeling devastated and angry.

Like Mary, Frances, a veteran teacher, found out about the transfer when she arrived at school that morning and Ronald was no longer there. Frances stated:

I don’t understand why he was taken . . . they knew in Dr. [Ronald] they had someone capable . . . Through the grapevine I found out . . . I was disappointed. I felt good for the other school because he is very good but disappointed. I felt like they let us down . . . the school board and superintendent.

This decision left Frances feeling powerless and let down by the superintendent’s decision and the school board’s support of his decision. When Frances says, “I don’t understand why he was taken” it indicates feeling out of control and not having power.

The language used by Mary and Frances indicate the depth and intensity of the emotions
they felt; the word “taken” is often used when someone has died, while the phrase “feeling . . . punched in the stomach” indicates that the loss the teachers felt from this decision was as painful as a physical blow.

Sam, a veteran teacher, initially felt angry about the way the superintendent used his authority. The awareness that the superintendent was more concerned with the success of the school district than with the needs of the McLeod CLC faculty made Sam feel angry. As Sam thought more about the superintendent’s decision to transfer Ronald, however, he accepted the decision. When Sam reflected on that emotional time, he explained:

First we were like “oh ok you know this is their way of getting rid of the AP at [McLeod CLC] . . . We’re getting screwed over here again.” But looking at it from an administrative standpoint, [Ronald] has more experience then any assistant principal; he’s got more experience then just about all the principals. I don’t think any of the principals have been an assistant superintendent. So he’s super qualified . . . From that standpoint you can totally see that that was a good decision made but as far as you know on our end everybody was screaming and yelling.

Sam identified with his colleagues’ feelings of loss of power and anger; however, he understood the superintendent’s choice. Sam’s anger came from the way the superintendent suddenly transferred Ronald, giving McLeod CLC no chance to say their goodbyes. The language used in Mary’s, Frances’, and Sam’s descriptions reflect the devastation people feel when something or someone they love is ripped away. These three teachers were not just angry, they were devastated.
Like Sam, Harriet, a veteran teacher, recognized Ronald’s abilities and was disappointed and angry with the superintendent’s decision. Her anger came from the abruptness of the superintendent’s decision, which resulted in a loss of teacher control and demonstrated the extent of the superintendent’s power. She explained:

It was not only disappointment but a little bit anger because we had already done without an assistant principal and felt the effects of that. And so we were finally able to hire an assistant principal then in place and start moving along. And then to just arbitrarily have that position jerked away from us . . . It kind of made me angry.

Like Mary, Frances, and Sam, Harriet felt angered by the abrupt nature of the superintendent’s decision to transfer Ronald. This sudden decision left teachers feeling helpless and a grave sense of loss to their school community. Harriet and her fellow faculty members’ disappointment and sadness over the loss of Ronald himself turned to anger when they became aware of the superintendent’s decision to eliminate the McLeod CLC AP position entirely.

A group of McLeod CLC faculty attended the school board meeting to share their concerns about the superintendent’s decision to transfer Ronald. Along with this concern, the faculty reinforced that they wanted Ronald to be able to interview for the principal’s position at McLeod CLC now that the current principal, Tucker, had announced that he would retire at the end of the school year.

Some faculty figured out the superintendent’s plan to cut McLeod CLC’s AP position in their discussions with him about Ronald’s transfer, while other faculty read about it in the newspaper. While the critical incidents differ, a common thread of teacher
anger in response to a further reduction of their power ran through the stories. What they
did with the anger differed among faculty members. Some said “there the school district
goes screwing us over again,” while others believed it was time for them to approach the
school board. This time the faculty were not disappointed; they were angry and thought
something needed to be done about it.

Carolyn described the anger she felt when the superintendent mentioned cutting
the AP position at the very time when he was supposed to be calming the faculty about
his decision to transfer Ronald. Carolyn explained:

A few weeks ago the [superintendent] had been asked by [Tucker, the principal]
to come to [McLeod CLC] to explain to the staff why [Ronald] was taken away
from our building as assistant principal and moved to stand in as principal at
[other] elementary [in district] until the end of their school year. Because several
of our staff members finally felt like [McLeod CLC] was doing the right thing, we
were headed in the right direction, we were getting the support we needed, and
after six months whamo--he was gone without so much as a goodbye or any
warning. And so when [superintendent] came over here we had lots of questions
for him, most of which he skirted. . . . One of them being, would [Ronald] be able
to be our principal? Because we would really like that. [And] if that happened,
could we have an assistant principal? And [superintendent] in so many words
said that due to budget cuts we might not have an assistant principal at all, which
really got us thinking we need to let the board know that is not appropriate.

Carolyn was angry about the superintendent’s decision to transfer Ronald to another
school, but when she realized the superintendent was going to further reduce their power
and cut their AP position, it spurred her to action. The superintendent had already 
“taken” Ronald and they were not going to let the superintendent destroy the AP position 
altogether. This second loss of teacher and school power made Carolyn realize that she 
needed to make the school board aware of the effects the superintendent’s decisions were 
having on the school and the success of the partnership. Unlike the death of a loved one, 
McLeod CLC faculty did have the opportunity to try to change the end results. McLeod 
CLC faculty presented their case to the school board to fight for the future of their school. 

A second incident that angered Carolyn occurred when the superintendent 
reported to the local paper that he was cutting the AP position due to the small number of 
students attending McLeod CLC. Carolyn was angry that the school data he reported left 
out a portion of the school population. She explained: 

I read that the superintendent is quoted in the paper as recommending that 

[McLeod CLC] has less students then we actually have, because he did not add in 
the 40 students who are in pre-K. Whether or not you add them in they do affect 
what is going on in the building. When you teach them every day, they go to all 
the special areas. They go to lunch, breakfast, [and] playground. They’re 
everywhere just like every other student in the building. So if you are not going 
to count them then don’t have them in the building. But you know that is 
frustrating and he says because we are a small school he is not going to 
recommend that we have a second administrator. Well without that second 
person there are a lot of things that that person does whether you see them on a 
daily basis they are going on behind the scenes . . . And with our partnership we
have more meetings and not necessarily a lot of meetings but there are more than the average school would have.

Carolyn’s anger, and that of other faculty, over the two recent decisions made by the superintendent using inaccurate data ignited a larger group of faculty, university, and community members to approach the school board.

Faculty Fight to Regain Their Power

A group of faculty at McLeod CLC spoke individually with parents, community members, and university faculty to express their concerns about the superintendent’s decision to cut the AP position. McLeod CLC teachers were angry with the superintendent, but they knew that they needed to manage their anger in presenting their case to the school board. Three faculty members indicated that the process of preparing for the school board meeting was a critical incident because in advocating for their own needs, they increased their previously diminished sense of power.

When Mary heard about the superintendent’s decision, she thought to herself, “We needed to protest the move and have him back the next day . . . you can’t do this or all of us will strike on the lawn.” Instead of protesting on the front lawn of the school, McLeod CLC faculty, parents, community members, and university faculty members strategized about how best to present their concerns to the school board. Mary described this process:

We began working on speeches and strategy . . . more strategizing. I guess . . . it is energizing to some extent you know there is some hope associated with doing something. You don’t know how it will turn out but at least doing something makes you feel a little better.
Mary felt better about the teachers’ lack of power when they acted instead of sitting passively with their anger.

Similarly, Sam felt better and supported when the community members started asking how they could help McLeod CLC in this fight for their AP position. Sam stated:

Basically what happened [was] the staff and community folks got together and [university] folks all kind of got together and rallied to . . . at least make sure that he was given the opportunity for the position, and it was successful. So he did interview and he ended up being the best candidate, which of course I always knew was going to be the case. But it was nice to see everybody pull together and work together toward a goal . . . I think it would not have been possible unless we had everybody working together to come through and speak out. Parents, faculty, community, [university] took all of them cause it really seemed like we were losing the battle there for awhile.

With the support of the community, Sam felt that the teachers were able to reclaim some of their power in the battle with the school district administration.

Echoing Mary’s and Sam’s views of their struggle to regain the AP position and rehire Ronald, Carolyn shared that she felt better in this process. She explained:

I just wanted to make the board members aware of what was happening in our building. If you are not here in our building every day or if you don’t volunteer a lot . . . you don’t know what it is like, you don’t know happens, and you really can’t make recommendations without being there or without talking to people at the school level. And so many times they make decisions based on hearsay or
what comes to them from the superintendent, who doesn’t necessarily get his information from the staff at the school.

Carolyn wanted to make sure that she clearly explained the needs of McLeod CLC to the school board because she did not trust the superintendent to make decisions in the best interest of McLeod CLC faculty and students.

McLeod CLC faculty described two incidents in which the superintendent first ripped away their AP, Ronald, and then tried to dissolve the AP position at McLeod CLC. At first McLeod CLC faculty felt devastated, as though there had been a death in the family. However, when they realized the superintendent was about to take away their AP position, a group of people acted on this anger. Instead of internalizing their anger and grief, McLeod CLC faculty realized that if they wanted their school to succeed in its reforms under the leadership of Ronald they would have to present their case to the School Board. McLeod CLC faculty, families, university faculty, and community members came together to express their concerns about the AP position being cut to the School Board.

At 7:00 p.m. on a Thursday evening in June 2004, 17 teachers, parents, and a university representative took their seats on the left side of the cafeteria-turned-board room. Unlike the previous board meeting where they advocated for their school, this Board of Education meeting was not crowded. The room contained the 17 advocates for a McLeod CLC assistant principal, a group of policemen being recognized for their service in the school system, a bus driver, a parent thanking the board for her child’s education, two SPLOST representatives, and three women addressing the career and technology program.
Nervously waiting their turn, faculty whispered to each other, “Where is Betsy [university representative]? She is the first one to address the board.” Glancing to the right, they glimpsed Betsy scurrying into the building, waiting for her turn to go to the podium. The president of the Board of Education directed the audience’s attention to the recognition of visitors, stating, “The first visitor to speak is [Dr. Betsy Lynch] who will be addressing the [McLeod CLC] AP position.”

Betsy walked across the room and up to the podium. She began by stating her home address and thanking the Board for the opportunity to speak. She brought the Board back two years to the time when they agreed to partner with the local university. Betsy noted that most reform efforts take three to five years, but in looking at the standardized test scores from 2003, McLeod CLC had already made great gains. While the standardized test scores were not yet available for 2004, there was little doubt that McLeod CLC would once again meet adequately yearly progress. She reminded the board that three years ago McLeod CLC was one step away from restructuring; now the school was out of corrective action entirely. Betsy then discussed the school’s interest in differentiated instruction, which would need the direction of an assistant principal. In conclusion, Betsy stated, “Let them know that you continue to support the partnership by providing at least a half-time assistant principal.”

