How participation in the Philadelphia Urban Seminar has Changed Students' Attitudes and Concerns about Teaching in Urban Settings

George R. Bieger and Yong Yu
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Over a period of nine years, nearly 1,500 students have participated in the Philadelphia Urban Seminar, an inner-city immersion experience in which they lived in inner-city Philadelphia, worked in local schools, participated in relevant professional development activities, and engaged in community service. Those students also responded to attitude questionnaires before and after the experience. The questionnaires assessed their concerns about teaching in urban settings on four dimensions: concerns about community and cultural differences, concerns about conditions in the school, concerns about teaching ability, and personal concerns. Analysis of questionnaire responses revealed that students' concerns lessened significantly in all four areas as a result of having participated in the immersion experience. Those changes in their perceptions and attitudes about various aspects of inner-city environments suggest that those students developed more positive attitudes toward living and teaching in urban settings as a result of the experience.

INTRODUCTION

In many, if not most, cities across the United States, the need for teachers prepared and eager to educate urban students is critical (McCaughtry, Barnard, Martin, Shen, & Kulinna, 2006.). Growing populations, an aging teaching force, and severe shortages in important subject areas have combined to create a growing demand for teachers in urban settings (Holloway, Rambaud, & Fuller, 1997). The challenge of recruiting qualified teachers who are eager, or even willing, to seek teaching positions in urban environments is becoming increasingly challenging in the United States. Many observers attribute this fact to multiple concerns on the part of teachers who otherwise might seek such positions (McCaughtry, Barnard, Martin, Shen, & Kulinna, 2006.) These concerns include apprehensions about their personal safety and security, misgivings about their ability to cope with the challenges of inner-city schools, concern about the perceived difference in cultural values, and lack of confidence regarding the ability of schooling to address serious social problems (Waxman, Padron, & Stringfield, 1999).

These concerns, though valid and real, may not be static. Hall and Hord (2001) describe a developmental pattern for how concerns, and the feelings and emotions on which they are based, change over the course of time. Hall and Hord offer a model, called the *Stages of Concern,* to identify the pattern of how concerns change with experience. This model suggests that concerns evolve from being initially focused on "self", then next being focused on the management of a "task", and finally, concerns become focused on "impact", or how the individual can become more effective.

Understanding the nature and source of those concerns is a key element in changing or alleviating students concerns (Oh, Ankers, Llamas, & Tomyoy, 2005). There is ample evidence to suggest that the bases of many student concerns are the misconceptions they have about urban life (Holloway, Rambaud, & Fuller, 1997; Tuggle, 2000) or their reliance on "deficit thinking" (Weiner, 2006). Misconceptions about inner city life abound in the college population, and among the general population overall (Holloway, Rambaud, & Fuller, 1997). Myths and stereotypes often prevent pre-service teachers from seriously considering teaching in an urban setting. The lack of first-hand experiences with different ethnic groups, coupled with socioeconomic problems unique to cities, creates a mindset of fear and intolerance. Thus, for a program, that seeks to dispel those myths and stereotypes, to be successful, it must incorporate a variety of avenues for contact between students and inner-city residents (Jorissen, 2003).

The study reported in this chapter explored whether or not participation in a two-week immersion experience in an inner-city urban setting could produce changes in the attitudes, concerns, and perceptions of participating students.

METHOD

In order to determine whether or not the Philadelphia Urban Seminar made a difference in changing students' attitudes and alleviating their concerns, questionnaire data were analyzed for all participants over a nine year period.

Sample

Between 1999 and 2007, 1,262 of the approximately 1,500 undergraduate students who participated in the Philadelphia Urban Seminar completed questionnaires both before participating in the experience and again upon completion of the two-week experience. Table 1 shows a breakdown of the sample.

Table 1

Demographics of the sample (n = 1262)

	Male	Female			
Gender	349	913			
	Elementary and EC	Secondary Education	Dual Certification		No Response
Certification Area	839	226	109		86
	Urban	Suburban	Small Town	Rural	No Response
Residence	105	490	429	234	4
	Yes	No	No Response		
Multicultural Education Course	633	623	6		

The Immersion Experience

In an attempt to counter the prevailing attitudes described earlier, we believed it was important to increase the contact our students would have with the varied and exciting educational practices that occur within a large city school. Through a comprehensive involvement with community, students, teachers, and other school personnel, it was hoped that the immersion experience would develop a group of pre-service teachers who would appreciate and understand the opportunities offered by inner city schools. The urban immersion experience from which our data were obtained includes a mix of carefully planned school, community, and cultural experiences. Among its unique features are intensive teaching in inner-city schools, carefully selected professional development activities, and participation in an intensive community service project.

