DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 205   SP 007 401

AUTHOR   Drake, Thelbert L.; Thompson, Diane D.
TITLE   Influentials Upon Student Teachers in Three
                Pre-Service Settings.
PUB DATE   [71]
NOTE   10p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   Behavior Change; *Changing Attitudes; *Community
                Influence; Educational Environment; *Parent
                Influence; Preservice Education; Student Attitudes;
                *Student Teachers; *Teacher Influence; Urban
                Education

ABSTRACT
                This study was conducted to determine if the
influence of key individuals on student teachers differed by
preservice teaching settings and if such persons could affect
differences in the perceived beliefs and behaviors of student
teachers towards their pupils and towards teaching. Sixty student
teachers were divided into three groups of 20 students each. Two
groups, "urban" for urban elementary schools and "suburban" for
suburban, used traditional teacher preparation programs. The third
group, the "project" group, participated in an experimental program
for students doing their preservice teaching in inner-city
classrooms. The instrument used in the study was a student survey
using a 10-point scale to rate the influence, positive or negative,
of eight groups of people: parents, teachers, professors, peers,
cooperating teachers, college supervisors, principals, and pupils'
parents or other members of the community. Results indicated
significant positive differences for "project" students. The results
of the study support the idea that a student teacher's attitudes can
be significantly influenced by the persons they encounter during the
student teaching period. (JA)

INFLUENTIALS UPON STUDENT TEACHERS IN THREE PRE-SERVICE SETTINGS

Thelbert L. Drake and Diane D. Thompson
The University of Connecticut

A number of persons, both lay and professional, argue that good teachers are "born not made". This argument at its most simplistic level denies there are many influences outside of an individual which affect a teacher's development. A different school of thought argues there are many influences, including certain key persons, who may affect the development of a teacher. Some of these influentials, such as a cooperating teacher and a college supervisor, may present themselves for the first time during the student teaching period; others, such as parents and peers, may overlap with it.

If the notion is accepted that persons and events can and should affect the development of a teacher during preservice teaching, it may be further argued that the more the experiences of the preservice teaching period differ from the usual experiences of the student, the more they will be influential in shaping her development as a teacher. An example is the white middle-class undergraduate who is placed in an inner-city classroom for his preservice teaching assignment. The student is taken out of his familiar environment and is confronted with a myriad of unfamiliar values and life styles. Unlike his counterpart who is assigned to a suburban classroom, the urban student teacher not only has to

assume a new role, that of a teacher in a classroom, but also to
adapt to an unfamiliar milieu. He is forced to put not only himself
into question, but also the new persons he meets and the new values,
ideas, and experiences he encounters. An assault on his familiar
values and life style comes precisely at the time when he needs
to define a teaching role for himself. He has to adapt to new,
sometimes completely foreign stimuli.

A Study of the Influentials Upon Student Teachers

A study was undertaken to investigate the influence of key
individuals on student teachers in three preservice settings. The
purposes of the study were to determine if the influence of key
individuals on student teachers differed by preservice teaching
settings and if the influences of key persons could affect
differences in the perceived beliefs and behaviors of student
teachers towards their pupils and towards teaching.

Sample

Sixty student teachers were divided into three groups of twenty
students each. Two groups of student teachers, urban and suburban,
participated in non-experimental programs similar to those used
by many teacher-preparation institutions. Suburban student
teachers did their preservice teaching in suburban elementary
school classrooms; urban students taught in inner-city elementary
in inner-city elementary classrooms. The third group of students,
project students, participated in an experimental program for
students doing their preservice teaching in inner-city classrooms.

Project students participated in a full semester program
which involved students in both the urban community and the urban
classroom throughout the semester. The underlying premise of
the program was that a teacher must have a prior understanding of
the inner-city child and his community in order to teach him
effectively in the classroom.

