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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Almost everyone is able to recall from their school years a special teacher or two that stood out from all the rest. Often, those same teachers were liked and respected by other students, too. That feeling developed in spite of the fact that those teachers were the cause of some hard work on the part of the students. Though we made strong efforts for those teachers, we liked doing it. We felt good about such classes and what happened as a result of our efforts heightened that feeling. For me, it was Miss R who taught a subject in which I previously had no special talent or interest. Yet, there was something about what Miss R did in that class that made a difference for me, and others too. Maybe it was the smile. Or, perhaps it was the encouraging way she would talk to students. It may have been the really nice comments she would write on our papers. The truth is that it was all of that and more. Miss R helped students to believe in themselves and their ability.
Once, while reading self-concept literature, the memory of Miss R came to me. I realized then that she had a direct effect upon my own self-concept in that classroom. Though I did not think about it at the time, she must have had a good feeling about her own ability as a teacher. That led me to wonder about what her own self-concept might have been. From there it was a short step to the decision to investigate the relationship between teacher self-concept and student self-concept.

Though self-concept was not the purpose of their study, Pedersen et al. (1978) recognized the existence of those "special teachers." They investigated the achievements of 59 adults who had attended the same school in a poor neighborhood. In the study one bit of interesting information kept recurring. Those people who had Miss A as a first grade teacher were more likely to demonstrate IQ increases and got better grades in the elementary years. They completed more years of schooling and had experienced success as adults. Not a single one of Miss A's students that were interviewed were in the low level of success as defined in their study. This was true in spite of the fact that the school was in a poor neighborhood consisting of mostly minority families. It was also true in spite of the fact that the students were similar to other students in the school in intelligence and economic status. Pedersen et al. concluded that Miss A was the reason for the
difference. She believed her students could learn, regularly conveyed that message to them, and she became interested personally in her students. They further suggested that students taught by optimistic teachers who believed they could learn and gave them a solid foundation in the basic skills are in better position to achieve than are those students exposed to a teacher with a discouraging self-defeating outlook. That Miss A had a positive impact upon the self-concept of those students was implied in the study. That she had a positive self-concept herself, we can only guess about that. The study does provide empirical evidence that those "special teachers" do exist.

When we review the self-concept literature we find there has been a surprising number of studies and/or reviews that relate to the subject in one way or another. The empirical interest in self-concept has existed in differing degrees since prior to the turn of the century. The first such interest was reported by William James (1890) who believed the matter of "self" was of such importance that he devoted one entire chapter to it in his classic work *Principles of Psychology*.

Cooley (1902) was an early social psychologist and explained the development of one's view of the self as being greatly affected by the social environment in which the person existed. He described the process as the individual imagining how he is viewed by others. Thereby,
the person experienced a reflected or a "looking-glass self." Cooley believed the development of the self did not occur independently of other people. The reflection was what one thought others thought of them.

Though Dewey had some secondary interest in the self, there was only limited notice paid to the self over the next forty years.

As Purkey (1970) points out, in the earliest years of psychology there were different schools of thought and each one vied with the others for general acceptance of their theories. Apparently at that time, the acceptance of a particular belief implied the accompanying rejection of all others. The behaviorist camp became the dominant psychological theory from the time of Watson (mid 1920s) until shortly after mid-century. The behaviorists believed the need to be scientific demanded the study of observable phenomena, as opposed to such intangibles as self-concept. The result was important. Purkey, in an extensive review of the self literature, described it as being far-reaching. He said, "...when psychology abandoned the self, so did education" (Purkey, p. 4).

There were, however, notable exceptions to the lack of interest in the self. The first was Adler (1927) who believed the self to be a personalized subjective system that provided conscious meaning to the person's experiences. Adler's conscious personality was in contrast
to Freud who saw the inner person as unconsciously reacting to occurrences in the past.

A second exception was Mead (1934). His work examined the way in which the self reacted to the social environment. The child gradually developed into a social self through interactions with the social environment. He further believed the person developed multiple selves. As many selves existed for the person as there were social groups. The individual related to each group in a unique way and a unique self resulted. The idea of more than a singular self existing was not new. James (1890) spoke of more than one self, but suggested one should discover the one true self and stick with that (p. 91).

A third exception was Lewin (1935) who viewed the self as a stabilizing effect upon the personality. Still another exception, Goldstein (1939), studied the "self-actualizing" process of a healthy organism with that of a sick organism operating under pressure. The major contribution of these works was to provide a basis for the later work by Maslow.

With the passing of World War II the interest in self research took on new meaning. Perhaps it was a result of, or a reaction to, the human suffering experienced in the war. Perhaps it simply coincided with the gradual development of humanistic psychology. In any event, the era brought two important occurrences in the study of self.
Initially, it was with the work of Raimy (1948) that the study of the self began in earnest. His study grew out of the psychotherapy treatment of the self. His original research was related to self-references in counseling interviews. The most significant aspect of the work was that it marked the point at which the greatest empirical interest in self began. That can best be illustrated by citing Gergen (1971) who reported that there were almost 2,000 studies conducted on self and self-concept problems in the succeeding two decades following Raimy.

The other item of importance at this time was the work and subsequent findings of Lecky (1948). In a study made of student spelling, Lecky noted that some students managed to consistently do poorly regardless of the level of difficulty of the spelling words. The observations he made in the study led him to conclude that students were responding more in terms of how they thought they could spell as opposed to actual spelling abilities. After exposing the poor spellers to counselors who were to enhance student spelling confidence, the scores improved. From this study Lecky developed the rationale that unity and preservation of the system was of the highest importance in motivating the self. Therefore, the individual would make strong effort to act in a manner consistent with what he believed true about the self. This was the beginning of the theory of self-consistency.
The self-consistency theory of Prescott Lecky played an important role in the research and study that was to follow.

For instance, Golin (1954) extended the self-consistency theory to interpersonal relationships. The work gave evidence, at times, when one receives information about another that is not consistent with current beliefs that it is often misconstrued to maintain consistency with such beliefs. The statement may provide some clue as to how rumors develop. Rogers (1963, 1969) described the consistency of the self as "self-congruency." Erickson (1959) described the need for "inner sameness and continuity." Goffman (1959) concluded that people even play roles to maintain perceived consistency.

But was the self that Lecky described a result of relating to, and experiencing, a social environment? Jersild (1952) said it was. His view was the self became the individual's "inner world" that was formed by the person's total experiences. Thus, the self, according to Jersild, was a product of the social environment as Mead suggested; it was also affected by others as Cooley stated; and it was influenced by one's self beliefs as Lecky reported.

A consensus was developing that the social—other, and the self-belief that one held—played a large part in the development of the self-concept. Riesman (1952) described
the way in which the self responds to internal and external expectations. He called the two modes "inner directedness" and "other directedness." He declared it important to be able to distinguish between the two if one was to have an accurate self-understanding. Helper (1958) found a positive relationship between parental view of children and how the children viewed themselves. Goffman (1959) reported people change presentation of face. Like actors they stage their behavior. It would appear, the implication was people act as they think they should for themselves, others, and both. There was a growing amount of evidence that behavior was based upon self-belief and self-belief was based upon what others thought.

While this may describe how the self-concept develops, how does it relate to the classroom? Purkey (1970) believed there was a direct and a strong relationship.

A basic assumption of the theory of the self concept is that we behave according to our belief. If this assumption is true, then it follows that the teachers' beliefs about himself and his students are crucial factors in determining his effectiveness in the classroom... (p. 45)

Purkey also stated in his review of the self-concept literature, "...Next to the home, the school is the single most important force in shaping the child's self-concept" (p. 40). That is a strong statement, but it was made within the context of Purkey having made an extensive review of the literature on self-concept. When viewed
along with the foregoing information, there appears to be a rationale for a study of the effects of self-concept. In addition, Austin (1979) reported:

...When the teachers and other school personnel feel successful about education in their school, children also believe they can achieve and they do. (p. 14)

Moreover, the findings of Battle (1982); Beane, Lipka and Ludewig (1980); and Coplin (1969) indicate in obvious, and in subtle ways, school performance is influenced by self-concept. As a result, we see self-concept to be an important factor in student classroom performance. Further, there is also reason to believe a study of the relationship between teacher self-concept and student self-concept is supported.

**Statement of the Problem**

As the research for the study matured there were further indications that a relationship between teacher self-concept and student self-concept may exist. Jersild (1955) offered a clue as to how that might happen when he spoke of people seeking to understand meanings in their own lives and responding to others:

The person who can most fully accept himself is the one who can most fully accept others. The one who accepts himself seeks to know the meaning and to grasp the impact of what is happening in his own inner life, and he is responsive to what is happening to others... (p. 130)
It appears he is simply describing people who are caring in their relationships with others. There is not a level of extremity in the description. It is simply an element of care for others that is best achieved by people who are accepting of themselves. It seems logical that such people would have healthy self-concepts. That assumption is supported by Purkey (1970) and then related to teacher self-concept:

The way the evidence points is that each teacher needs to view himself with respect, liking, and acceptance. When teachers have essentially favorable attitudes toward themselves, they are in a much better position to build positive and realistic self-concepts in their students. (p. 46)

The statement by Purkey indicates that he believes a relationship exists between teacher self-concept and student self-concept.

Next, we find Brookover, Patterson and Thomas (1962), with some reservation, indicating if certain needs are met by the adult, improved achievement could occur:

...If self-concept is subject to modification, as theoretically postulated, and if modification in the images and expectations which others hold for the student takes place, then significant enhancement of achievement may be possible... (p. 75)

The reservation about modification may raise some question, but we find research evidence (Hansford and Hattie, 1982; Hummell and Cecil, 1984) that school performance is influenced by self-concept. Could anything other than a modification have occurred? It is not likely. While
modifications may be caused by all types of things, could we create a study to test whether teacher self-concept could influence student self-concept?

For the sake of developing a manageable study we needed to more clearly define and limit the scope of the study. Hamachek (1987) offered a description of self-concept that appeared to pull together our understandings of the term:

...self-concept refers to that particular cluster of ideas and attitudes we have about ourselves at any given moment. Another way of understanding it is to view self-concept as the organized cognitive structure of ourselves as individuals derived from the sum of all our experiences. From these experiences grow the ideas (concepts) of the kind of person we see ourselves as being. Self-concept, then, is our private mental image of ourselves, a collection of beliefs about the kind of person we are. (p. 10)

A private mental image of what we believe about ourselves, and the idea that it was formed from our total experiences, kept it consistent with the idea that it is affected by others. The description acknowledged that self-concept is what is believed at the moment about the self. Therefore, if a reason developed to change the self-concept the description recognized the possibility of it happening.