According to Bieger, Vold, Song, & Wang (2003), it was hoped that as a result of participation in the urban immersion experience, participating students would:

1. reflect on their previous educational experiences
2. collectively identify the educational experience that is characteristic of the dominant culture
3. enhance their understanding and appreciation of the complexity of urban culture
4. sharpen their qualitative research skills
5. identify effective classroom practices by observing and participating in a classroom experience
6. become aware of exemplary practices unique to an urban setting
7. examine their own value system in a multicultural context
8. participate in a volunteer experience with a cultural group

Instrument

A survey questionnaire was the source of data for this study. This questionnaire consisted of 43 items that asked for demographic information and also about respondents' perceptions, beliefs, and concerns regarding living and teaching in an inner-city setting. Responses were indicated on a five-point Likert scale, where a higher number corresponded to a lower level of concern. The questionnaire items were grouped into four categories, assessing participants concerns about teaching in urban settings on four dimensions: *Concerns about community and cultural differences, Concerns about conditions in the school, Concerns about teaching ability,* and *Personal Concerns*.

Procedures

Prior to beginning the experience, the students completed the questionnaire. The questionnaire was also given to the students at the end of the experience, thus providing a pre- and post-experience measure of attitudes and concerns. The data were analyzed primarily by comparing pre-experience and post-experience questionnaire responses. Appropriate statistical tests (e.g., *t-tests* and ANOVAs) were used to conduct these analyses.

Results

Questionnaire responses were analyzed quantitatively to identify possible changes in students' attitudes and perceptions as a result of having participated in the immersion experience. The items from the questionnaire were first grouped into the four clusters mentioned earlier: *Concerns about community and cultural differences, Concerns about conditions in the school, Concerns about teaching ability,* and *Personal Concerns*. Then, a series of *t-tests* and ANOVAs were done to analyze the data to see if the program changed students concerns.

Overall change in levels of concern

The first analysis, summarized in Table 2, compared the students' pre-experience survey scores with their post-experience scores in each of the four areas of concern. An examination of the means, and the paired-samples *t-test*, indicated significant differences between the pre-experience and post-experience scores in all four of the

areas of concern. Student teachers' concern levels were reduced significantly after the Urban Seminar experience.

Table 2

Comparison of concerns pre- and post-experience

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	P
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	11.96	1184	3.20	-36.72	1183	.000
	Post	15.71	1184	4.02			
Concerns about school conditions	Pre	17.01	1198	3.76	-3.165	1197	.002
	Post	17.45	1198	4.76			
Concerns about Teaching ability	Pre	11.27	1209	2.75	-10.78	1208	.000
	Post	12.36	1209	3.69			
Personal concerns	Pre	18.42	1207	4.44	-21.99	1206	.000
	Post	21.27	1207	5.22			

Change in level of concern by gender

In order to determine whether the finding noted above was true for both male and female students, the data were further analyzed on the basis of gender. Table 3 shows the results of the analysis of the change of concerns for female students, and Table 4 shows the results of the analysis of the change of concerns for male students. As can clearly be seen, the concern levels of both female and male students decreased following participation in the urban seminar. The one exception was that male students' concerns about school conditions, while they decreased, did not change significantly. (Note that in each of the following tables, a negative *t* value means the concern level was less on the post-experience survey than on the pre-experience survey.)

