A Comparison of Urban Teacher Characteristics for Student Interns Placed in Different Urban School Settings

Sueanne E. McKinney
University of North Carolina–Charlotte

Jack Robinson
Old Dominion University

Melba Spooner
University of North Carolina–Charlotte

Abstract

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if there was a difference in the development of effective urban teacher characteristics between student interns placed in either an urban Professional Development School environment or an urban non-Professional Development School environment. Student interns in urban universities with partnerships in neighboring urban school districts participated in this investigation. The Urban Teacher Selection Interview was used to assess 10 characteristics, including (1) Persistence, (2) Values Children's Learning, (3) Putting Ideas into Practice, (4) Approach to At-Risk Students, (5) Professional/Personal Orientation to Students, (6) The Bureaucracy, (7) Fallibility, (8) Teacher Success, (9) Student Success, and (10) Planning and Organization. Assessments were completed before and after subjects participated in internship experiences. Using a causal comparative research design, pre- and post-test scores were compared using Descriptive Statistics and an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) statistical procedure. The results communicated that although there were individual growth and declines for the student interns on each of the characteristics, there was not a significant difference between the two groups. The results suggest that a link between the Professional Development School reform effort and the development of effective urban teacher characteristics could not be established.

Most people agree that there is an urgent need to improve the quality of education in America's urban districts, and the effects of not doing so are profound. For example, Meyerson (2001) states "The failure of most public schools to teach poor children is a national tragedy and national disgrace" (p. 1). With over 14 million children living in urban poverty, "Every miseducated child represents a personal tragedy" (Haberman, 2003, p. 2).

Many urban districts are characterized by failure, violence, achievement gaps between the majority and minority populations, and high dropout rates (Haberman, 2003; Meyerson, 2001; Olson and Jerald, 1998). Poor quality instruction also characterizes many urban schools and classrooms, partly because many districts report the inability to attract and retain effective teachers (Stafford and Haberman, 2003; Haberman, 1995; Ascher, 1991). Teachers in urban districts are often hired with provisional certifications, lack the appropriate endorsements for teaching content specific subjects, and often leave the system within the first five years of their professional career (Stafford and Haberman, 2003; Haberman, 1995). Moreover, Dill and Stafford-Johnson (2003) and Olson and Jerald (1998) report that urban schools suffer from teacher shortages and teacher turnover, and these critical trends are likely to continue. This is especially alarming since teacher quality has been identified as the foremost indicator of students' scholastic success (Sanders & Rivers, 1996).

Professional educators acknowledge that preparing individuals to develop into high quality teachers who are committed to making a difference in the lives of urban children should be first priority in improving urban schooling. It is critical

that urban children be provided with a rigorous, world-class education, with high quality teachers. Haberman (1995) reports that ". . . having effective teachers is a matter of life and death. These children have no life options for achieving decent lives other than by experiencing success in school. For them, the stakes involved in schooling are extremely high" (p. 1). However, Ladson-Billings (1994) points out that "the quest for quality education remains an elusive dream for the African-American community" (p. ix). Educational success for urban children should no longer be viewed as an "elusive dream." All urban schools and teachers can be of high quality.

Haberman (1995) states that teaching in an urban school is not a job, or a career, but rather "an extraordinary life experience" (p. 1). He describes this experience as a "volatile, highly charged, emotionally draining, physically exhausting experience for even the most competent, experienced teacher" (p. 1). Outstanding urban teachers accept this challenge daily in order to be models of exemplary practice for their students.

In *Star Teachers of Poverty* (1995), Haberman identifies fifteen characteristics of effective urban teachers and refers to those educators who possess these characteristics as "star teachers." Star teachers' ideology is what separates them from teachers who are not successful teaching children in urban schools. For example, Haberman (1995) reports that how a teacher approaches at-risk students is a powerful indicator of a teacher's success in the urban classroom. "Star teachers" constantly seek teaching strategies, activities, and techniques to meet the needs of all of their students, regardless of their background, life circumstances, or life experiences.

The research of Baron, Rusnak, Brookhart, Burrett, and Whodley (1992) also focused on competencies needed for urban teaching. Through their research, they identified nine behaviors and practices demonstrated by successful teachers in their preparation for teaching and interacting with urban students. These characteristics are organized to encompass both internal (classroom practices) and external (outside school) practices.