What we were seeking to discover through this study was an answer to the question, does the teacher's self-concept have some relationship with the student's self-concept? The context in which the problem should be tested would be the classroom. It was logical, then, to bring the broad term self-concept into a closer alignment with the context.
A way to do so was to confine the teacher self-concept and student self-concept to that context. As a result, we described one variable as teacher self-concept of teaching ability, and the other as student self-concept of academic ability. In that way, the variables were sufficiently narrowed to enable a test of both to be made within the same setting. The intent was to study more than one classroom and it was necessary to further limit the study. The classrooms that were to be studied were at the elementary level. This choice was made on the strength of the report by Hamachek (1987) that self-concept and school achievement appeared to be the most highly related between the years of seven to fifteen. It appeared the elementary level was the most appropriate level to study.

The hypothesis statement then became: Elementary students in the classes of teachers who have higher self-concepts of teaching ability will experience increases in their own self-concepts of academic ability.

The independent variable in the study was teacher self-concept of teaching ability. The dependent variable was student self-concept of academic ability.

The study was to be conducted by using an attitude inventory to establish and measure the independent variable. An attitude inventory was also used to establish and measure the dependent variable.
To more adequately test the hypothesis, a null hypothesis statement was developed. There is no difference in the self-concept of academic ability for elementary students, after one semester, in the classes of teachers who have higher self-concepts of teaching ability as opposed to students in the classes of teachers who had less positive self-concepts of teaching ability. This, then, became the focus of the study.

Purpose of the Study

The study purpose was to test the null hypothesis and thereby investigate the relationship between the two variables. The literature revealed other studies (Lewick, 1983; Markus and Smith, 1981; Shepard, 1979; and Shrauger and Patterson, 1976) that reported findings of moderate, but significant, positive relationship between what we see in others and how we feel about ourselves. These studies gave further indication that it was logical to test the two variables for possible relationship in elementary classrooms.

In light of the findings by West, Fish and Stevens, as reported by Hamachek, there remained some doubt as to what results the study may produce. West et al. (Hamachek, 1987) reported that global measures of self-concept tended not to be good indicators of achievement in specific subject areas. Implied was the idea that students may not
feel the same way about their ability in every subject. The point was recognized and understood from the outset of this study. We were not testing single subject self-concept, but the broader academic self-concept. The interest in a single subject was left for someone else to test.

In order to specifically define the concept that we were testing, we began with the detailed definition presented by Soares and Soares (1985) and the following was extrapolated from their lengthy definition:

- Self-concept cannot be observed, it is inferred, it is a construct.
- Self-concept is both subject and object, because it perceives the self and at the same time is perceived. It influences choices while being influenced by those choices.
- Self-concept is both structure and process, it is a part of the whole and is involved in the dynamics that the person experiences.
- Self-concept is marked by consistency but is multi-dimensional.
- Self-concept is both resource and value in that it becomes a resource of evaluation and thereby a valued object of worth.
- Self-concept can be preserved and enhanced and it becomes the frame of reference for evaluations. (p. 10)

They are saying it is a psychological construct that explains human inner direction for the self, in that it perceives and is perceived, is dynamically involved in personal experiences, is consistent but multi-dimensional, and is a source and reference frame for personal evaluations. A more concise definition is offered by Hamachek (1987), "...self-concept...the organized cognitive
structure of ourselves as individuals derived from the sum of all our experiences..." (p. 10). The sum of experiences statement recognized the dynamic aspect that comes through the social contacts. The input that comes from others would alter personal experiences and could thus alter the self-concept. It is consistent with what we have discovered in the literature.

For the purpose of clarity, the operational definition of teacher higher self-concept of teaching ability was a teacher score, on the Soares Self Perception Inventory (Self-Concept Teacher form), of 46 or higher. Such a score on this particular inventory would place the teacher in the sixth stanine or above.

The student scores were established by using the class mean scores on the Soares, Affective Perception Inventory, (Intermediate Student Self form) pre-test. A later comparison was then to be made with posttest scores.

Importance of the Study

As indicated earlier, the interest in studying self-concept began nearly 100 years ago and yet it seems there remains a great deal that we do not know about the construct. For example, Lecky (1948) was the pioneer in demonstrating that self-concept was related to school achievement. That was forty years ago. Yet, we find many contrary school practices that occur in spite of what seems
to be known about the self-concept. Purkey (1970) says, "All too often, schools are places where students face failure, rejection, and daily reminders of their limitations..." (p. 40). And then, "What these studies seem to indicate is that the image of school grows gradually less positive with time, and communicates a sense of personal inadequacy to many students..." (p. 42). Needless to say, that hardly seems to be appropriate as a description of the school role in developing the student self-concept.

It does appear appropriate to investigate the effect of teacher self-concept in the classroom in light of all that we have found and in view of the fact that Combs (1969) described the attitude of the teacher to be more important than techniques, practices, or materials.

While there have been numerous studies made of self-concept and achievement there has been little or no attempt to investigate the relationship between teacher higher self-concept of teaching ability and student self-concept of academic ability. Therefore, this study represents original research of what appears to be an important problem.

The work may produce information of value for use in preservice and inservice education of teachers. It is possible that it may contribute something of value to the body of knowledge regarding self-concept. The study may
also raise some additional questions that could direct future research efforts.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

This study tested the null hypothesis that there is no difference in student self-concept of academic ability regardless of whether or not students are taught by teachers who have higher or lower self-concept of teaching ability. To be able to fully address the question, we needed to know what the literature indicated about student academic self-concept and teacher self-concept of teaching ability. For a complete understanding it was also necessary to know how self-concept is measured, and what the beliefs and evidence are regarding the development of self-concept. As a result, the review of the literature is divided into the following six areas: Development of Self-Concept; Measurement of Self-Concept; Parent Influence; School Influence; Academic Self-Concept; and Teacher Self-Concept. The literature review systematically examines research and reports in each of the six areas.

Development of Self-Concept

It is clear that the development of self-concept for each individual begins very early. Within the first few
days and weeks there is a relationship between certain occurrences. The baby quickly comes to know that certain events occur together (Purkey, 1970), and when they cry specific needs will be attended. Through such crude, but effective communicating, the child calls for attention and has needs met. The child also further develops the ability to communicate and relate to other people in his or her social world. Attention, or lack of it, must convey an early understanding to the child of how important she/he is in the known social world.

White (1975), who studied infant behavior for seventeen years, described eight months to three years as the time of primary importance in the development of the individual. It is during this period that the child develops a sense of pleasure from mastering the environment. The pleasure increases as the feeling of competence develops. It comes to produce a satisfaction and results in a sense of intrinsic motivation. This sense of mastering the environment was supported by Sigel and Hooper (1968) who described the development of the self as a manifestation of the human need to determine constancies in a world of continual sensations.

It is still within the first few months that the child learns there is a "me" and a "not me." The first stage of that recognition occurs when the child learns she/he is separate from others; thus, the "existential self." It is
not possible to have a self-concept prior to that recognition according to Lewis and Brooks-Gunn (1979).

Since we cannot measure precisely what is occurring within the infant, no small amount of conjecturing occurs in regard to the development process, but it is logical to believe that the awareness of a self marks the beginning point in the development of a self-concept.

As the self-awareness develops, object awareness is occurring at the same time. Hamachek (1987) described two aspects of the latter development, "...infants learn that objects continue to exist even when the infants can't see or feel them any longer..." (p. 37). In this awareness of "object permanence" the child comes to know that mother exists even when she is not visible and that she will remain the same from one encounter to the next. The second aspect of object awareness is "object identity," which he describes as, "...the rattle is the same, the crib is the same object each time the infant is placed in it, and so on..." (p. 37). Object awareness is consistent with the Sigel and Hooper concept on "determining constancies." It is also a necessary prerequisite if the child is going to "master the environment" as White suggests.

The second stage of the self-development Lewis and Brooks-Gunn (1979) refer to as the "categorical self." In this stage the child begins to define self in terms of specific categories such as sex, size, color and skills.
For instance, between 18 and 24 months the child is able to recognize self in a mirror, name self in pictures, and look more at their own picture when there are others in the picture (Dickie and Strader, 1974; Gallup, 1979). The separation from others is established in this stage and the awareness of the individual uniqueness is beginning.

At approximately 2 1/2 years of age the child is able to make gender distinctions and can categorize self by sex (Thompson, 1975). Between the years of 3 and 5 the child begins to make age distinctions such as little or big child, parent or grandparent (Edwards and Lewis, 1979). The ability to discriminate and the contact with others in the child's social world carries the awareness forward and by age 4 or 5 the "categorical self" is well established (Hamachek, 1987, p. 38).

The child's evaluations of ability and worth have been developing throughout the awareness process and is shaped by the sum total of experiences in the social world. Purkey (1970) describes it as not instinctive but as a process of experiences (p. 30). Throughout these first five years the child has received an endless number of comments from those in the social world about what she/he can or cannot do. Thereby the self-worth is formed and constantly reinforced by the reflected appraisals that come from the social world (Schlenker, 1980). The greatest influence from others in the social world is without a
doubt that of the parents. The strong parent influence upon the child's self-view has been well established. Helper (1958) found a positive relationship between the parent's view of the child and the child's own self-view. Manis (1958) reported the self-regard of a child is closely associated with parent's reported level of regard for him. That a close relationship exists between parent view of child and the child's own self-view has consistently been supported (Davidson and Lang, 1960; Shaw and Dutton, 1965; Brookover et al., 1965; Meyers, 1966).

These studies and reports suggest the expectations of the parents are internalized by the child. The parents who are the first significant other in the life of the child are the greatest influence in the development of the self-concept. The social other effect, and what the child thinks they think, work interrelatedly to form the inner awareness. By age 5 the self-concept would appear to be well established. Maslow believed the inner nature was very fragile and could be easily changed.

This inner nature is not strong and overpowering and unmistakable like the instincts of animals. It is weak and delicate and subtle and easily overcome by habit, cultural pressure and wrong attitudes toward it. (Maslow, 1962, pp. 3-4)

Though change can still occur in the self-concept, the evidence would appear to indicate that it is much more strongly developed than the fragile delicate description
above. Soares and Soares offer a description that would be more widely accepted today.

...this concept of self is maintained by an intermittent schedule of reinforcement which then makes the self highly resistant to extinction. That organism is reinforced by others who are similar, others who are considered emotionally and cognitively important to the individual, others who are identification models of behavior, and by itself when choosing those behaviors which endorse the self as it has evolved... (Soares and Soares, 1985, p. 11)

Their description acknowledges the potential effect of others, but "resistant to extinction" indicates a far greater degree of strength.

The self-concept is strong, it is well established before the school years, it is greatly influenced by parents, and it is continually being reinforced by self and others.