The visitors applauded Betsy’s remarks and a McLeod CLC parent stepped up to the podium to address McLeod CLC’s need for an assistant principal. She presented the board with a petition containing 100 signatures. The parent observed, “[McLeod CLC] is an under selected school and in order to promote the school they need a full staff” (“under selected” refers to the stigma that McLeod CLC carried as a failing school,
causing parents not to send their children to McLeod CLC). Her remarks addressed the
school’s renovation and its future administrative needs. She concluded by reiterating the
school’s need for an AP.

Another McLeod CLC parent also addressed the Board on the issue of the need
for an AP. This parent explained that she was not only a parent and a university
professor, but had previously served as a juvenile court judge. Like the previous speakers
she thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. She expressed her concern that
McLeod CLC was being “cut piece by piece,” noting that, “parents no longer have the 15
extra days and now the AP.” She acknowledged that in the current budget situation
money was tight, but argued, “you can’t take it from the schools that need it the most.”

Drawing on her experience as a juvenile judge, she asserted, “[we] can pay now
or we can pay to incarcerate in the future,” and implored, “If you can’t change your
decision give us time.” Looking at the board members and specifically the
superintendent, she argued that “we can petition to the state to make [McLeod CLC] a
site-based school [giving the school district access to more funds].” The McLeod CLC
representatives looked at each other as the parent concluded, “We know you care and will
make the right decision.”

The next visitor spoke regarding the needs of bus drivers. Taking a deep breath,
the audience shifted in their seats. Jennifer gathered her papers, for she was the next to
speak to the board about the need for an AP at her school. Unlike the other speakers
Jennifer planned to address the professional development needs and how an AP plays a
critical role in professional development. When her turn came, Jennifer reminded the
board of her previous visit to share the literacy gains of the students at McLeod CLC.
Now she was here to express the need for an AP. She began by noting that McLeod CLC was “launching the standard base curriculum and differentiated instruction, which is an ambitious plan.” The district offered to send central office staff over to help when the principal was out of the building as soon as Ronald was transferred, but Jennifer responded that this “cut and paste [approach] may create more work in the long run.” She concluded by asking for two full-time administrators at her school.

Denise eagerly awaited her turn while listening to Jennifer finish her remarks. Denise then walked from the second row up to the podium. Looking at each board member, Denise expressed the legal concern of having teachers handle discipline issues when the principal is out of the building. Denise reminded the board that “two years ago you made a pledge of support as we embarked on the partnership. [This decision] represents a broken promise.” When one of the board members held up a card to indicate that she was out of time, Denise jokingly pushed the card down and stated “that a full team was essential.” After Denise spoke her last word, the 17 UCS supporters stood up and gave Denise a standing ovation.

Gaining Power: Excitement over the School Board’s Supportive Decision

After McLeod CLC faculty had approached the school board, Ronald, McLeod CLC’s former AP, interviewed for their principal’s position. The interview team and the school council recommended to the superintendent and the school board that Ronald be hired as the 2004-2005 principal. When McLeod CLC faculty heard that Ronald had been chosen as their principal, they expressed relief. They learned that the superintendent did not recommend Ronald for the principal position at McLeod CLC, however, the school board decided to approve Ronald as McLeod CLC principal for the
2004-2005 school year. Four faculty described the critical nature of the decision, which is illustrated below.

Sam’s description of this critical incident illustrates a feeling of support coming from the school board and an excitement about the upcoming school year. Sam stated:

Once our interview team interviewed I think three or four candidates and then they have to decide . . . who they’re going to pick. . . . So they picked him and then once they do that the name goes before the superintendent and the school board and then they have to approve it. . . . Generally speaking [when a] school counsel or interview team from a school chooses someone that’s who they go with [the recommendation]. I heard there was a little mismatch between the superintendent and school board. But the school board was definitely in favor of supporting our decision. And the superintendent I think came around to support it after he realized the school board was very adamant about having Ronald over here . . . I was just very excited just kind of relieved. Relief was when you know there is always that doubt in the back of your mind that something is not going to shake out the way you think . . . It was like woo-hoo, sigh of relief, very excited and it just made me think next year is going to be great. I just can’t wait to get started.

Sam acknowledged the superintendent’s resistance to Ronald’s selection as McLeod CLC principal but described the excitement in the school board’s decision to give McLeod CLC faculty back some of their power by approving Ronald as principal. Sam was excited about the school board’s decision and the upcoming school year.
Similar to Sam, Carolyn expressed feeling supported by the school board’s decisions and being excited that Ronald would be McLeod CLC’s principal. Carolyn felt that finally they had won their battle with the superintendent. Carolyn reflected on that night:

It was about suppertime. It was you know 6:00 and so I guess I figured a couple hours later around 8:00 I needed to start checking my e-mail and so right before I started tucking the kids in bed and stuff I checked and nothing was there . . . and so I don’t know was it 8:32 maybe when the e-mail came out . . . I was very excited for us and about McLeod CLC and for where we were headed that we have had Ronald and that he is a hard working and he’s dedicated. He is an early bird. He’s here before anybody else gets here. We know what to expect of him. He is tough and that’s going to be good. We need to be responsible and make sure we are doing the right thing and being held accountable to teaching our kids our students. So I was very excited . . . I was so glad to be able to know that the person I would face every day on my workdays and have to work with was somebody that I felt was strong and predictable, reliable, stable, knowledgeable, all those “ables” . . . I think it became a winning situation when the Board announced that they would like for Ronald to become the principal here. And I think that the staff felt really backed by the Board of Education. It was a very positive thing for them to do.

Carolyn was glad for herself and her colleagues that the school board decided Ronald would be McLeod CLC’s principal. Her excitement continued as she thought about the upcoming school year and the characteristics of their new principal.
Sam and Carolyn expressed excitement about the upcoming school year and relief that the school board had supported McLeod CLC’s recommendation to appoint Ronald as their principal. The school board increased the faculty’s sense of power, resulting in a sense of excitement about the upcoming school year. After Ronald was appointed by the school board to be the 2004-2005 principal, faculty had positive views about the next school year.

Two faculty members described the characteristics they liked in Ronald’s leadership approach. Brittany mentioned what it was like to see Ronald come by her classroom every morning. She stated:

He would almost every morning make the rounds to every single room and you know people just felt like, wow, you came all the way out to my room? Um, just to look in and say good morning and it’s like wow, you know, somebody cares that we’re out here and you didn’t feel like you were being watched and checked up on necessarily.

Bertha also expressed this feeling of being supported in her description of Ronald’s leadership. Bertha compared Ronald’s leadership style to those of previous principals:

I feel he is totally in control . . . He will tell you what he expects and how he expects it to go . . . I see that he really is about taking care of the kids and being sure that we meet their needs and I respect that. I like that much better than somebody you don’t know and he is not letting one teacher float around do[ing] nothing while everybody else working. He goes to different faculty and he will tell them individually what they need to do and how they need to do it. But he is
getting the messages across and he put us on committees he is giving us responsibilities. . . .

Brittany and Bertha relished the prospect of this new style of leadership and the promise for a better future. In thinking about their future they know what to expect, know that everyone will be treated equally, and that the School Board approved a half-time AP for the school.

Summary

This chapter presented the thematic and categorical findings for the anger and power cycle. As the power of the McLeod CLC faculty decreased, they experienced emotions of disappointment and anger. The removal of the 15 extra days, the transfer of Ronald, and the elimination of the AP position led the faculty to take their anger and turn it in to action. In this process of advocating for their needs, they felt better about their situation due to the support of parents, community members, and university faculty. When the school board supported McLeod CLC’s recommendation that Ronald be chosen as principal for the 2004-2005 school year, the faculty regained even more of their power. In regaining this power, they experienced excitement about the upcoming school year.

During this same time that McLeod CLC dealt with anger about the superintendent’s decision, McLeod CLC teachers’ professional selves\textsuperscript{5} were being challenged. When McLeod CLC changed its literacy program to Cunningham’s Four Blocks many of the teachers had to reconstruct their perceptions of literacy instruction and their views of themselves. In reconstructing their professional selves, teachers

\textsuperscript{5} Jeffrey and Woods (1996) explained that when teachers are challenged in educational reform processes they experience a “loss of self” (p. 331).
experienced fear; however, with the support of the literacy coach and university faculty, the teachers eventually saw the success of their new instructional approaches in the achievements of their students. The next chapter contains the findings related to the theme of fear and excitement in the reconstruction of McLeod CLC faculty members’ professional selves.
CHAPTER 6

FEAR AND EXCITEMENT IN THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PROFESSIONAL SELF

Introduction

McLeod CLC faculty described fear and excitement in response to the task of reconstructing their professional selves; that is, changing the way they act and perceive themselves in their professional roles. In this process, the teachers experienced fear and intimidation when someone challenged their instructional approaches, which they also interpreted as a challenge to their professional selves.

In the process of reconstructing their professional selves, teachers received support from university faculty members and the school literacy coach, which led to improvements in the quality of their teaching. Through this process of transformation, McLeod CLC faculty and administrators recognized improvements in their students’ literacy skills, solidifying the teachers’ new perceptions of themselves. During this reconstruction processes, McLeod CLC administrators celebrated the school’s success. The teachers’ recognition that new instructional approaches had improved student achievement and the administration’s celebration of the progress made by students and teachers reinforced the benefits of this new professional self. Figure 4 illustrates this process.
Fear and Intimidation in Challenges to the Professional Self

Faculty members described a number of incidents that elicited fear and feelings of intimidation in the process of reconstructing their professional selves. While the incidents differed, they all dealt with the changes that were implemented in literacy instruction. The reconstruction of teachers’ professional selves began with a decrease in control but changed over time to an increase in power.

Chris, a veteran teacher, described the first faculty meeting with their new literacy coach. This faculty meeting challenged the way Chris saw himself as a teacher. Chris explained:

I remember one of the first faculty meetings where [the literacy coach] called everybody together. And she had a PowerPoint and she was putting up test scores and correlations between the different races and ethnicities and gender and age it had another correlation to go along with it. And it was very scary. It was the fact...
that the students we were turning out and promoting a majority of the population of people who are in jail were reading at the level our students are when they left us.