A comprehensive study conducted by Campbell, Dempsey, Margolin, Mathewson, and Reichbach (1983) also sought data to identify characteristics and practices needed for successful and quality teaching in urban schools. Serving as a follow-up from a 1981 investigation, a questionnaire format was utilized, comparing responses of those teachers identified by their school administrators as outstanding to those teachers not so identified.

A comparison of the research reported by Haberman, Baron et al., and Campell et al. on effective urban teacher characteristics is reported in Table 1. All the identified characteristics are similar, providing some degree of coalition of what characteristics effective urban teachers typically possess.

Many educators believe that traditional teacher preparation programs do not prepare teacher candidates for the ideology needed for working with urban children (Dill & Stafford-Johnson, 2003; Meyerson, 2001; Haberman, 1995). This challenge of preparing and retaining qualified and quality teachers for the urban environment sparked the development of the Holmes Group and the concept of Professional Development Schools. Such schools evolved in the mid 1980's with a charge to bring both public schools and universities in partnership to focus on urban school reform. Professional Development Schools are unique collaboration efforts between schools and colleges of education that function "For the development of novice professionals, for continuing development of experienced professionals, and for the research and development of the teaching profession" (Tomorrow's Schools, 1990, p. 1). These collaborative alliances would assume greater responsibility for the preparation, induction, and retention of new teachers for urban districts when compared to traditional preparation programs (Tomorrows Schools, 1990).

Often compared to the medical profession and the "teaching hospital," Professional Development Schools hold promise as a model that combines teacher preparation, student learning and educational research, and advances the teaching

Table 1
A Comparison of Effective Urban Teacher Characteristics

Haberman	Baron et al.	Campell et al.
Persistence	Positive Classroom Management Variety of Teaching Methods Efficacy and Expectation	Uses both direct and indirect methods of presentation. Demonstrates teaching skills which assists students in developing their own values, attitudes, and beliefs. Is able to use different techniques for stimulating student interest. Formulates a standard for student behavior in the classroom. Establishes rapport with students in the classroom by using verbal and/or visual motivational devices. Presents directions for carrying out an instructional activity.
Protecting Children's Learning	Variety of Teaching Methods Applicability	Demonstrates teaching skills which assists students in developing their own values, attitudes, and beliefs. Is able to use different techniques for stimulating student interest. Establishes rapport with students in the classroom by using verbal and/or visual motivational devices. Presents directions for carrying out an instructional activity.
Putting Ideas Into Practice	Active Teaching	Demonstrates an awareness of patterns of physical and social development in students. Is able to use different techniques for stimulating student interest. Presents directions for carrying out an instructional activity.
Approach to "At-Risk" Students	Positive Classroom Management Variety of Teaching Methods Knowledge of Urban and Multi-Ethnic Sociology	Counsels with students both individually and collectively concerning their academic needs. Demonstrates teaching skills which assist students in developing their own values, attitudes, and beliefs. Formulates a standard for student behavior in the classroom. Demonstrates instructional and social skills which assist students in developing a positive self-concept. Establishes rapport with students in the classroom by using verbal and/or visual motivational devices. Presents directions for carrying out an instructional activity

(table continues)

Table 1 (continued)

Haberman	Baron et al.	Campell et al.
Professional/ Personal Orientation to Students	Interpersonal Skills	Is able to communicate students' problems to parents. Counsels with students both individually and collectively concerning their academic needs. Demonstrates instructional and social skills which assist students in developing a positive self-concept. Establishes rapport with students in the classroom by using verbal and/or visual motivational devices.
The Bureaucracy		
Fallibility		
Emotional and Physical Stamina		
Organization Ability	Planning and Sequencing	Uses both direct and indirect methods of presentations.
Explanation of Teacher Success Explanation of Children's Success	Efficacy and Expectation Interpersonal Skills Efficacy and Expectation	Is able to communicate students' problems to parents. Demonstrates the ability to read, comprehend, and interpret professional material. Counsels with students both individually and collectively concerning their academic needs.
Real Teaching	Active Teaching Variety of Teaching Methods	Is able to use different techniques for stimulating student interest. Demonstrates instructional and social skills which assist students in interacting constructively with their peers. Establishes rapport with students in the classroom by using verbal and/or visual motivational devices.
Making Students Feel Needed	Positive Classroom Management	Counsels with students both individually and collectively concerning their academic needs.
	Interpersonal Skills	Demonstrates teaching skills which assist students in developing their own values, attitudes, and beliefs Is able to use different techniques for stimulating student interest.

