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Abstract

Poverty is a theme that pre-service teachers and social work candidates will encounter in a real way in both training and in their chosen careers. College students experience a glimpse of poverty during a poverty simulation based on actual poverty situations. The purpose of the poverty simulation is to allow pre-service teachers and social work candidates to gain a greater understanding of what it is like for those who live in poverty, and how the children and adults in this situation may have a different focus than their own. A survey is utilized to gather data providing insight into college students’ perceptions of poverty before and after participating in the poverty simulation, coursework, class discussions, and videos. Several characteristic factors are examined including gender, age, and ethnicity. Personal reflections indicate changes in attitudes and understanding.
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1. Introduction

Poverty is a way of life for many Americans. Pre-service teachers and social work candidates will both face students and clients in poverty situations, either in the classroom or at a social services institution. The following scenario expresses challenges that children and adults in poverty may experience.

Jasmine is a five-year-old child attending school for the first time in kindergarten. She has lived for five years in locations all over the aging, dilapidated section of a small town in rural America. She lives with her mother and three younger siblings; her mother has a drug habit which interferes with her ability to pay attention to her children. They frequently play unsupervised in their rundown neighborhoods. There is no routine to their lives and often they are not fed enough or regularly. There are no books in the house and the television runs all day long. Jasmine did not start speaking until she was two and one-half years old, and has an extremely limited vocabulary. She often pushes and bullies her siblings to get her way. She also bullies neighborhood children by hitting, pushing, and taking their belongings. Jasmine has a short attention span and is very active, getting into trouble with her mother and others in the neighborhood. Her mother yells at her often and hits her with a belt.

When Jasmine comes to school, it becomes apparent to her teacher that she lacks the social skills necessary to navigate the middle class based classroom. She does not understand taking turns, respecting others and their belongings, talking only when called upon, or talking softly. Her language delays interfere with her ability to learn the curriculum of kindergarten. In addition, her hyperactivity and inattention keep her from being able to pay attention and to remember what she has learned. Her mother does not respond to calls or notes home. Jasmine does not seem to have a support system.

Poverty follows her into her life. Poverty has followed her into the classroom.

At a southeastern university, pre-service teachers spend time in local classrooms during field experiences related to coursework. They often observe situations similar to the above scenario, but lack understanding of how to best handle the situation. Reading and learning about poverty situations in a college classroom does not necessarily translate to understanding the effects that poverty has on a five year old child in a classroom. Similarly, social work candidates experience college coursework that introduces poverty situations. They also spend time in field experiences that provide contact with poverty-stricken clients. They may deal with adults in situations similar to the one in the scenario. Few of these college students have experienced poverty themselves, and often cannot comprehend the mind frame of those living in poverty.

A County Extension Agent learned of the poverty simulation available through Missouri Association for Community Action (http://www.communityaction.org/Default.aspx). The state agency purchased the usage rights for the poverty simulation, and the county agent offered to present it to university students. The authors/college instructors decided to include it as partial course requirements for pre-service teachers and social work candidates. The poverty simulation allows pre-service teachers and social work candidates to gain a greater
understanding of what it is like for those who live in poverty, and to gain an awareness of the attitudes and actions of children and adults in poverty may exhibit. The three-hour poverty simulation allows college students a glimpse of what life is like for those actually living in poverty. Participants are grouped in a variety of family configurations, and act out different scenarios based on real-life situations. A fifteen-minute session represents one week, during which the participants live the life of their family members. Family member roles change weekly so that each person has the opportunity of being each family member and experiencing the challenges encountered. Few families survive the four-week simulation with electricity intact and avoiding eviction. A debriefing session wraps up the simulation. Participants are left with a different understanding of what life in poverty can be. Students are asked to complete a poverty simulation reflection or a journal entry based upon their experience at the poverty simulation.

2. Literature Review

Poverty is more than lack of money. According to Jensen (2009, p. 3), poverty is defined as “a chronic and debilitating condition that results from multiple adverse synergistic risk factors, and affects the mind, body, and soul. It is complex; it does not mean the same thing for all people.”