Table 3

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for female students

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	11.82	984	3.14	-35.06	983	.000
	Post	15.66	984	4.00			
Concerns about school conditions	Pre	16.97	993	3.78	-3.18	992	.002
	Post	17.46	993	4.88			
Concerns about teaching ability	Pre	11.21	1002	2.77	-11.52	1001	.000
	Post	12.33	1002	3.34			
Personal concerns	Pre	18.23	1001	4.30	-21.03	1000	.000
	Post	11.89	984	3.14			

Table 4

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for male students

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	12.64	199	3.43	-12.08	198	.000
	Post	15.93	199	4.17			
Concerns about School conditions	Pre	17.22	204	3.67	-0.61	203	.542
	Post	17.41	204	4.18			
Concerns about teaching ability	Pre	11.53	206	2.64	-2.60	205	.010
	Post	12.46	206	5.07			
Personal concerns	Pre	19.35	205	5.01	-6.908	204	.000
	Post	21.40	205	5.24			

To determine whether or not the drop in concern level was different for male and female students, a difference score was calculated for each area of concern, by subtracting the pre-experience score from the post-experience score. These difference scores were then compared using independent samples *t-tests*. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 5, which reveals that female students' concerns about community and culture, and personal concerns decreased by a statistically greater amount than male students in both of these categories.

Table 5

Comparison of male and female students' difference scores

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Independent Samples *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Female	3.84	984	3.44	2.01	1181	.045
	Male	3.30	199	3.85			
Concerns about School conditions	Female	0.49	993	4.89	0.83	1195	.406
	Male	0.19	204	4.36			
Concerns about teaching ability	Female	1.12	1002	3.08	0.71	1206	.481
	Male	0.93	206	5.14			
Personal concerns	Female	3.02	1001	4.54	2.82	1204	.005
	Male	2.05	205	4.25			

Change in level of concern for different certification areas

Because the sample included a higher number of Elementary and Early Childhood Education majors, it was decided to examine more closely the decrease in concerns, following participation in the Philadelphia Urban Seminar, by examining the scores for each category of major (Elementary/Early Childhood, Secondary Education, or Dual Certification). Tables 6 through 8 show the results of a series of paired samples *t-tests* that analyzed these pre-experience/post-experience differences. (Note that in each of the following tables, a negative *t* value means the concern level was less on the post-experience survey than on the pre-experience survey.)

As can be seen in Table 6, significant differences existed in all four areas of concern between the pre-experience and post-experience scores for Elementary and Early Childhood Education majors. In all cases, the level of concern decreased after participation in the experience.

Table 6

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for elementary/early childhood majors.

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	11.78	816	3.05	-31.03	815	.000
	Post	15.53	816	3.97			
Concerns about School conditions	Pre	16.89	830	3.68	-2.58	829	.010
	Post	17.27	830	4.29			
Concerns about teaching ability	Pre	11.18	839	2.66	-10.88	838	.000
	Post	12.30	839	3.33			
Personal concerns	Pre	18.25	837	4.31	-21.10	836	.000
	Post	21.08	837	4.79			

Students in Secondary Education majors showed significant differences in all but one category of concerns (See Table 7). In spite of the reduced level of concern about school conditions, the difference was not statistically significant ($p>.05$).

Table 7

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for secondary education majors.

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	12.01	219	3.23	-15.79	218	.000
	Post	15.87	219	4.11			
Concerns about School conditions	Pre	17.11	219	3.71	-1.66	218	.098
	Post	17.79	219	5.77			
Concerns about teaching ability	Pre	11.16	222	2.80	-3.76	221	.000
	Post	12.42	222	5.00			
Personal concerns	Pre	18.48	219	4.46	-7.27	218	.000
	Post	21.53	219	6.670			

Results of the *t-test* for paired samples of students in dual-level certification areas indicated a reduced level of concern between the pre-experience and post-experience scores (See Table 8). However, the decreases in concerns about school conditions and teaching ability were not statistically significant.

Table 8

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for dual-level certification majors.

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	13.54	109	4.06	-9.27	108	.000
	Post	17.00	109	4.26			
Concerns about School conditions	Pre	18.14	106	4.59	-0.63	105	.527
	Post	18.46	106	4.67			
Concerns about teaching ability	Pre	12.46	107	3.24	-1.27	106	.206
	Post	12.93	107	3.51			
Personal concerns	Pre	20.22	109	5.12	-4.87	108	.000
	Post	22.60	109	5.09			

To determine whether or not the drop in concern level was different for students in the various certification areas, a difference score was calculated for each area of concern, by subtracting the pre-experience score from the post-experience score. These difference scores were then compared among the various certification areas using a one-way ANOVA. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 9, which reveals that there were no significant differences among the various certification areas regarding the decrease in concerns in any of the four categories of concerns.