When a student leaves the fifth grade reading on the second grade level, middle school and high school are going to alienate them. I remember her statement was we are in fact generating criminals. We are generating people whose foundation in education is so poor that their lifestyle and means for success are going to come otherwise than through [a] high school degree and jobs that you can get through [a] high school degree, not to mention college. And that is not to speak for every single child but there is a significant population of students at [McLeod CLC] . . . I think . . . she was driving in a point was this isn’t the kids’ fault, it’s not the parents’ fault. We as a faculty, we as a staff have to assume responsibility for what goes on. We have to understand that what we have been doing has not been working. . . . The fact [is] that the problem is with the faculty. It lies with instruction, it lies not necessarily [in] what we are not doing but [in] how we were doing it . . .

And I remember in that faculty meeting the silence . . . the silence the silence as she talked. The shock. I remember myself saying you know it is not an excuse but a lot of the scores are comparable to students who are minority low socioeconomic . . . so I think we all left that meeting a little disheartened. I would be lying if I didn’t say to actually hear her say that we were producing children who would be prepared for nothing but jail is a different reality. . . . It scared the
hell out of me. It scared the hell out of a lot of people on the staff. I can certainly tell you it scared the hell out of her.

Chris’ fear came from the realization that he had failed in his purpose of creating a better future for his students. He feared for the future of his students and he feared for the professional he had become. Chris recognized this fear, so when he began to feel helpless in working with students with so many odds against them, he reminded himself that he was not powerless. Although he might experience periods of decreased power as he recognized the need to change his current professional self, he had the resources and the ability to reconstruct his professional self. Through this reconstruction he would regain his power and achieve his purpose in being teacher: to teach students the skills that they could access when looking at many different types of literature.

Similarly, Frances explained the process of having her professional self challenged. In her critical incident, Frances described how she felt overwhelmed, and traumatized because she had to stop using the books she had become accustomed to using with her class. She stated:

I just remember last year how traumatized I was when we started guided reading. For example, it was like throw out everything you’ve ever done with reading. Let’s try something new. No you may not use any books in your room. It was overwhelming trying to learn to do that and now I am just really glad I did because it really [has] been successful with the kids. We’ve seen improvement made so I feel better but it was hard last year.

In Frances’ reconstruction of her professional self she felt challenged by being told not to use her books or previous literacy instructional practices. She was forced to
enter into an ambiguous, uncomfortable, and unfamiliar space in which she had to construct a different professional self, which left her feeling overwhelmed and traumatized. However, she received support in this unfamiliar place making her able to increase student achievement. This success left her feeling glad and professionally validated.

Contrary to Frances’ experience, Elizabeth, another veteran teacher, described one of many incidents in which she felt her opinions and experience were not valued in the discussion of literacy at McLeod CLC. The incident occurred during a dialogue about her interest in serving on the reading committee. She explained:

I feel like I have a lot of experience . . . I was always considered an excellent, top reading teacher. . . . I want to be on the reading committee because we are supposed to be on a committee and that is the one that I am most interested in. . . . But I am not wanted on the reading committee because . . . they want to keep it smaller. And I said, “Well, that is my interest, my passion, and I’ve been considered an expert reading teacher.” And the answer was “We have a lot of experts here.” . . . I felt sort of slapped in the face. . . . I felt devalued. I also felt like there is nothing else I can say. I am not going to be heard and that did not feel good.

Elizabeth explained how her status and view of her professional self were challenged in the process of changing the literacy program. Her years of teaching and reinforcement from her previous school community had affirmed her view that she was an expert reading teacher. However, when she was told that the school had “lots of experts” she felt devalued, leaving her questioning her professional self. The continual tension
between the expert teacher she knew herself to be and her new perception of having no special expertise resulted in a conflicted and silenced professional self. This challenge to and conflict in her view of her professional self made her feel unimportant and unwanted.

Faculty described feeling scared, overwhelmed, traumatized, or devalued in the face of this change process. Chris and Frances recognized their need to refine their instructional approaches, which in the end resulted in excitement in the reconstruction of their professional selves. In contrast, rather than feeling excitement in constructing a new professional self, Elizabeth was caught between seeing herself as a valued teacher in the past and a devalued teacher in the present. Educational reform involves a process of challenging teachers’ sense of professional self, which can create negative emotions, especially initially. However, these emotions can be turned around if teachers receive the support they need during this period of transformation. In the next section, faculty reported on the support they received in changing their instructional approaches and reconstructing their professional selves.

Support Systems Facilitating Change in the Professional Self

In their school improvement plan, McLeod CLC faculty advocated for a full-time literacy coach. They hired a literacy coach for the 2003-2004 school year. In addition, the partnership coordinators provided the faculty with contact information for university professors who were interested in collaborating with teachers in writing, mathematics, art, and science. The responsibility for contacting the professors was placed in the hands of McLeod CLC faculty. Twenty-six of the 32 McLeod CLC teachers invited university faculty to collaborate with them.
When McLeod CLC teachers realized that they were not meeting their students’ academic needs, they accepted this challenge and reached out for support. During the 2003-2004 school year, McLeod CLC teachers received instructional support from their literacy coach and from university faculty members. McLeod CLC teachers reported feeling nervous when they first made contact with a university professor to propose working collaboratively. Once the collaboration began, however, the teachers became proud of their professional and personal growth.

**Literacy Support**

As McLeod CLC faculty learned about new forms of literacy instruction, they received support from their literacy coach and from the university’s Department of Language Arts. In receiving the support, McLeod CLC faculty acknowledge that the professional self they created over the years did not meet the needs of the students. When faculty asked for help from the literacy coach or the university professors they initially felt intimidated and powerless. Once they saw their students improve, however, most of the faculty embraced their reconstructed professional selves.

In one incident, Denise felt a need for professional development in writing instruction and contacted one of the university Language Arts professors. When this collaboration began, Denise was scared of being judged; however, as she learned the instructional process and saw improvement in the quality of her students’ writing, she became motivated, which eased her fears. In the following incident, Denise described her emotions:

When [the language arts professor] first came in I was really intimidated because I felt really inadequate in the field of learning. And I felt like she would come in
and be judgmental or she would come in and give me advice. That was okay for a college classroom setting but not practical for a classroom setting, but I knew I needed help and I was willing to see whatever she could offer me.

She did *Amazing Grace* one day and *Boundless Grace* and she read the stories as a read-aloud and then modeled a discussion and modeled the reading lesson . . . Out of those two days kids wrote about feelings or things they wanted to do and [it] was exciting to see the high quality writing . . . I got really motivated to figure out how I could use literature in the classroom because at first I did not see the connection in using the writer’s craft to teach and so that really helped.

In this example, Denise illustrated the tension between protecting her professional self and enhancing the instruction of her class. She knew she needed help in developing effective instructional techniques, yet she feared that the professor would judge her, taking away her power and devaluing her expertise in knowing the needs of her students. Once the collaboration began, however, Denise did not feel threatened, and it proved to be an eye-opening experience. Denise’s feeling of motivation when saw her students’ achievements encouraged her to integrate the new instructional techniques into her reconstructed professional self.

In addition to motivating her to improve her writing instruction, this collaboration renewed Denise’s interest in her own writing. She remarked:

[T]he thing with [the university language arts professor] stands out in my mind because I used to write and then I kind of closed myself off to writ[ing] now and didn’t develop that as a talent and a skill. I feel like I am a weak writer and I did
not want to pass that on to my students. I didn’t want my weakness to be my students’ weakness and to feel so strong about something where she not only inspired me to improve my teaching but she inspired me to write again . . . I am really proud to have been a part of [it]. I feel like I have really grown professionally and personally as being a part of those [collaborations] and meeting those people.

Denise’s interaction with the writing professor enhanced her views of her professional and personal self. Previously Denise turned away from improving her writing and her skills in teaching writing. However, when she realized that this approach would leave her students feeling the same way about writing, she felt she had to ask for help. To Denise’s delight this collaboration provided her with a renewed sense of power and inspiration in teaching writing and a renewed interest in her personal writing skills. In the end she felt proud that she conquered her personal weaknesses for the good of her students.

Similarly, Leslie wanted to improve her writing instruction, and she contacted the same language arts professor. In this collaboration, Leslie and her students related to each other and formed a stronger bond. Leslie described the lesson:

The lesson was on mapping the heart. The kids had an outline of their heart and the night before I drew what was inside my heart. It was kind of like getting them to draw what was inside their heart and then they would list those things and . . . write a poem. . . . I did mine, I showed them mine, and then we did one as a class. I drew a big heart and we did one as a class and then I gave them their individual ones and they did those . . . It was a very personal-type thing and I had to sit down
[and] think about what is inside my heart so you know it was very like a reflective-type thing . . . I could see a little bit of myself in all of their hearts. So that made me feel proud and you know it made me hopeful, like I am making a difference, but sometimes you question: Am I making a difference? Do they even care? That kind of answers some of those questions, like those “what if” type questions and listening to the other kids’ poetry . . . some of the kids’ poems were sad. And that made me feel sad like wow, they really do deal with a lot of problems at such a young age . . . Some of them were happy; that kind of made me feel good . . . so it was a range of emotions.

Reflecting on the professor’s role in this experience, Leslie recalled:

I was excited that she’s going to work with me. [I was] very grateful because I did not know a lot about teaching poetry. I was just really trying to pay attention to what she was doing and trying to model what she was doing. I don’t know if there is a feeling for that like when you are trying to look up to someone I don’t know what that feeling would be called . . . You know just excited and you’re grateful that she was willing to come take time out of her schedule to help me.

Leslie’s experience with the language arts professor made her feel proud and grateful for this opportunity because of the way it allowed her to grow professionally and connect emotionally with her students. Similar to Denise, Leslie wanted the interaction to involve a sharing of power. However, once the university professor came into her classroom, she relinquished her power and took on the role of a student. In this role she absorbed as much as she could to apply later. The willingness to relinquish her power came from accepting the fact that she did not know much about poetry and from realizing
that she did not feel evaluated or judged by the professor. Leslie viewed herself as a student seeking to learn from the professor, and she appreciated the professor’s willingness to give her time and share her knowledge. Leslie’s power increased when the professor left her classroom and Leslie had a new set of skills for teaching writing to her students. Through this experience, Leslie emerged with a stronger, enhanced sense of her professional self.

By accepting their limitations and fears, McLeod CLC teachers were able to identify the areas in which they needed help and request the support that would enable them to improve. When a literacy coach or a university professor demonstrated a lesson and coached teachers in a nonevaluative way, they enabled teachers to be open to new teaching practices, resulting in more effective classroom instruction and producing a reconstructed, stronger sense of teachers’ professional selves.