In the book, *Teaching with Poverty in Mind*, Jensen (2009) related that children in poverty have risk factors in the following areas: emotional and social challenges, acute and chronic stressors, cognitive lags, and health and safety issues. Ruby Payne (2005) identifies hidden rules that function in poverty, middle class, and wealth in the book, *A Framework for Understanding Poverty*. She articulated the differences in expectations and behavior and the potential misunderstandings that occur because of this disconnect between middle class expectations of behavior and the expectations of those living in poverty.

A New York Times article from January 10, 2010 stated that, “the South has become the first region in the country where more than half of public school students are poor” (Dewan, p. A20). New data indicate that poverty has increased in the past few years as a result of rising unemployment during the recession. Poverty has become more prevalent in classrooms across the nation—but particularly in the South. According to Jensen (2009), rural poverty is even more extreme than urban poverty, always running five percent more of the population than in urban settings.

Furthermore, The State of America’s Children 2010 Report stated that Black preschool children living in single-parent homes are the poorest. Hispanic and Black children have three times the chance to be poor as non-Hispanic, White children. The numbers of children in both rural and urban cities and states were studied, with the District of Columbia leading the list of poor children. Tennessee ranks tenth in the urban poor children ranking report, and seventh in the rural poor children ranking report.

Burt, Ortlieb, and Cheek (2009) conducted a study to investigate the attitudes and perceptions of students in four fourth-grade classes towards their teachers, two with Caucasian female teachers and two with African-American female teachers. All teachers had at least 20 years of
teaching experience. The school population is predominantly African-American, with 90% qualifying for free and reduced lunch. The study postulates that because of the persistent gap in reading achievement between Caucasian and African-American children, student perceptions of teacher attitudes have an impact on student achievement. Teacher expectations have an important impact on student achievement. Since 90% of public school teachers are middle-aged, Caucasian females, there are concerns with the dominant class teachers’ expectations relating to minority, poor students in relation to impact on reading dispositions and achievement. However, this study found that students felt positively towards their teachers and reading; the teacher’s race was not a consideration of these feelings.

Similarly, a study by Graybill (1997) suggested that minority students are not held to higher expectations; therefore, their achievement is lower. Teachers’ attitudes and expectations are very important in students’ success. Public schools are staffed predominantly with Caucasian females, who do not match the racial diversity of the student population.

Thomas-Richmond (2004) examined the effectiveness of a teacher education graduate course addressing the impact of poverty on teaching and learning. The author claimed that the course, entitled The Challenges of Poverty in Special Education, was very successful. Evidence supported the advocacy of specialized courses to prepare pre-service teachers for diverse school populations. The competencies rated as most valuable by the students included: promoting a community of learners through lessons; experiences receptive to cultural differences that are safe and supportive; and utilizing cultural diversity to impact student achievement and development.

Given these circumstances, the importance of teacher and social worker awareness of and sensitivity to students coming from poverty backgrounds cannot be overstated. Since most teacher and social work candidates typically come from non-poverty backgrounds, they have little experience with children coming from the context of poverty and the kinds of behavior and circumstances those children bring with them to the classroom and the streets (Jensen, 2009). Because most teachers come from the middle class and hold that perspective, poverty is often incomprehensible and the students or clients who come from poverty environment misunderstood (Payne, 2005). Payne also states that because teachers operate with the ‘hidden rules of middle class’ they often misinterpret the behaviors and attitudes associated with poverty.

2.1 Pre-Service Teachers

Poverty is not just about lack of money; poverty is about lack of resources that allow children and adults to access middle class society and its benefits (Payne, 2005). In order to remedy the problems that poverty brings to school classrooms, it is critical that pre-service teachers (those being trained to become teachers) gain an appreciation of the effects of poverty on their classrooms (Jensen, 2009). Pre-service teachers need the skills and strategies that address the multitude of problems that poverty brings to the classroom. Likewise, social work candidates need to address those same problems in the context of home and society. Not only are there overt consequences resulting from poverty appearing in the classroom and the streets, but underlying stressors associated with the lack of structure and routine and security
prevail in the young people’s lives. Teachers, social workers and school administrators deal with these consequences and the concomitant stressors each day.