Measurement of Self-Concept

Though there have been additional tests developed in the twenty years since Purkey's review of the self-concept literature, his observation is still accurate - there are two ways to measure self-concept—observation and self report (Purkey, 1970, p. 58). The evaluation of self-concept can be done by a trained observer or through accepting the results of a self-report. The shortcomings for both methods are easily recognized. In terms of the observation evaluation, it requires that a person trained
in the field of the study of personality does the evaluating. Even that does not preclude the possibility of the observer having limitations and biases that would affect the outcome (Purkey, p. 58). As to the self-report, the evaluation then rests upon what the individual is willing to share about him or herself.

Of the two methods that were available, it was clear that it would be virtually impossible to employ the observation method if multiple evaluations were needed at the same time in many different locations. So the observation method was not adaptable to the need in this study.

It was readily clear that the self-report was more practical for use in this study and would be used if the dependence of realistic self-reports could be established.

Rogers (1951) believed that self-reports basically provided valuable information about the individual. The statement could be made that the individual was always reporting about some aspect of the self anytime a test or form was completed. The difference between the two, though, is roughly equivalent to the difference between cognitive and affective beliefs. The self-report has to do with the person's innermost feelings and there is always the concern about how one looks. Allport (1955) believed the individual had a right to have his feelings believed and Strong and Feder (1961) stated that every self
evaluation statement offers a sample of the self-concept of the person reporting.

Nonetheless, it must be acknowledged that the self-report is only what someone is willing to reveal to someone else (Combs, Courson and Soper, 1963). Recognizing that to be the case, it also seemed reasonable that the self-report did offer a sample of the self-concept. They do reveal characteristics and are commonly used.

Purkey reports the major self-report inventories to be:

a) The Self-Esteem Inventory (SET), to be used with children 8 to 10, and developed by Coopersmith in 1967.

b) The Bledsoe Self Concept Scale (BSCS), to be used for students in grades three through eight, and developed by Bledsoe in 1967.

c) The Self-Appraisal Scale (SAS), used originally to test high achievers from a deprived background. It was developed by Davidson and Greenberg in 1967.

d) The How-I-See-Myself-Scale is used for elementary and secondary students and was developed by Gordon 1958-1967.

e) Q-Sort is a method rather than an instrument whereby self-reference statements are deposited along a continuum that best described his or her feelings. It was developed by Osgood and is
popularly used in a number of instruments (Purkey, 1970, pp. 61-61).

The semantical differential has come to be very commonly used as a means of self-reporting. The individual selects the descriptive level of an attitude trait that best describes his or her feelings. The instruments generally have 25 to 40 opposite statements and a selection is made from the four or five choices.

The particular advantage that we found with the Soares and Soares inventory was that we could use their instruments to facilitate self-report from teachers as well as students.

Parent Influence

We noted earlier that the single greatest influence coming from the social world of the child was that of the parent. It was of such importance that Purkey (1970) was led to conclude that the emotional climate of the family was of greater importance in the development of an enhanced self-concept that was economic or social factors (p. 36).

The crucial importance of the role of the parents was demonstrated by Brookover et al. (1965). They attempted to improve, by three methods, the scholastic achievement of 49 low achieving ninth graders over a period of nine months. They tried:
1. To enhance the academic expectations and the evaluations that parents had of student ability.

2. To introduce the student to an "expert" who directly communicated enhancing information about the student's ability.

3. To create a significant other in the form of a counselor whose high academic expectations and evaluations of the student might be internalized by the student.

Of all three methods, only the first produced the desired results. The belief that the role of the parent is crucial in influencing student self-concept was supported.

The influencing role of the parent in low student self-concept was a result of a lack of sufficient acceptance of the child and it influenced the development of low self-concept, low self-esteem and a low level of personal security (Kimball, 1953). Kimball described the lack of sufficient acceptance as the underlying condition in the development of the negative self feelings.

The child has a self-concept that is molded and formed through interpersonal relationships that begin in the home. Harry Stack Sullivan (1953), a neo-Freudian psychiatrist, advanced the interaction ideas of Mead and Cooley and is credited with the interpersonal theory of personality development. As we found earlier in the review, the child continuously experiences a never ending
flow of reflected appraisals. Coopersmith (1967) identified three important contributions that the parents could make to help a child value himself. They were: parental warmth, respectful treatment, and clearly defined limits. According to Coopersmith, the factors provide positive regard and affection for the child. The importance of this is clear when we know that once a child has acquired an idea about the self, it serves to edit all further incoming information and as a result future performance is influenced (Purkey, 1970, p. 12). Others agree that we develop a consolidated framework of beliefs about ourselves and we live and perform in accordance with those beliefs (Underwood and Moore, 1981).

There is evidence indicating that these formative young years are also the time that group consciousness and social prejudice develop (Raddke-Yarrow, Trager and Davis, 1949). The importance of the development was reported in a study that found black children and white children differed significantly in self ratings of intelligence (Gabbler and Gibby, 1967). We can begin to see why certain children begin school from a disadvantage point.

The socioeconomic status of parents is not a cause of either a positive or negative self-concept in a child.

...Rather, it would be more accurate to say that parents within certain SRS groupings have developed particular behavior patterns that are somewhat consistent with their educational backgrounds and occupations...
As a result, high status people

...are more likely to use the very skills they use in their jobs - reasoning, negotiation, positive reinforcement - and to emphasize self-reliance...

On the other hand, people at the low SES point on the continuum

...are more likely to reflect feelings of helplessness, low self-esteem and frustration, which, over time, their children adopt, through identification as their own feelings... (Hamachek, 1987, pp. 216-217)

Without ever intending to do so the low SES parent almost assures the same fate for the child.

In considering the influence that the parent has in the readiness of the student when he or she enters school, we find a pertinent study by Shaw and McCuen (1960). They reported in male underachievers the presence of a predisposition to underachieve was present before they entered school, and such a predisposition could not be ruled out for girls. Furthermore, there is evidence that a negative self-image, before the child enters school, may affect a later basic skill (Wattenberg and Clifford, 1964). In this study 128 beginning kindergarten students in two schools were tested for intelligence, self-concept, ego strength and reading ability. They were tested again as they finished the second grade and they found the early measures of self-concept and ego strength to be better predictors of reading ability than the intelligence measure.
A possible reason for this was identified in a study that found a high verbal ability was encouraged by intensive interaction between parent and child while number and spatial ability developed more from the physical environment (Bing, 1963). The parental influence consistently appears to be very important.

The home has a direct impact on the child's development of group consciousness and social prejudice. Raddke-Yarrow, Trager and Davis (1949) found that such attitudes were developed in the pre- and early school years.

It appears that if the parents do not help the child to develop a healthy self-concept that recognizes the self-worth, the results can be very negative. Purkey says that the result can be worse than a physical handicap (1970, p. 37).

Not only does the parent have an important influence on the youngster prior to beginning school, but it can continue through the school years. Brookover, Thomas and Patterson (1974) reported that almost all students tested, grades 7 through 12, reported parents as individuals significant to them. Over 90% of the students identified parents as being concerned about them.

An important influence appears to be the level of acceptance that the child perceives as coming from the parent. In a study of high school juniors and seniors, Hilliard and Roth (1969) found mothers of achievers to be
more accepting of their children than were the mothers of underachievers.

The influence of the parent in the forming of the self-concept is strong and it appears to be lasting if the acceptance remains. It is equally clear that the process begins very early and the parents are the most important factor throughout the developing process.

**School Influence**

It would be improper to conclude at this point that the self-concept of a child was established at home and would not be changed after that. It is clear in the literature that change can occur and the next important factor in the development of self-concept is the school. Purkey (1970) describes the role of the school as the single most important force, next only to the home, in shaping the child's self-concept. We shall see the role of the school is of no small importance in the process.

Unfortunately, the home and the school are not always mutually supportive of each other. Howsam points out:

Many lay citizens view education as important but do not attach comparable status to the role of the teacher. Speculating on the effects of low public teacher esteem, Cogan suggests two self-fulfilling prophecies. First, teachers will internalize a low opinion of their work; and, second, students who share the negative view of teachers expressed by their parents will learn less effectively than if their education had been conducted in an atmosphere of high esteem for teachers and schools... (Howsam, 1976, p. 79).
One might criticize the attitude that is being described, and yet we know the schools, or individuals within the schools, do things that influence such attitudes. The statement points out the need for positive school-home relationships. Nevertheless, we have looked at the role of parents and now turn attention to the school influence in the development of self-concept.

There are two ongoing themes that are consistently found throughout the literature. The first is that the development of self-concept begins very early and, secondly, what one comes to believe about the self is influenced by others. We shall see how the school influences that development.

Staines (1958) measured over twelve weeks the influence that teacher comments have upon student self-concept. The study controlled for age, intelligence, and socioeconomic level in two elementary classes. Teacher A attempted to help students see themselves as planning, purposeful, selective, responsible and accountable individuals. Teacher B used a traditional approach of great stress on correctness, emphasized passing exams and the seriousness of failure. Staines concluded that changes in self-concept do occur in the learning process, and the self must be recognized as important in the process. Even though the study only covered twelve weeks, students did have slightly
higher average improvement in standardized reading and number tests. So we find evidence as early as 1958 that the self-concept does change and the school can play an influencing role in the process.

Insofar as the school is concerned, does a student have just one single self-concept? The answer, of course not!, can be quickly given. For by now, it is clear that an individual views the self differently in different situations and the school is a continual flowing of different situations. That would be consistent with James' (1890) description of multiple self-views. Specifically, in the school setting the existence of three school related self-concepts were described by Shalverson, Huber, and Stanton (1976). They identified a general self-concept, an academic self-concept and a non-academic self-concept. However, that is still a broad categorization in view of the fact that later research provides evidence that there may be as many student views of self-concept as there are subjects for the students (Marsh, Parker and Jones, 1985).

While we recognize that point of view, we are more interested, at the moment, in ascertaining the manner in which the school influences the general area of self-concept.

Staines demonstrated that self-concept changes can occur, but how? Purkey (1970).suggests that it can only occur when the teacher becomes a "significant other" (p.
45) to the student. The importance of such a relationship was supported by other research. We dismiss or reject feedback from those we dislike or believe to be incompetent (Bergin, 1962). In addition, we find that we give more weight to the opinions of individuals that we believe to be important (Backman, Secord and Pierce, 1963). Thus, a significant other relationship would seem to be a factor in the influencing process. We are influenced by others, but primarily it is by others that we like or respect. Therefore, the teacher would need to be liked or respected by the student and then they become a significant other.

The other recurring theme, the development of the self-concept begins early in school, can be supported by the work of several different people. For instance, Lamy (1965) investigated the relationship between kindergarten students' self-perceptions and their respective reading in the first grade. The finding was that the self-perception was as good a predictor for reading as was intelligence. He suggested the self-perception may even be a causal factor in their first grade reading. Williams (1973) reported finding a high relationship between self-concept and achievement at the fourth grade. A similar finding at the sixth grade was reported by Piers and Harris (1964). The importance of a youngster getting a good start in the early school years would appear to be very important. The earlier the better would appear to be the case also. Bloom
(1964) stated that factors other than intelligence, that contribute to achievement, to a considerable extent are stabilized during the first three years of school. Early school success does appear to be crucial for the student.