**Mathematics Support**

Before the partnership began, two professors from the university’s Mathematics Education Department collaborated with McLeod CLC faculty to begin developing a mathematics community and to improve mathematics instruction. The professors had been awarded a three-year grant that allowed McLeod CLC faculty to attend conferences and gave them access to needed supplies (i.e., mathematics manipulatives). When the grant concluded, faculty at McLeod CLC continued the mathematics community, known as the “Mathematics Leadership Team.” The Mathematics Leadership Team included McLeod CLC math faculty from each grade level. This group was charged with guiding McLeod CLC in mathematics instruction and planning professional development in mathematics.
In one of her incidents, Leslie expressed her gratitude for the math collaboration and described how much she valued the support it provided. Leslie’s view of herself as a mathematics teacher was strengthened after she attended a national conference. She explained what it was like for her to attend this conference:

[The SIPsII university coordinators] chose two of us to go to the National Council for Teaching Mathematics, their conference in Philadelphia. And that was exciting--it [was] really exciting. It made me feel more like a professional. You know sometimes faculty feel like they are just laborers, a hard labor-type worker, but that gave me a chance to sit down and think about what I do as a teacher. And just being away from the kids that day I just feel like a professional, like I was a part of corporate America . . . I mean obviously you are not a part of corporate America because you just sometime[s] feel like you work at McDonald’s or something cause it is so much you have to do. It is like hard labor, like construction, but . . . when I was there I really felt like a professional. I got to eat lunch with adults. And I got a lunch break. I could go out and eat lunch and talk with professors about things and discuss it with other[s] . . . We do that here a lot too but a lot of time when you are in your day-to-day routine you do not feel like a professional. You feel like “Lord, I am just doing manual labor--that is all I do.”

In this incident, Leslie felt an increase in power after being chosen to represent her grade level at the conference. This process increased her power and gave her the opportunity to get to know the university professors. The discussion at the conference
further reinforced her sense of professional self-worth. Before going to the conference, Leslie felt like a laborer who never received credit for the energy and hard work she put into her teaching. However, the conference allowed her to feel validated in her current knowledge and approaches to mathematics instruction, creating excitement. The excitement she felt came from both having expertise in mathematics instruction and being validated by her colleagues at the conference. This validation came from individuals with power equal to or greater than her own. The time out of the classroom allowed her to reflect and be validated in her instructional practices, which made her feel excited.

Her sense of purpose in being a teacher of mathematics was enhanced by the conference, strengthening her overall view of her professional self.

Through a second incident, Leslie shared her mixed emotions about attending this conference the following year, because on this occasion she would be presenting with the two university mathematics professors. In reflecting on this presentation, Leslie remarked:

In discussing the presentation at the conference, one of the university mathematics education faculty encouraged the teachers to write a proposal. She was like “go for it . . . Let’s write the proposal . . . We are going to be presenting on creating a math community.” . . . I think I am just always intimidated, I’m like “Oh my god I have to get up and people are going to look at me like I am strange.” But you know with that I really have to think about the specifics because this is something we have to write up and send to the master council for them to either approve or disapprove. Just one more thing I’ve got to do . . . but I know it is very beneficial. So it is kind of mixed emotions about that; I am stressed but then I am excited.
When Leslie thought about presenting in front of people, her doubts about her professional ability came out. The support of the university professor provided Leslie with the encouragement to share her expertise, but at times Leslie felt intimidated by the possibility of being judged. The work coupled with concerns about being viewed as strange stressed Leslie; however, at the same time she was excited about the possibility of being seen as an expert.

*Art and Science Support*

McLeod CLC faculty collaborated within their school to integrate science and art in the classroom. Along with these efforts, the university’s Recreation and Leisure Studies and Art Departments provided additional support to classroom teachers. Through the efforts of professors in these two departments, McLeod CLC faculty were given grant money to pay for trips to art and science conferences. Two McLeod CLC teachers attended art and science conferences and integrated the skills they learned into the instruction of a particular unit in science.

In addition, pre-service teachers from the university Art Department collaborated with classroom teachers to incorporate art into a lesson on the power of words. At the conclusion of the collaboration, the artist whose work served as the inspiration for the lesson spoke to the McLeod CLC students. In his presentation, he acted out skits, sketched the portraits of two students, and answered students’ questions.

McLeod CLC faculty described their excitement about participating in art and science collaborations in their school. Suzanne, a veteran teacher with expertise in art, collaborated with Denise, a veteran teacher with expertise in science. The two worked together to integrate art and science by having the students illustrate science concepts and
discuss scientific concepts as they applied to the arts. The project was funded through a
grant written by two university professors in Recreation and Leisure Studies. The
McLeod CLC teachers attended both an art conference and a science conference. These
conferences facilitated the planning of their lesson on habitats, which is the focal point of
this section.

Reflecting on this experience, Suzanne emphasized the importance of being able
to experience each other’s worlds. In her description of the collaborative effort, she said:

We went to two conferences together. [Denise] went to an art conference and I
went to a science conference. I got to be in her world . . . learn about her stuff and
think of ways I could make the connections. She did vice versa in the art
conference . . . She really was kind of afraid of art I think . . . Now [she] is just all
about it. [She] loves teaching with art and through art. So that is a really positive
thing . . . seeing that this was something that was possible.

This in-school collaboration expanded the teachers’ knowledge and allowed them to find
ways to integrate art and science learning. This crossing of instructional fields allowed
both teachers to expand and refine their views of their professional selves. At the
beginning of the collaborations the teachers experienced fear and apprehension, but those
feelings quickly subsided as they realized how their instructional practices could improve
through this collaboration.

Denise explained how this project helped her find ways to integrate the arts into
reading, writing, math, and science instruction. Denise mentioned her emotions of fear
and excitement in attending these conferences. She remarked:
I was scared cause I was going to the art conference . . . I knew going into these workshops they were hands-on and there would be people in there creating and making these wonderful sculptures or drawings. So I was just really intimidated to go into these sessions . . . We got into the class and . . . everyone was real receptive and warm. And not to see them real critical of what I was doing but to be real supportive. And say how I could help my children learn through that learning experience . . . I thought that was really neat.

Once you get there . . . you realize you have such a unique opportunity to bring these things together. You really get excited hear[ing] ideas we can use. I think all your fears . . . kind of disappear and you see where you can go with something [and] how you can incorporate [it] into your classroom.

Before arriving at the art conference Denise was afraid that the other participants would judge her. Since Denise’s background was not in art, she feared that art teachers would examine and criticize what she constructed at the conference. This fear of the unknown and her feelings of powerlessness dissipated after Denise introduced herself to the group and they were excited about her interest in integrating art and science and wanted to offer their help. Through this experience Denise was able to increase her knowledge of the arts, discover a new dimension of her professional self, and increase her power as a teacher who can cross disciplines. This reconstructed professional self fueled her excitement in collaborating with others.

The support the McLeod CLC faculty received from one another, from the university faculty, from the literacy coach, and from colleagues at professional conferences facilitated their reconstruction of their professional selves. At first McLeod
CLC faculty recognized their difficulties and asked for support, even when they feared they would be judged as bad teachers. When the collaborations began the teachers temporarily relinquished their power while watching and learning from those with greater expertise and experience. However, after learning new instructional approaches, they had more power than they did before the collaboration. This increase in power, coupled with their students’ increased academic success as a result of the new instructional practices, ignited the teachers’ excitement about their enhanced professional selves.

McLeod CLC faculty who were chosen to attend national conferences felt validated and excited about this opportunity. Listening to colleagues across the country reassured faculty such as Leslie that they had a level of expertise in mathematics. The acknowledgement of this expertise served as a source of excitement; however, when it was recommended that this expertise be shared by presenting at the conference, new insecurities arose. This expertise produced mixed emotions of excitement at being seen as knowledgeable and intimidation at the prospect of being judged by other participants at the conference.

The support McLeod CLC faculty received from the literacy coach and the university professors was initially intimidating, but this feeling quickly dissipated and was replaced by excitement. The excitement came from the expansion of teachers’ own knowledge and from seeing how much their students improved. Finding the courage to ask for help, learning new instructional approaches, and seeing the results in their students’ achievement created an enhanced sense of professional self for McLeod CLC teachers.
Excitement in the Recognition of Student and Teacher Progress

*Seeing the Fruits of Their Labor in Students’ Success*

After three years of hard work, the faculty at McLeod CLC relished in the fruits of their labor. The students’ reading improvements served as the basis for many critical incidents. Three of the nine incidents focused on teacher changes observed in the classrooms, media center, and hallways. As the faculty recognized that their new instructional practices had increased student achievement, they experienced a greater sense of power and felt ecstatic, thankful, and proud.

Tiffany noticed that faculty talk in the hallways had shifted from primarily complaining to reporting students’ success. One day Tiffany was walking down the hallway and a fellow teacher stopped her and said, “Oh [Tiffany] [Shantel] is on an M level . . . she has come two years [in her reading]. I mean from point A to point B in this year and we still have four more weeks of school.” Previously, McLeod CLC faculty discussed their struggles with the changed curriculum. Tiffany shared how the talk in the hallways changed from discussions about everything that was wrong in the school to talk about the successes teachers observed in their students.

For the first time in a long time, McLeod CLC faculty saw improvements in their students. These improvements led to a new kind of hallway talk at McLeod CLC. Tiffany attributed the students’ success and the change in hallway talk to the new literacy program. Tiffany acknowledged that many McLeod CLC teachers were so immersed in their classroom instruction that they had not had time to reflect on the factors contributing to their students’ success. Tiffany then shared a second example of the change in hallway conversation:
I see them lined up coming in from recess and you know I will stop and speak to the children: “Hi, how are you? Are you having a good day? What is going on?” And [the teacher] might take a moment to say, “Oh [Tiffany], you know Jesus’ reading is just great.” It is just really good.

Pinpointing the root of students’ reading success can be difficult; however, many faculty members saw improvements in student reading performance after the implementation of the extensive literacy program. This improvement led to positive emotions and positive hallway conversations.

Similarly, Jane observed that in all her years of experience at McLeod CLC, the literacy program had facilitated students’ reading success more than anything else. Unlike students at some schools, students transfer to and from McLeod CLC at different points in the school year. This high mobility rate is attributed to the fact that many of these students’ families live in extreme poverty, and are forced to move to wherever they have a place to stay. The transient nature of the student population leaves McLeod CLC faculty with the need to continually revise their instructional approaches and assess the reading skills of the students in their classrooms. Each year and sometimes each week, McLeod CLC faculty members receive students whose reading levels are different from those of their current students. Jane noted that in the previous year, her students improved tremendously, but she feared they might not repeat their success this year because new students were entering McLeod CLC with fewer skills. Jane explained:

I’ve just finished doing the beginning of the year testing for [my class], assessing and looking at those tests. The children we have this year have considerably
lower scores coming in than what we had last year. So last year may have just
been a fluke, a really super class, but I don’t think so.