(table continues)

Table 1 (continued)

Haberman	Baron et al.	Campell et al.
The Material vs. The Student	Applicability Variety of Teaching Methods Active Teaching	Demonstrates teaching skills which assist students in developing their own values, attitudes, and beliefs. Is able to use different techniques for stimulating student interest. Counsels with students both individually and collectively concerning their academic needs Uses both direct and indirect methods of instruction.
Gentle Teaching in a Violent Society	Knowledge of Urban and Multi-Ethnic Sociology Family and Community	Demonstrates teaching skills, which assist students in developing their own values, attitudes, and beliefs.

profession (Starling, 1999). These sites have the potential to be places where exemplary models and practices are demonstrated, thus providing rigorous and systematic training for novice teachers. Over 1,000 Professional Development Schools throughout the United States have been established (Schwartz, 2000), each with its own distinguishing features as it continually evolves.

Many of the Professional Development School sites are designed to specifically prepare teachers for urban schools, although specific curriculum changes in the teacher preparation program have not been noted. However, many studies tend to support this effort in preparing student interns for urban school environments. Fountain (1997) investigated the impact urban Professional Development Schools had on student interns and beginning teachers. The results communicate that 72% of the student interns were working as first year teachers, and of those, 88% began their teaching career in an urban school. Significant differences were also found in efforts to collaborate with fellow colleagues, teaching diverse students, beliefs in the capabilities of urban students' abilities, and understanding the "out of school" factors that can influence teaching and learning when comparing first year urban school teachers involved in the Professional Development School initiatives, to those not so involved.

A comprehensive study conducted by Houston and his colleagues (1999) concluded that student interns who participated in an urban consortium involving four universities and school districts, the Professional Development School interns had higher pass rates on the Texas Test for new teachers. Additionally, the researchers report that those student interns who participated in this urban consortium spent more time interacting with the students and their needs when compared to those student interns not attending the consortium.

Most traditional teacher preparation programs tend to focus on universal teaching pedagogy and methodologies. Haberman (1996) and Guyton (1994) believe that teacher candidates should focus on specific pedagogy for working in urban schools and with urban children. When Professional Development School sites provide teacher candidates with urban pedagogy and a framework for understanding the impact and effects of poverty, program graduates tend to perceive themselves to be more confident and capable in their ability to teach students who are at-risk for failure (Morris & Nunnery, 1994). However, while these sites have been promoted as places where exemplary models of teaching will be developed, demonstrated, and refined, it is still unclear whether a Professional Development School site contributes to the development of effective urban teachers (Book, 1996).

The existing literature on Professional Development Schools has focused on general processes that are fostered within the different sites, such as reflection and collaboration (Zeichner & Miller, 1997). Numerous studies report the contention that a Professional Development School environment positively impacts teacher attitudes and sense of efficacy, and lowers teacher attrition rates (Fleener, 1998; Morris and Nunnery, 1994; Stallings, 1991). At present, the research has not demonstrated a link between the establishment of Professional Development School partnerships and the development of quality urban teachers.

Method

This study examined the extent to which an urban Professional Development School environment was perceived to contribute to the development of quality preservice urban educators. For the purpose of this study, quality urban educators are defined as teachers who possess the characteristics of effective urban teachers as identified by Haberman (1995).

Participants

Professional Development School sites have been compared to other schools that follow the traditional education program on different factors. However, because Professional Development School sites have different procedures, components, and standards, such as self-selection and the duration of the internship experience, it is difficult to follow the fundamentals of social science research techniques, and compare randomly assigned groups (Teitel, 2001).

Participants in this study were student interns from two urban universities who were members of the Holmes Partnership. Each university formed partnerships with neighboring urban school districts to create seven Professional Development School sites. The two universities' programs emphasized the preparation of student interns for urban settings, and allowed the students to volunteer for either an urban Professional Development School environment or an urban non Professional Development School environment. A total of 59 student interns were involved in this investigation. All of the interns met their university's requirements for student teaching. Of this population, 29 student interns completed their internship experience in an urban Professional Development School. The original population consisted of 30 subjects, but one intern was unable to complete the internship experience in an urban setting, citing the difficulties of teaching in this type of environment

A comparison group, consisting of 30 student interns, was formulated by matching each urban Professional Development School student intern with an urban non Professional Development School student intern on the variables of school demographics, closely related grade point average (.00-.09), teaching experience, length of internship experience, and assignment of their clinical faculty member. The internship experience varied in length among the two universities. One program required two 7 week placements, while the other program required a 16 week placement. The 16 week internship allowed for an additional 2 week observation period when compared to the two 7 week internships. Consideration was given to the length of each program as a mechanism to skew the results. However, student interns were matched on the length of their internship. Regardless of the length or placement of the internship experience, each student candidate was required to master similar requirements. Additionally, all clinical faculty members assigned to the student interns had at least three years of teaching experience.