No consensus exists in the literature as to which comes first—positive self-concept or success in school. For example, work by Weikart (1971), Kifer (1973), Revicky (1982) and Felson (1984) all concluded academic performance is influenced by self-concept. On the other hand, Shiffler, Lynch-Sauer, and Nadelman (1977) report finding evidence that positive self-concept precedes high achievement. Purkey (1970) concluded the best evidence so far tells us it is a two-way street. Hamachek (1987) described it as being mutually reinforcing. The best description may have been offered by Shiffler, Lynch-Sauer, and Nadelman (1977) who explained the process as a positive feedback loop. School success and positive self-concept can be an ongoing positive feedback process.

Rubin (1978) sampled nine to fifteen year olds and reported the relationship between self-esteem and achievement continues to increase in strength during this time. Other studies indicate the trend fades and then decreases by the time the youngster reaches high school age. O'Malley and Bachman (1979) reported educational success becomes less central to self-esteem during and after late high school years. Morse reported a decrease in
professed self-regard over the school years. Morse (1964) found 84% of the third graders in the study were proud of their work while only 53% of the eleventh graders reported the same feeling. Brookover et al. (1965) and Yamamoto, Thomas and Karnes (1969) reported similar findings. Brookover, LePere, Hamachek, Thomas and Erickson (1965) stated self-concept was found to be a significant factor in achievement at each grade level studied. Though it apparently fades in late high school years, a relationship between self-concept and school achievement does exist and can be documented.

The positive feedback loop can be further supported with the answers given when successful students were asked to describe themselves. They tended to rate themselves in positive ways and express high self-confidence, self-acceptance, feelings of adequacy and competence (Gownn, 1960; Hogan, 1974; Hummel and Cecil, 1984). Dyson (1967) suggested that just having successful experiences in school is more important than how the students are grouped for instruction.

We earlier found the belief in self that comes with positive self-view is an important factor in producing success (James, 1890; Lecky, 1945). Hamachek (1987) says the self-belief can produce courage which can result in hard work. The hard work would tend to offer greater assurance of success which simply reinforces the positive
self-concept. Yarworth and Gauthier (1978) found that high self-concept students took more risks and therefore had more chances to succeed. All of the interrelated factors above, i.e., self-belief, work, increased risk-taking and success apparently keep the positive feedback loop going.

As one might suspect, we also found all that occurs in schools, and for students, is not necessarily success. Deutsch (1963) pointed out; it is while some students are in the school setting that strong negative attitudes develop. Though we know there are people other than teachers influencing such attitudes, there is strong evidence that lack of success in school also plays a role. Eshell and Klein (1981) describe the characteristics of unsuccessful students as: feelings of uncertainty, feelings of inferiority, low self-regard, and self-derogatory attitudes. This is consistent with the research by Harding (1966) who found almost half of the dropouts being studied cited adverse experiences in school and negative self-feeling as reasons for leaving.

There have been a number of reported findings that underachievers tend to view themselves in negative ways (Goldberg, 1960; Shaw and Alves, 1963; Durr and Schmatz, 1964; Zimmerman and Allebrand, 1965; Carlton and Moore, 1966, 1968). In fact, O'Malley and Bachman (1977) found instances in which self-esteem improved after students dropped out of school. It goes without saying that those
students were not having successful experiences in school. While we may not be able to simply eliminate failure, certainly schools ought to be able to prevent students from experiencing what may be a negative feedback loop. Apparently the students in this category possess negative feelings which result in a lack of self-belief, work, risk-taking and a lack of success is the result.

What other factors may be involved in influencing the development of student self-concept? Probably the single most important thing that teachers could do, according to research, would be to hold high expectations (strong beliefs) that the student is capable of achieving.

In 1968, Rosenthal and Jacobsen conducted the first major study of a subject that has since come to be known as teacher expectancy research. They demonstrated that the expectations of teachers can influence student classroom performance. By artificially manipulating information given to teachers, the study created the possibility that certain students could be expected to become academic "spurters" during the year. After one year, those students who were expected to gain tended to show greater gains than did the other students. There was criticism of Rosenthal's research method and design (Thorndike, 1968; Snow, 1968; Gephart, 1970), but not of the findings. Similar expectancy studies and findings were reported by Keshock (1970), and Guttman and Bar-tel (1982). However, they also
artificially manipulated the data to create the expectation.

A slightly different method to create the expectation was employed by Seaver (1973). This research studied the influence of "natural teacher expectations," i.e., it involved twenty-seven elementary students who had older siblings precede them in school, by not more than three grades, and who had the same teacher. Seaver found teachers' expectations did make a difference. When the older sibling performance had been high, the high expectancy students scored higher than a control group on eight different measures of academic achievement. On the other hand, when the older sibling performance had been low, the low expectancy group scored lower than the control group on seven of the eight tests.

Braun (1976) reviewed over 85 studies related to teacher expectations and reported that variables such as name, ethnic background, sex, cumulative records, physical characteristics and intelligence tests tended to influence the expectations of students for better or worse. Other large-scale reviews of the research into teacher expectancy (Cooper and Good, 1983; Weinstein, 1982) supported the findings of teacher expectations being an important variable in the learning process.

In fact, Palardy (1969) demonstrated that if first grade teachers believed boys would achieve better in
reading, they did. Apparently, teachers convey encouraging messages when they hold high expectations of students, and they may not even be aware of it. Chaiken, Sigler and Derlega (1974) found that teachers anticipating superior performance used more positive non-verbal behaviors than did teachers with low expectations.

The positive non-verbal messages that high expectancy teachers send to the expected high performers would explain a finding reported by Brophy and Good (1970). The "highs" (the teacher expected high performers) seek out the teacher and initiate more interactions than "lows." It would appear that the teacher conveys to the student the understanding of acceptance and encouragement and thereby the teacher becomes a significant other to the student. Brophy and Good (1970) also report that teachers favored "highs" over "lows" in demanding and reinforcing quality performance. As a significant other they are in a better position to influence the youngster in the belief that they can achieve at a more demanding level. It is of interest to note that the same two researchers later made it clear that effects of teacher expectations were not universal. Not all teachers will be "Pygmalians" and not all students will be affected by their expectations (Good and Brophy, 1974). Teacher expectations are simply one of the factors that may influence a student’s success, and since that is a
part of the positive feedback loop, we are suggesting that it can be a part of the development of self-concept.

We know there is a positive relationship between student academic performance and the expectations of significant others (Clark, 1960). We also find evidence that says teacher feelings toward students correlate in a positive way with student self-perception (Davidson and Lang, 1960). Thus, we can accept the idea that teacher expectations may influence the development of student self-concept if the teacher is a significant other for the student.

Another way the teacher may influence the student was reported by Videbeck (1960). The finding: more positive self-ratings of speech skills occurred from students receiving positive evaluations by the teachers. Not surprisingly, we are hearing that what the teacher verbally says may also have an influence. Brophy (1981) described teacher praise as one effective reinforcer. McMillan (1976) said more learning occurs as a result of praise as opposed to criticism. McMillan also felt some transference value from one class to another may exist for praise.

We find the existence of a fine distinction that bears mentioning at this point. While it is a semantical difference, it appears to have relevance. Dinkmeyer and McKay (1982) state in working with youngsters it is better for adults to encourage rather than praise. They go on to
explain the two words are not synonymous. They take the position that you can properly encourage all students, but you can only praise high achievers. In *Webster's New World Dictionary* we find encourage defined as: "to give courage, hope, or confidence to; embolden; hearten; to give support to, be favorable to; foster; help." No one could disagree with that statement as being a desirable role for teachers to play in the classroom. The statement is not restrictive and therefore it could relate to all students. On the other hand, the definition of praise is: "...to commend the worth of; express approval or admiration of..." The fine difference is that we tend to apply the latter only when there has been high achievement or for winning. While it is on the surface only a semantical difference, it may in practice occur as Dinkmeyer and McKay suggest. We withhold praise except for a high achievement, but we can always be encouraging toward all youngsters.

That is precisely what Miss R was doing, in the descriptive offered in the first chapter. She was encouraging her students to do better work. There is research support which indicates encouragement given to students in the form of written comments can influence improved work (Page, 1958).

As was the case with teacher expectations, the qualifier must be added that encouragement provides no universal assurance of improved work. Leith and Davis
(1969) suggested introverts and extroverts will respond differently. Sechrest (1962) found a decline in the use of non-verbal techniques begins at about the third grade level. Ascione and Cole (1977) reported that high SBS students and high ability students will tend to show lesser response than low SBS and low ability students to praise designed to make them feel good about themselves. Their finding would appear to be contradictory of the positive feedback loop. That provides sufficient reason to state that encouragement is no more of a panacea than any other single factor.

What does remain, though; is that teachers can and should consistently encourage students by emphasizing the ability and skill that they possess (Hamachek, 1987). When students develop a belief in their competence, have an interest in learning, and are attentive, achievement can result (Kohlberg, LaCrosse and Ricks, 1972). It comes down to that self-belief which the teacher can encourage.

To summarize what we have found in the literature regarding the school's influence upon the development of self-concept, we can say that there are at least five major ways that the teacher may have an influence. First, the teacher must become a significant other to the student in order to have a positive influence. Secondly, it appears very clear that early school success is necessary to establish a foundation to build upon. Thirdly, the teacher
should hold high expectations for student achievement because they will convey non-verbal expectancy messages to the student. Fourth, the teacher should be consistently providing the student with encouragement, verbally and in written comments. Finally, when the latter two conditions exist, and the teacher is a significant other to the student, and the student has self-belief in the possibility of achievement due to earlier success, then the positive feedback loop is complete and high achievement is the result. It is obvious that the self-concept development is influenced in the school setting and the complexity of the pattern variables make it easier to see why it doesn't always end up with positive results, and the negative feedback loop develops.

Self-Concept of Academic Ability

Earlier it was noted that the more specifically self-concept is related to a subject area the greater predictability could be expected. While that point is acknowledged, we are confining the focus of this study to the area of academic self-concept. Though that remains a broad general category, it is measurable and is applicable to this study.