I do believe that we did a much better job . . . of writing instruction. I
think we did a much better job doing the guided reading groups. Having the
books . . . collected by the literacy coach, gathered and catalogued and put in the
library for all of us to use . . . you know has been something that served the actual
teaching of reading.

Jane described her excitement about the tremendous gains made by her students
the previous year; however, she cautioned that her students this year came in with lower
literacy skills. Jane, like other teachers at McLeod CLC, expressed excitement about her
students’ past success but viewed the future with caution, knowing that some of the
students were still struggling and needed her support. The changes in the literacy
program and methods of instruction provided Jane with a level of confidence, but she
feared the day might come when they were once again considered to be failing teachers.

In the reconstructing of Chris’ professional self he realized that his students were
leaving him with low literacy skills which the literacy coach linked to the level of people
in jail. This realization angered Chris and he did everything he could to improve and
change his instruction. As he did so, he started to see students coming to him with skills
and reflective abilities that he had never seen so early in the year. Chris said:

I made it my responsibility to make sure nobody [was] left behind. And this year
I think I am more excited about that than ever because I am seeing the fruits of the
labor of the past year. . . . Earlier this year . . . we read a chapter and we were
supposed to identify words that let us know about the character’s feelings. [One
of my students] came to me not with a word but with a phrase . . . I won’t remember it word for word but it equated to . . . a boy who had a secret. The secret was a knife that was stabbing into his soul over and over and over again. . . . [My student] said “I brought that phrase to this group to talk about because when I read that I went Wow, this is so much better then saying it was a painful memory.” Having my children come in here and talk about that about literature is powerful . . . and the fact that they understood that on their own and were ready to talk about it that is what fifth graders need to do, that is what college kids need to do. . . .

I literally just threw my lesson plans out the window because this was so much better . . . The children are thinking about how what they read relates to their world and the world around them. . . . And it seems like I have never been able to have that type of talk before . . . some at the end of last year when we started evolving our children into that. But this year they have already come with it and it is an amazing thing. . . .

[When] I think that the students were having this conversation I [am] overwhelmed. I was so ecstatic about it. . . . Regardless [of] what they are reading, whether it is a newspaper article . . . a biography, a memoir, a novel, the Bible . . . for them to look at what they are reading and personally connect with it and form an opinion about it . . . share that opinion . . . more importantly listen to other people’s viewpoints, and maybe change your opinion is phenomenal. The critical nature of this incident comes from the students’ ability to make connections between the story and their life experiences. In comparison to previous
years, the students made these connections earlier in the year. In this teachable moment, Chris threw his lesson plan out the window. Chris’ purpose of teaching for the betterment of society was coming to fruition in his class. No longer was Chris’ students being prepared for a dismal future; instead he was preparing them to reflect on different types of literature giving them other options. This realization left Chris feeling ecstatic. His reconstruction of his professional self was becoming evident in his classroom.

McLeod CLC faculty emphasized that improved and consistent instruction throughout the school was critical to improving student achievement. When McLeod CLC faculty realized that their instruction was consistent across the school they found themselves feeling thankful for their literacy coach. Both Megan and Jane discussed the benefits of having a literacy coach at McLeod CLC. Megan explained that she was pleased with the literacy coach’s ability to work with all the classes, a factor that resulted in a consistent literacy program. She stated, “I am pleased that someone is going around other classrooms to see what others are doing. I think that is why test scores are going up.”

Jane expressed her appreciation for the literacy coach’s knowledge and her tact in working with McLeod CLC faculty. Jane notes:

There has been tremendously wonderful change in the reading instruction I believe and it’s because of having a literacy coach who can deal effectively with classroom faculty. And it’s because of having a literacy coach who is tactful about those dealings . . . I think that she has a tremendous amount of knowledge and that she’s quick to let that knowledge be known but she is not overbearing about it. . . . There’s been a tremendous change in the reading instruction in what
people are doing and in the way they are doing it . . . I think there has been a lot of
positive change . . . a lot better instruction going on.

Both Megan and Jane expressed their gratitude and pleasure at having a
knowledgeable, consistent, and tactful person as their literacy coach. The literacy coach
modeled instructional approaches and observed teachers in their classrooms. In these
interactions, they described the literacy coach as someone who tactfully identified areas
for improvement and provided suggestions for improving the instruction. When McLeod
CLC faculty recognized the areas in which they needed to improve they had their literacy
couch there to support them. Her support allowed McLeod CLC faculty to reconstruct
their perceptions of their professional selves in relation to literacy and not get stuck in
feeling devalued.

*Reading Celebration*

On February 24, McLeod CLC faculty went to an after-school meeting expecting
a typical faculty meeting, but instead they discovered a party in the media center. The
purpose of the surprise party was to acknowledge their hard work and to demonstrate the
profound growth many of their students had made. Faculty enjoyed refreshments while
their literacy coach presented illustrations of students’ reading improvement.

Harriet expressed her delight at the reading celebration and the success of the
students. Finally, McLeod CLC faculty and students were being recognized for their
hard work. Harriet observed:

I think everybody in there was just taken aback at how much progress the students
made. I think everybody . . . had tears in their eyes. To think that some of these
children that we had known to struggle had made this enormous progress . . .
Everybody was just saying, “Oh, aw” . . . There was such a huge gain in half a year in their reading level, especially from some children who we all knew had been struggling for their whole school lives and had made really remarkable progress . . . You know so that was a good emotion. I don’t know what brought it about but it obviously had to do with some reform that we had this year because it was a major change. So that was a good.

Harriet was surprised that the teachers’ efforts were recognized by having a party, but the critical aspect of this story is Harriet’s surprise and delight that children at McLeod CLC had improved so much in their reading. Harriet’s emotions intensified when she saw students whom she knew had been struggling make such tremendous growth in six months.

These critical incidents show the positive results stemming from the faculty’s improved reading instruction. In their statements, the teachers expressed joy and hope for their students’ futures. McLeod CLC faculty recalled these instances because they received recognition and because their students were making connections with the literature as they never had before. These successes supported the importance of the sometimes painful process the faculty went through in reconstructing their views of their professional selves.

Pride in Students’ Poetry Success

In acknowledging their success, McLeod CLC faculty repeatedly expressed gratitude for the opportunity to work with the Language Arts Department at the university. Two faculty members talked about what it was like to have students from a university poetry class come over and work with McLeod CLC students on poetry. In
this collaboration, McLeod CLC students developed and refined their poems, which were then published in a book and presented at a poetry picnic at the school. The focal point of this category deals with faculty feeling a sense of pride in their students’ poetry success.

In discussing this critical incident, Denise described the positive emotions she experienced in connection with the poetry picnic. After she addressed the preparation required for poetry picnic, she reflected on the event’s significance for her:

I loved the poetry [picnic] because usually when we do things in the classroom and we don’t get to see what was going on and we are kind of isolated . . . But being out there all together, it kind of bound the school together. We had a real culminating experience where we could hear all about what other classrooms were doing and hear their poetry . . . that was really nice . . . [It] really kind of bonded not only the families together but the whole school was like one big family . . . So it was really nice.

Denise loved the poetry collaboration because the community came together “like one big family” to recognize students’ poetry accomplishments and celebrate the importance of poetry. Denise valued and appreciated this collaborative element of the reform.

Similar to Denise, Harriett recalled her enjoyment of the poetry picnic. Harriet experienced positive emotions because she was so impressed with the quality of the students’ poetry. She commented:

We were on the front lawn, which is a nice spacious place . . . The weather was beautiful [and] it wasn’t too hot or too cold . . . We had a little supper . . . It was pretty nice. Everybody had blankets and chairs and things . . . Each class had
children who went up to the stage and recited a poem that they learned or some of them maybe had written. But mostly, I think it was poems they had learned . . . They recited on the stage to the parents and other visitors. Also there was a guest a poet who was a rapper poet . . . Everybody was sitting around on the grass and eating and listening to poetry and I thought, “You just can’t get any better than that” . . . It was really neat . . . It was really nice . . . I just didn’t envision anything real coming out of it. So it really all worked better then I would have ever dreamed it would . . . I thought “Oh my gosh, the poems these children wrote are better then the examples in the book.”

This poetry event reinforced to Harriett that McLeod CLC was headed in a positive direction. She knew that the students’ outcomes in literacy, but she never imagined that they would be capable of creating such well-written poems. In this time of change, teachers like Harriett found themselves shocked by the tremendous skill their students illustrated.

During this collaboration, some of the teachers found a national poetry contest for the students to enter. In the following incident, Denise reflected on finding out that one of her students had won the contest. She said:

I opened it and I was like, “Oh my gosh, I can’t believe it.” So I call the student first and told her what was going on what was happening. She got all excited . . . We made an announcement to the class [but] that wasn’t enough. I was so proud of her. So I sent out an e-mail to all my colleagues and everything. I sent a letter home to her parents and then at the award assembly . . . she was able to read her poem that was being published. . . .
It was just a really neat moment because she was an ESOL student and when she first came she did not write straight lines on the paper. I couldn’t look at her writing really make heads or tails out of it. And that was one thing with poetry because poetry can take any form any shape. She was able to work with it and express herself very well. And for her to come the beginning of the year not really being able to write anything legible to be able to produce something and be the one out of the class that got published. It was just really an outstanding moment for her. . . . I was trying not to cry because I was so proud of her and this accomplishment. And I guess just wanting everybody to realize what an honor it was for her . . . to see her be able to shine at that moment, and to know how much she had done to grow.

Denise had to hold back tears when she reflected on her joy in her students’ progress and success. Like the faculty at McLeod CLC, this student had a dismal future at the beginning, but in the end she surpassed all expectations.

The poetry picnic and a student’s success in winning a national poetry contest elicited emotions of excitement and pride from the McLeod CLC teachers. McLeod CLC faculty members provided vivid pictures of their students’ improvements. The collaborative efforts and the faculty’s investment in improving reading and writing instruction resulted in success in the classroom, on poetry picnic, and on standardized tests, as well as changing the tenor of school discussions.

Summary

Faculty at McLeod CLC initially expressed fear about changing their instructional practices. This fear, along with administrative pressure to identify more effective
teaching methods, led faculty to reflect on their professional views of themselves. When they realized they were not meeting the needs of their students, some McLeod CLC faculty became angry and fearful about their students’ futures. During this period of negative emotions and self-doubt, McLeod CLC reached out to university faculty members and to their literacy coach.