Many risk factors perpetuate the challenges of children in poverty, including insufficient housing, lack of nutrition, and minimal health care (Edwards & Young, 1992). Pre-service teachers must be aware of and recognize these stressors in students within their classrooms. Edwards and Young (1992) suggested that experiences, family, home, and circumstances affect the cultural understandings that both students and teachers encounter upon entering the classroom, as teachers and students may have different backgrounds.

Typically, teacher candidates are white females who have limited contact with diverse cultures (Ahlquist, 1991; Brookhart & Freeman, 1992). Barry and Lechner (1995) conducted a study of pre-service teachers and found that they expect to have classrooms including diverse students; however, they are not confident of their abilities to deal with students and families from varied backgrounds. The authors suggest stronger teacher preparation courses to provide information and experiences so that pre-service teachers manage multicultural concerns in a professional manner. Children of poverty need teachers who see themselves as capable of making a difference in children’s lives. These teachers do not show helplessness; rather, they are able to teach at-risk students to succeed in school (Leland & Harste, 2005).

Additionally, Winfield (1986) identified two types of beliefs that teachers have for understanding student achievement, or lack of achievement that may relate to students from poverty. Winfield uses the term “tutor” for teachers who think it is their responsibility to improve student achievement for at risk students. The term “custodian” describes teachers who think that at-risk students cannot improve their skills and thus are provided busy work instead of meaningful instruction. Teacher candidates who do not understand the culture or background of his/her students may not have high expectations for culturally diverse students.

By design, pre-service teachers depend on and are greatly influenced by the supervising teacher (Morin, 1993). Homan and Pearson (1997) conducted a study of purposefully selected student teachers placed in secondary social studies classrooms. Six student teachers were selected, including the three who earned the highest scores on the Multiculture Perceptions Inventory, and the three who earned the lowest scores on the Multiculture Perceptions Inventory. The case study model was utilized, including interviews, document analyses, observations, scores on the Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument, and scores on the Multiculture Perceptions Inventory, created by Nahlen-Man y in 1994. Homan and Pearson (1997) found that four of the six student teachers exhibited positive attitudes. However, the majority did not have the skills and knowledge necessary to teach students from a culturally diverse background successfully, based on recommendations in the literature shown to lead to positive academic performance for culturally diverse students. Only one student teacher had both the attitude, skill, and knowledge expected to provide positive academic performance for culturally diverse students.

In the same vein, Grant and Koskela (1986) stated that cooperating teachers who understand and support cultural diversity and integrate learning style preferences are helpful to student
teachers. These findings came from the expectations that student teachers lack experience with students culturally different from themselves.

Immersion into other cultures allows pre-service teachers an opportunity to gain a greater understanding of student backgrounds (Follo et al. 2002). Field experiences, practica, and internships should be required for pre-service teachers, according to Clark et al (1996). These opportunities will allow pre-service teachers to recognize that students have diverse needs; dealing with these needs will provide a greater understanding of and knowledge to meet these needs (Barrett, 1993). Additionally, Burnette (1999) suggests that teachers share their high expectations for all students; keep students involved during lessons; and demand mastery. These instructional strategies are successful with diverse students.

2.2 Social Work Candidates

In an effort to gain an understanding of undergraduate students’ perceptions of the causes of poverty, Sun (2001) compared social work students’ perceptions of poverty causes with undergraduate non-social work students’ perceptions of poverty causes. Non-social work students were engineering, finance, business, accounting, and biology. Further, students were also identified by age, gender, and race. Sun (2001) found that social work students viewed the causes of poverty in a significantly different way than non-social work students. The study found that largely, social work students believed poverty was more of an environmental factor than an individual factor. Non-social work students believed environmental factors and individual factors were equally important. Additionally, female and male students perceived the causes of poverty in a significantly different way. Female social work students thought that poverty was more of an environmental factor than individual factor; and male social work students believed environmental factors and individual factors were equally important.