Changes in level of concern as a function of residence

It was hypothesized that the students' residence, in either a rural, small town, suburban, or urban area might influence their level of concerns. To test this hypothesis, a series of paired-samples *t-tests* were used to compare the pre-experience and post-experience scores for students from each type of residence. Tables 10 through 13 show the results of these analyses.

Table 9

Comparison of difference scores for different certification areas.

Category of Concerns	Certification Area	Descriptive Statistics				ANOVA		
		N	Mean	SD	Variance	F	df	p
Community and Culture	Elementary and EC Ed	816	3.76	3.46	Between groups	.581	3	.627
	Secondary Ed	219	3.86	3.61				
	Dual level certification	109	3.46	3.89	Within groups		1155	
					Total		1158	
School Conditions	Elementary and EC Ed	830	0.38	4.19	Between groups	.346	3	.792
	Secondary Ed	219	0.68	6.01				
	Dual level certification	106	0.32	5.20	Within groups		1166	
					Total		1169	
Teaching Ability	Elementary and EC Ed	839	1.12	2.98	Between groups	1.302	3	.272
	Secondary Ed	222	1.26	5.00				
	Dual level certification	107	0.48	3.88	Within groups		1178	
					Total		1181	
Personal Concerns	Elementary and EC Ed	837	2.83	3.87	Between groups	.544	3	.652
	Secondary Ed	219	3.05	6.20				
	Dual level certification	109	2.38	5.09	Within groups		1176	
					Total		1179	

Table 10

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for students residing in urban areas.

		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
Category of concerns		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	13.23	95	3.52	-9.78	94	.000
	Post	16.88	95	4.32			
Concerns about School conditions	Pre	17.53	98	4.14	-1.23	97	.220
	Post	18.11	98	4.65			
Concerns about teaching ability	Pre	11.70	93	2.87	-3.36	92	.001
	Post	12.89	93	3.41			
Personal concerns	Pre	20.83	95	5.43	-5.68	94	.000
	Post	23.18	95	5.54			

Table 11

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for students residing in suburban areas.

		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
Category of concerns		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	11.86	457	3.10	-23.189	456	.000
	Post	15.49	457	3.91			
Concerns about school conditions	Pre	17.05	466	3.82	-.531	465	.596
	Post	17.15	466	4.02			
Concerns about teaching ability	Pre	11.14	474	2.67	-7.589	473	.000
	Post	12.15	474	3.15			
Personal concerns	Pre	18.35	471	4.39	-15.431	470	.000
	Post	21.06	471	4.70			

As can be seen in Table 10, the *t- test* for paired-samples for urban students indicated significant differences in all of the concern areas except the one about school conditions. These student teachers, whose home residence is in an urban area, had less concern about all of the four categories following their participation, though their change in concerns about school conditions did not reach a statistically significant level. Similar results were found about student teachers from suburban areas (see Table 11) and rural areas (see Table 12).

Table 12

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for students residing in rural areas.

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	11.99	226	3.23	-15.534	225	.000
	Post	15.67	226	3.94			
Concerns about school conditions	Pre	17.03	227	4.04	-.627	226	.532
	Post	17.22	227	4.27			
Concerns about Teaching ability	Pre	11.51	226	2.81	-5.195	225	.000
	Post	12.54	226	3.28			
Personal concerns	Pre	18.39	227	4.47	-7.894	226	.000
	Post	21.55	227	6.43			

However, student teachers from small towns showed significant decreases in all areas of concern between the pre-experience and post-experience scores (see Table 13).

Table 13

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for students residing in small town areas.

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	11.74	402	3.18	-21.60	401	.000
	Post	15.68	402	4.09			
Concerns about school conditions	Pre	16.84	403	3.44	-3.31	402	.001
	Post	17.78	403	5.73			
Concerns about Teaching ability	Pre	11.20	412	2.76	-5.51	411	.000
	Post	12.83	412	4.44			
Personal concerns	Pre	17.94	410	4.07	-13.71	409	.000
	Post	20.89	410	4.87			

In order to determine whether or not the drop in concern level was different for the various residence areas, a difference score was calculated as described previously. These difference scores were then compared among the various residence areas using a one-way ANOVA. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 14, which reveals that there were no significant differences among the various residence areas regarding the decrease in concerns in any of the four categories of concerns.