In reviewing the academic self-concept literature we find several major contributions from Brookover and his various associates. Brookover, Erickson and Joiner (1967)
reported that student perception of academic ability by significant others is associated with self-concept of academic ability. The influence of significant others that we found related to general self-concept is apparently also related in a similar way to academic self-concept. In an earlier report, Brookover, along with LePere, Hamachek, Thomas and Erickson (1965) found self-concept of academic ability and grade point average had a significant and positive relationship, and that it occurred at each grade level studied. They further found the correlation between self-concept of ability and grade point average to range from .48 to .63 and it fell below .50 only once and that was with boys at the twelfth grade level. Further, they reported the findings tended to support the theory that perceived evaluations were a necessary and sufficient condition for the development of a positive or high self-concept of ability. Self-concept of ability is influenced by others. Since we know that it occurs primarily with significant others, we see that teachers can directly influence the development of self-concept of academic ability. The last cited work by Brookover, LePere, Hamachek, Thomas, and Erickson (1965) had another finding that bears upon this subject. They reported self-concept of ability is necessary but not by itself sufficient for achievement. Of course, that is where the encouraging teacher comes into play. If that teacher is a significant
A basic assumption of the theory of the self-concept is that we behave according to our beliefs. If this assumption is true, then it follows that the teacher's beliefs about himself and his students are crucial factors in determining his effectiveness in the classroom... (p. 45).

We have found early (Lecky, 1945) and recent evidence (Underwood and Moore, 1981) that supports the contention that we behave in accordance with our beliefs. In addition, we have found many sources to support - what the teacher believes about the student is also important. Now we need to know specifically what the literature can reveal regarding teacher self-concept.

Over twenty years ago it was said, by none other than Carl Rogers (1965), that behavior changes occur primarily as a result of attitudinal characteristics of relationships. Further, Combs and Soper (1963) felt the crucial question in terms of the helper was the attitude of the helper and how he perceived himself. Combs brought the matter even closer to our concern when he stated that effective teachers, counselors, and priests can be distinguished from ineffective ones based upon attitudes about self and others. Combs (1969) even went so far as to say that the attitude of the teacher was at least as important as techniques, practices or materials. Combs left little doubt as to the importance he placed upon teacher attitude and self-concept.
There were two "self-monitoring" studies that appear to lend support to the notion that it could be important for the teacher to have a high self-concept. A twenty-five item self-monitoring inventory was developed by Mark Snyder in 1974 and he reported (1979) that high self-monitors are good people readers. The same conclusion was reached by Briggs, Cheek and Buss (1980). In other words, people need to be self-acceptive to view others objectively. Not only do they view them objectively, they are also more likely to be more accepting of others (Trent, 1954). To carry it a step further, Berger (1952) found a positive correlation between self-acceptance and acceptance of others.

Wylie (1974) reported that a high self-regard reflects a healthy personal adjustment. There is also a moderate but significant positive relationship finding reported between what we see in others and how we feel about ourselves (Shrauger and Patterson, 1976; Shepard, 1979; Markus and Smith, 1981; Lewick, 1983).

It is not surprising, then, that Purkey (1970) would conclude after his extensive review of the self-concept literature that teachers are in a better position to build positive self-concepts in students when they possess positive attitudes about themselves as teachers. He went on to describe the teacher self-attitude as the key to the process.
There are things that teachers can do to influence, in a positive way, the development of student self-concept. It appears to be logical to believe that teachers with higher self-concepts of teaching ability are in the best position to do so.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Method Overview

To test the null hypothesis, an experimental study was developed. Two groups, a high and a low teacher self-concept group, were created and the study compared the student self-concepts of academic ability in both groups. The high teacher self-concept group was composed of classes of teachers scoring above the mean on a self-inventory of teaching ability. The low teacher self-concept group was made up of the teachers with self-concepts of teaching ability below the mean. A pretest was used to establish the level of comparability for the two groups. After one semester the two groups were given a posttest for the purpose of comparison for any difference in student academic self-concept.

Due to the fact that the teacher identification process went through school district superintendents and building principals there was a large attrition of the potential sample before the teachers were ever reached. This produced a smaller sample number than was expected and also
resulted in the need to use a sample that was not randomly selected. This fact is therefore recognized as a weakness in the study, but the realization came too late to make any change in the process of sample selection. The end result was that the research became a quasi-experimental study.

Once contact was made by letter, the teacher was requested to participate in the study by completing a self-concept inventory. On the basis of the results of the inventory, the scores of the teachers were divided into two groups - the higher scores (above the mean) and the lower scores (below the mean). Thus, two groups were established by identifying the higher scores as the high scoring group and the lower scores became the low scoring group.

The pretest was administered at the beginning of the school year and the posttest at the end of the first semester. That enabled the two groups to receive the respective treatment over one semester. The high scoring group treatment then was - students received regular instruction from a teacher with a higher self-concept of teaching ability. The low scoring group treatment was regular instruction by teachers with lower self-concepts of teaching ability.

At the end of the semester the posttest was administered to the students to determine if any difference occurred between the high scoring and the low scoring
groups. An analysis was then made of the pre- and posttest data.

**Identification of High Scoring Self-Concept Teachers**

It is not an easy matter to identify high and low self-concept teachers. There are significant questions and issues that arise that make it difficult. For instance, the following questions are easily raised. At what point does high cease to be so and become low? Is there a high-low and a low-high? Exactly what is high and what is low? We found such questions to be difficult and not easily answered. However, it is necessary to at least consider the questions and issues as we attempt to develop a definition.

Is there an actual zero point above which all is high and below which all is low for everyone? It is not likely to be so. Soares and Soares (1985) point out that there can be no absolute neutral point, or "nothingness" (p. 11). It is not possible for a person to be completely neutral or devoid of either high or low self-concept. In addition, we earlier were able to conclude that an individual does not have one unitary self-concept about all aspects of life. People have multiple self-concepts that vary from time to time, place to place, and situation to situation. Therefore, what is high or low in any situation is highly relative for that person at that place and at that time.
What we can say, though, with certainty is that on self-concept inventories some scores are higher than others. If we can be assured that the inventory is in fact able to measure self-concept (a consideration that must yet be examined), then we are able to identify some persons as having higher scores and some lower than others. For that reason, we describe the high scoring and low scoring groups as having respectively higher and lower self-concepts of their teaching ability (as opposed to the more absolute high and low self-concept), and therefore define them as being the scores above and below the mean score on the inventory.

The inventories used to identify the teacher self-concept of teaching ability and measure the student self-concept of academic ability were both developed by Soares Associates.

The instrument used for the teacher identification was the Soares Self Perception Inventory, Form SCT (Self-Concept Teacher). The inventory is more commonly referred to as the Soares SPI. The scores of all teachers completing the SPI were ranked from highest to lowest and the mean (45.5) was established. The higher scores (46 and above) were the teachers of the classes in the high scoring group and the lower scores (45 and below) were the teachers of the classes in the low scoring group.

In checking the Soares normative group information, we find that they describe a moderate perception of self-
concept in this fashion:

In general, those scores falling between the fourth and sixth stanine indicate moderate perceptions. More specifically... A moderate Self-Concept shows that the individual (or group) sees the self as generally positive. The person may view himself/herself positively in all traits or positively in most traits but having a few negative traits... (Soares & Soares, 1985, p. 7)

They then present the Standardized Equivalents and the stanine information is indicated below along with an indication of how the teachers in this study compared with the norm group.

TABLE 1
High Scoring and Low Scoring Teachers Compared with Soares SPI Standardized Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanines</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
<th>High Scoring</th>
<th>Low Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+72 to +66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+65 to +60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+59 to +50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+49 to +45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+44 to +39</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+38 to +22</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+21 to +15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+14 to 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1 to -72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Soares, 1985, p. 65)

As indicated previously, we had a mean of 45.5 which meant that all of the scores in the high scoring group were in the sixth stanine or higher. Except for two scores of 45, all of the teachers in the low scoring group were in the fifth stanine or below.
Definition of Terms

For the sake of clarity and common understanding, the following definitions are presented.

Higher teacher self-concept of teaching ability or high scoring group is defined as teachers in this study who viewed themselves as having moderately positive conceptions of ability as teachers. While they may not report selves as being on the positive side of the bi-polar continuum for each inventory item, they generally tend to score on the positive side for most items. Operationally, they are defined as scoring 46 or higher on the Soares and Soares Self-Concept, Teacher Inventory which places them in the sixth stanine, or higher, according to the normative information provided by the test developer.

The term, lower teacher self-concept of teaching ability or low scoring group, is defined as teachers in the study who viewed themselves as having less positive conception (compared to the high scoring group) of teaching ability. There was a greater tendency for teachers in this group to report less positive or negative responses on the bi-polar continuum side of the items on the inventory. The operational definition will be that all teachers in the low scoring group scored no higher than 45 on the Soares and Soares Self-Concept, Teacher Inventory. This meant that 80% of the low scoring self-concept teachers scored below the sixth stanine.
Student self-concept of academic ability refers to the degree to which a student views himself/herself capable of achievement in school. It could be generally positive, generally negative, or it could be a combination and therefore differ by subject. While individual measures of student academic self-concept were developed on both the pre and posttest, they were not recorded individually. All student scores were summed together by respective class and a mean score was recorded for the class as a whole.

The attitude measurement instrument used with the teachers is referred to as the SPI which is an acronym for the Self Perception Inventory developed by Soares Associates of Trumbull, Connecticut. The specific form used was the Self-Concept, Teacher. The SPI provided data regarding teacher self-view of ability as a teacher, and it was from such data that the high scoring and low scoring teacher designations were determined. A part of the reasoning for selection of the SPI was that Soares had available specific forms to measure self-concepts of both teacher and student. The two instruments employed similar formats and pool of bi-polar adjectives as trait measurements. While that provided no guarantee, it did appear to build in a consistency of self-measurement for both teacher and student.

The student attitude measurement of academic ability was determined for the class as a whole by using the Soares
Affective Perception Inventory, or API. The form used was the API, Intermediate Level Student Self. This form was designed for measurement of student academic ability for grades four through eight.

**Instrument Validity and Reliability**

For the SPI, Self-Concept Teacher Form, Soares and Soares used a normative group with a total number of 828, and the reliability of the instrument was established by a test/retest over an eight week interval. The validity of the instrument was reported through content, concurrent, and predictive measurements.

There are two related factors that need to be mentioned. First, the SPI was used only once for measuring teacher self-concept and therefore no teacher retest was involved in the study. Secondly, the specific teacher self-concept involved in this study may not have been very well represented in the Soares normative groups. This study centered upon teachers in small cities in a rural setting while the Soares normative groups were reported as being urban and suburban. In addition, there were only 202 actual teachers (as opposed to student teachers and interns) reported in the normative group and 54 of those were from another country. However, there is present in the data an indicator that the normative group does reflect the teacher attitude in this study. The 45 teachers in the
norm group, from the suburban setting with ten years or more of teaching experience, had a mean score of 45.88. The mean for all teachers in this study was 45.5 which is similar to veteran suburban teachers of the normative group.

In terms of reliability, the SPI, Self-Concept Teacher Form had a coefficient of stability of .89 which indicates high stability and reliability for the inventory.