Vandsburger et al (2010) examined undergraduate students’ understandings of poverty during a research project that allowed students to experience a poverty simulation. One-hundred-and-one students represented five undergraduate majors in the College of Health and Human Services. Upon completion, survey results indicated student changes in their ability to evaluate situations, and their perceptions of the challenges of daily living for persons in poverty. However, students did not alter their beliefs on the causes of poverty. These results were true for all undergraduate majors, including social work.

Similarly, Schwartz and Robinson (1991) conducted a study of 119 undergraduate social work students, examining their perceptions of the causes of poverty. The study found that social work students’ attitudes often reflected those of their instructors and peers. Beginning social work students perceived poverty more as result of culture than individual deficits.

Given this disconnect between teacher/social work and student/client, it is vitally important that these professionals both examine their biases and broaden their perspectives. This need gave impetus to the injection of a poverty simulation into the training of teacher and social work candidates. To determine the effectiveness of this simulation in raising awareness of poverty issues in the lives of children and young people, a pre- and post- survey was developed to address awareness and biases. The Likert-Scale survey was based on a variety
of questions based on the authors’/instructors’ ideas of questions appropriate to the curriculum.

3. Methods and Procedures

The education and social work programs at a public university in the southeast have an initiative to expose their candidates to the context of poverty through a poverty simulation. At the beginning of the semester courses, students answer questions on a poverty survey requiring them to examine their perceptions of poverty. During the semester’s coursework, students learn about poverty, its causes and its effects. Class lectures, discussions, textbook readings, and videos provide additional information. Specifically, pre-service teachers examine the impact of poverty on students, and social work candidates examine the impact of poverty on client populations. The courses carry the requirement that candidates attend and participate in a three-hour poverty simulation. This poverty simulation is set up to mimic the day-to-day encounters of persons in poverty and experience the concomitant frustrations and challenges. The three-hour poverty simulation allows college students a glimpse of what life is like for those actually living in poverty. At the end of the semester, students answer questions on the same poverty survey requiring them to examine their perceptions of poverty after they have participated in the poverty simulation, class lectures, discussions, textbook readings, and videos addressing poverty. Specifically, changes in attitudes are reviewed.

As students arrive at the poverty simulation, they are guided to small groups of chairs that are set up to represent a “family.” Several different scenarios represent actual real-life situations: a single mother with 3 small children, living only on government assistance; an elderly couple who cannot afford to purchase both necessary prescriptions and food; or an unemployed father whose teen aged daughter is pregnant. A fifteen-minute session serves as a week’s time during which the participants live the life of their family members, looking for jobs, caring for children, dealing with illnesses, and regular life events. Throughout the following fifteen-minute sessions, family member roles change so that each person has the opportunity of being each family member. The frustrations of not being able to access agencies, not having enough money to pay necessities, and not giving in to the lure of “easy money” by selling drugs are soon evident as participants encounter several challenges. Many families are evicted from their homes; lights are shut off, children removed due to neglect. These and other events are discussed in the debriefing session held at the end of the scenario, leaving participants with a different view of what it could be like for those who live in poverty.

At the end of the simulation, candidates complete a reflection stating what they have learned from this experience, and how they can take what was learned in the simulation and apply it to their particular area. This qualitative data serves as another information source. Additionally, at the end of the course, a post-survey is given to see if there has been a change in attitudes and perceptions about poverty. The survey is based on general poverty attitudes, questions, and concerns that the authors/instructors had seen over time.

Student data were collected over a period of three consecutive semesters (n=304). Survey results were gathered by adding the total of the 12 poverty attitude questions to get an overall
score. Data were examined using Anova to determine significance. A mean score within the 12-24 range indicates a positive attitude toward poverty. A mean score from 25-60 indicates negative poverty attitudes. For the purpose of this study, a positive attitude toward poverty indicates that the participants exhibited a greater understanding of poverty characteristics.