Settings

The urban Professional Development School placement sites were established at different time periods, and because of this, were identified as being at different stages of evolution using the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Standards for Professional Development Schools (2001). Of the 6 Professional Development School sites used in this investigation, 3 were identified as being at the Developing Level, and 3 were at the At Standard Level. Conditions of the Developing Level include a commitment to pursue the mission of the partnership, and engage

in a variety of initiatives to support the mission (NCATE, 2001). The At Standard Level considers the Professional Development School site as highly developed and functioning. These sites are characterized by practices that are directed at the implementation of each site's school mission, with changes in policy and practice being made as a result of new learnings from the partnership (NCATE, 2001).

Regardless of each of the Professional Development School's stage of evolution, these sites employ and participate in several initiatives and practices that may contribute to each of the student intern's development of the traits needed to be effective in an urban environment. For example, seminars and workshops are provided to both student interns and their assigned clinical faculty members to gain an understanding of the framework of poverty, and its' impact on the learning environment. Participants are also exposed to and made aware of different social agencies that assist urban families and students. Additionally, all participants are provided with training in Frieberg's (1996) Consistency Management and Cooperative Discipline Project. Through this professional development focus, student interns and clinical faculty members are provided with a student discipline and management plan for enhancing and improving student cooperation, participation, and self-discipline.

Each school site also has a University liaison who works with the administration and clinical faculty to share in the responsibilities for the preparation of new urban practioners (e.g., providing weekly observations, identifying seminar topics and conducting seminars). Through this effort, each plays a part in supervising the student interns, although the University liaison takes the lead role. Other major Professional Development School initiatives implemented within the sites include collaborative teaching between university and clinical faculty members at both the university and school house level, early exposure to and experiences in the urban school environment prior to the internship experience, on-site method classes, and increased discussion and dialogue between the participating professionals.

The urban non-Professional Development School sites used in this study regularly placed student interns, but there was far less collaboration between the specific schools and the university beyond the traditional teacher preparation program. University Supervisors appointed to the student interns were part-time university faculty, and were required to conduct weekly seminars on topics of their choice and bi-monthly observations. School administrators solely determined student intern classroom placement, and were required to make one formal observation.

Procedures

All student interns were administered the Urban Teacher Selection Interview both prior to and following their student teaching experience. Data was first collected at each university's Student Teaching Orientation program, which was scheduled 2 weeks prior to the internship experience. Each subject was also assessed at the last internship seminar, which was scheduled during the last week of the experience.

The Urban Teacher Selection Interview was used to assess the student interns' development on 10 of the 15 effective urban teacher characteristics, including (1) Persistence, (2) Values Children's Learning, (3) Theory to Practice, (4) Work With At-Risk Students, (5) Approach to Children, (6) The Bureaucracy, (7) Admit Mistakes, (8) Teacher Success, (9) Student Success, and (10) Planning/Organization. Developed by Haberman, this 50 item research based questionnaire measures stable attributes, such as relationship skills and ideologies (Haberman, personal communication, November 30, 1998). Correct responses for each item are those made by "star teachers." Each item is worth 1 point, with a total possible score of 50. In order to pass the oral interview, subjects may not have a low ranking on any of the characteristics. Rankings are assigned according to the number of correct responses for each characteristic. Based on Haberman's research, approximately 1 out of 10 undergraduates in traditional education programs pass the Urban Teacher Selection Interview.

The instrument predicts who will pass an oral

interview conducted by school personnel at an extremely high rate. According to Haberman (personal communication, November 30, 1998), 100% of those candidates with scores under thirty do not pass the oral interview. He also reports that 100% of teacher candidates pass the oral interview with scores over forty-three. Furthermore, 0% of those teachers who left the urban environment with poor evaluations or described themselves as unable to continue teaching in this type of environment passed the assessment instrument.