The first half of the project students' semester emphasized
student participation in the urban community; the second half of
the semester emphasized classroom teaching. The community
involvement included "interning" in various community action
agencies, seminars with community representatives, field trips,
and informal meetings with parents. A full-time community
representative worked with the college supervisor in both the
community and the classrooms.[1]

All undergraduates used in the study were either juniors or
seniors in a semester program of clinical student teaching.
Students were assigned to an experienced cooperating teacher
and to a college supervisor who visited the classrooms an average
of once a week. All students had previous classroom exposure in
an "observation and methods" course.

---

[1]A more complete description of this type program can be found
in "Educating Teachers for the City", by A. J. Pappanikou and T. L.
Drake in the Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 4,
No. 4, Summer, 1971.

Method and Design

The instrument used in the study was the "Influentials Upon
Teaching Beliefs and Behavior" survey developed by Thelbert L.
Drake. Student teachers used a 10-point scale to rate the
influence, positive or negative, of eight groups of people:
parents, teachers, professors, peers, cooperating teacher, college
supervisor, principal, and pupils' parents and other members
of the community. These persons were rated according to the
amount of influence, positive or negative, they were perceived to
have exerted upon the student teacher's opinions about pupils and
teaching. The specific items on which the eight persons were
rated were as follows:

1. My beliefs about the relative abilities of children
   have been influenced by the following persons to
   the degrees indicated:

2. My behavior toward disciplining children has been
   affected by the following persons to the degress indicated:

3. My beliefs about how children learn best has been
   influenced by the following persons to the degrees
   indicated:

4. My teaching style (methods) has been affected by the
   following persons to the degrees indicated:

5. My ideas about how best to evaluate children's per-
   formance has been influenced by the following persons
   to the degrees indicated.

Prior to preservice teaching, students in each of the three comparison groups completed the "Influentials Upon Teaching Beliefs and Behavior"survey. These surveys were used as the pre-test measure. Students complted an identical survey at the conclusion of their preservice teaching as the post-test measure. The instruments were administered by a graduate assistant and analyzed by the Bureau of Educational Research at the University of Connecticut.

Thirteen dependent variables were used: the ratings of all key persons combined for each of the five categories (abilities, discipline, learning, teaching methods, and evaluation) and the ratings of each of the eight key persons separately across the five categories. A series of t-Tests were performed to measure pre-test versus post-test differences within each of the three comparison groups.

Results

Results for all key persons combined in the five categories of pupils' abilities, discipline, learning, and teaching methods and evaluation are given in Table 1. Significant positive differences were found for project students in each of the five areas. The combined influences of all identified key persons altered the project students' perceptions at the end of the preservice teaching program as compared to the beginning. These differences were even more important when they were compared to the two significant differences found for urban student teachers. Differences for urban student teachers showed that without the support of the

TABLE 1

Results for the Five Areas Influenced by All Key Persons Combined

Variable	Category	Test	Student Teaching Situation								
			Suburban			Urban			Project		
			Mean	S.D.	$\underline{t}$	Mean	S.D.	$\underline{t}$	Mean	S.D.	$\underline{t}$
1	Abilities	Pre	23.0	7.1		25.4	7.8		19.6	7.7	
		Post	24.4	8.3	.57	21.9	8.8	-.33	25.3	5.5	2.67*
2	Discipline	Pre	15.9	11.6		23.3	7.9		14.6	8.1	
		Post	17.4	9.3	.44	17.5	9.9	2.08*	21.2	8.1	2.55*
3	Learning	Pre	19.7	8.3		25.0	6.8		16.2	6.8	
		Post	22.3	7.8	1.05	19.5	8.2	2.28*	22.9	5.6	3.11**
4	Teaching Methods	Pre	19.5	8.7		22.4	7.9		15.1	7.8	
		Post	20.6	5.0	.49	18.1	7.9	1.71	22.0	5.6	3.20**
5	Evaluation	Pre	15.8	10.6		22.1	7.1		15.2	7.2	
		Post	21.8	5.9	2.21*	19.2	6.4	1.36	22.5	5.4	3.65**

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

experimental project program there was a decline in the ratings
for discipline and learning after the preservice teaching period.
For the suburban group there was only one significant change in a
positive direction in the area of pupil evaluation.