The content validity was rated by a pool of experts to be .55/ \( p < .01 \). This raises a question regarding who the experts were, how many there were, and what their qualifications were since content validity is a judgment arrived at through a logical determination rather than a quantitative measurement. We do know from the data that the inventory sought to measure bi-polar items in four different trait areas. The areas were sensitivity, competence, vibrancy and sociability. Of the total of 36 items, nine dealt with how sensitive the teacher viewed the self as being; ten items had the teacher rating competence; twelve dealt with ratings of vibrancy; and five were related to sociability. In the area of vibrancy, the teacher was rating self on the degree to which they believed they possessed such qualities as cheerfulness, consistency, enthusiasm, optimism and patience. We agreed with Soares that sensitivity to the needs of students, competence as a teacher, and vibrancy and sociability as a
human are reasonable measures by which teachers can be judged.

The concurrent validity for the SPI was established by comparing SPI scores with the ratings of competence given to interns. The coefficient that was reported was .46/ p < .01. While that could be an acceptable rating, the method of comparison is suspect. The usual procedure is to make a comparison with a previously established valid test. By using the ratings (certain to be somewhat subjective) given to interns, the comparison is not with a previously established valid test. While such a procedure would be acceptable if there were no established valid tests for comparison, it is questionable to report such a coefficient when there are many tests available for comparison. In fact, we find in one Soares source a coefficient rating with the MMPI to be .37 and reported as .55 in still another source, but with no significance level reported.

The predictive validity coefficient reported by Soares for the SPI was .48/ p < .01. However, this poses a problem. The comparison was - SPI scores and the prediction of on the job success presumably by interns, or student teachers. It would appear to be more logical to make the comparison with experienced teachers as opposed to aspiring teachers. We also found two predictive validity coefficients of .59 and .38, which appeared to have been
with the MMPI, but that was not clear. Regardless, there was no significance level reported.

The second instrument utilized in the study was the Soares Affective Perception Inventory (API), Student Self form. There was considerably less than an abundance of information provided regarding the normative information for the API. For instance, after a long search it was found that there were 207 students used to establish the norms. However, they do not provide any information regarding race, cultural setting, or even socioeconomic status of the students. There is data, though, regarding the stanine designation for the norming group and we find that our lowest class mean would fall in the fourth stanine and the highest class mean would fall in the seventh stanine. Thus, the student scores in our study would appear to be not much different from the scores of the normed students.

While certain other forms of the API were not highly reliable, the Student Self form had a reported reliability coefficient of .79 which is a respectable rating. Rulan's split half method was used to establish reliability on all of the API forms.

The convergent validity coefficient reported was .74 for the Student Self form. Soares Associates then present detailed information on discriminant validity (based upon clusterings of self-concept, student self and language arts
scores) and provide no information at all regarding content, concurrent or predictive validity. Thus it is necessary for us to state, though reliable, caution had to be used regarding the validity of the API Student Self Instrument.

Population Selection

In the State of Ohio, public school districts exist in one of three different forms. There are city districts which must contain a city as the name implies. There are local districts which are a part of a county school district. The third group is in between and they are exempted villages. The latter are no longer chartered as such.

Teachers at the intermediate elementary level in small city school districts in rural Ohio were chosen as the population to be sampled. For purposes of this study, city school districts are defined as rural when they are located in Ohio counties that have a county seat population of 15,000 or less, as of the 1980 census. It is in just such a setting (small rural cities) that much of the population of the mid-west can be found. As a result, many students are raised in this type of setting. It is the intent of this study to sample such a population because it is representative of the life in the mid-west, and specifically the State of Ohio.
Sample

The study began with a listing of all of the city school districts in the state that met the definition of rural Ohio, forty-one in all. One district was excluded since the researcher was employed in that school system.

School district superintendents of the population being studied were contacted by written letter during the summer of 1986 and requested to participate in the study. It was explained that the study had the potential of producing information that may be of interest to the school districts and, therefore, they might view the study with greater reason to participate.

Upon receiving a favorable response from superintendents, the elementary principals of the responding school districts were then contacted by letter. The letter provided instructions to the principals regarding the manner in which the intermediate elementary teachers were to take the self-concept inventory. The attitude inventory was taken by the teachers. When completed, the results were then returned to the researcher. The teachers were all from the intermediate level, third grade or above, and below seventh, and teaching in self-contained classrooms. They were invited to participate in a study that measured the influence of teacher self-concept of teaching ability upon student self-concept of academic ability.
It soon became clear that there were too many steps for the procedure to work efficiently. While forty school districts met the definition of rural city districts, only twenty responses were received. Ten superintendents agreed to participate in the study and ten declined. In the ten participating districts, a total of thirty-eight principals were contacted. At that point, a potential of 150 teachers still remained but a number of principals chose not to proceed with the survey. Fifty-one teachers did complete the survey and returned the survey along with the consent to participate forms. That provided a potential population of fifty-one intermediate teacher classrooms located in ten separate counties scattered around Ohio.

As the teacher surveys were being returned, it was evident that there would not be the expected 300 returns. Sixty of the highest SPI scores and sixty of the lowest scores were to be randomly selected from the 300 returns to provide the sample population. The researcher was faced with the dilemma of starting over or making the best of the situation. A restart would have meant waiting for another year until the next school year began. The latter of the options was chosen. The practical decision was made to proceed with the study by dividing the total into high scoring and low scoring groups based upon the Soares SPI scores. The mean Teacher SPI score was between 45 and 46 and that point established the higher and lower groups.
All fifty-one teachers were then mailed the student pretests and related material. The student material included the Soares Affective Perception Inventory, Student Self form (which measured student self-concept of academic ability), parental consent to participate form, and an explanation of the purpose of the study.

When the returns were received, the number was further reduced to a total of only twenty-three classrooms because twenty-eight teachers did not return the pretest. Two of the twenty-three teachers did not return the posttest.

**High Scoring Group**

The classes of the teachers that scored above the mean on the teacher Self-Perception Inventory were placed in the high scoring group. The teachers of this group had the higher scores on the inventory. There were 177 intermediate elementary students in this group.

**Low Scoring Group**

The classes of the teachers that scored below the mean on the Soares, SPI were placed in the low scoring group. The teachers of this group had the lower scores on the inventory. There were 159 students in these classes.
Treatment

The treatment in the high scoring group was that the students were taught by teachers who had the higher self-concept of teaching ability scores. The low scoring group was taught by teachers who had lower self-concept of teaching ability scores. At the end of the first semester, a posttest was given to the students of both groups.

Posttest

Again, the posttest was the Soares API. In the high scoring group, 166 students took the posttest. The loss of eleven students from the number who took the pretest is explainable as typical attrition of subjects. In the low scoring group, 157 students completed the posttest which was a loss of only two from the pretest number. The scores were tabulated and class mean scores were again established.

Human Subjects Concern

During the early part of the summer of 1986, we found that we had to have university approval of a study involving human subjects. Since the study involved the testing of human subjects, it was imperative that conditions be established, and followed, to preserve the anonymity and integrity of all people involved in the study. To receive university approval for the study, two
conditions were established by the Human Subjects Committee.

First, no person or place was identified by name in the study, nor was any such information to be passed on by the researcher to any other party.

Second, any person or persons could choose at any time not to participate in the study. Both conditions were fully acceptable to this researcher. No effort was made to persuade or coerce anyone to participate in the study and no persons or places were identified.

With these assurances, and the required use of university approved permission forms, approval was granted by the Human Subjects Research Committee to proceed with a study that involved human subjects.

Analysis

After collecting data from the pretest and posttest for both groups, an analysis was required to determine if a significant difference existed. The method used was an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). The ANCOVA was designed to be used in experimental studies where the samples are randomly selected. Use of the ANCOVA in other situations has some limitations because there is an artificial advantage for the group scoring the highest on the pretest and that can present misleading data (Gay, 1981, p. 324).
The ANCOVA was used, with that caution in mind, because of the need to adjust the posttest scores for the pretest difference. In addition, a second benefit existed in that the ANCOVA increases the power of the sample (Gay, p. 325). That became important in this study when the number of subjects (classes) dropped to only twenty-one.

The analysis of covariance procedure was applied to the collected data, and the probability level of \( p = .05 \) was selected for the testing of the hypothesis.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

In this chapter the analysis of data will be done by first reviewing the teacher scores and the range of these scores within the high scoring and low scoring groups. After the section on teacher scores, an examination will be made of the student pretest results and then the student posttest results, followed by a comparison of the two sets of scores. Finally, the significance of the scores will be discussed in the last section.

As the SPI and the API inventories were received from the teachers, they were scored and recorded by class. With only twenty-one teachers returning the posttest inventories, that left a high scoring group of eleven classes that were taught for one semester by teachers with higher self-concepts of teaching ability. It also left a group of ten classes in the low scoring group and the students in this group were taught by teachers with the lower self-concepts of teaching ability.
**Teacher Scores**

The twenty-one teachers, designated by a letter, are presented in Table 2 with their respective SPI scores, the number of teachers achieving that score, and placement in high scoring or low scoring groups is indicated. The high scoring group teachers had a high score of 68 and a low of 46 which resulted in a range of 22 points. When compared to the stanines developed by Soares, the range was from the low end of the sixth stanine (45) to the low end of the ninth stanine (which was 66). The teachers in the low scoring group had a high of 45 (two of them) and a low of 28, for a range of 17 points. The lower scores ranged from the bottom end of the sixth stanine to near midpoint in the fourth stanine when compared with Soares normative information.

**Pretest Results**

The second step in the testing process was to administer the Soares API to the students (with permission from parents) in the classes of the teachers. It was important that the pretest be taken as near to the beginning of the school year as possible to include the early teacher effect. Since teacher influence was being measured, it was important that the classes be as nearly alike as possible in terms of the influence of the teacher. When the pretest data was received, the student scores were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>SPI Scores</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F, E</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
determined and a class mean score established for each class in both groups. The teacher and respective student pretest class mean scores are presented in Table 3, and shown by high scoring and low scoring groups.

The range of pretest mean scores in the low scoring group was a low of 11.33 to a high of 30.91, a difference of 19.58. The pretest mean of all classes in the low scoring group was 21.1380. In the high scoring group the range of pretest mean scores was from 18.56 to 27.88 for a difference of 9.32. The high scoring group pretest mean was 22.5854 for a difference of 1.4474 when compared with the low scoring group mean. The range of scores for the higher group is well within the range of scores of the lower group and the high scoring group pretest mean is larger than the low scoring group mean. The difference between the scores of the two groups on the pretest was assessed through the application of an analysis of covariance which adjusts posttest scores for pretest differences.