Predictive reliability (r = .93) was established using previous interview scores as the criterion and reinterviewing the candidates. There are no differences based on sex, age, or ethnicity when teacher candidates are interviewed a second time (Haberman, personal communication, November 30, 1998). Haberman also reports that this instrument has been periodically tested since 1962, and no changes have been made based on this discrimination level. To prevent any interview coaching or preparation, a confidentiality agreement was signed between the researcher and Haberman. Dr. Haberman also agreed to score each of the interviews for all subjects involved in this study. He provided an overall score for each candidate as well as a rating on each of the ten characteristics.

Results

Data from the Urban Teacher Selection Interview were analyzed using Descriptive Statistics and an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA). The mean, median, range, and standard deviation for the pre- and post-test scores are listed in Table 2. Mean scores on the pre and post-test for student interns placed in an urban Professional Development School were 34 and 33, and mean scores on the pre- and post-test for the student interns placed in an urban non Professional Development School were 34 respectively. Mean scores for each of the groups on both the pre- and post-test are notably similar.

Distributions on each of the urban teacher characteristics are reported in Table 3, and appear very similar. While there may have been some individual growth and decline for all interns, the distributions reveal that there are no striking differences between the student interns placed in an urban Professional Development School and student interns placed in an urban non Professional Development School. According to the distributions, the student interns placed in an urban Professional Development School increased the most on Planning/Organization, and decreased the most on Work With At-Risk Students. Additionally, the student interns placed in an urban non-Professional Development School also decreased on Work With At-Risk Students. Of concern is that both groups decreased on this characteristic. Haberman (1995) believes that this is the most powerful indicator of successful urban teachers. Final scores on the post-test show that 75.9% of the urban Professional Development School student interns and 86.7% of the urban non Professional Development School student interns received a low rating on this characteristic. These scores also reflect a decline in ranking from pre- to post-test. For example, 13 of the 29 student interns placed in an urban Professional Development School received a low ranking on the pre-test. Post-test scores show that 22 of these interns received a low ranking, an increase of 69%.

An Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was also performed on the post-test scores of the Urban Teacher Selection Interview, using the pre-test scores as the covariate. The results are reported in Table 4, and reveal there was not a significant difference between the two groups at the .05 level of significance. Haberman (personal communication, April 11, 1999) believes that this is may be due to the fact that predispositions are needed to teach children in poverty and that short-term experiences do not adequately prepare student interns for the dilemmas of teaching in an urban environment. Complete raw data for each of the groups are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 2

Mean, Median, Range, and Standard Deviation for the Urban Teacher Selection Interview Pre and Post-Tests

	Total Score	
Student Interns	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Urban PDS (N=29)		
Mean	34	33
Median	34	34
Range	19	22
Standard Deviation	2	-1
Urban non PDS (N=30)		
Mean	34	34
Median	35	33.5
Range	15	22
Standard Deviation	0.5	0.4

Table 3

Frequency Distributions for the Urban Teacher Selection Interview Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores on the 10 Urban Teacher Characteristics

	PDS (N = 29)						Non PDS (N = 30)					
	Pre			Post			Pre			Post		
Characteristic	H	A	L	H	A	L	H	A	L	H	A	L
Persistence	12	12	5	19	4	6	20	6	4	13	13	4
Values Children's Learning	22	3	4	20	4	5	25	2	3	27	0	3
Theory to Practice	23	3	3	21	5	3	26	3	1	26	4	0
Work With At-Risk Students	3	13	13	2	5	22	2	6	22	2	2	26
Approach to Students	20	5	4	22	2	5	25	5	0	26	2	2
The Bureaucracy	15	11	3	15	8	6	15	11	4	16	12	2
Admit Mistakes	5	10	14	2	13	14	5	3	12	10	8	12
Explanation of Teacher Success	17	8	4	14	9	6	17	7	6	11	12	7
Explanation of Student Success	6	14	9	6	16	7	8	10	12	7	14	9
Planning and Organization	3	6	20	3	12	14	4	9	17	1	14	15

Note: H = High, A = Average, L = Low.

Table 4
Analysis of Covariance on the Urban Teacher Selection Interview Post-Test N = 59

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between Groups	19.71	1	.83	0.37
Error		23.80	56	

Note: Not significantly different at $p < .05$.