4. Findings

When the completed poverty attitude surveys were examined, no significant differences were indicated between pre and post-survey scores. However, a post-survey trend reflected more positive attitudes toward people in poverty. These changes were evident after students attended the poverty simulation. The post-survey results showed that students’ attitudes moved in the direction of more positive perceptions, although no statistical significance was found. Table 1 illustrates the means.

Table 1. Pre and post-survey Overall: Comparison of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty attitudes total</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.81</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty attitudes total</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27.89</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA shows significant differences in Poverty Attitudes among the different age groups for the pre-survey group. The largest difference is shown between the thirty-five and over age group, and the eighteen to twenty-two year old age group. Poverty Attitudes for the pre-survey shows significant differences between age groups, $f (4,297) = 4.60, p < .01$; the means and standard deviations for the groups are as follows: 18-22 year olds $M = 30.67$, SD = 6.67; 23 – 25 year olds $M = 28.07$, SD = 6.37; 26-30 year olds $M = 29.69$, SD = 6.97; 31-35 year olds $M = 26.43$, SD = 6.90; Over 35 $M = 25.52$, SD = 8.73. This difference is not present in the post-test group. This information is shown in Table 2.
Table 2. Comparison of Means Based on Poverty Attitudes Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35+</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.52</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 308 participants who took the pre-survey; of these, 235 were female and 66 were male. For the post-survey there were 295 participants, 53 males and 233 females. No gender differences were found in the survey based on gender, as indicated in Table 3.
Table 3. Pre and Post-survey Gender: Descriptive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Male</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering ethnicity of participants, when numbers were combined, African Americans and Hispanics together seemed to have a more positive attitude toward poverty than Caucasians. The post-survey mean showed a change of attitude in understanding poverty characteristics. In comparing Caucasian attitudes towards poverty with the African American and Hispanics, it appears Caucasian participants had a more negative view of people in poverty than African American and Hispanics on both pre and post-surveys. However, Table 4 illustrates the post-survey trend toward more positive attitudes in all sub-groups.

Table 4. Pre and Post-survey Ethnicity: Comparison of Means Based on Poverty Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>30.08</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Eskimo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>28.11</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Eskimo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though a significant difference was not found in the data, anecdotal records from pre-service teachers and social work candidate reflections and journals indicate that participating in the poverty simulation changed their perception of poverty, and deepened
their understanding of the condition. Pre-service teachers completed a Poverty Simulation Reflection, and social work candidates completed a Journal. One example of a misconception is that many students thought that most poor people do not work. They learned that the perception is inaccurate, as many poor people work, but do not earn enough to escape poverty. Another misconception was that people on welfare get more benefits than regular, middle class people do, but in fact, they do not. For example, middle class families get income tax breaks and deduction for children and home ownership that amount to more than welfare payment.

One student reflects:

Wow! Going through the poverty simulation definitely changed my perspectives about poverty…my feelings toward the less fortunate were even shifted. My reactions taught me how easy it was to make bad choices for money. Many of these people are just desperate and probably hungry and have hungry families. It is so frustrating and stressful to live in poverty. (Anonymous undergraduate student).

Another student states:

I allowed myself to get lost in the symbolism of the experience, and came away with a great appreciation for the people who have to live like this every single day and feeling of guilt for taking everything for granted. Prior to this experience, I was quite biased towards people of poverty. I just assumed that their poor quality of life was their own fault. I see now that poverty is such a difficult that to live with, much less rise above. (Anonymous undergraduate student).

5. Conclusions and Discussion

Students seeking education certification and social work candidates are required to participate in the poverty simulation. Attending the simulation provides an opportunity for students to gain a greater understanding of the challenges that people in poverty encounter. Additionally, poverty is a topic discussed in classes for both majors. Although the college students experience the simulation, the poverty simulation survey data suggest that few of them are actually able to internalize the situation; many do not. These findings are in line with recent research that states while teachers have an overwhelming influence on children in poverty, there is a disconnect between the teacher and the students, mostly due to the teachers’ cultural background. The student demographics from this university are in line with research showing a majority of education majors are Caucasian, and the many students in poverty are not. The situation is parallel with social work candidates. College students need additional opportunities to work confidently with diverse populations.