Results for the influence of the eight key persons across
categories is given in Table 2. Three positive, significant
differences for project students are found for the supervisor,
the principal, and the pupils' parents and the community. The
positive influence of the community is especially important when
compared to the significant change toward a negative effect of the
community on the urban student teachers. Suburban student teachers
were influenced positively by the school principal.

The differences noted between the urban student teachers
and the project student teachers are conservative in that the mean
scores for urban students were significantly more positive for the
urban student teachers at the time of the pre-test on analyses
one through five, seven, twelve and thirteen.

Discussion

The results of the study support the idea that a student
teacher's attitudes can be significantly influenced by the persons
they encounter during the student teaching period. Both positive
and negative influences were detected. Differences were found for
individual persons across the five measured categories and for
these categories combining all persons.

TABLE 2

Results for Key Persons Influencing the Five Areas Combined

Variable	Person	Test	Student Teaching Situation								
			Suburban			Urban			Project		
			Mean	S.D.	t	Mean	S.D.	t	Mean	S.D.	t
6	Parents	Pre	11.2	6.0	.87	12.6	7.5	.55	11.8	9.6	.09
		Post	8.9	10.1		11.5	4.8		12.1	8.1	
7	Teachers	Pre	7.6	10.8	.32	15.5	7.7	1.70	2.8	14.9	1.24
		Post	6.6	8.6		11.4	7.4		7.8	10.5	
8	Professors	Pre	17.9	6.2	1.49	17.5	6.3	1.10	15.2	9.5	.11
		Post	20.1	1.6		15.3	6.3		15.5	7.1	
9	Peers	Pre	15.8	6.9	.60	15.5	5.0	1.61	15.1	8.1	.18
		Post	14.7	4.9		12.5	6.8		14.7	7.5	
10	Cooperating Teacher	Pre	12.8	11.5	1.71	18.3	6.6	.98	12.9	11.9	1.49
		Post	18.6	10.1		18.6	11.1		17.5	6.9	
11	Supervisor	Pre	14.1	6.6	1.56	15.5	6.5	.54	13.3	7.1	3.85**
		Post	16.9	4.3		14.3	7.6		20.7	4.9	
12	Principal	Pre	6.7	9.0	2.88**	11.9	6.3	1.42	4.2	11.5	3.23**
		Post	13.6	5.6		8.3	9.6		13.9	6.9	
13	Pupils' Parents/Community	Pre	7.9	7.2	.31	11.4	4.7	3.11**	5.6	7.7	2.95**
		Post	7.3	4.8		4.3	9.0		11.8	5.4	

** p < .01

As was anticipated, the greatest differences were found between the two groups of student teachers in the inner-city, the urban group and the project group. Project student teachers were influenced in a positive manner on all five categories. The influence of parents and the community was felt to be a positive one.

The fact that project student teachers felt that their contact persons and experiences influenced them positively is especially important when this is compared to the negative influences felt by urban student teachers in a more traditional program. Urban student teachers without specific community training were negatively influenced by key persons in relation to the areas of discipline and learning. The urban student teachers also rated the influence of parents and the community as negative.

Suburban student teachers, in a more familiar setting than either the urban or the project student teachers, did not alter their perceptions over the student teaching period as much as the other two groups. The two significant differences for suburban student teachers, in evaluation and towards the school principal, are probably attributable to their greater experience with both after student teaching. These two factors were probably the least operative ones during their previous classroom experience of "observation and methods".

In summary, the results demonstrate that key persons do influence student teachers during the period of their practice teaching. The influences of key persons are shown to be particularly

important for the inner-city student teacher who is coping with
an unfamiliar environment at the same time that she is developing
a new teaching role.

The results support the need for planned experiences with
the inner-city community prior to and concurrent with assuming
responsibility for teaching inner-city children. They demonstrate
that such experiences can combat the negative effects of the
student teaching experience on students who do not have an inner-
city frame of reference. A community-based program can exert a
demonstrably positive influence upon student teachers' beliefs
and behaviors toward children.