Table 5
Individual Total Scores on the Pre and Post-Test of the Urban Teacher Selection Interview Professional Development School Student Interns

Subject	Pre-Test Total Score	Post-Test Total Score
1	38*	36
2	34	29
3	37	38*
4	34	35
5	34	37
6	23	25
7	41	35
8	37	35
9	30	32
10	42	37
11	32	23
12	31	38*
13	41*	45*
14	27	28
15	35	37
16	36	32
17	37	36
18	34	32
19	34	32
20	32	27
21	31	30
22	42*	44*
23	33	30
24	33	39*
25	28	22
26	34	28
27	32	28
28	32	35
29	40	34

Note: * represents a passing score.

Table 6
Individual Total Scores on the Pre- and Post-Test of the Urban Teacher Selection Interview Non-Professional Development School Student Interns

Subject	Pre-Test Total Score	Post-Test Total Score
1	36	27
2	33	34
3	36	42*
4	36	37
5	27	30
6	33	35
7	41*	37
8	38*	32
9	34	43
10	35	39
11	30	21
12	34	39*
13	42*	29
14	40*	40*
15	35	30
16	31	30
17	36	35
18	29	34
19	35	35
20	36	33
21	32	29
22	33	32
23	29	34
24	30	35
25	30	31
26	35	32
27	38*	33
28	36	29
29	35	33
30	40*	37

Note: * represents a passing score.

Discussion

Our findings suggest that a link between the Professional Development School reform effort and the development of effective urban teaching characteristics as measured by the Urban Teacher Selection Interview could not be established. However, this finding needs to be tempered by both the number of subjects involved, the length of the study, and the instrument used. This investigation is not suggesting that the Professional Development School effort is not a worthwhile endeavor. Other studies support the new trends that are taking place within this type of environment. This study does raise many questions about how colleges of education are preparing teachers for the urban environment, if at all.

The student interns had either a 14 week or 16 week experience in an urban school setting. This may not be a long enough time span to internalize the beliefs and commitment needed by urban teachers to be effective. More time and earlier, concentrated efforts in the field may be needed, as well as opportunities to develop a deep understanding of the forces that impact the urban learner. Community field experiences should also be considered for the student interns. This movement will provide the student interns with the opportunity to gain a better understanding of the dynamics impacting the urban environment, outside of the school setting. These community field experiences may also be fruitful in allowing the student interns to gain a better perspective of the handicapping conditions many children in poverty face. This reflects the growing acknowledgement that if urban schools are going to meet success, there has to be a meaningful partnership based on trust with the parents and community.

The frequency distributions for each of the 10 characteristics revealed that both groups of student interns experienced difficulty working with at-risk students. This is crucial since urban schools have a high population of students at-risk. More opportunities in the field may assist the student interns in understanding the characteristics, commonalities, and challenges of the urban learner. Furthermore, schools of education need to continue their efforts and search for additional ways for assisting the student interns with the skills, knowledge, and commitment for working with at-risk students.

Haberman's research highlights pre-dispositions and one's life experiences as the pivotal element to learning to work effectively in an urban setting. His research also supports the notion that not every teacher has the needed characteristics to be successful in that type of setting. Colleges of Education may want to consider and begin exploring practices and procedures for attracting teacher candidates who have the dispositions needed to teach in culturally diverse classrooms. Alternative certification programs and employing selection procedures are options that Colleges of Education can undertake to identify teacher candidates who hold potential for teaching effectively in urban schools.

Recommendations for Further Investigation

Further study is needed involving a larger population sample. Schwartz, (2000) reports that there are over 100 established Professional Development School sites, thus providing for the availability of a large population sample. The present study involved a limited number of participants. Future studies should be replicated on a larger scale to increase the generalizability of the findings.

Further consideration should be given to conducting this research as a longitudinal study. Professional Development School student interns can be followed through their observation, practicum, internship experience, and transition from student intern to first year professional educator. To do so, could enable the researcher to ascertain the impact of the Professional Development School reform effort on the long term development of effective urban teacher characteristics.

Future research should also be conducted to gain a better understanding of the predispositions, as identified by Haberman, required for teaching children in poverty. This investigation may prove insightful when selecting candidates for student teaching in an urban Professional Development School.