By reaching out they found that these collaborators were there to help them, brainstorming new instructional approaches and not judging them. They showed McLeod CLC faculty new ways to teach, giving them more power to influence the future success of their students. As McLeod CLC teachers employed these new techniques they began to reconstruct their sense of themselves as professionals, and they found their students improving beyond their expectations. These improvements left teachers ecstatic for their students, and their pride and excitement in the students’ achievements and in their own success made all the pain they had experienced seem worthwhile.
CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 painted a picture of the emotional nature of the fishbowl in which teachers must work during periods of school reform. This chapter outlines these findings within the context of the literature on theories of emotions and teachers’ emotions. Implications for future research are presented, as well as recommendations for policymakers and school districts interested in undertaking reform initiatives.

Influences on Teachers’ Specific Emotions during the CSR Initiative

*Teachers’ Anger Resulting from the School District Diminishing Their Power*

When the school district broke its promise to provide financial and administrative support, McLeod CLC teachers experienced emotions of disappointment, anger, and devastation. The teachers described three main events that evoked these emotions: (1) the elimination of the extra 15 days in the extended calendar; (2) the superintendent’s decision to transfer the McLeod CLC AP; and (3) the superintendent’s decision to cut the AP position.

This finding regarding the disappointment, anger, and devastation teachers felt in response to the school district’s broken promises highlights the need for a psychological and sociological approach in defining teachers’ emotions. As Averill (1980) has suggested, emotions result from social interactions and cognitive appraisal. The McLeod CLC faculty interacted with each other, the school district, the community, and their students to improve student achievement. These interactions and cognitive appraisals elicited positive and negative emotions. Each time the school district administrators went
back on a commitment, McLeod CLC teachers remembered the previous times the
administrators had also broken promises. The elimination of the 15 extra days reminded
the faculty that in the original conversation about how the school system would pay for
the extended calendar, the university dean and the school superintendent promised to
obtain the necessary funding. The transfer of Ronald, the AP, and the cutting of the AP
position reminded the faculty of the many ways in which the school district had failed to
support the partnership.

When the faculty cognitively appraised these events, they unconsciously asked
themselves questions similar to Scherer’s (2001) questions:

5. How relevant is this event for me? Does it directly affect me or my
   social reference group? (relevance)

6. What are the implications or consequences of this event and how do
   these affect my well-being and my immediate or long-term goals?
   (implications)

7. How well can I cope with or adjust to these consequences? (coping
   potential)

8. What is the significance of this event with respect to my self-concept
   and to social norms and values? (normative significance) (p. 94).

The superintendent’s decisions to transfer Ronald and remove the AP position had
day-to-day implications for the faculty, making it more difficult for them to teach. As a
result, the teachers became devastated and angry. The decisions impacted the quality of
the teachers’ instruction because many of them would have to assume administrative
duties traditionally performed by the AP. By making it more difficult for the faculty to
teach, the superintendent’s decisions interfered with the goal of improving student achievement.

In cognitively appraising these decisions, the teachers considered their relevance and implications, assessed their own coping potential, and reflected on their normative significance. Their response to these considerations was one of anger. These decisions affected some of the teachers so deeply that they described experiencing a physical response, such as the sensation of being punched in the stomach. Teachers described the cognitive, physical, and interactional aspects of the superintendent’s decisions that caused them to experience emotions of anger and devastation.

In the three critical incidents that angered McLeod CLC faculty, their anger occurred when they cognitively appraised the situation and recognized the decrease in their power and status. When the superintendent exercised his authority by transferring Ronald and removing the AP position, the teachers became angry. Their anger came from the reality that the superintendent had so much control over the administrative success of the McLeod CLC. In conversation with the teachers, the superintendent reinforced their loss of power by establishing that he had higher status than they did and would exercise his power and status as he saw fit.

The teachers’ past interactions with the superintendent, along with his current decisions, reinforced their anger towards him. Many of the teachers experienced angry feelings but determined that this was not an appropriate way to address the superintendent’s dismissal of their school’s needs. In managing their emotions, McLeod CLC faculty refrained from expressing their anger to the superintendent; instead, they
came together as a staff and planned an approach to let the school board know of their concerns.

These findings support the conclusions of previous research on teachers’ anger. When Graham (1984) studied pre-service teachers’ use of sympathy and anger, he found that they expressed sympathy toward individuals in situations they perceived as uncontrollable. Participant’s anger connected to individuals not using their ability to control the circumstances. The teachers in this study attributed their anger to school district not using their control. The administration had a measure of control in that they had the option of attempting to find support for the extended calendar. McLeod CLC faculty became angry when they perceived that the district office administration was not making an effort to find funding for the additional 15 days. Not only did the administration fail to make this effort, but the superintendent also transferred their AP and eliminated the AP position. The superintendent could have used his power to support McLeod CLC; however, those three decisions illustrated to McLeod CLC faculty that he chose not to support them. The fact that he had power and control but chose not to use it to support them angered the McLeod CLC faculty.

The findings of this study support Graham’s (1984) conclusion that anger results from controllable events and lack of choice. The district office administration could not control the governmental cuts to educational funding, but they could control the effort to find alternate sources of funding, and their unwillingness to make this effort angered faculty. While this study did not find the teachers talking about sympathy, teachers did talk extensively about disappointment. Disappointment came from uncontrollable events. Faculty at McLeod CLC expressed disappointment on behalf of the students because they
would not have the 15 extra days the students needed to improve their achievement. The
students had no control over this administrative decision, leaving the teachers feeling
disappointed for the students.

Additional research on administrative intrusions into teachers’ work supports the
findings pertaining to teachers’ anger. Jeffrey and Woods (1996) highlighted teachers’
feelings of being intruded upon during the OFSTED inspections. Similarly, the McLeod
CLC faculty described instances in which the superintendent and the school board
interfered with the progress of their school. Whether the issues were the superintendent’s
unsupportive decisions or the appointment of Janice as their AP, McLeod CLC faculty
felt angry. When Janice started as McLeod CLC AP, she told teachers how they needed
to teach their students. McLeod CLC faculty described feeling fear and intimidation
during this process. These emotions support Carlyle & Woods’ (2002) findings that
negative emotions create a climate of fear. During this time, a group of teachers at
McLeod CLC were extremely unhappy, angry, and even fearful. The more the teachers
felt that Janice did not understand or acknowledge their position, the more their fear
intensified. The climate of fear involved a fear of this individual administrator, as well as
concern for the future of their school climate.

When Hargreaves (1998a), Golby (1996), and Lasky (2000) studied teachers’
emotions in educational reform, they found parents to be a source of intrusion for
teachers. In this study, none of the McLeod CLC faculty discussed the role of parents in
provoking negative emotions during this reform. The reason for this discrepancy may be
that the teachers in this study did not see parents as having power or control in the
partnership reform initiative. Another explanation may be that the families at McLeod
CLC were not considered to be an outspoken and judgmental group of people because they were too busy working, trying to survive and that the teachers would take care of the academic needs of their children. The evaluation and judging of teachers’ abilities came from federal, state, district, and school administration.

While Ria, Seve, Saury, Theureau, and Durand (2003) examined differences between the anxiety levels of beginning teachers and those of veteran teachers, this study found similar levels of anxiety in beginning and veteran teachers. The difference in this finding may be that the Ria et al study did not occur during an educational reform initiative. The findings in this study indicate that when the veteran teachers’ professional self is challenged they feel like a beginner again, making them feel anxious. Their anxiety diminished when they were able to voice their concerns to the school board.

Two implications occur in these findings. The first is the importance of communication between the school district administration and teachers. School district administrators needed to demonstrate to teachers that they were actively trying to fulfill their promises. The district office ran a number of simulations to figure out how to fund the extra 15 days through Title I funds, leading to the realization that they did not have the funding (Design team meeting minutes, 2003). McLeod CLC faculty remained unaware of the hours these administrators spent discussing possible ways to fund the extra 15 days. This lack of awareness led the teachers to conclude that the district office administration did not make any effort to uphold their promise. To date, it is unclear what efforts were made to find funding beyond the allocated Title I funds. The lack of communication from the district office administration about their efforts to uphold this
promise led McLeod CLC faculty to believe this was just one more of the district office’s broken promises, leaving the teachers to respond with anger.

A second implication of these findings is that in the educational reform process families can serve as a source of support, not just intrusion. The families at McLeod CLC supported the faculty and did not judge their competence. However, the heavy hand of No Child Left Behind has left some school districts and administrators with no choice but to do whatever they think will improve standardized test scores. This pressure is causing some administrators to devalue teachers and to create climates of fear in which teachers worry about losing their jobs.

*Fight and Gaining Power: Excitement about the School Board’s Supportive Decision*

When the school board approved McLeod CLC’s recommendation of Ronald to be their principal, the teachers felt relieved and supported. The McLeod CLC faculty still believed that the superintendent had broken his promises; however, they perceived the school board as supportive of their efforts to improve student achievement and their school.

McLeod CLC faculty became concerned about the superintendent’s motives causing the teachers to experience emotions. The elicitation of these emotions can be seen in Kemper’s (2000) power and status theory. When the superintendent exercised his authority, he increased his power and status in his role as superintendent. He made no apology for his use of power and status, and this angered the McLeod CLC faculty. The faculty acknowledged his role but responded by invoking their power to go to the school board to address their concerns. In this process of approaching the school board, the
faculty at McLeod CLC accessed the power they had, which resulted in an increase in status.

Ultimately, the school board acknowledged the limits of the teachers’ power and supported them. The school board’s use of its influence over the superintendent to support the teachers’ choice of a principal increased the feeling of power among the teachers, leaving the teachers excited about the appointment of Ronald as their principal and about being given a half-time AP rather than none at all. The McLeod CLC faculty had spent many years feeling that the school district and the school board were against them and did not understand their needs. When the school board made decisions in support of the teachers’ recommendations, the teachers changed their previous cognition. The McLeod CLC faculty began to believe that the school board supported their efforts to improve their school. Similar to the findings of earlier studies, the connection between cognitive appraisal and Kemper’s (2000) power-status model provides a foundation for understanding the emotions of McLeod CLC faculty.

Currently little research exists on how administrators can elicit positive emotions from teachers. Intertwined with the study of teachers’ work is the discussion of teachers’ job satisfaction. In order for teachers to feel satisfied they need to be seen as professionals (Carlyle & Woods, 2002; Cockburn, 2000). The event in which the superintendent exerted his power and the faculty became angry supported Carlyle and Woods’ (2002) finding that negative emotions come from a dictatorial approach to decision-making and a bullying approach to management. In contrast to the dictorial approach to management, McLeod CLC felt support when Ronald, AP, asked them for feedback on curriculum and school decisions. When the school board approved Ronald
as their principal teachers felt supported by those in authority and they experienced a sense of relief and excitement about their future.