It is important that college students take up the challenges of poverty in their chosen professions. Both education and social work majors address populations who came from poverty, and approaching these populations to maximize learning and living potentials is essential. In the future, education instructors will focus on pre-service teachers’ relationships with students from poverty in the field experience setting; social work instructors will focus on social work candidates’ relationships with clients from poverty in the public agency setting.
6. Recommendations for Future Research

Regarding further research, a trend was noted that older college students exhibited a more positive attitude towards persons in poverty. Further research of this sub-topic would provide opportunity to validate this trend. In order to see the long-range effects of the simulation, a follow up survey could be conducted at the end of the students’ college career. All three scores would be compared to see if the student had internalized the poverty attitudes and perhaps even reached the stage of true understanding of the issues and causes of poverty. These additional evaluations would make the research stronger and be more beneficial in guiding the revision of coursework to strengthen preservice teachers’ and social work candidates’ understanding of persons living in poverty. Furthermore, student perceptions based on ethnicity could be more fully developed and examined to ascertain trends in that area.
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Appendix 1

Survey Regarding Poverty

Rate your views on people living in poverty. Read each statement carefully, and then select
the best answer. Mark the answer on the answer sheet

Use the following scale to select the best answers to statements 1-12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Very few people in the United States are ever poor because there is open opportunity to succeed.

2. People become poor by making bad choices and/or having an immoral lifestyle.

3. Most people are poor because they do not work.

4. Most people are poor because they do not want to work.

5. Most of the poor get welfare, and so they are not poor anymore.

6. Most people on welfare are African-American.

7. Welfare encourages women to have illegitimate kids while we honest folks cannot afford more kids because of high taxes.

8. Our government does more for the poor than it does for the rest of us.

9. Folks on food stamps eat better than we do.

10. If people on welfare managed their money better, they would not be poor.

11. The welfare state does not work; instead of curing poverty, it makes the poor dependent on handouts.

12. Private organizations can do a better job providing help to the truly needy than the government can.

Statements 13-27: Fill in the circle by the best answer.

13. My encounters with the poor occurred first when I was:

   a. A child
   b. A youth
   c. An adult
   d. I was poor at some point in my life.
   e. I have not had encounters with the poor.

14. My encounters with the poor have mostly been at or in:

   a. Work/school
   b. Church
c. Leisure activity locations

d. Public spaces

e. Other

15. The duration of those encounters tended to be:

a. Brief

b. Extended

16. When I think of poor, the ethnicity that I picture is: (select one):

a. Whites

b. Blacks

c. Hispanics

d. Asians

17. When I think of the poor, the group that I picture is (select one) 

a. Men

b. Women

c. Children

d. Peers

18. I think about their (select one):

a. Income

b. Behavior/Social relations

c. Morals

d. Intelligence/Abilities

e. Knowledge

19. My sources of information about the poor have been:

a. Parents/Family

b. Friends/Coworkers

c. Teachers/Preachers

d. Preachers

e. Media

20. The general public views that poor as:
a. A group to avoid
b. A group to fear
c. A group to help
d. A group to embrace
e. A group like the rest of us

Please indicate the following demographic information:

21. Your year at college:
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Post-Bac

22. Your current age:
   a. 18-22
   b. 23-25
   c. 26-30
   d. 30-35
   e. 35+

23. Your ethnicity:
   a. Caucasian
   b. African-American
   c. Asian-Pacific Islander
   d. Hispanic
   e. Native American/Eskimo

24. Your gender:
   a. Male
   b. Female

25. Your major:
   a. Education: P-3
b. Education: K-6

c. Education: 4-8

d. Education: 7-12

e. Social Work

26. Please indicate the following

a. I have had Social Work 220.

b. I have not had Social Work 220.

c. I am currently taking Social Work 220.