Teachers in urban schools are faced with a vast array of diverse situations and problems. These teachers need to be equipped with the necessary knowledge, experiences, and insight as they will face many challenges that are enigmatic and frustrating, to say the least. There is an expanding amount of literature to support the significant role a teacher serves in fostering student achievement and overall well-being (Haberman, 1995). Teachers play a momentous role in the intellectual, social, and emotional development of students. Students faced with the special circumstances of growing up in an urban area need effective teachers (Haberman, 1995). These teachers will demonstrate the best teaching practices, and go about their task with a high degree of commitment and enthusiasm. This is the first step

in improving the schooling for urban students. As Haberman (1995) reports ". . . having effective teachers is a matter of life and death" (p.1).

References

Adams, G. J., & Dial, M. (1993). Teacher survival: A cox regression model. *Education and Urban Society, 26*(1), 90-99.

Ascher, C. (1991). *Retaining good teachers in urban schools*. Eric Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, NY.

Baron, E., Rusnak, T., Brookhart, S. Burrett, K., & Whordley, D. (1992). *Collaborative urban education: Characteristics of successful urban teachers*. Paper presented at the AASA Convention, San Diego, CA.

Book, C. (1996). Professional development schools. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 194-210). New York: Macmillian.

Campell, R., Dempsey, A., Margolin, E., Mathewson, G. & Reichbach, E. (1983). *Basic competencies and characteristics of the successful urban teacher.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando, Florida.

Dill, V., & Stafford-Johnson, D. (2003). Can teachers be found and certified to teach students at risk? *The Haberman Educational Foundation: EducationNews. org* (http://www.haberman foundation.org).

Fleener, C. E. (1998). *A comparison of attrition rates of elementary teachers prepared through traditional undergraduate campus-based programs and elementary teachers prepared through centers for professional development and technology field-based programs by gender, ethnicity, and academic performance.* Unpublished Doctorial Dissertation, Texas A & M University, Commerce.

Fountain, C. A. (1999). *Collaborative agenda for change: Examining the impact of urban professional development schools on urban interns and beginning teachers*. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Phoenix, AZ.

Frieberg, H. J. (1996). From tourists to citizens in the classroom. *Educational Leadership, 54*(1), 32-36.

Guyton, E. (1994). *First year teaching experiences of early childhood urban teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, LA.

Haberman, M. (2003). Who benefits from failing urban school districts? An essay on equity and justice for diverse children in urban poverty. *The Haberman Educational Foundation: EducationNews.org* (http://www.haberman foundation.org)

Haberman, M. (1995). Star teachers of children in poverty. *Kappa Delta Pi.*

Haberman, M. (1996). Selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 747-760). New York: Macmillian.

Holmes Group, Inc. (The). (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools.* The Holmes Group, Inc.

Houston, W. R. (1999). Effects of collaboration on urban teacher education programs and professional development schools. In D. Byrd & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Research on professional development schools. Teacher education yearbook VII.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Meyerson, A. (2001). Forward. In S. Carter (Ed.), *No excuses: Lessons from 21 high-performing, high-poverty schools* (p. 1). Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.

Morris, V. G., & Nunnery, J. A. (1993). Teacher empowerment in a professional development school collaborative: Pilot assessment. (Tech. rep. No 931101).

NCATE (2001). Standards for Professional Development Schools. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Olson, L., & Jerald, C. D. (1998). Barriers to success. *Education Week, 17*, 9-23.

Olson, L., & Jerald, C. D. (1998). The urban challenge. *Education Week, 17*, 6.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement*. The University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.

Schwartz, W. (2000). *The impact of professional development schools on the education of urban students.* Eric Digest Number 156. Eric Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, NY.

Stafford, D., & Haberman, M. (2003). Can I be a star teacher of diverse children in poverty? *The Haberman Education Foundation: EducationNews.org* (http://www.haberman foundation.org).

Stallings, I. C. (1999). *An analysis of practicum student attitudes in urban professional development school and urban traditional school programs*. Unpublished Doctorial Dissertation, Old Dominion University.

Stallings, J. A. (1991). *Connecting preservice teacher education and inservice professional development: A professional development school.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, IL.

Teitel, L. (2001). *How professional development schools make a difference: A review of research.* Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Teitel, L. (1998). Professional development schools: A literature review. In M. Levine (Ed.), *Designing standards that work for professional development schools.* Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Zeichner, K., & Miller, M. (1997). Learning to teach in professional development schools. Levine, M. & Trachtman, R. (Eds.), *Making professional development schools work: Politics, practice and policy* (pp. 15–31). New York: Teachers College.