Multicultural Coursework

The final area of interest for analysis pertained to whether or not a student had enrolled in a course in multicultural education prior to participating in the Philadelphia Urban Seminar. To test the null hypothesis that having taken or not taken a multicultural education course (MCE) would make no difference in concerns, a series of paired-samples *t-tests* were used to compare the pre-experience and post-experience scores for students who had taken a multicultural education course with the scores of those students who had not taken such a course. Tables 15 through 17 show the results of these analyses. (Note that in each of the following tables, a negative *t* value again means the concern level was less on the post-experience survey than on the pre-experience survey.)

Table 14

Comparison of difference scores for different residence areas.

Categories of Concerns	Residence Area	Descriptive Statistics			ANOVA			
		N	Mean	SD		F	df	p
Community and Culture	Urban	95	3.65	3.64	Between groups	.474	4	.755
	Suburban	457	3.63	3.34	Within groups		1176	
	Small Town	402	3.94	3.66				
	Rural	226	3.69	3.57	Total		1180	
School Conditions	Urban	98	0.58	4.66	Between groups	1.850	4	.117
	Suburban	466	0.10	4.10				
	Small Town	403	0.94	5.69	Within groups		1190	
	rural	227	0.19	4.45				
					Total		1194	
Teaching Ability	Urban	93	1.19	3.42	Between groups	.247	4	.912
	Suburban	474	1.01	2.90				
	Small Town	412	1.18	4.36	Within groups		1201	
	Rural	226	1.03	2.97				
					Total		1205	
Personal Concerns	Urban	95	2.35	4.03	Between groups	1.025	4	.393
	Suburban	471	2.71	3.81				
	Small Town	410	2.95	4.36	Within groups		1199	
	Rural	227	3.16	6.04				
					Total		1203	

As Table 15 shows, student teachers who had taken a multicultural education course displayed significant decrease in all of the concern areas.

Students who had not taken a multicultural education course also became significantly less concerned after the experience in three of the four categories. However, the decrease in their concerns about school conditions was not statistically significantly (see Table 16).

Table 15

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for students had taken a MCE course.

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Sample *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	12.12	595	3.12	-25.97	594	.000
	Post	15.85	595	3.99			
Concerns about school conditions	Pre	17.16	597	3.75	-2.92	596	.004
	Post	17.70	597	4.70			
Concerns about Teaching ability	Pre	11.47	607	2.78	-6.97	606	.000
	Post	12.59	607	4.06			
Personal concerns	Pre	18.90	607	4.47	-13.19	606	.000
	Post	21.51	607	5.51			

Table 16

Comparison of concerns pre- and post- experience for students had not taken a MCE course.

Category of concerns		Descriptive Statistics			Paired Samples *t-test*		
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Concerns about community and culture	Pre	11.79	584	3.29	-25.74	583	.000
	Post	15.57	584	4.07			
Concerns about school conditions	Pre	16.87	596	3.77	-1.62	595	.107
	Post	17.19	596	4.82			
Concerns about Teaching ability	Pre	11.05	597	2.70	-8.63	596	.000
	Post	12.11	597	3.26			
Personal concerns	Pre	17.92	595	4.38	-18.42	594	.000
	Post	21.02	595	4.90			

As was done earlier, in order to determine whether or not the drop in concern level was different for student who had, or had not, taken a course in multicultural education, a difference score was calculated as was done in the previous analyses. These difference scores were then compared between those students who had taken a MCE course and those who had not. A series of independent-samples *t-tests* were used to test whether or not any differences between the two

groups were significant. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 17, which reveals that there were no significant differences between those who had and those who had not taken a course in multicultural education.

Table 17

Comparison of difference scores for students who have and who have not taken a MCE course.

		Descriptive Statistics			Independent Samples *t-test*		
Category of Concerns		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Community and Culture	Have Taken	3.72	595	3.49767	-0.23	1177	.822
	Have Not Taken	3.77	584	3.53984			
School Conditions	have Taken	0.54	597	4.52922	0.74	1191	.461
	Have Not Taken	0.34	596	5.07074			
Teaching Ability	Have Taken	1.12	607	3.95466	0.25	1202	.799
	Have Not Taken	1.07	597	3.01988			
Personal Concerns	Have Taken	2.61	607	4.87038	-1.89	1200	.059
	Have Not Taken	3.10	595	4.10452			

The results presented here show that in almost every analysis, and in every category of concern measured, there was a significant decrease in the expressed level of concern. Further, the results show that this effect was widespread, and not limited by gender, certification area, residential type, or whether or not a student had prior coursework in multicultural education.