Fear and Excitement in the Reconstruction of the Professional Self

Fear and Intimidation in Challenges to the Professional Self

McLeod CLC faculty described the fear and intimidation they felt when they realized they needed to change their instructional approaches to provide students with the skills needed to succeed in life. They also experienced intimidation and fear when they were asked to leave all their training behind and try a new approach to literacy instruction. In both of these situations, teachers’ emotions connected to their views of their professional selves. The instructional approaches they had grown accustomed to were leading to the risk of their school being taken over by the state, and even worse, a dismal future for their students.

When the teachers realized that their purpose of creating good people was in question, they expressed fear. Lortie (1977) found that teachers go into teaching in hopes of bringing out the good in children. Rather than leaving teaching like some of the participants in Roulston et al.’s (2002) study, Chris decided that he had to do what he could to increase the odds of success for his students. Chris did not take this fear as an occasion to walk away, but rather as an opportunity to renew his dedication to his students and change his instructional methods.

Additionally, the findings of this study support the research on teachers’ emotions in educational reform. Jeffrey and Woods (1996) found that during the OFSTED inspections, “Professional uncertainty was induced, with teachers experiencing confusion, anomie, anxiety and doubt about their competence. They also suffered an
assault on their personal selves, closely associated among primary teachers with their professional roles” (p. 325). The pressure from the UK inspections left teachers feeling intimidated. The teachers in Jeffrey and Woods’ study experienced a loss of self because of the OFSTED inspections and because “the teachers’ self is indistinguishable from the professional role” (p. 325). The McLeod CLC teachers’ realization that their approach needed to change likewise resulted, in some cases, in a temporary loss of self.

Accountability in schools challenges teachers’ professional selves, eliciting a variety of emotions related to fear.

The way teachers come to realize that they are failing their students impacts their view of the situation. When McLeod CLC teachers were simply told the problem was with their teaching, many of the teachers felt angry and wanted to leave McLeod CLC. However, when the McLeod CLC teachers were told this same thing as a starting point for brainstorming what administrators and faculty could do to change the future for their students, the teachers rose to the challenge. When administrators use the accountability measures of legislation such as No Child Left Behind to blame teachers or make them fearful and apprehensive, the teachers get angry and dig in their heels. However, when teachers are brought into the problem-solving process with the ultimate goal of helping students to be successful in life, they rise to the challenge.

Ultimately, teachers need to be credited with the knowledge they bring to the education process. As McLeod CLC faculty demonstrated, the success of reform initiatives hinges on the dedication and hard work of the teachers on the front line. Reformers need to work side-by-side with teachers, rather than above them delivering mandates.
Support Systems Facilitating Changes in the Professional Self

The collaboration between university professors and McLeod CLC faculty members is a prime example of how reformers can work side-by-side for the good of the students. When McLeod CLC faculty collaborated with university faculty members from departments of art, language arts, math, and science, students’ achievement improved and teachers expressed gratitude for the collaborators’ help. The students’ improved skills left McLeod CLC faculty feeling proud and excited about all their students could accomplish. When the teachers’ sense of their professional selves was challenged, they had the literacy coach and the university faculty to help them brainstorm and demonstrate instructional approaches in a nonjudgmental way.

The nonjudgmental and non-intrusive nature of the collaborations fueled the students’ improvements and the teachers’ process of reconstructing their professional selves. In contrast to previous literature on teachers’ emotions in educational reform, these individuals were not seen as intruders but as collaborators (Adams, 2002; Blackmore, 1999; Golby, 1996; Hargreaves, 1998a, 1998b, 2000, 2001, 2004; Hargreaves & Development, 1997; Hargreaves et al., 2001; Jeffrey & Woods, 1996; Lasky, 2000; Woods & Jeffrey, 1998). In Jeffrey and Woods’ (1996) study it was clear that the inspectors were there to evaluate the school using governmental accountability measures. Jeffrey and Woods cautioned that “if surveillance continues or expands in this form as originally planned, on the basis of this research it could have long-term consequences for teachers’ sense of professionalism and for any genuine educational improvement” (p. 336).
The collaborators at McLeod CLC supported teachers’ moral purpose of creating opportunities for student success rather than failure (Lortie, 1977). These collaborations started out causing anxiety, as described by Tickle (1991) and Ria et al. (2003) beginning teachers, but over time such collaborations became more comfortable. The McLeod CLC teachers did not feel evaluated in their collaborations with university professors; instead, they perceived the professors as helping them gain more knowledge to help them better teach their students.

The rewards of these collaborations were less that teachers received recognition for their work and more that students were succeeding beyond anyone’s expectations. As in Cockburn’s (2000) findings, the McLeod CLC faculty enjoyed the process of collaboration because their relationships with students, colleagues, and university faculty were enhanced. In this reform initiative, positive emotions resulted from the support of those who helped to institute reforms in structure and pedagogy. In recognizing the value of such support, this study extends the current literature on teachers’ emotions to discuss the positive role of the literacy coach and partnerships with university members in reform initiatives. However, more research is needed in this area to support these findings and provide further understanding of the emotions involved in collaborations.

This study demonstrates that universities and public schools can collaborate for the good of students. The way in which McLeod CLC faculty accepted their limitations and requested collaboration illustrates the importance of not just challenging teachers’ professional selves in accountability measures, but also providing them with the support they need to reconstruct their professional approaches and selves. When these collaborations are less evaluative and more supportive in nature, faculty respond more
positively, which in turn leads to student success. The key to these collaborations is the acknowledgement of teachers’ knowledge of their students and university faculty’s knowledge of the research. Together, they can change instruction and create positive emotions leading to enhanced student success. Accountability measures alone cannot improve student achievement, but collaborations with the goal of improving student achievement for long-term success can improve failing schools.

Excitement in the Recognition of Student and Teacher Progress

In the process of reconstructing their professional selves, McLeod CLC faculty and administrators saw that their students were making tremendous gains in their literacy skills. The acknowledgement of student improvement occurred in the classroom and at school-wide events like the reading celebration and the poetry picnic. McLeod CLC faculty described their excitement and pride in the progress made by their students.

The excitement and pride in student improvement support the research on the emotional nature of teachers’ work and the factors leading to job satisfaction. Cockburn (2000) described the connection between teachers’ relationships with their students, their relationships with their colleagues, their students’ progress, and their job satisfaction. Like the teachers in Cockburn study, McLeod CLC faculty discussed their relationships with students and their students’ progress as factors that generated excitement about their role as teachers.

Similarly, Lortie (1977) illustrated that teachers go into the teaching profession because of a desire to contribute to the lives of their students and to society. Through the recognition of their efforts at the reading celebration and in their classrooms, McLeod CLC faculty saw through the eyes of their students that they were in fact making a
difference in students’ lives and, by extension, in society. This realization left McLeod CLC faculty feeling excited. Nias (1989) also examined factors leading to teachers’ job satisfaction. The emotions expressed by McLeod CLC faculty at the reading celebration and in their classrooms replicate Nias’ finding that teachers feel exhilarated and satisfied when they see the success of a difficult job done well.

The faculty at McLeod CLC faced extreme difficulties in taking their school from a failing status to a distinguished school in a matter of three years. When the teachers saw their students’ reading levels improve years in the course of six months and heard them reflecting on the literature they read, they felt proud of what they had accomplished. These findings illustrate the need for schools undergoing reform to take sufficient time to reflect on their practices and celebrate their accomplishments.

Conclusion

This study illustrates the highly emotional aspects of educational reform initiatives. Educational reform elicits specific emotions of disappointment, anger, devastation, fear, intimidation, excitement, and pride. The lessons learned from the McLeod CLC faculty reveal that anger results from a decrease in power and from the frustration of not being heard. In this reform, the school board recognized the needs of the McLeod CLC faculty and students and stood behind them. The changes instituted as a result of this reform initiative challenged the teachers’ instructional practices and undermined their views of their professional selves. The support provided in this partnership facilitated the teachers’ learning of new instructional practices and led McLeod CLC faculty to grow personally and professionally as they reconstructed their professional selves. When they saw their students’ improvement, the teachers
acknowledged the students’ achievements and their own professional success, allowing them to be excited about the future.

Due to the stressful nature of educational reform initiatives, the literature on teachers’ emotions during educational reform often centers on negative emotions. The teachers at McLeod CLC showed that it is possible to turn difficult situation into a positive situation in which students and teachers grow. Good things are occurring at schools that undergo reform initiatives, and those successes need to be celebrated. The teachers at McLeod CLC have much to teach us about becoming “some good fish to look at” in this emotionally charged time of educational reform.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TEACHERS’ PERSPECTIVES OF THE EMOTIONS INVOLVED IN REFORMS

Thank you for participating in this study. The purpose of this study is to understand the emotions teachers experience during the partnership reform initiative. This information will be used to determine a representative sample from which I (Alexa Darby) will interview participants with diverse experiences and perspectives. **Note:** Your name and contact information is required only so I may contact you for a potential interview in May 2004 and/or September 2004. All of your responses will be kept confidential.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Name: ___________________________________________________________________

Phone Number: __________________________________________________________

Email address: __________________________________________________________

Ethnicity (optional): ______________________________________________________

Grade that you currently teach: _____________________________________________

Grade level taught last year (only if you were at [McLeod] last year): ____________

YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Total years of teaching experience: _____

Years of teaching experience teaching in the School District: _____

EDUCATION (Please mark one)

Four-year certification: ______

Masters Degree (Please indicate your major): ________________________________

Specialist Degree (please indicate your major):____________________________

PhD (Please indicate your major): _________________________________________

Other: __________________________________________________________________

**Please mark an “X” before any committee upon which you served during the 2003-2004 school year.**

PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEES

Partnership Nuts and Bolts Committee: _____

Partnership Design Team: _____

Please turn over to complete this survey
Partnership Action Team (If you participated on an Action Team, please specify which one (Calendar, Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment, Community and Family Involvement, etc): ______________________________

Partnership Evaluation Committee:_____

Other (Please state the name of this committee and your involvement): ______________________________

SCHOOL-LEVEL COMMITTEES

Leadership Committee:_____

School Council:_____

SIPPsII:_____    Discipline Committee:_____

School Improvement Study Group (please indicate which one- reading, writing, math): ______________________________

Other committees (Please state the name of this committee/task force and your involvement): ______________________________

Below, please indicate other ways in which you have been involved in reforms that do not match the items above:

Please return the survey to the envelope in Alexa Darby’s mailbox.
Thank you again for your participation!!!
APPENDIX B: OVERVIEW OF STUDY AND INTERVIEW GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Thank you so much for agreeing to participate in my research. My dissertation leading to a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology features an investigation into teachers’ emotions during an educational reform initiative. Specifically, I am exploring teachers’ emotions during the [University-School District-Community] partnership reform initiative.