In Table 4 a comparison is presented of the teacher SPI scores and respective class API mean scores. The comparison is made to determine if any pattern or relationship could be found between the teacher scores and class scores. If there is a pattern, it is beyond the ability of this researcher to discern it. But there were a couple of interesting items that emerged when the data were
### TABLE 3

Student Pretest Class Mean Scores on API

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Scoring Group</th>
<th>High Scoring Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPI Teacher Score</td>
<td>SPI Teacher Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>API Class Mean</td>
<td>API Class Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>SPI</th>
<th>Class Mean</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>SPI</th>
<th>Class Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.91</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.1380

22.5854
TABLE 4

High Scoring and Low Scoring Groups Ranked by Teacher SPI Scores and Corresponding Student Pretest API Class Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Scoring Group</th>
<th>SPI Score</th>
<th>API Score</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Class Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Scoring Group</th>
<th>SPI Score</th>
<th>API Score</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Class Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>30.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B    21.66
presented in this manner. First, both the highest and the lowest API class mean scores are found in the low scoring group. Secondly, the highest API mean score came from a class that was taught by the teacher who had the lowest score on the SPI Self-Concept as Teacher Inventory. The irony of that happening was a little amusing. It also gave rise to the logical question - What will be found in that class with the posttest scores?

Posttest Results

At the end of the first semester, student test material was sent to the participating teachers and a posttest was administered. The inventory used was again the Soares API. The inventories were scored and class mean scores were again calculated. In Table 5, the class mean scores from the student posttest are listed.

The posttest range of class mean scores for the low scoring group ran from a low of 13.29 to a high of 29.66, a difference of 16.37. Clearly, the low scoring group posttest scores were less scattered than were the pretest scores. The posttest mean score for the low scoring group was 20.5590 which, interestingly, was a decrease of .579 from the low scoring pretest mean. For the high scoring group, the posttest range was from 19.52 to 27.00, for a difference of 7.48. The posttest mean score for the high scoring group was 23.9654, an increase of 1.38 over the
### TABLE 5
Student Posttest Class Mean Scores on API

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Scoring Group</th>
<th>High Scoring Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Class Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>29.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>25.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>17.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20.5590</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.9654</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pretest. So, while the low scoring group mean actually decreased from pretest to posttest, the high scoring group mean increased. What remained to be determined, though, was the matter of whether the increase was a significant difference.

**Pre and Posttest Comparisons**

A quick comparison of the pre and post mean scores in Table 6 indicates eight classes in the high scoring group experienced an increase in mean scores and three had a decrease. In the low scoring group, four classes experienced an increase while six classes had a decrease in mean scores from pre to posttest. It is of interest to note that once again the lowest and the highest student scores appeared in the low scoring group. Not only that, but it was the same two classes. That is to say, the class with the lowest pretest score also had the lowest posttest score though there was an improvement of almost two points. And, again, the class with the highest pretest score also had the highest posttest score and that occurred in the class of the teacher with the lowest self-concept of teaching ability score. Though a drop of a little over one point occurred, the irony of the happening remains striking.

There is one further item of interest observable with a careful examination of Table 6. Three of the top four low
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Scoring Group</th>
<th>API Mean</th>
<th>Low Scoring Group</th>
<th>API Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPI</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>19.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>23.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>25.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>24.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>24.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>22.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>25.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scoring teachers had class gains from pretest to posttest. That resulted in a much clearer pattern of increased scores from pretest to posttest, at teacher score 43 and up. It is fascinating to consider what the results of the study might have been if the line between high scoring and low scoring had been placed between 42 and 43. The reason for dividing between 45 and 46 was due to the mean falling at that point. While that is valid, there may be an indicator here that to measure the full influence of high scoring self-concept teachers, it should be between 42 and 43.

Next, it is important to know something about the confidence level that can be placed in the findings. In Table 7, the comparison data between pretest and posttest means are presented.

Referring to figures for the standard error of the mean, the probability that there was a chance finding is not very great. In the low scoring group pretest, there is a 68% chance that another sample from the population would be within plus or minus 1.66 of the mean 21.1380. For the low scoring posttest, another sample would fall within plus or minus 1.50 of 22.5854 and be correct 68% of the time. For the high scoring group pretest and posttest, another sample would be within 1.03 and .64 of 11.5854 and 23.9654, respectively. The standard error indicates confidence in the findings because of relatively low standard error numbers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Stand. Deviat.</th>
<th>Stand. Small Mean</th>
<th>Stand. Large Mean</th>
<th>Stand. Error of Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Scoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.1380</td>
<td>5.2531</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>30.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.5590</td>
<td>4.7415</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>29.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Scoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.5854</td>
<td>3.4432</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>27.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9654</td>
<td>2.1355</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significance

Now for determination of significance. The analysis of covariance was applied to the data to take into account any differences that existed within the groups on the pretest. Table 8 presents the comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted treatments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td>4.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual error</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>138.94</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>173.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

The data reflect the adjusted posttest means for the pretest differences. In other words, the pretest effect has been statistically removed. The measure of variance is presented under the mean squares and it is 34.85 as compared with the error or within mean squares of 7.71. Is there a significant difference? Yes, there is. The F ratio of 4.51 is larger than the 4.41 figure found at the 1 and 18 entry point in the .05 probability table. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The higher teacher self-concepts of teaching ability was associated with higher student self-concept of academic ability scores.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

Findings

This study has produced further evidence that there was such a thing as self-concept. The study described it, compared it, and measured self-concept. However, that was to be expected based upon the existing evidence of self-concept that was found in the literature. The review revealed several detailed descriptions of the formation and development of self-concept by such people as White (1975) and Lewis and Brooks-Gunn (1979). There are descriptions and explanations of self-concept dating prior to the turn of the century, when James (1890) first defined the self. Current information (Hammachek, 1987) was found to be remarkably consistent with James and such other early authorities as Cooley (1902) who saw the person being affected by the social environment and the "looking glass self" resulted. The consistency continued through Mead (1934) who described a child developing as a social self and through interactions with the environment. With Raimy (1948) the empirical testing of the self began in earnest and more than 2,000 studies were conducted of the self and
self-concept problems in the next twenty years. One such empirical study was conducted by a contemporary (Lecky, 1948) who demonstrated that students would make strong efforts to act in a manner that was consistent with what they believed to be true about themselves. Brookover, LePere, Hamachek, Thomas and Erickson (1965) found self-concept was a significant factor in achievement. Thus, not only was there evidence that the self-concept existed, but it was clear from the literature that it influenced behavior.

It was also clear in the literature that the two most potent factors in the development of the self-concept was — first, the parents (Brookover et al., 1965) and then the school (Purkey, 1970). Both were found to be strong influences. As a result, there was reason to believe that some valuable data might be found in a study in which higher self-concept teacher influence was continued long enough to perhaps influence student self-concept.

This study found that the self-concept of student academic ability could be influenced in a positive direction by teachers with higher self-concepts of teaching ability. The finding in this study is consistent with the work of Staines (1958). In the Staines study, Teacher A attempted to help students see themselves as planning, purposeful, selective, responsible, and accountable. After twelve weeks the students had a slightly higher average
gain in standardized reading and number tests over the control group. The Staines study demonstrated that if a student felt good about his/her ability – achievement would follow. This study demonstrated that higher self-concept teachers could become Teacher A's.

The students in the high scoring group versus the low scoring group not only had a slightly higher gain, but after one semester it was found that there was a significant improvement in their academic self-concept and it was associated with higher teacher self-concept of teaching ability.

If the literature is correct regarding significant others, being accepting of students, early success, teacher expectations, and encouragement, then it would be reasonable to expect that the higher scoring group of teachers had a greater tendency to exhibit such characteristics. That is to say, based on the literature, the high scoring group (compared with the low scoring group) may have tended to: (a) be significant others to students, (b) be more accepting of students, (c) create more early opportunities for student success, (d) hold higher expectations for students, and (e) be more encouraging of students. Let's examine why this may be so.

First, it is believable that the high scoring teachers were more inclined to be significant others to their students because Purkey (1970) tells us that self-concept
change can only occur when the teacher becomes a significant other. It was also found (Bergin, 1962) that people dismiss or reject feedback from those that they dislike or believe to be incompetent. Backman, Secord and Pierce (1963) reported that people give more weight to the opinions of others they believe to be important. Since academic self-concept did change, it is reasonable to speculate that the significant other factor had some influence.

Next, the high scoring teachers may have been more accepting of their students. Hilliard and Roth (1969) found mothers of achievers to be more accepting of their children that were mothers of non-achievers. From the studies of Gowan (1960), Hogan (1974), and Hummel and Cecil (1984), self acceptance was one of the phrases that successful students used to describe themselves. If the teachers were perceived as being non-accepting, it is probable that the students would dismiss or reject (Bergin, 1962) their input. It, therefore, seems logical to speculate that the high scoring teachers were seen as being accepting by their students.

Third, it is believed that the high scoring group teachers created more opportunities for their students to have early success. The students in the high scoring group realized a gain in self-concept of academic ability and that would not have been predicted if they had been
experiencing failure. The mutual reinforcement of success and positive self-concept described by Hamachek (1987) apparently was at work in this study for the gain to be achieved by the high scoring group. Success does breed success (Shiffler, Lynch, Sauer, and Nadelman, 1977), and it is speculated that this phenomenon was at work in this study.

It is also probable that teacher expectations played an influencing role in the student gain. The work of the teacher expectancy researchers such as Rosenthal and Jacobs (1968), Kesheck (1970), and Seaver (1973) tell us clearly when the teacher expects a gain to occur, the chances of it happening are greatly increased. It is not likely that the high scoring group teachers were conveying negative expectations to the students in light of the gain achieved. Therefore, it is speculated that there was a greater tendency on the part of the high scoring teachers to have higher expectations than that of the low scoring teachers.

Also, it is believed that the high scoring group teachers more regularly sent encouraging messages to the students. Since the high scoring group students reported higher self-concepts of academic ability after one semester, and the low scoring group did not, it is probable that there was more encouragement within the high scoring group. Such a difference would not have occurred with negative messages regarding student ability coming from the
teachers. Hamachek (1987) says the encouragement by teachers should focus on student skills and abilities. It would appear that it was happening with the high scoring group. The significant difference between the two groups offers support for the speculation that the high scoring students did receive more encouragement.

Implications

What does this mean in terms of possible implications? First, it must be acknowledged that the study sampled only intermediate grades in small city school districts in rural Ohio. The study did not test anyone or anything in a large metropolitan area. The research did not study a remote Indian reservation, nor any other condition beyond the sample that had been defined. Therefore, the ability to generalize from the study has limitations. Nonetheless, it can be said that the findings are consistent with those of other researchers who did sample other conditions. For instance, Pederson et al. (1978) found that Miss A had a strong influence upon a number of students in a school located in a poor neighborhood consisting mostly of minority families. This study found that the high scoring group teachers may have had qualities that had a strong influence, too. A teacher can have a strong influence. Brookover and his colleagues conducted their study in an urban setting. They found self-concept of students made a
significant difference for students in an urban sample. This study found the self-concept of teachers to be associated with student self-concept in a non-urban sample. Coplin (1966) studied negro students and concluded that those who reported more positive self-concepts tended to have higher academic achievement. Self-concept apparently had no racial boundaries, nor is it limited by SES, or size of the community in which a person lives. Self-concept influence has been found over and over to be significant and this study found it to be so for intermediate elementary students in small city school districts in rural Ohio. It is reasonable to speculate that it would be a significant influence in practically any setting.