CONCLUSION

The most clear and striking conclusion to emerge from the analyses of the quantitative data from this program is that the Philadelphia Urban Seminar has clearly demonstrated its effectiveness in alleviating many of the concerns that students have about living, working, and teaching in urban settings. An immersion experience, even one of such short duration as two weeks, can have a noticeable and substantial impact on students' concerns and attitudes toward teaching in inner-cities.

In each of the four areas of concern: *Concerns about community and cultural differences, Concerns about conditions in the school, Concerns about teaching ability,* and *Personal Concerns,* the data clearly showed decreases in the levels of those concerns following participation in the Philadelphia experience. The multi-faceted character of the program is, as some researchers suggest, a likely key feature that has contributed to the effectiveness of this program (Tabachnick & Zeichner 1993).

These findings are consistent with and support the *Stages of Concern* model proposed by Hall and Hord (2001), which suggested that people's concerns evolve as their involvement increases.

In an article entitled "Getting to we: Developing a transformative urban teaching practice", Kelly Donnell argues that learning to teach in an urban setting is a complex process that is enhanced when beginning teachers develop a transformative teaching practice which emphasizes "we." This idea recognizes that in a genuine learning community, learning is mutual, between teacher and pupils (Donnell, 2007). This mutuality is central to the Philadelphia Urban Seminar and is a key underpinning of the program's several components. The careful combination of planned school, community, and cultural experiences that characterize the Philadelphia Urban Seminar has been shown, in the analyses presented here, to have successfully modified the perceptions of students toward teaching in urban settings.

The Philadelphia Urban Seminar has demonstrated that it is a useful and effective program for developing teachers willing, and even eager, to teach in our nation's cities. These new teachers, it is hoped, will help create and maintain urban school cultures where "courageous commitment to excellence is fostered and nurtured" (Duncan-Andrade, 2004, p. 349).

Based on the results of this study, it can be confidently concluded that a carefully designed immersion program, which incorporates cultural and social experiences as well as school experiences, can dramatically change students' concerns and beliefs about urban environments and may serve as a mechanism for increasing the likelihood that students will include inner cities as a teaching career choice.

REFERENCES

Bieger, G.R., Vold, L.A., Song, W. & Wang, D. (2003). Changes in student attitudes and concerns toward inner-city teaching as a result of participation in an urban immersion experience. In Hall, N. & Springate, D. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Conference of the European Teacher Education Network*, London: Greenwich University Press.

Donnell, K. (2007). Getting to we: Developing a transformative urban teaching practice. *Urban Education, 42*(3), 223-249.

Duncan-Andrade, J. (2004). Toward teacher development for the urban in urban teaching. *Teaching Education, 15*(4), 339-350.

Hall, G.E., & Hord, S.M. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Holloway, S., Rambaud, M.F., & Fuller, B. (1997). *Through my own eyes: Single mothers and the cultures of poverty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jorissen, K.T. (2003). Successful career transitions: Lessons from urban alternate route teachers who stayed. *The High School Journal, 86*(3), 41-51.

McCaughtry, N., Barnard, S., Martin, J., Shen, B., & Kulinna, P. H. (2006). Teachers' perspectives on the challenges of teaching physical education in urban schools: The student emotional filter. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport, 77* (4), 486-497.

Oh, D. M., Ankers, A. M., Llamas, J. M., & Tomyoy, C. (2005). Impact of pre-service student teaching experience on urban school teachers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology 31*(1), 82-98.

Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. M. (1993). Preparing teachers for cultural diversity. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 19*(2), 113-125.

Tuggle, M.B. (2000). *It is well with my soul: Churches and institutions collaborating for public health*. Washington, DC: American Public Health Association.

Waxman, H.C., Padron, Y.N., & Stringfield, S. (1999). Teaching and change in urban contexts. *Teaching and Change, 7*(1), 3-16.

Weiner, L. (2006). Challenging deficit thinking. *Educational Leadership, 64*(1), 42-45.