Introduction to the Study:

Recently, numerous scholars have suggested the importance of understanding teachers’ emotions during reform initiatives. This study focuses on understanding the specific emotions teachers experience during the implementation of the school reform. The outcome of this study is to provide a rich portrait of teachers’ experience to help facilitate understanding of this change process.

Interview Guidelines for Teachers:

In getting ready for our interview, I have prepared a guideline that describes what a “critical incident” is and lists some of the questions that I will be asking you during our meeting. Prior to our meeting, I would like you to recall about two or three situations, or “critical incidents” that you believe stand out in your mind about times when you think you become aware of an emotional time during the partnership.

In order to assist you, I have provided some information below that may help clarify what I am calling a “critical incident.” Please feel free to make some notes that will help you describe these situations during the interview. You may find that the descriptions of critical incidents stimulate your thinking and that you can come up with more than three incidents. If that is the case, I will ask you to pick out the ones that you deem most critical for our interview. In the interview, I will ask you to describe each incident to me in as much detail as you can. I have included the questions that I will ask you for each of the incidents you share with me.

A “critical incident” may be thought of as having one of the following features:

- An incident or situation that you feel your intervention really made a difference in the outcome, either directly or indirectly.

- An incident or situation that went well or did not go so well, that led to various emotions.

Now that you have an understanding of what a critical incident is, I am going to ask you to think about two or three incidents that you feel are most critical. During our
conversation, I am going to ask you imagine yourself back in that situation. I am particularly interest in aspects of:

- The context of the situation (where and when did this incident take place).
- A detailed description of what happened. Imagine that you are back in time in that situation. Tell me exactly what happened, what you said or did or experienced at that time.
- What made this situation or incident “critical” for you?

The information is designed to give you an idea of the overall approach to our interview. Please do not be concerned at this point about trying to recall all this information prior to our interview. I will help you during the interview with a series of questions to stimulate your recollection of the incident.

Thanks again for your willingness to participate in my study. I look forward to our meeting.
### APPENDIX C: COMMON CRITICAL EVENTS

#### ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Critical Incident: Janice (new AP) Sudden expectations/lesson plans</th>
<th>Specific Emotions</th>
<th>Common Critical Incident: New AP Ronald</th>
<th>Specific Emotions</th>
<th>Common Critical Incident: Superintendent transfer Ronald</th>
<th>Specific Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brittany</td>
<td>B: upset, angry Suddenly had person with expectations</td>
<td>Brittany</td>
<td>B: didn’t feel watched friendly</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>M: denial to anger to acceptance No heads up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>E: fear and anger “sadness to see something good ruined” Angry she won’t believe you Angry- “messing up things for you”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td>B: we’re getting screwed again “things going really good then…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>F: disappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>H: disappointed they let us down Angry- “to just arbitrarily have that position jerked away from us it made me angry” “not happy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Critical Incident: Tucker announces retirement and Ronald transferred</td>
<td>Specific Emotions</td>
<td>Common Critical Incident: Superintendent mentioned cutting AP position</td>
<td>Specific Emotions</td>
<td>Common Critical Incident: Speaking to Board (twice)</td>
<td>Specific Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td>B: scary</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>C: “He skirted issues”</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>M: anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>H: “Oh no not [McLeod]” “too often we’ve been shorted” disappointed</td>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>C: nervous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Critical Incident: Finding out Board approved Ronald becoming principal</th>
<th>Specific Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td>B: school board supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>C: excited know what to expect Backed by board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:
1. Someone coming in and reining something good (Janice and Superintendent)
   a. No warning
   b. Have to keep coming together to pick up pieces (i.e. absorb AP position)
2. Superintendent not giving support he initially said he would
## CALENDAR COMMON CRITICAL INCIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Critical Incident</th>
<th>Specific Emotions</th>
<th>Common Critical Incident</th>
<th>Specific Emotions</th>
<th>Common Critical Incident</th>
<th>Specific Emotions</th>
<th>Common Critical Incident</th>
<th>Specific Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Extended Calendar to Booker T Staff</td>
<td>C: firing line Frustrated and surprised by questions</td>
<td>Superintendent speaking in cafeteria when teachers signed up to be apart of partnership</td>
<td>J: Steamed at district confusion</td>
<td>District unaware of UCLC schedule (Not having supplies start of school and Training for phonics program</td>
<td>J: steamed</td>
<td>Removal of 15 extra days (Staff meeting and newspaper)</td>
<td>B: sorry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>C: frustrated</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>E: disappointed Not fair Angry</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>J: angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha-</td>
<td>general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>M: ticks off “Why start if never going to finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Critical Incident: Needed to change calendar</td>
<td>Specific Emotions</td>
<td>Common Critical Incident: Possibility of whole district going to balanced calendar</td>
<td>Specific Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>C: here we go again</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>C: hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions: 1) We made a commitment for 5 years and the district does not follow through (J)
2) Promised something...at least make some effort at backing their words (C) 3) promised and reneged (E)
4) Have not offered support they promised-makes it difficult for anything to do with partnership to be valid (J)
### APPENDIX D: INCREASE AND DECREASE OF POWER AND CONTROL

#### Broken Promises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Reminded of other incidents (Cognitive Theory)</th>
<th>Source of anger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudden resignation of initial partnership principal</td>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Not sure power issue</td>
<td>She used her control to leave them hanging</td>
<td>Pretended to be there and walked away with little notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Not sure power issue</td>
<td>She covered up her intention and did not follow through</td>
<td>She already questioned the principal commitment before but she told herself to trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken promise of finding funding</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Decreases (didn’t know about it and then original commitment broken)</td>
<td>Had no control</td>
<td>Reminded of questioning the superintendent original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>decrease</td>
<td>No control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>Decrease slowly going away</td>
<td>No control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Decrease, but students really have no power</td>
<td>No control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>decrease</td>
<td>decrease</td>
<td>Other times they undercut the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District office lack of support with scheduling and supplies</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>No power</td>
<td>No control</td>
<td>Feeling disregarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Maybe a disregard for their commitment to partnership and teachers.
Lack of warning in change- interference of administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sudden transfer of AP Ronald</th>
<th>Mary</th>
<th>Lost it overnight</th>
<th>Lose it overnight</th>
<th>No preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td>Lost power in decision but understood</td>
<td>Central office screwed us again</td>
<td>Getting screwed over again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriett</td>
<td>Lost overnight</td>
<td>Lost it overnight</td>
<td>Screwed again</td>
<td>No preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Lost it overnight</td>
<td>Lost it overnight</td>
<td>Felt let down by school board and superintendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AP position unexpectedly taken away | Carolyn | Lost power in previous incident and losing even more with superintendent decision to cut AP position | He said we have no control | Suppose to make us feel better instead he said that he was also cutting the AP position |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Janice expects lesson plans and doesn’t believe teachers</th>
<th>Brittany</th>
<th>Decrease drastically</th>
<th>No control</th>
<th>Suddenly this person came in and expected things from us. Took away our power and control Eventually not believed and felt threatened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Loss of power</td>
<td>Loss of control</td>
<td>Unreasonable expectations- lose of teacher power and control even Tiffany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Loss of power</td>
<td>Loss of control</td>
<td>Lost so much power and control even in being believed that felt threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tiffany</th>
<th>Loss of power</th>
<th>Loss of control</th>
<th>Unreasonable expectations- lose of teacher power and control even Tiffany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Loss of power</td>
<td>Loss of control</td>
<td>Lost so much power and control even in being believed that felt threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden transfer of AP Ronald</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lost it overnight</td>
<td>Lose it overnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td>Lost power in decision but understood</td>
<td>Central office screwed us again</td>
<td>Getting screwed over again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriett</td>
<td>Lost overnight</td>
<td>Lost it overnight</td>
<td>Screwed again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Lost it overnight</td>
<td>Lost it overnight</td>
<td>Felt let down by school board and superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP position unexpectedly taken away</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Lost power in previous incident and losing even more with superintendent decision to cut AP position</td>
<td>He said we have no control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harriett</td>
<td>Lost again</td>
<td>Have no control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td>Loss of power</td>
<td>Loss of control Both leaving and don’t know what will happen</td>
<td>They did it again and we can’t let them get away with it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking to Board</th>
<th>Mary</th>
<th>Using power to speak</th>
<th>May not have control but at least spoke up</th>
<th>Anxious in the process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board appointing Ronald as principal</th>
<th>Bryn</th>
<th>increase</th>
<th>increase</th>
<th>Relieved and excited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn increase increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining control with Ronald</td>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>He is in control which will give her more control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittany increase increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not being watched having control in your classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superintendent takes away the teachers power and control. However, they got it back when they made the board aware of their concerns.
Teachers are not being valued for all their effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Reminded previous events</th>
<th>Source of Anger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>superintendent</td>
<td>superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Convenient for superintendent he discusses partnership putting nothing back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Paper took away the power of teacher student accomplishment</td>
<td>Media in control</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not valued for all hard work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning new approaches through collaborations with university professors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of emotion</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear/Intimidated at first</td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>decrease</td>
<td>decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>decrease</td>
<td>decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated at first: Writing</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know what to expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited in support: Writing</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being out of element: Art and Science conference</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimidated at first Excited how can cross disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td></td>
<td>reminded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math conference</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Felt like a professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At first, do not know what to expect, but in end happy because treated like a professional and valued
Exception: Elizabeth still feels devalued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Source of Emotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Improved literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increased</td>
<td>(and teachers’ instruction changed due to literacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>tacticful approach in addressing need for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increased</td>
<td>(coaches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Students’ improved analytic skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increased</td>
<td>(learning on both ends)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Both students</td>
<td>Learning on both ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learned and</td>
<td>(and increased power)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>Gained love of writing back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>Grateful support learning poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art/science</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>Proud in students increase scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collab</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>(and increased scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>recognized</td>
<td>Recognized teacher and student ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(and student ability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>Brought community together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration</td>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>Beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(and increased scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student poetry contest</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students achievement improving
Both teacher and student being recognized for work
Teachers had support to improve and change instruction