The next important implication is that there are indicators that seem to say students tend to respond in a positive way to teachers they perceive as possessing the qualities that enhance student self-concept. Based upon the literature of the field, it has been suggested that teachers with higher self-concepts of teaching ability will tend to be a significant other for students; they will tend to be more accepting of students; they will tend to create more opportunities for student success; they will tend to have higher expectations for their students; and they will tend to be more encouraging of their students. The speculation then is that all of those factors interrelate and the development of a positive feedback loop is a
greater possibility in the classes of teachers with higher self-concepts of teaching ability.

There is an implication in this study for individual teachers. There really is evidence that the teacher's attitude about his/her teaching ability can make a difference for some students. If a teacher is truly interested in continually developing better instructional skills, then the attitude they hold regarding their teaching ability needs to be regularly considered. The work of Lecky (1945) demonstrates that performance is determined primarily by how one thinks they can perform. Teachers need to guard against becoming cynical and developing negative attitudes because such attitudes will influence students. A regular self-concept inventory of teaching attitude could alert teachers to possible danger signs if it was individually viewed with reasonable objectivity.

There is still another implication from this study for teacher education programs. It is reasonable to suggest that one of the criterion used to determine admission to such programs should be a measurement of the applicant's self-concept. Note, it is said, "one of the criterion." It need not be weighted any heavier than any other factor, but Keefer's (1966) work indicates self-concept of ability is also a predictor of performance at the college level and
therefore a score of 43 or higher may be relevant to teacher education programs in light of this finding.

There are also implications in this study for teacher educators and school administrators who are responsible for teacher preservice and inservice training programs. It appears that it would be productive to seek ways to help teachers feel good about what they are doing. It might be done by stressing the five teacher qualities that tend to influence student self-concept.

Another implication that needs to be raised is what does this study say about teachers who do not have high self-concept of teaching ability. The study found an association not a causal relationship. Therefore, a lack of high teacher self-concept is one factor among many that determine effectiveness and, on the basis of this study, no negative connotations can be ascribed to it.

There are some thoughts that come to mind regarding further research. It is of interest to wonder what the results might have been if the study had fully implemented a random sample. It is interesting to speculate what difference it might have made. Or, what if the group division were to fall between 42 and 43. Such a study might produce interesting findings.

The study could be replicated in different settings and with specific SES conditions being tested. It is recognized that self-concept is not limited by some of the
normal barriers and it might be interesting to see the study replicated with a sample of disadvantaged or low SES students. Purkey (1970) offers some possibility that even greater significance might be uncovered in such a setting.

The final implication goes beyond teachers and the classroom. This study suggests that when people feel good about what they are doing, their effectiveness may be higher than people who do not. While that may seem to be stretching a point, the study produced some empirical evidence to support that position.

Conclusion

The study focused on the self-concept of academic ability because of an interest in the area and because of the promise that it may offer a finding of some value. It seems that the study did find something of value. Further proof was found to show that student self-concepts can be changed in the school setting and that teachers with higher self-concept of teaching ability can be associated with such a change. No other studies have examined the relationship between teacher and student self-concept. Therefore, this study represents an original piece of research.
Dear Mr. Berg:

I am conducting a research study of the effects of high teacher self-concept of teaching ability upon student self-concept of academic ability. The hypothesis that is being tested is that teachers with high self-concept of their teaching ability will tend to create high student self-concept of academic ability.

The study will be conducted in intermediate self-contained elementary classrooms in small city school districts in rural Ohio. Your school district is a part of that population. Therefore, I am requesting your approval to give a short attitude inventory (Soares SPI) to the teachers in your district that are in self-contained intermediate elementary classrooms. By that we mean, teachers above third grade and below seventh that are in self-contained classrooms. From the responses that are received 120 will be randomly selected to complete the study. The second part of the study will consist of students in selected classes taking a short attitude inventory (Soares API) at the
beginning of school and at the end of the first semester.

You may be assured that school districts by name will not be identified and the anonymity of all respondents, teacher and students, will be assured. The information that is collected from the study will not be used for any purpose other than to become a part of the data base for the study. You may also be assured that the total time required to participate in the study will be only a few minutes.

If you have any further questions please feel free to call me collect at either of the two numbers.

(614) 622-1901 office
(614) 622-9455 home

I believe the information that is derived from the study may be of benefit to those who work daily with teachers. Please return the enclosed Study Intent Form whether or not your district will participate in the study.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

John A. Berg
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University
Dear Principal:

I am writing to request your cooperation so that I may carry out a study of positive self-concepts in teachers. I will be testing the hypothesis that teachers with high self-concept of their teaching ability will tend to create high student self-concept of academic ability. Your superintendent has given permission for me to contact you.

Would you kindly give one of the enclosed packets to each of your teachers, in grades 4, 5 or 6, who are in self-contained classrooms. From all of the respondents, a number will be randomly selected and a similar survey will be given to their students.

No names of schools or individuals will be released at any time, and precautions will be taken to preserve anonymity of the respondents. The information gathered will be used for no purpose other than to develop a data bank for the study.

If you have any questions at all please feel free to call me collect at any of the numbers below.

(614) 622-1901 office
(614) 622-9455 home

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

John Berg
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University
College of Education
Instructions to Teacher

You are requested to become part of an educational research project that will attempt to measure the effect of teacher self-concept of teaching ability upon student self-concept of academic ability. We are testing the hypothesis that teachers with high self-concept of teaching ability will tend to create high student self-concept of academic ability.

The study will be conducted in intermediate elementary classrooms, that are self-contained, in small city school districts in rural Ohio. Approximately 120 teachers, and their classes, will be randomly selected to provide the data base for the study.

You are being asked to complete the attached consent form, and complete the enclosed attitude inventory, if you are willing to serve as a part of the study. A random selection process will determine the teachers who are involved in the second part of the study. Those teachers will be sent a Study Information Sheet, consent form and inventory forms for each student in their class.

The Study Information Sheet and consent form should be sent home with the students in the class. As near the beginning of school as possible, the teacher is requested to administer the attitude inventory to all students for which parent approval has been granted. The teacher is asked to keep a master list of the students that have taken the inventory so the same students can be given the post test at the end of the first semester. The inventory is short and will require only a few minutes to complete. The teacher would be requested to read the script and the inventory instructions to the students. The students would check the response that best described him/her. They would not write their names on the paper. It is also important to assure the students that their answers are for research purposes only and the teacher will not be checking their responses. Return all consent and inventory sheets (completed and non-completed) in the stamped, addressed envelope that is provided. A reminder, a post test will be given at the end of the second semester and the procedure will remain the same.
As you consider participating in the study you may be assured that at no time will the names of the participants be made public and the information collected will only be used to become part of the data bank for this study.

If any further information is needed, or any adjustment in the number of forms, please feel free to call me collect at the following numbers:

(614) 622-1901 office
(614) 622-9455 home

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

John A. Berg
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

P. 97-98 Self-Perception Inventory (T)

P. 104-105 Student Self
Teacher:

Enclosed is the material needed to give the Soares Self Perception Inventory to your students. There are sufficient copies of the Study Information Sheet and the Consent for Participation to send home with each of your students. There is also a Student Self inventory for each student. In addition, you will find enclosed a copy of the script to be used when the inventory is given to the students.

Once the Consent for Participation forms have been returned the Student Self should be given to the students.

Please return the consent forms and the inventories in the envelope provided.

Keep a list of the students who have participated in the study. We will give a post test to the same students at the end of the semester.

Thank you for your cooperation.

John Berg
Study Information Sheet

We are requesting your youngster's class to be a part of an educational research study. The study will be conducted in selected elementary classrooms across the State of Ohio. The purpose of the study is to conduct research of the effects that teachers may have upon student self-concept of academic ability. The study will be referred to as the Positive Teacher Study. The students will be asked to take an attitude inventory at the beginning of school and a follow-up inventory at the end of the first semester. The inventory will consist of twenty questions that ask the student to indicate which of the choices best describe him/her.

Participation of all students is voluntary. You can be assured that none of the names will be made public and none of the information derived from the study will be used for any purpose other than to provide an information base for the study.

The students will only be asked to take the attitude inventory and you may feel free to ask the teacher to review the questions before granting your permission. The inventory that will be used will be the Soares, Affective Perception Inventory, (Student Form - Student Self). The names of the students will not be recorded on the papers. The tests will then be collected by the teacher and returned to the researcher.

If you have any questions whatsoever, or if you feel any explanations should be made, please feel free to call me collect at either of the two numbers below:

(614) 622-1901 office
(614) 622-9455 home

Please indicate your agreement by signing the consent form as the Person Authorized to Consent.

Thank you.

John A. Berg
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

A Study of the Effects of Teacher Self-Concept of Teaching Ability Upon Student
Self Concept of Academic Ability

(Principal Investigator)

or his/her authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child). The information obtained from me (my child) will remain confidential unless I specifically agree otherwise by placing my initials here.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ____________________ Signed: ____________________ (Participant)

Signed: ____________________ Signed: ____________________ (Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative) (Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: ____________________

HS-027 (Rev. 12-87) -- To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.
Script to Use in Explaining the Study to Students

Before distributing the inventory to the students the teacher will say:

"We are going to spend some time now in looking at ourselves in certain ways. What we are giving you today will measure how you feel about yourself as a student. The people who have developed this study are interested in knowing what kind of a student you feel you are. So please put a check, or an X, in the space that best describes your feelings."

"This is not a test and the information does not come back to me. Therefore, your answers will not affect your grade in any way. The information is used only to find out more about people's feelings. You are not required to participate in this study. It is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time."

The teacher should then distribute the inventory, read the instructions at the top, and then say:

"Since this is not a test you will not need to put your name on the paper, but please put my name beside the grade space. That way they will know which class is which. At the top, on the right side, please mark whether you are a boy or girl."

"If you find a word you do not understand, you may ask what it means, as you go along."

"Work quickly. Lay your pencil down when you have finished."
The teacher should gather all of the papers. Make sure grade level and teacher name appears on each one. Attach a list (last name and first initial only) of all students who took the inventory. This is necessary only to assure consistency with the post test at the end of the semester.

Thank you and please thank the students.
With this note you will find sufficient copies of the Soares Student Self Inventory for your students to take the post test. Based upon the number of tests I received I am returning the same number. Please give the inventory only to the students who took the pre test. It is not necessary to have another permission slip completed.

I ask you to now give the survey to the students and to return in the enclosed envelope.

I am appreciative of your cooperation and assistance in the study and will send you a copy of the findings. Thank you.

John Berg
(614) 622-1901 office
(614) 622-9455 home
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